

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—continuing on my time—I thank the Senator for the exemplary job he has done as manager of this bill. The bill has been before the Senate now for 7 weeks, more or less, and Senators have had ample opportunity to call up amendments and to speak at length thereon.

I also express appreciation to all Senators for the splendid cooperation they have given with respect to the working out of time agreements on amendments. But we have now reached the time when the majority of the Senate has spoken its will, and it is the sentiment of the majority of the Senate—as expressed by the vote on cloture—that the Senate expedite final action on this bill.

This is why the majority leader and the minority whip have spoken as they have today, urging Senators to call their amendments up, and proceed to final action on this bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield the floor.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield 30 minutes of my time, under the cloture rule, to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. He is very thoughtful.

#### RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in ac-

cordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, 1971, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 23, 1971:

##### NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MATERIALS POLICY

The following-named persons to be members of the National Commission on Materials Policy (new positions):

Lynton Keith Caldwell, of Indiana.  
Jerome L. Klaff, of Maryland.  
J. Hugh Liedtke, of Texas.  
Lee W. Minton, of Pennsylvania.  
Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland.  
Frederick Seitz, of New York.  
Maurice H. Stans, of New York.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 23, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*It is required of stewards that they be found faithful.*—I Corinthians 4: 2.

Our Father, we lift our hearts in gratitude to Thee for life and health and strength and for the opportunity of serving Thee as the representatives of our people on Capitol Hill. By Thy grace may we prove ourselves worthy of Thy gifts and use them for Thy glory and for the good of our country.

Illumine our minds, quicken our hearts, and guide our steps this day that we may add a bit to the sum of human justice and human happiness which will make life more worth living for us and for our people.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2036. An act for the relief of Miss Linda Ortega.

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

H.R. 7736. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the student loan and scholarship provisions of titles VII and VIII of such act.

The message also announced that the

Senate has passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 26. An act to revise the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah;

S. 27. An act to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Utah;

S. 30. An act to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah;

S. 108. An act for the relief of Kyung Jo Min and Kyung Sook Min;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Manuela C. Bonito;

S. 248. An act for the relief of William D. Pender;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Maria de Lourdes Moitoso Mota;

S. 504. An act for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.;

S. 624. An act for the relief of Fung Yut Ma, also known as Ma Yut Fung;

S. 654. An act for the relief of Frederick E. Keehn;

S. 751. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond crushing bort from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 752. An act to authorize the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile;

S. 753. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

S. 754. An act to authorize the disposal of silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 755. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile;

S. 756. An act to authorize the disposal of quartz crystals from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 757. An act to authorize the disposal of iridium from the national stockpile;

S. 758. An act to authorize the disposal of mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 759. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 760. An act to authorize the disposal of manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide from the national stockpile;

S. 761. An act to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile;

S. 762. An act to authorize the disposal of

chromium metal from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 763. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 765. An act to authorize the disposal of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 766. An act to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 767. An act to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 768. An act to authorize the disposal of chemical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 769. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 770. An act to authorize the disposal of columbium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 771. An act to authorize the disposal of selenium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 772. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile;

S. 775. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile;

S. 776. An act to authorize the disposal of abaca from the national stockpile;

S. 777. An act to authorize the disposal of sisal from the national stockpile;

S. 778. An act to authorize the disposal of kyanite-mullite from the national stockpile;

S. 1489. An act for the relief of Park Jung Ok;

S. 1545. An act to amend section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to remove certain limitations on the establishment of acreage allotments for other farms owned by persons whose farms have been acquired by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain;

S. 1670. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;

S. 1759. An act for the relief of Leonarda Buenaventura Ocariza and her daughter, Lucila B. Ocariza, and

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating July 20, 1971, as "National Moon Walk Day."

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A REPORT**

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Space Science, Veterans, and certain other independent agencies appropriation bill for 1972.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4724, MARITIME PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATION, 1972**

Mr. GARMATZ submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce:

**CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-300)**

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$2,370,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 2 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,  
THOMAS N. DOWNING,  
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
THOMAS M. PELLY,  
WILLIAM MAILLIARD,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RUSSELL B. LONG,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
ROBERT GRIFFIN,  
TED STEVENS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE**

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

**AMENDMENT NO. 1**

*House bill*

The House authorized to be appropriated \$2,200,000 for financial assistance to State marine schools.

*Senate amendment*

Senate Amendment No. 1 increased this amount by \$320,000, to \$2,520,000, with the intent that (a) \$150,000 would be used by the Secretary of Commerce for subsistence payments for students pursuant to section 6

of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958, and (b) \$170,000, to repair, recondition, equip as necessary, and maintain in good repair the vessel *Allegheny* for use as a training vessel by the Great Lakes Maritime Academy.

*Conference substitute*

The conference substitute authorizes to be appropriated \$2,370,000 for financial assistance to State marine schools. The managers determined that projections for future need and demand for graduates of State marine schools did not justify the additional \$150,000 authorized for subsistence payments for students.

**AMENDMENT NO. 2**

*House bill*

No comparable provision.

*Senate amendment*

Senate Amendment No. 2 adds a new section 2 to the bill which amends section 3 of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 1382) by inserting a new subsection (c) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce where, prior to enactment, he has not furnished a suitable training vessel to a State, to repair, recondition, equip as necessary and maintain in good repair a vessel which is owned by a State on the date of enactment of this new subsection for use as a training vessel for a maritime academy or college meeting the requirements of that Act.

*Conference substitute*

This is the same as the Senate amendment.

As used herein, "a vessel which is owned by a State" is to be construed to include a vessel owned by a State entity legally designated to receive assistance under the provisions of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958.

**TITLE OF THE BILL**

*Conference substitute*

This is the same as the Senate amendment to the title of the bill since it more accurately reflects the proposed text.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,  
THOMAS N. DOWNING,  
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
THOMAS M. PELLY,  
WILLIAM MAILLIARD,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RUSSELL B. LONG,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
ROBERT GRIFFIN,  
TED STEVENS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**JESUS MOVEMENT**

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to see evidence of a new stirring in the ranks of some of our young people. I believe it appropriate that notice be taken of it.

Many elders in America seem willing to label the entire generation under 25 as being dedicated to sex, drugs, and violence. This is not true, but in all too many individual instances there have been reasons to believe it.

But there have been recent reports of a new rebel movement—a trend toward something many of our young people are discovering—a guiding force which has helped lead a great many Americans and, indeed, America itself over many generations.

I refer to what is known as the Jesus movement.

There probably are some among us who scoff at the idea that young people,

particularly those with long hair, beards, and strange clothes, can experience an affinity for the Christian movement. But who better could truly live in concert with Him than young people, some of whom, perhaps, have the same kind of stirrings in their bosom as did Jesus of Nazareth nearly 2,000 years ago.

As a matter of fact, many of the young people of today, have something of the same concerns for mankind as did He. They want peace. They want everyone to be well fed, properly housed, cared for medically, and tranquil of mind and spirit.

If these recent reports are accurate—and I pray they are—thousands of young people now are turning to Him as the inspiration for their own lives. They should be encouraged to continue to find the way, for, if they do, they will emerge from their journey through youth as better adults, dedicated to the right things, and prepared to make a significant contribution to themselves, their Nation, their families, and our God.

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NEEDED ON THIS SUMMER'S LUNCH PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN**

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the time is growing short for some affirmative action by the Agriculture Department regarding this summer's lunch program for our Nation's cities. Last year under the special food service program my city of Chicago was able to provide nutritious lunches for over 50,000 needy youngsters per day. This year, only 7 days before the program is to begin, the Department has informed the administrators of the program that funds will be reduced by 90 percent to a total of \$185,000. This complete turnabout is even more shocking in light of the fact that during all prior negotiation representatives from the Department were giving assurances that the program would receive \$1.2 million.

During the House hearings on the National School Lunch Act, which passed the House on May 17, the administration failed to seek a significant extension of the summer nutrition program. And a spokesman for the Department of Agriculture appearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in June, stated that they had adequate funds to continue the program. So now, a week before the program is to begin, its very existence is threatened by this disastrous cut of nearly all its funds.

Mr. Speaker, this program may not seem overly significant to our national administration but for thousands of American children who too often must go without it, provides a much needed nutritious meal. And for our cities, it provides an essential cornerstone around which to build an effective and complete summer youth program.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. 158]

Abbutt	Davis, S.C.	McCulloch
Abourezk	Davis, Wis.	Madden
Ashbrog	Dent	Mathias, Calif.
Ashbrook	Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Donohue	Pepper
Baring	Edwards, La.	Pettis
Blatnik	Ford	Purcell
Cabell	William D.	Runnels
Celler	Gray	Scheuer
Chappell	Gubser	Taylor
Clark	Hanna	Whitten
Clausen	Hollfield	Winn
Don H.	Jarman	Wyatt
Clay	Long, La.	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ENTITLED "INVESTIGATION INTO ELECTRONIC BATTLEFIELD PROGRAM"

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-301) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Investigation Into Electronic Battlefield Program," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 9

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Armed Services two thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Electronic Battlefield Subcommittee of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee during the Ninety-first Congress, second session, entitled "Investigation Into Electronic Battlefield Program".*

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this concurrent resolution I think is very clear. It is simply to provide for the printing of 2,000 additional copies of these hearings. The Senate has asked that these additional hearings be supplied in view of the great public demand for them.

Mr. Speaker, I might make it clear to the Members that the subject matter of the hearings has earlier been declassified by the Department of Defense.

So, I would hope that the concurrent resolution is concurred in.

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

Mr. BRADEMAs. Of course.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I want to say right here and now that I further appreciate the gentleman's withholding the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 on May 19 at my request, after consultation with the lead-

ership. This is more than comity between Members. It is consideration for the people who are engaged in protecting the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, my sole concern was that there is unnecessary information made available to all sources insofar as military development, test and evaluation, or even basic research is concerned that has to do with the military security of our Armed Forces.

I have had correspondence from the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness of the other body, indeed, from various and other interested U.S. Senators; and I know now that having committed the printing of the first few following declassification, as my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) says, by the Pentagon authorities, that the damage has been done.

Probably the first  $\times$  number of hundreds of these reports found their way immediately into the offices of the military attachés of the foreign embassies represented in this land who least have the United States interest at heart, and so forth.

However, all of that is practically meaningless in view of the other and greater exposés of military security classification, that have come our way recently. I just see no use, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, of reporting the air-delivered seismic intrusion detector with all of its uses, of laying out the protected battle plan and means of using sensors of electronic nature for protecting bivouac areas, with the duties of the command functions written therein. However, this having been done, and having been printed, it would only, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration has pointed out, necessitate an additional conference and, indeed, as my own chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has pointed out, will throw back on the authorities in the Pentagon for having declassified too much too soon; whereas to the contrary oftentimes they seem to keep classified for some military purpose that which should not have been classified in the first place. This instance is certainly useless and adverse to our security.

Be that as it may, I shall no longer offer objection because it would just simply serve to create friction between the two bodies. The initial error in my opinion has been made, and it serves no further purpose to delay this printing.

Again I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) for his consideration.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because of the death of my father, I was unable to be present for rollcalls Nos. 134 and 144. Had I been present, I

would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 134, the conference report on S. 575, the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1971, and "yea" on rollcall No. 144, the Nedzi-Whalen amendment to the military procurement Authorization for fiscal year 1972.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. 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. 9270) making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

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. 9270) with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, we bring to you today a bill on which the committee has had extensive hearings. In my judgment, it is a basic bill to all the actions that the Congress will take not only this year but any other year.

Mr. Chairman, this morning in the Committee on Appropriations, we dealt with the appropriation bill for HUD, space, science, veterans. It carried public housing and many other things—NASA and all the rest. Yesterday, the House passed a bill providing for social security and many, many other things, all of which are written in terms of dollars. But the bill we bring to you today, really should have your attention and your thoughts because if you think the matter through, those dollars provided in those bills are just so much paper, unless this country continues to produce food, clothing and shelter, and unless we develop from the land the material things that you can buy with those dollars, then those dollars are meaningless.

You can pass all the food stamp bills in the world providing for the distribution of food stamps, but they are no good if when you go to the store there is no food there. This has reached serious proportions in this country primarily because we are a democracy—I like to think we were intended to be a representative republic—but because we are a democracy fewer and fewer people realize that life itself is tied to the land.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the total amount included in the bill is \$12,080,-596,050, including the first full year appropriation for the Environmental Protection Agency, an increase of \$2,531,-688,500 over 1971 and \$22,117,800 below the budget.

The bill is divided into four titles—a division which is designed to demonstrate the general impact of the appropriation. Such a division is by no means precise and is subject to individual interpretation because of the multiple benefits derived from the programs funded in this bill.

#### TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Title I includes the programs of benefit to agriculture, including restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of \$3,-613,331,000, totaling \$5,258,671,050. It includes many items which could be properly classified as environmental and consumer protection. For example, the Agricultural Research Service spends \$20 million on improved methods for controlling sedimentation, \$5 million on nutrition, \$18 million on quarantine inspection, and \$20 million on alternative means of pest control.

Further it includes \$50 million for the nutrition aides program in the Extension Service. Each of these programs and others serve interests far broader than agriculture.

#### TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Title II includes \$932,847,000 for the programs primarily directed to rural development, including the administrative funds for the Farm Credit Administration which is seeking broadened authorities to better serve rural America. It includes funds for the resource conservation and development program and water and waste disposal grants which in addition to proper rural development clearly reduce environmental degradation where they are administered.

#### TITLE III—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Title III includes \$3,126,055,000 for the programs primarily directed to improving our environment including the new Environmental Protection Agency and HUD water and sewer grants. It includes as well, the USDA programs long provided in this bill including the rural environmental assistance program which this committee has had to restore over 16 times. It also includes the watershed protection programs which through dams, stream channelization and sedimentation control do much to halt pollution at the headwaters.

#### TITLE IV—CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SERVICES

Title IV provides \$2,763,023,000 for Consumer Protection and Services. This chapter provides funds for the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission and the work of the Office of

Consumer Affairs. It includes \$3.5 billion for the food assistance programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which this Committee has strongly supported including the food stamp and special milk programs. This chapter also includes funds for the Department's consumer protection and regulatory activities including inspection of meat, poultry, and eggs.

#### ENLARGED COMMITTEE JURISDICTION MAKES SENSE

Last year the committee pointed out that the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture could well be referred to as a bill providing for public health and safety because it carried funds for inspection and protection of food. Or it might be termed a bill for the protection of the economy, since agriculture was the chief and largest customer of industry and labor. On the other hand, it could be called the committee for rural development since it carried funds for rural electricity, water and sewer grants and loans, and other programs for the development of rural areas. Or it might be called a bill providing for nutrition since it carried funds for the extension service nutrition aide program, the food stamp program and the child nutrition programs.

This was true of the bill as presented last year, and the same applies here. Since last year the jurisdiction of this subcommittee and the items found in this bill have been enlarged to include environmental and consumer protection, the amounts for which were described in the foregoing.

#### AGRICULTURE AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

The assignment of jurisdiction to this subcommittee was not the drastic move many people think. This bill includes \$9,360,451,050 for the Department of Agriculture, of which \$3,613,331,000 is for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$532,-805,000 is for environmental programs, and \$2,636,128,000 is for programs of direct benefit to consumers. This subcommittee more than 16 times has restored the agricultural conservation program, now called the rural environmental assistance program—under which more than 2 million retarding dams, plus thousands of miles of terraces, have been built throughout the United States, holding back millions of tons of pollution in the form of sediment at the upstream level. This subcommittee has known that you can't wait to clean up a stream at its mouth.

We have sponsored the national watershed protection and flood prevention programs and other Soil Conservation Service programs. Last year, we included language to enable the Soil Conservation Service to better cooperate with the Corps of Engineers in the foothill areas where the problem is a joint one.

The committee has regularly provided funds to the consumer for school lunch, school milk, and a myriad of other food programs. We have provided for consumer protection through meat inspection as well as for quality testing of foods, and funding for plans for economical and sanitary handling of foods. We sponsored the language which says the Secretary of Agriculture shall see that no one goes

hungry, even if all costs have to be paid. It is this committee which sponsored the change in wording in the law from "farm" to "rural" so as to increase eligibility for financing of homes in rural areas, resulting in millions of farm homes with modern conveniences.

This subcommittee has provided funds for rural water systems, for sewer and waste disposal in cities with a population under 5,500, and for rural electrification. Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget froze \$56 million in funds for grants which, under our subcommittee's sponsorship, the Congress provided to meet the tremendous need for rural water and waste disposal systems. To make bad matters worse, the average grant to rural areas has been approximately 23 percent, while in urban areas it has been close to 50 percent. This has limited the rural areas covered.

It was this committee which provided funds for radiation to control the screw-worm, and for other alternative, non-chemical means of controlling pests. Since 1964, we have increased research funds for these purposes from \$7.2 million to \$20 million—and, incidentally, \$1,000,000 of these funds have been frozen by the Office of Management and Budget for 1971.

#### SIGNIFICANT COMMITTEE ACTIONS

In the bill under consideration today the committee has:

Recognized the problems of rural development by adding \$200 million to the request for REA electrification loans, and capitalized the new telephone bank at \$30 million, the amount authorized; \$1 million has been added over the budget request for R.C. & D. and funds have been provided for the new Rural Development Service.

Recognized the problems of the environment by providing a \$134 million increase over 1971 for the Environmental Protection Agency, the budget request, and a total of \$2 billion, when authorized, for the waste disposal facilities grants.

The committee also restored the rural environmental assistance program for 1972 and \$195.5 million; added \$2,800,-000 for testing of non-chemical alternatives of pest control and for improved control methods compatible with our environmental needs for such pests as the gypsy moth.

The committee has significantly increased the budget request for both water and sewer grants programs. The 1972 program recommendations are \$100 million for the Farmers Home Administration and \$350 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Recognized the problems of consumer protection and nutrition by providing increased funds for school lunch, meat and poultry inspection as well as the new egg inspection bill.

The committee is providing the full estimate of over \$2 billion for the food stamp program and has again directed that the 147 counties which have applied but have not been admitted be given the benefits of the program.

The committee has provided the full budget estimate for the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission as well as \$450,000 for the

new Consumer Products Information Coordinating Center.

#### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

##### THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AGRICULTURE

From the beginning, man's progress—man's supply of the good things of life—has been measured by how much time he had left for other pursuits after he provided food, clothing, and shelter.

With that yardstick before us, we can see the reason for our high standard of living; for with only 5 percent of the American people on the farm, 95 percent of our people are freed from farm labor to do other things. This is the key to our well-being.

But, as a result, we find fewer and fewer young people studying for agriculture in our colleges. More and more young people are moving away from providing food and fiber; and more and more established agricultural producers are leaving their vocation—from 500,000 to 600,000 farmers and their families a year for the last 6 years—largely because farm income has dropped from 7.1 percent of investment in 1945-49 to 3.3 percent in 1970.

As a nation, our moves to solve the problems of rural America must begin with agriculture, because agriculture is the base on which rural America depends. For this reason, programs have been designed to protect farmers from drastic drops in farm prices—to assure that they at least get return of their costs.

USDA has programs which make available loans for electrification, telephones, equipment, and for addition of lands to uneconomic units.

To improve and maintain the land, held by the farmer in trust for future generations, programs have been designed through Government cost sharing and loans for land treatment and permanent preservation of marginal cropland and water conservation.

By any means of measurement these programs have been successful. As the Secretary of Agriculture pointed out in an article last year:

Farmers have freed manpower. If our agriculture had remained at the 1920 level of efficiency, we would today have 20 million workers in agriculture, instead of less than 5 million.

Farmers have freed income. Fifty years ago the basic requirements of life—food, clothing, and shelter—required about 80 percent of all consumer spending. Today these essentials take less than 65 percent.

Farmers have freed time. Fifty years ago the average work week in manufacturing was 51 hours and paid vacations were few. Many things have helped, but if food and fiber production still required a fourth of the work force, industrial workers would not now have a work week averaging below 41 hours.

Farmers have freed space. Fifty years ago 350 million acres of crops were required to provide for a nation of 107 million people. In recent years we have harvested fewer than 300 million acres. If farmers had remained at the 1920 level of efficiency, we would now need to harvest 500 to 550 million acres, even if we stopped exporting. The acres spared by farm efficiency have added immeasurably to soil and water protection, wild-

life, recreation, and land for new towns and open space.

On the other hand, American farmers today, with numbers reaching an all-time low of 5 percent of the population, have little weight in national elections and with the news media—notwithstanding the fact that they are the biggest market for industry and labor and the consumer's most economical and best supplier, and a key element to the prosperity of the Nation. Many seem to believe it is the agricultural producer who will be the loser if farm programs are reduced and funds needlessly cut off—in reality it will be the consumer he serves, along with industry and labor from which which he buys.

Several years ago we did a study of the contribution of the American farmer to our economy. At that time it was estimated that farm producers spent over \$30 billion a year for goods and services, and another \$12 billion a year for the same things other consumers buy. Each year, farm purchases include more than \$3.4 billion in new farm tractors and other farm vehicles, and another \$3.4 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance. Farmers use more petroleum than any other single industry, and 320 million pounds of rubber (about 9 percent of the total used in the United States, or enough to put tires on nearly 6,000,000 automobiles). They consume annually more than 28 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity and use more than 5 million tons of steel.

Agriculture is not something apart, but with expenditures and investment substituted for people, it is the first and major partner in the firm of agriculture, labor and industry.

##### THE PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

We must get across to all Americans that it is their supply of food and fiber that we deal with; and a sound economy must be based on sound agriculture—for that is the basis for all the rest.

Demands for the farmer's dollar are greater. Agricultural productivity has greatly increased, but as the price of industrial materials and labor have increased, the farmer's costs have spiraled. Increased costs cannot be passed on to the consumer, which in turn results in pressures for farmers to do something to maintain their relative position in the economy. The result has been that, as pointed out earlier, for the last 6 years an average of 500,000 to 600,000 have quit farming each year. Perhaps they can afford to quit. It is the rest of us who cannot afford to have them do so.

##### RURAL DEVELOPMENT

During the hearings one of the research agencies of the Department reported on a survey made in connection with their research in rural development. The study is directed at the dual problems of continued migration to urban areas and the planning necessary to accommodate about 100 million more people in the United States over the next 30 years. The results are really not surprising. They found that most rural youth aspire to prestige, white collar jobs, college education, and a middle class, urban way of life. The study also showed that, like the millions that preceded them into our cities, they look to

the city because of the limited opportunity to achieve their aspirations in the rural areas of today.

The fact is that these young people surveyed and others who reflect their attitudes must understand the Nation's commitment to a balanced growth between urban and rural areas. For this reason the committee has provided \$932,-847,000 for rural development. These funds will be directed to providing many of the fundamental requirements for rural development including electrification and telephone services, water and sewer systems, land and resource development, and rural housing.

A recent survey completed this year indicated that there are nearly 32,000 rural communities that require new or improved water systems and over 30,000 that require new or improved sewer systems. Funds in this bill provide a total of \$100 million for planning and development grants and \$300 million for insured loans. This is well in excess of the \$44 million and \$230 million allocated by the Office of Management and Budget for these purposes in fiscal year 1971.

Housing continues to be a major problem in rural areas. Over half of the Nation's substandard housing is located there, although only a little more than 30 percent of the population lives there. Major increases have been provided over the past several years. Loans in 1969 totaled \$500 million, \$800 million in 1970 and are estimated to total \$1.5 billion in 1971. The committee approves a program of \$1.6 billion for 1972. Authorization was recently provided to include towns of up to 10,000 population under the rural housing program.

Electrification and telephones is the third major program for which funds have been provided in this bill, including a \$545 million loan level to move to improved service and area coverage for electricity, and \$30 million for the capitalization of the new telephone bank, and funds for a loan level of \$125 million under the regular telephone program.

The committee has watched the growth of the resource conservation and development projects since its authorization in 1962. They are designed to bring together our knowledge of conservation and in cooperation with community leaders, improve the opportunities for jobs and other needs. Sixty-eight projects are now operating with promising results. The committee has added \$1 million over the budget to assure continued progress.

##### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The President's annual report on environmental quality stated:

Environment is not an abstract concern, or simply a matter of esthetics, or of personal taste—although it can and should involve these as well. Man is shaped to a great extent by his surroundings. Our physical nature, our mental health, our culture and institutions, our opportunities for challenge and fulfillment, our very survival—all of these are directly related to and affected by the environment in which we live. They depend upon the continued healthy functioning of the natural systems of the earth.

To this the committee would add the other side for man, in turn, has influenced or changed his environment.

From the beginning as man has gone along day by day, year by year, throughout history, he has continued to change and to build for himself a synthetic environment—his clothing, his housing, his food; in fact, almost everything about him is a result of converting natural elements into products of use to him.

Man departed from natural processes when he domesticated his first animal and later when he planted a seed.

#### THE FARMER'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The farmer has been an environmentalist since man first tilled the soil to grow his food. He deals with the mutual relationships of plants and animals and how they live and flourish in the essential elements of land and water, sunlight and air. He must protect those elements or he, and those dependent on him, will perish. Agriculture then is a natural custodian of the land. The farmer has faced the dual challenge of producing more food each year in a way that protects his resources and preserves his ability to produce. It is no accident that the average farmer produces food and fiber for 46 others and continues to expand this number.

Farm production per acre has increased about 3 percent a year due to such influences as the use of fertilizers, pesticides, better technology including soil and water conservation practices, and less use of lower grade land. One of these influences, the use of fertilizer, has been considered by some as a detriment to environmental quality. But if fertilizers were restricted as a pollution control, the results undoubtedly would be an increase in consumer prices for food, and an expansion of intensive agriculture into so-called marginal land with higher erosion with greater pollution, not less. Agricultural scientists find that a more proper direction would be toward achieving maximum production from the best soils, using the best combination of all practices. This may mean the use of higher rates of fertilizer appli-

cation by farmers on good land, with even greater attention to erosion and water control so that fertilizer residues will not leave agricultural fields but remain for their benefit.

Pesticides are a must if we are to control the pests that compete with man for survival. Through the use of these chemical materials, we have made progress in controlling the insects that carry such human diseases as yellow fever, malaria, typhus, and bubonic plague. We have also been making progress over the years—in lesser degree—in controlling agricultural pests and diseases, rather than accept the full impact of production, storage, and quality losses of food and fiber.

It is imperative that pesticides be used judiciously, with knowledge of total effects, because of the potential dangers to human health, livestock, fish, and wildlife, desirable plants, and beneficial insects. It is especially important to use persistent pesticides only when they are necessary in the best interests of mankind.

Another environmental problem of concern to agriculture is contamination by animal wastes. Concentrations of cattle and hogs raised in confinement have increased waste-disposal problems. The tremendous growth in the U.S. broiler industry has brought additional waste problems. Handling such wastes in such a way as to minimize the pollution to the environment is a goal we must accept, but with present technology it will be costly.

#### POLLUTION VERSUS CONVENIENCE

As soon as primitive man moved his fire into his cave, he became aware of air pollution in the form of smoke. He probably learned to reduce the smoke in his cave by careful placing and stoking. He then decided to accept some smoke in return for the warmth and convenience of the fire nearby. We have been weighing pollution against convenience ever since.

We all realize that if the people in our major cities would park their automobiles, trucks and buses for a month or moved out of town for an equal time, there is no doubt as to the progress we could make in restoring many of the antiquated and deplorable conditions we find in many sections. But automotive transportation, too, is an integral part of our way of life and part of our prosperity. Is it essential to our economy, and it will take a healthy economy to retain public support as we attempt to find the billions of dollars needed if we are to restore our environment for present and future generations.

The cost has been estimated at hundreds of billions of dollars.

Thus, in view of the costs and of the tremendous job ahead of us, with the need to keep our economy healthy and strong as we try to correct the mistakes of the past and to prevent them in the future, we believe it will be necessary to set up a system of priorities, putting those conditions that are downright dangerous ahead of those conditions which may be only undesirable.

It is not that we don't need both, but we need to establish some priority so as to deal with first things first.

Of course, we all know we must stop emptying raw sewage into our streams. We must provide for controlling industrial wastes and chemicals shown to be dangerous to health while we keep those things which, by providing protection from insects and diseases, pest and pesticide, have increased our life expectancy by 20 years since 1900 and our physical stature by about 2 inches since 1900.

Examples of reports required by the Environmental Protection Agency presented to the committee are so voluminous as to raise a serious question as to whether public support of needed environmental improvements can be retained.

The importance of agriculture in our environment can be seen from the following table:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR POLLUTION RESEARCH, EDUCATION, ABATEMENT, AND CONTROL PROGRAMS, 1963-72

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
<b>Agricultural Research Service:</b>										
Salaries and expenses:										
Research.....	30,262	35,733	52,124	54,982	58,043	59,432	59,646	65,203	71,979	80,730
Plant and animal disease and pest control.....	5,100	5,100	5,700	6,100	6,900	7,300	7,000	7,500	8,100	8,600
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	35,362	40,833	57,824	61,082	64,943	66,732	66,646	72,703	80,079	89,330
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses.....	5,155	6,315	9,487	11,177	11,405	11,070	12,400	12,800	13,570	14,670
<b>Extension Service:</b>										
Payments and expenses: Payments to States and Puerto Rico.....	4,252	4,725	5,675	6,615	7,575	8,525	9,000	9,243	9,656	9,944
Extension Service.....	248	275	325	385	425	475	500	557	644	656
Total, Extension Service.....	4,500	5,000	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	9,500	9,800	10,300	10,600
<b>Soil Conservation Service:</b>										
Conservation operations.....	33,600	34,800	37,100	39,100	40,100	41,800	48,700	54,378	56,297	62,570
Great Plains conservation program.....	9,500	10,700	11,700	12,600	14,800	13,200	13,900	11,984	12,424	12,719
Watershed works of improvement.....	10,600	11,700	12,100	12,700	13,600	13,300	13,900	14,342	16,781	22,841
Flood prevention.....	7,200	7,500	7,900	7,600	7,500	7,200	6,900	7,584	6,876	7,297
Resource conservation and development.....			150	340	900	1,300	2,200	3,543	4,794	5,900
Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	60,900	64,700	68,950	72,340	76,900	76,800	85,600	91,831	97,172	111,327
Economic Research Service.....			20	20	50	90	200	58	161	221
Consumer and Marketing Service.....	40	42	43	45	46	48	50	60	64	64
<b>Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:</b>										
Rural environmental assistance program.....	182,100	182,800	184,600	179,500	188,800	170,200	159,400	156,100	135,000	185,000
Emergency conservation program.....	3,700	5,800	12,100	5,700	3,600	7,900	11,100	12,000	11,500	10,000
Administrative expenses for REAP and ECM.....	28,225	27,354	29,301	29,482	32,298	37,596	33,000	32,900	33,700	35,800
Cropland adjustment program.....				7,100	500	600				
Cropland conversion program.....	2,000		1,900	200						
Appalachian land stabilization and conservation program.....					6,500		3,000	3,300		

Item	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Water bank program.....										1,000
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.....	216,025	215,954	227,901	221,982	231,698	216,296	206,500	204,300	180,200	231,800
Farmers Home Administration: <sup>2</sup>										
Water and sewer system loans:										
Direct.....	8,400	11,300	13,100	27,500	82,900	79,400	74,600	64,280	30,000	-----
Insured.....	5,500	22,100	37,000	84,700	92,000	83,100	90,000	81,751	130,000	300,000
Subtotal, water and sewer system loans.....	13,900	33,400	50,100	112,200	174,900	162,500	164,600	146,031	160,000	300,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants.....				18,600	22,500	23,000	24,000	42,981	40,000	98,000
Administrative expenses.....	209	501	752	1,962	2,961	2,783	2,500	3,300	3,800	5,500
Total, Farmers Home Administration.....	14,109	33,901	50,852	132,762	200,361	188,283	191,100	192,312	203,800	403,500
Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization.....	30,500	31,600	34,000	36,500	41,300	48,000	54,700	57,200	62,900	78,900
Total, pollution research, abatement, and control.....	366,591	398,345	455,077	542,908	634,703	616,319	626,696	641,064	648,246	940,412

<sup>1</sup> Committee recommendations.  
<sup>2</sup> Excludes loan repayments.

Note: Excludes activities transferred to Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to reorganization plan No. 3, dated Dec. 2 1970.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SERVICES

In addition to the environmental concerns, this committee has had its jurisdiction expanded in the area of consumer protection. The bill directly provides \$2,763,023,000 for this purpose. As noted earlier, these include the—

Food and Drug Administration which was originally established in the Department of Agriculture in 1929. Its principal areas include the safety, purity and wholesomeness of food; the safety and efficacy of drugs and therapeutic devices; and proper labeling, including warnings for safe use as well as honesty in packaging.

Federal Trade Commission where direct activities of benefit to consumers include investigating and correcting unfair or deceptive acts, including false and misleading advertising, that are injurious to the consumer. Less direct, though of equal importance to the consumer, are the Commission's activities to maintain competition by investigating unfair trade restraints and monopolistic practices.

Office of Consumer Affairs which is the President's arm in attempting to assure that consumers interests are fully considered in the farflung operations of the Federal Government. One of the activities sponsored by the Consumers Affairs Office is the Consumer Product Information Coordinating Center presently located in the General Services Administration to provide consumers with as much Federal buying information as possible.

As with the environmental programs, the work of these agencies is highly interrelated. The interests of consumers are strongly represented in the programs of the Department of Agriculture as well. In recognition of this fact the activities of the Consumer and Marketing Service and the Food and Nutrition Service have been included in this title.

AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Department of Agriculture engages in many direct and indirect activities of significant benefit to the consumers. These activities totaled \$281.6 million for fiscal year 1970 including:

Research studies on minimizing pesticide residues in livestock and crops; studies on the nutrition, quality and human metabolism of food; research on plant and animal diseases of danger to man such as salmonella, milk allergens and aflatoxins; and the study of methods to reduce deterioration and spoilage in marketing. In 1970, \$43,015,000 was spent on these activities.

Control and eradication of diseases such as brucellosis and tuberculosis as well as pest control activities at ports. Agriculture funds totaling \$49,162,000 were spent in 1970 for these activities.

Meat and poultry inspection to assure the consumer a wholesome supply of these products. This year the Department will provide a similar type of inspection for egg products.

In addition, inspection grading and standardization services are provided to facilitate marketing of foods, largely paid for by industry fees. About \$165 million was spent on these activities in 1970.

Food and nutrition programs are of direct benefit to consumers by encouraging improved nutrition through school lunches, food stamps, and commodity distribution activities. In addition, USDA administers a number of programs such as soil conservation, and marketing activities which in the long run benefit consumers by reducing the costs of producing and marketing food.

FOOD PRICES AND THE FARMER

All of us are consumers. We, as consumers, have been hit by the fact that what we buy costs more. It seems that we are earning more with less to show for it. In a word: "Inflation".

Even with this inflation the cost of food represents only 16 percent of the total income spent. As was stated earlier, it is this statistic that truly represents our standard of living, for the 84 percent is now available for other things we buy. Imagine what you would lose from your living standard if you had to spend twice that amount for food.

NUTRITION

The record of the Department of Agriculture, made possible by the actions of the Congress and this committee, is long and strong in the support of nutrition and cost of production research, research on marketing, and support of other agriculture programs designed to improve the basic structure of agriculture and to enable the American people to spend only 16 percent of their income on food. This remarkable achievement is largely unnoticed. The committee is proud of another part of this record which is also unnoticed. That is this committee's direct support of food aid.

Two years ago the Congress adopted, at the committee's request, some important new language for the section 32 appropriation. This language provided \$45 million for a number of expanded and innovative programs. The amount was

raised to \$100 million in the 1970 budget. The language follows:

(4) In addition to other amounts provided in this act, not more than \$100 million (including not to exceed \$2 million for State administrative expenses) for (a) child feeding programs and nutritional programs authorized by law in the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, as amended, (b) additional direct distribution or other programs, without regard to whether such area is under the food stamp program or a system of direct distribution, to provide, in the immediate vicinity of their place of permanent residence, either directly or through a State or local welfare agency, an adequate diet to other needy children and low-income persons determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be suffering, through no fault of their own, from general and continued hunger resulting from insufficient food, and (c) milk for children in nonprofit high schools and schools of lower levels, child-care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

This language has meant valuable flexibility in meeting many emerging needs for our food programs. In 1971 a total of \$169 million was allocated to supplement the funds available from the child nutrition direct appropriation to provide for:

(1) Special cash assistance which provides schools with a higher rate of cash reimbursement for serving free or reduced-price lunches to needy children;

(2) Serving school breakfasts to children in schools that draw attendance from low-income areas and those in which a substantial portion of the children must travel long distances; and

(3) Equipment necessary for serving these lunches and breakfasts.

The primary emphasis in the use of these funds is the extension of program benefits to needy children.

The \$2 million designated for State administrative expenses is allotted to the States on the basis of detailed plans and justification of need for supervising and giving technical assistance to local school districts for additional activities undertaken by them to reach more needy children with lunch and breakfast programs.

A special experimental program authorizing free food stamps to persons with little or no income was started in March 1969, in Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., with \$5,000 of these funds. Free food stamps for very low income persons have since become permanent law.

The special supplementary food package program makes available enriched foods for new and expectant mothers,

infants, and young children in food stamp areas. The program is operated through local health facilities such as clinics, with doctors and public health nurses prescribing for clients those foods offered by the Department of Agriculture.

An experimental program involving the issuance of a special purpose food certificate is being tested in limited areas. Eligible recipients—low-income new and expectant mothers and infants—use this food voucher to purchase milk, infant formula and baby cereal in local retail stores.

Last year the Congress appropriated a total of \$1,670 million, including a supplemental of \$250 million, for food stamps. This program has grown from a small experiment conducted under section 32 to be the major food aid program of the Department.

For example, in 1967 the conference agreed and the Congress directed that \$5 million of the funds for the food stamp program go to especially needy persons.

The committee has supported a strong nutrition education program. Last year's report stated:

The committee has approved an appropriation of \$30 million for the nutrition aide program initiated last fall. This is in line with the latest budget recommendation and places existing programs on a yearly basis. Of this sum, \$7,500,000 shall be available for professional workers to promote 4-H type programs in the depressed areas of our cities. This program involves educational work among low-income groups to reduce the incidence of malnutrition, by providing homemaker aides who will use available information, knowledge and skills to teach needy people to utilize all resources toward the achievement of a more nutritionally adequate diet.

In this connection, the committee feels that full use should be made of the Nation's 3 million 4-H Club members to promote 4-H Club-type work with the youth of our towns and cities. The success of this program in rural areas has forcefully demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. It may well be found that the most successful results from nutritional education of low-income families will come through work with the younger members of the family.

For 1972, the committee has restored the special milk program recommended for deletion in the budget estimate. This will provide about 3 billion half-pints of milk to about 17 million schoolchildren.

The committee has provided the full budget estimate of \$2 billion for food stamps.

The committee raised by \$45 million to \$401,400,000 the funds available to provide free and reduced price lunches. It questions the budget assumption which provides the same program level for 1972 as in 1971 for this program. It is suggested, however, that these funds be placed in reserve pending determination of need through review of State plans.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

First, I should like to thank the gen-

tleman for his good leadership and for the action of the subcommittee in recommending to this body that money be set aside for what has become a very critical problem in my part of the country, the TGE swine disease.

I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the leadership in providing for the needs of the Rural Electrification Administration. I am gratified that the privately-financed CHC has made some progress on private financing, but I do feel that what the subcommittee recommended here in Government loans is very much in the public interest.

I do have a question for the gentleman. On page 30 there is a paragraph dealing with reimbursement for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The reason I draw attention to this is the difficulty some of us have in trying to determine the actual costs of the various commodity programs.

As I read the committee report, the subcommittee has not sought enough money to restore fully the losses realized by the CCC. I wonder if the gentleman could explain why this is the case, if I correctly interpret the committee report.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his question. May I also tell him that the committee is thoroughly aware of his interest, as well as the interest of others, in TGE, and this entire matter, and we were glad to cooperate in providing what is necessary.

When we come to the items in the bill, I believe I should touch on them.

We were faced with a number of things which were not in the budget, but which the Congress clearly was for. We had to add \$104 million for the school milk program. That was not provided. The Congress, as I recall, passed by a vote of 398 to 2 a provision to keep the school milk program in.

We had a number of other places where we had to increase funds. We increased, for instance, the funds available for rural water loans and for water and sewage grants in rural areas. We have now available some \$300 million in loans on the rural water systems, and we maintain \$100 million, which is greatly above the budget, for grants in rural areas.

In that connection may I say that we also asked in the report that they try to work out a similar percentage rate for urban and the rural areas.

The average grant in the rural areas to the rural water systems is about 23 percent. In the urban areas it is about 6 percent. In addition to that we did provide funds for the Rural Electrification Administration. Now the REA and the local associations, provide electric power through their associations to those who live in 70 to 80 percent of the land area of this country. You either let that local cooperative have the money to loan, which will be repaid with interest in order to serve that area, or else it does not get served. We had to add that to the budget. When we got through adding things which were essential in the opinion of a majority of our committee to the rural areas, and to alleviating the situation in urban areas and cities, you end up where, in the absence of reducing the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we greatly exceeded the budget. So, we failed to restore capital

impairment completely in order to make up that difference. I want to tell you exactly what we did, and I did this before the full committee also.

We did it in that way so that we would come to you with a bill that has the appearance of being sound, and it really is sound. Let me tell you why. This bill has \$22 million less available to spend, just like it says it does. I think it makes just as much sense to not restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation as it does to charge off, on the basis of an annual expenditure, money that they lend for rural electrification and other things, which will be repaid with interest.

So, in order to bring the bill down, and hold expenditures in line, we added things where we had to add them, and we made it up by failing to restore the capital of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the gentleman's position is understandable. I commend him for his explanation. The committee report shows exactly the extent to which the capital impairment has not been restored, does it? That is the thing that we really need.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is clearly available in the report, because the budget estimate was for full restoration of \$4.2 billion and we reduced that amount by \$600 million.

Mr. FINDLEY. Now, if I may add one more comment. It is a fact, and I think it is a very reassuring fact, that during the past year the Cooperative Finance Corporation has come into being, an institution organized by Rural Electric Cooperative, financed entirely with non-governmental money. Even though its beginnings are perhaps not as great as a lot would like to see, the REA cooperatives have made a beginning toward developing supplemental financing through the private market. I think that is rather plain to all of us, and most reassuring.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say one thing in response to that. Last year in an effort to commend the associations for their efforts, we provided in the bill that the administrator could waive annual payments where a local cooperative was in excellent financial shape. They might waive payments so that they could buy into this corporation if they wanted to. I regret to say that they did not use this authority, but we in the committee did our part in trying to get them to do it, and we are calling on them to do it again where it is sound.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is good news indeed for the Nation's hog farmers to learn that contained on page 20 of the committee report is a specific mention for increased research funding for transmissible gastroenteritis during the coming fiscal year. A year ago the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee in its report suggested that economic losses caused the Nation's pork industry by this disease justified additional research emphasis. Regrettably no additional emphasis in disease research funding for TGE took place this past year.

I am delighted that the subcommittee this year in its report has specifically earmarked \$50,000 over and above what is currently being spent by USDA for TGE research.

A survey conducted by the University of Illinois of farm losses caused by TGE

shows that this insidious killer of baby pigs has affected swine herds from coast to coast. It attacks and destroys the intestinal lining in baby pigs, completely eliminating their ability to absorb the nutrients in their mother's milk. Consequently an entire crop of baby pigs can be wiped out in a very few days.

The University of Illinois survey shows that for each of the past 3 years TGE has cost Illinois farmers alone more than \$10 million annually. The estimated national losses to the disease exceeds \$100 million annually. It has been termed the number one disease problem among swine by the Illinois Department of Agriculture superintendent of meat, poultry, and livestock inspection, Paul B. Doby, D.V.M.

Currently the University of Illinois is the only land grant institution, as far as the U.S. Department of Agriculture knows, which is conducting an active TGE research study. The College of Veterinary Medicine at Champaign-Urbana has been conducting research on TGE since 1965. In mid-May of this year, the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Illinois, Dr. L. Meyer Jones, submitted an extensive proposal for a research grant to Dr. Paul D. Delay, director of the Veterinary Research Science Division of the USDA. The proposal is for a 3-year program to develop a cure or control for the disease. Up to now the University of Illinois has been operating its research program almost entirely with funds contributed by Illinois pork producers. In order for the necessary expansion of research to locate a cure for this costly disease, additional funding is necessary.

Late last year the USDA announced the issuance of a special license for a 1-year period of trials of a TGE vaccine developed by Diamond Laboratories. The U.S. Animal Health Association in describing the vaccine's effectiveness said:

Tests on the vaccine conducted by the Division of Veterinary Biologics of the Agricultural Research Service resulted in a mortality of 38 percent in pigs nursing vaccinated sows in contrast to 71 percent in pigs nursing non-vaccinated sows following challenge of three day old pigs with virulent TGE virus.

It is apparent that while this vaccine is helpful in reducing baby pig mortality, it can by no means be considered as yet to be the effective control the Nation's pork producers so badly need.

I commend the committee's action for including specific reference to the needs of TGE in its report and urge the support of the entire House for this badly needed research funding.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi will recall that in our full committee meeting, I called to his attention the item that appeared in the Washington Post for June 18, 1971, which has the headline "Cities Lose U.S. Funds for Summer Lunches."

The first paragraph of that reads as follows:

The Agriculture Department has informed big cities throughout the country that they

will not receive expected funds to feed hundreds of thousands of poor children this summer.

The gentleman from Mississippi at that time indicated to me that he thought that this could be worked out and he proposed to do it.

As I understand what has happened since that time, the gentleman has been able to work that out. Will the gentleman tell the House just what has happened?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is substantially correct. But I would say further that I do not see how we can hope to get this bill passed and over to the other body and get it signed quickly enough to take care of the matter this summer. But, I did promise to look into it and see what we could do. We expect to offer a committee amendment which will take care of this matter in this bill. Should this bill pass the other body before the end of the fiscal year, it will take care of it now. However, it may get bogged down. I have been told by the Department that it would accept an increase of \$11.25 million for that item in this bill, making available section 32 funds for this purpose. So we will have the opportunity to remedy that situation in this bill insofar as the rules permit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand that in the event a continuing resolution is offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in view of the fact that the agriculture bill will probably not be signed into law in time to take care of this situation, appropriate provision will be made in the continuing resolution?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I cannot speak for the chairman on that matter. But I would say that the Department—and I received their approval on that—agrees to the amendment which we expect to offer. The decision is based upon sound reasoning. I certainly hope that the chairman of the full committee will agree to this and I think he will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, on that same point, am I correct in understanding that a committee amendment will be offered for an \$11.5 million for this program?

Mr. WHITTEN. \$11.25 million additional.

Mr. VANIK. I understand that the program for this summer alone will probably cost in the neighborhood of \$32 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. The additional \$11.25 million to be provided in the committee amendment represents the maximum that the Department could use.

Mr. VANIK. Making \$32 million available?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can we assume that the program for this year will be funded to provide every community no less than was provided for this program last year?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say to the gentleman that the committee has an amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time to do just what the gentleman is talking about. But the funds, the entire funds, for the next fiscal year will be dependent upon whether or not the other body passes the bill in this form. I have been told that they plan to mark up the bill this week and hope to be able to pass it. I am not optimistic about it, but we have done all we can do in the bill here.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the effort will be made to cover the situation in a continuing resolution in order to take up the slack?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly; I am sure of that.

Mr. YATES. I will say to the gentleman that I will work with him in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I notice in title III, environmental protection, and I am pleased about that inclusion. I have in mind a little rural community, it is very small, and there is a fine eating place there, and it is about to be closed down because the money is not available for a sewer connection with a larger city.

Would the funds included in here enable this little town to be qualified for that? It is a small community of about two or three or four hundred people.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding in this connection—and may I say that I have not tried to touch on all of the things which I think our committee was very sound in providing. For instance, you know we provided \$100 million for sewer and water grants to towns up to 5,500. The subcommittee had that jurisdiction already. This year subcommittee's jurisdiction was expanded to included cities. The HUD program for sewer and water lines for larger cities is included at \$350 million.

We provided the \$2 billion for sewer facility grants to be available when it is authorized. So you see we have tried to meet the needs of both urban and rural areas.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have one other question I would like to ask of the distinguished gentleman.

I would like to inquire whether funds are appropriated in this bill to provide

resources for the purchase of orange juice, a commodity not particularly in the basic agricultural program. I do so because every year or so when the orange crops are heavy in Florida we see an acquisition program after which the juice is then made available in the school programs.

It at times seems that this program is not designed to provide nutrition to the young people in the schools as it is to provide higher prices to the consumer.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman from Ohio was here, I am sure, and he heard my earlier statement. We might think of this bill as being the bill that made food available. As I said, 500,000 or 600,000 people have quit producing food. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that 30 percent of the import duties are to be set aside to buy surplus food production to keep stable prices.

So, you let those folks who produce this orange juice not have any outlet for their crop and they would go bankrupt in 2 years and they are whipped and then you and I could not buy any orange juice. This is to keep a stable income for people to keep them working and to keep them producing so we can buy it. If you do not buy the surplus, it is going to wreck the market.

Mr. VANIK. I might point out that we do not do that for the automobile industry or various other industries.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I recall, and I believe the gentleman spoke for it, where the military bought 100,000 trucks a few years ago, so as to stabilize the economy in the automobile industry.

I was on the committee and I know what I am talking about. You can just figure what we do do. You can figure what we do for organized labor because they threaten to go on strike. I repeat this is all for the protection of the consumer. I would point out to the gentleman that this is peanuts compared to what we do for other segments of the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve as usual has done a great job in explaining this bill which is so important to all of us.

It is a privilege to work with him and with the other members of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the basic features of the bill which is up for consideration are, of course, far broader than they have been in the past because of the add-ons to the responsibility of our subcommittee. I am sure all Members of the House recognize that the jurisdiction of our subcommittee has greatly increased over the past year.

I come from a farm area and I have followed probably closer than most Members of the House the operation and management of the Department of Agriculture. The expansion in our subcommittee is very logical. We find ourselves now having jurisdiction over the environmental aspects of our Nation—and who is more interested in the environ-

ment than the farmer who works with it on a day-by-day basis?

I sincerely believe that the budget placed before you today makes a great deal of sense not only because of the vast experience that our subcommittee has had in this area, but because of the drastic needs of this Nation in the areas of food, environment, and consumer practices.

Our chairman showed you an article from *Life* magazine which told about the problems that farm families in the upper Midwest are faced with. This could be true additionally of farm families in the South or the East or the West. Wherever you go farmers are in an economic bind. Those of us from rural areas who have stood up and complained about the economic problems of the farmer—and who have tried to convince our city colleagues of the economic problems that we face in the rural areas—have perhaps overlooked that our city friends have economic problems of their own and they necessarily are worrying about their economic future rather than ours.

But let us for a moment consider what would happen if all of a sudden the farmers of this country, as it was shown in this article in *Life* magazine, were to quit farming and were to be forced off the land. What would happen then—in New York, Boston, Los Angeles, and the other great metropolitan areas of the United States?

I am convinced that, if this were to happen, the people of our country would finally realize the important role that our farmers play in our daily lives—producing food at a reasonable price, which is necessary for every American's livelihood.

People in our country can buy their food and fiber for less of their disposable income than in any other nation in the world.

Our President said not over a month ago in a salute to agriculture day that we have come to a crisis in America where the steel industry is not competitive any more—and this is one of the most basic industries.

We have come to the point where most of the television and radio sets that we purchase are imported from overseas. They might have an American label on them, but they are made in Japan.

Our cameras are made elsewhere and shipped into this country.

The basic industry in which we are still highly competitive is agriculture and we have to keep it this way if we are to resolve the balance-of-payments situation and many other problems affecting people in the cities as well as those in the rural areas.

For the past 3 months, our subcommittee held hearings on the various agencies that have come under our jurisdiction. I would urge everyone of you, if at all possible, to review the testimony presented in the over 5,000 pages of the hearings.

To give you some idea of how far we went into the various problems, we questioned William Ruckelshaus, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for over 8 hours. During that period, we heard what that agency

plans to do in the area of protecting our environment for generations to come—a subject that has been placed on the top of almost everyone's priority list.

Our committee has recommended a \$2.4 billion budget for EPA for fiscal year 1972. A majority of this money, \$2 billion, will be used for construction grants. This particular appropriation covers the Federal grants that would be made available to municipal, intermunicipal, State, and interstate agencies for the construction of waste treatment works and major interceptor sewers. Administrator Ruckelshaus told our subcommittee that in December of 1970, EPA completed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's municipal waste treatment needs. This study showed the need for a national investment of \$12 billion through the end of 1974.

Such an investment would overcome the backlog of construction needs necessary to bring all municipal discharges into compliance with established water quality standards, or equivalent levels of quality where standards are not established, and the development of self-sufficient programs at the State and local levels for assuring the future operation, maintenance, expansion, and replacement of treatment works. This bill, our bill today, is the beginning of the national commitment to resolve this serious problem.

During Administrator Ruckelshaus' testimony before the subcommittee I asked him about the problem of mercury contamination and what programs EPA plans to initiate toward the goal of obtaining more information on mercury in the environment and the ecological and health significance of this mercury presence. We have heard about it in our fish; we have heard about it in our ducks; we have heard about it in more and more food products. But so far we do not have the basic knowledge to be able to tell our people just what the impact of this mercury is. Is it something new or has it always been in these products? And how should we react to it? This budget calls for a \$1.1 million increase in research capacity specifically aimed at such problems of mercury and other heavy metals. Certainly the House must go along with these requests. Our society's future depends on it.

Another agency now under our subcommittee's jurisdiction is the Food and Drug Administration. As Dr. Charles Edwards, Commissioner of Food and Drug told us, the purpose of FDA is "To achieve a single overall objective, consumer protection." Surely none of us can downgrade the importance of this agency. Dr. Edwards told me in the hearing that the highest priority of FDA is safety. A major need of the Food and Drug Administration is to have the scientific resources to give factual answers rather than emotional answers to these various pressing problems. This is a major thought our subcommittee kept in mind when setting appropriations figures for this agency in fiscal 1972.

Americans deserve facts, not fiction, in this important matter of the drugs that are administered to us and our loved ones during illness and the other products we use on a day-by-day basis.

The committee recognizes the tremendous task of providing these answers with regard to food, medicine, and other products through FDA.

One of the most persistent criticisms of FDA decisions has been that they are frequently based upon unrealistically high dosages of drugs given to experimental test animals. This budget includes \$4 million to begin a new research program at Pine Bluff, Ark., which is designed to overcome this problem. This laboratory was recently turned over to FDA by the Army as a result of the President's decision to cease biological warfare activities. In this new research program FDA will give low dosages of drugs to test animals over a long period of time. This will more nearly approximate the type of dosages that patients actually receive, and, therefore, should more nearly indicate their effect on humans.

The Federal Trade Commission has also been placed under the jurisdiction of our subcommittee. The purpose of the Commission, as outlined by its Chairman, Miles W. Kirkpatrick, is: Preserving free competitive enterprise through the prevention and suppression of monopolistic practices and unfair restraints of trade. Additionally, it is responsible for detecting and prosecuting acts and practices which unfairly deceive or victimize the consuming public.

When you digest those aims I think you can see that the role of the Federal Trade Commission is pretty darned important.

One of the subjects I discussed with Chairman Kirkpatrick when he appeared before the subcommittee was an FTC study of the breakfast cereal industry. I am sure most of you have seen the recent news articles on this subject, stimulated, I am sure, by an enterprising reporter reading our hearings. Some were in the Washington Post, some in the New York Times, and others in newspapers around the country.

During the hearing I asked the chairman if the tremendously concentrated breakfast food industry may be causing an unnaturally high price for breakfast cereals. Although Chairman Kirkpatrick could not give a definite answer to the question because the study was not yet completed. He did indicate that this was the direction the investigation was moving.

It appears that perhaps 20 percent or more of the price of a box of cereal you and I buy at the store goes for the tremendous advertising campaign put on by the cereal industry and not to improve the nutrient value of the product.

Cereal products should be the cheapest food available to the low-income people in our country.

The breakfast cereal study should provide a better understanding of the sources of high profits in this and other concentrated industries. This study, of course, is of particular interest to all of us who are concerned that the American public should be able to buy nutritious foods at reasonable prices. It is of particular interest, however, to the farmers of this country who grow the food we eat, who see the prices of this food on the supermarket shelves continually going up while the prices they get for producing it remain essentially the same or go down.

The U.S.D.A. also in this vein provided for us a chart showing the farm-to-retail-spread-for-bread. Bread is certainly a staple domestic commodity. Since 1950 the price of a 1-pound loaf of white bread has nearly doubled from 14 cents to 26 cents, yet the farmer, for this 1-pound loaf of bread, gets the same 3 cents he got 20 years ago. I am sure that also is true of many, many other foods in this country.

Mr. Chairman, of course our subcommittee is most familiar with the needs of agriculture, as this is the area in which we have had jurisdiction for many years.

I should like at this time briefly to address the Members of the House who come from the predominantly urban areas of this great Nation. We all know the problems which you and your constituents face. We know that your cities are becoming overcrowded, that the unemployment rate in your areas continues to increase, and that there are numerous other problems which you and your people face day after day. Let me assure you that all of my rural colleagues in the House want to do everything possible to assist you. But, at the same time, we need your help. We have people in the country who want to stay in the rural areas but, because of the present cost-price squeeze our farmers are facing, many of them are being forced off the land.

Where do these people go? What do they do? Most of them are going right into the already overcrowded cities, thus multiplying the problems your urban areas presently face. This is the major reason why rural development is so important, and why our subcommittee placed so much emphasis on it.

The area of rural development can be expanded throughout most of the ramifications of this legislation. One of the major provisions which our subcommittee provided is to bring the REA loan fund, back to the reserves we had in 1960. Without electricity in our rural areas we are lost. The backlog of REA loan requests is gigantic, and the subcommittee feels it is time that we begin doing something to take care of this most basic need in rural America.

Another basic area of need is the funding and credit requirements of our farmers, especially our younger farmers. The average age of farmers in America today is 56. Where will we go, with no replacements coming along?

Year after year young people are forced off the land because of inability to receive credit to continue operating the family farm.

Each year I receive literally hundreds of requests from people below 25 years of age, wanting help in obtaining an FHA loan to continue operating a farm that has been in the family for two or more generations. Each year I run into the same problem: Funds for operating loans have been depleted toward the end of the fiscal year, and there is nothing that can be done to help the young farmer. This simply means that he must then sell his land to his big neighbor nearby, and move to the crowded cities to try to find a job to raise his family. If he cannot find a job you know what happens. He ends up on the welfare rolls.

But he is eager. He is alert. He is one of the finest young Americans we have, coming from the rural area, and he will find a job. But he will force somebody from the city off the job, and that will add one more individual to the welfare rolls.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I want to begin by commending the gentleman for his concern. I have known of his interest for a long time.

Inasmuch as we are talking about young farmers, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me briefly what, if anything, has been done so far as improving the Farmers Home Loan program, to make certain that the young farmer is in a better position to get credit.

I know this has been a concern of the gentleman, and I guess my concern is that I find that there does not seem to be much of an emphasis on loaning money to young farmers. In other words, I thought that was part of the program, and I was wondering what we could do in your opinion to see that these funds are rechanneled to help primarily the young farmers.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. As the price of that green machinery which is made in my colleague's area goes up and up and up, the young farmer needs more and more cash in order to buy the tractor which his father had bought and now must be replaced. As a matter of fact, it takes about three times as much now to buy a tractor as it did 20 years ago.

We increased the amounts available for the FHA operating loans by \$75 million to \$350 million. That is the money that can be used to buy your tractor and to pay for your feed and gasoline. Within the agency additional emphasis has been given to giving larger loans because of the higher costs of machinery and also loans on farmland will be able to be made at a higher percentage of actual value. So the younger individual with a more limited equity will be able to borrow these funds. The trend is moving more and more in this direction, and with the add on in loan funds, we hope we will see some real progress in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I wonder if the gentleman will yield for one further question.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I appreciate your answer to the other question. Illinois is one of those States that is in compliance with the Federal Water Quality Control Act, which was enacted with provisions in it that imposed certain stringent requirements on local communities to come up with funds to improve their sewer and water systems. Many of these communities have been able to go ahead only to find that the Federal Government has not come up with its matching requirement. I know too our administration has

frozen some of these funds, including, I believe, some of the direct grant funds, which greatly concerns me. I had a chance to testify, not this year, but last year, before your subcommittee as well as the subcommittee on the Senate side handling this matter. The question I have is this: I wonder what, if anything, we can do to see to it that the administration releases the freeze on these funds which are so important to many of our local communities. I might mention for the record that in respect to Illinois, for instance, we have many, many communities that are in noncompliance with the law, not through their own fault, but because the Federal Government has not come up with its fair share of the funds. I wonder what we can do to undo this freeze.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Today in this budget we are reappropriating amounts which were frozen and adding \$150 million to it. That should give us an adequate solution of this particular problem. I will join my colleague from Illinois in imploring the powers that be at the other end of the avenue to begin releasing the funds.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I want to comment only that it became a very serious thing when you have local communities that are in danger of noncompliance and could be penalized on a daily basis, because the Federal Government which designed the program has not been meeting its responsibilities. It has been going on ever since the Federal Government first enacted the legislation in 1965. I hope that your great subcommittee and great committee are able to apply pressure to force them to release the funds. This is a very serious thing.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution in pointing out the importance of this section of our bill. As I said, our subcommittee added these funds in operating loans, and this will go a long way to help solve the problem of the young men in farming. We are also providing sensible levels for loan and grant money for sewer and water extension. This, of course, is going to be more responsive to the needs of this country.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, we forget the gigantic contributions agriculture gives this Nation. We forget, sometimes, that only 5 percent of the people of this Nation are providing 100 percent of the people with food, and that our food budget has been less inflationary than almost every other item a family buys. At the same time, our farmers have always been concerned about our environment. This is not something new to them. The Soil Conservation Service has, over the past years, worked very hard on the problems of maintaining our environment for generations to come. Our farmers, because of the very basic nature of their work, must be environmentalists.

Mr. Chairman, not too long ago I was on the Anacostia River. This river does not go through any farmland whatsoever, it goes through urban developed land. That river is the muddiest and most turgid river it has been my experience to see. Why? Not because of runoff of

protected farmland, but because of the runoff from unprotected urban real estate in the process of being developed by these large land rapers who do not care, who leave the soil to wash into the channel and thus pollute our rivers and lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Soil Conservation Service deserves to be commended for the work they have done. Not being a hydraulic engineer, but having taken some engineering when I went to college, this business of channelization of streams is something we must look at from the standpoint of realizing what happens when water flows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if water goes in a straight line, it flows easily. If water comes down and hits against a curve and has to go into that curve, it makes a whirlpool and takes with it a portion of the bank picking up the sediment and moves it on to the next curve where it picks up some more sediment.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not want pollution, we had better make sure that our water courses do not erode the banks as they go their twisting way downstream.

Mr. Chairman, just as you cannot make water run up a hill, you cannot stop water from scouring away the dirt on the banks if it has to make many curves in its course, rather than travel in an unimpeded straight line.

Mr. Chairman, one accomplishment of the 91st Congress was the Waterbank Act. For those of you who are not familiar with it, the basic purpose is to prevent the drainage and destruction of natural wetlands needed by migratory waterfowl and other wildlife. This destruction has been so extensive in the last few years that by 1970 approximately half of the wetlands of the prairie pothole regions of the United States have been drained.

Our farmers, caught in the merciless cost-price squeeze, have had to take these steps to utilize every acre of the land they own, and on which they pay taxes.

The Waterbank Act offers the owners of these wetlands an acceptable alternative to drainage. Our committee which has jurisdiction over these funds has pointed out the necessity of putting this land into the Waterbank Act as soon as possible in order that we can get away from this environment harming drainage which has been going on.

Our bill funds the payments for wetlands preservation, thereby making it feasible for farmers, ranchers and other landowners to resist the economic pressures that encourage wetlands destruction.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. I certainly do not want to be repetitious. I think the very able chairman of our subcommittee has

pointed out some of the key features of this bill and I have tried to add to those and I hope as the debate develops the entire House will realize the major need for this legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Environmental, and Consumer Protection, of the Appropriations Committee, now brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriations bill for the Agriculture, Environmental, and Consumer Protection programs for fiscal year 1972.

For a period of 16 years I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the subcommittees that I have served on during this period of time is the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. All funds for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies were presented to our subcommittee. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have added environmental and consumer protection programs with the bill that makes recommendations for appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. Our committee now considers all appropriation requests for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, along with requests for the Environmental Protection Agency, Consumer Protection and Services, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Trade Commission, and grants for basic water and sewer facilities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In this bill we have established a number of milestones and the appropriation requests now presented for agricultural programs, rural development, environmental protection, and consumer protection and services are not only of great importance to our people but are so related that it is proper for the House of Representatives to consider all of these requests at the same time and in the same bill.

The total amount included in the bill is \$12,080,596,050. This is an increase of \$2,531,688,500 over the 1971 appropriations and \$22,117,800 below the budget.

For our agricultural programs we recommend the sum of \$5,258,671,050. This includes restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of \$3,613,331,000.

For rural development, Mr. Chairman, we recommend \$932,847,000.

This bill contains \$3,126,055,000 for programs primarily directed to improving our environment, including the new Environmental Protection Agency and Housing and Urban Development water and sewer grants. It includes, as well, the Department of Agriculture programs long provided for in our bills which have heretofore been presented to the House of Representatives, including the Rural Environmental Assistance program and watershed protection programs.

We recommend, Mr. Chairman, \$2,763,023,000 for Consumer Protection and Services. Under this section of the bill we recommend funds for the Food and

Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the work of the Office of Consumer Affairs. We also include under this title of the bill \$3.5 billion for the food assistance programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which our committee has strongly supported all down through the years, including the food stamp and special milk programs. This section of the bill, Mr. Chairman, also includes funds for the Department's consumer protection and regulatory activities including inspection of meat, poultry, and eggs.

This bill provides for necessary funds for agriculture and the consumer. Our farmers know how to produce and we have an adequate food supply. In every emergency, when called upon, the American farmer has produced the necessary food and fiber.

I would like to call your attention to the item in the bill providing for funds for fiscal year 1972 for the Statistical Reporting Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Department requested \$19,702,800 for this Service. We recommend the sum of \$20,500,000 for our Statistical Reporting Service, \$800,000 of the increase is to be used for a survey updating price indexes. We must modernize the indexes which relate to farm parity price relationships. The correcting of basic data to be used in a price formula should begin as soon as possible. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the basic data have not been collected since 1955. Such a survey will show the prices paid by farm producers and then, Mr. Chairman, we can have the comparison between prices paid and prices received. Since parity prices are so important a part of the relationships of farmers with the rest of the economy, it is imperative that the basic data in determining these relationships be brought up to date. No longer can we rely upon the figures established in the year 1955. The time has arrived when we must devote attention and resources to the improvement of our price indexes. As pointed out during the hearings, when I requested this additional amount for updating price indexes, we were advised that at the time the long-range program was formulated a national survey for updating the weights used to compute the indexes of prices received and prices paid by the farmers had just been completed. The Department fully anticipated that another survey would be conducted again within a period of 10 years since this had been the established practice for keeping the price indexes up to date. We were further advised that more than 15 years had intervened since the last survey providing weights for these indexes; therefore, they are now obsolete. It is not necessary to try to convince anyone that the pattern of expenditures of farmers for the things they buy for production of their crops and livestock and for the things they buy for home living have radically altered since 1955. Therefore, according to the testimony that we received, the indexes of prices paid and prices received by farmers, computed by multiplying today's market prices by expenditure rates measured in 1955, could not be regarded as representative of to-

day's conditions. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it is essential to undertake this survey in order to help restore the integrity of the parity concept.

There are many other reasons why this survey should be conducted in addition to matters pertaining to parity. We all know that farm income is an essential statistic for a wide variety of economic analyses.

Mr. Chairman, the \$800,000 included in this bill, to be used by our Statistical Reporting Service to complete a survey of the prices paid by farm producers which will update the last survey made in 1955, is one of the most important sections of the bill from the standpoint of the American farmer.

Our rural electrification program is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government. I know, Mr. Chairman, that our rural electric systems throughout our country, as a group, are in a more precarious position today than they were 12 months ago. Our REA co-ops have plowed back their reserve funds into their plants in order to be able to provide electricity to the American farmer. The number of loan applications now pending clearly establishes the fact that the \$345 million amount requested is inadequate. Our rural electrification program and our rural telephone program are more important today than at any time since they were first started. I sincerely believe that as far as electric power is concerned today we have need for more power than at any time during my lifetime. The events taking place last summer throughout our country, and especially on the eastern seaboard section, definitely shows that we must have more electricity. It was a serious mistake to withhold \$15 million in REA funds and \$5 million in rural telephone funds during the fiscal year 1971. This money should never have been frozen, and our President was ill advised when he took the action which halted expenditure of this money. We have finally succeeded in having these funds released and now, Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we take the necessary action to provide adequate funds for our rural electrification program and our rural telephone program for fiscal year 1972. Our committee has made a major contribution to the development of rural electrification all down through the years. One of the major reasons why 600,000 farm families leave the farm each year is due to the fact that the facilities available are inadequate and the farmer is not receiving an adequate share of our national income. Our rural electric co-ops must be able to provide more power to farms and rural areas. Electric power is necessary to replace farm labor which is no longer available, and further, Mr. Chairman, electric power is fundamental for rural development which will relieve congestion in our crowded cities. We recommend \$545 million for loan authorization for our Rural Electrification Administration. This is \$200 million more than the amount approved for fiscal year 1971. In addition, we recommend that \$25 million be placed in a contingency

reserve fund for use in our rural electrification program. For our rural telephone bank program we recommend the sum of \$30 million.

For our Soil Conservation Service we recommend \$315,305,000, which is an increase of \$43,238,000 over the amount carried in the 1971 fiscal year bill.

This bill contains adequate funds for our tobacco program. The research facilities at the University of Kentucky are receiving adequate funds for tobacco research. We started appropriating for this facility in the year 1958, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky has since that time erected a new building to be used for this program, and in addition has enacted legislation which will produce several million dollars a year to be used for tobacco research. Both the Federal and the State funds will be fully utilized for this important program.

Congress created the Soil Conservation Service in 1935 to give local people onsite technical assistance in protecting and improving their natural resources. Down through the years we have passed laws and appropriated money to help our Soil Conservation Service equip itself to do a better job. We initiated the Small Watershed program in 1954, and here we have a local effort with Federal assistance and not a Federal program. Under no circumstances, Mr. Chairman, should we destroy our Small Watershed program.

Our agricultural conservation program started in the year 1936, and today we have about 1,300,000 farmers participating. This program seeks to restore and improve soil fertility, reduce erosion caused by wind and water, and to conserve water on the land. The purpose of the program is to help achieve additional conservation on land now in agricultural production rather than to bring into production more land. This is a matching program. We have about 682 million acres of tillable land in this country and it must be preserved and protected. Only 25 to 30 percent of the land surface of the earth can be recorded as tillable land. We must take care of and use more effectively our available land. For a number of years now our committee has restored the ACP appropriation. On a number of occasions the entire program has been deleted from the budget request and each time we have restored the necessary amount to continue this program. The budget request of \$150 million was recommended for payments earned in the 1971 program. We know that to administer the program in full the sum of \$195,500,000 is required, and therefore for 1972 our committee has directed that the Secretary announce a program of \$195,500,000, the same level as authorized in 1971.

Mr. Chairman, our Extension Service has been of great benefit to the American farmer. This service, as you know, has three functions: serves as liaison between the Department of Agriculture and the States, providing program leadership and assistance to the States in the conduct of extension work; administers Federal laws authorizing extension work and coordinates the work among the States; and provides leadership in the coordina-

tion of educational phases of all programs under the jurisdiction of the Department. We recommend \$171,779,000 for our Extension Service.

For a number of years the county agents and home demonstration agents in Kentucky were next to the bottom in the salary scale range. Finally, after discussing this matter in detail on a number of occasions when the hearings were held, we have succeeded in having the salaries of our agents raised on several occasions and now we are in the upper half of the salary scale. The salaries in Kentucky, Mr. Chairman, are still too low and again this year I have discussed this matter in detail with the Secretary of Agriculture and with the Director of the Department of Extension.

Mr. Chairman, we should at all times keep in mind that we still have many serious problems in agriculture and certainly this is not the time to turn our backs on the American farmers. It is becoming more difficult to maintain a sound agricultural economy due to increasing cost of labor, equipment, and the high cost per acre of good farmland. We must give more time and study to the situation that now prevails between the time agricultural commodities leave the farm and are sold, to the time the products go into the homes of our people for consumption.

The American farmer is entitled to a fair share of our national income.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman and new ranking member of our subcommittee have set forth in considerable detail the items included in this appropriations bill. I should like to confine my remarks to several areas which are of particular concern to me.

Before doing so, however, because of the reshuffling of the membership on our side of the aisle on the subcommittee, I would like to pay special tribute to our ranking member, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. MARK ANDREWS) who after serving several years on the subcommittee, now serves in a ranking capacity because of the departure of our good friend, Odin Langen, who served for several years in that capacity.

MARK ANDREWS has had a great deal of experience, of course, coming from the agricultural ranks himself, and he brings a breadth of experience and a scope of knowledge that we certainly welcome on the subcommittee.

And then, too, to have sitting to my left on that subcommittee, a new Member of our committee, the gentleman from Iowa (BILL SCHERLE) who has long been identified in agricultural circles and who is a farmer of no small note himself, we find ourselves adequately manned on our side of the aisle.

I am most grateful to have both MARK ANDREWS and BILL SCHERLE on our committee. Of course, it goes without say-

ing that over the years it has been a privilege to work with the Members from the Democratic side on our subcommittee.

There are several points I would like to make having to do with the area of the restoration of the CCC, and the Rural Electrification Administration increase, and then a note or two especially about the amendment I hope to offer later in the day.

Our overall figure in the bill reflects a \$22 million reduction in the budget, but it comes about as a result of our cutting the full restoration of capital impairment for the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$600 million. In prior years I have raised questions about our using this gimmick to bring a bill to you whose total figure was seldom, if ever, in excess of the budget and making the point that before the fiscal year was over there would probably be a supplemental request to make up the difference.

The CCC currently is in pretty good shape so far as a cushion is concerned for transacting its business and even with this \$600 million reduction I doubt very much whether it will be necessary for us to come to you with a supplemental request. I do regret, however, that we are departing from what I thought was a charted course to keep the books of the CCC balanced from year to year, rather than falling behind as we have done in the past and losing all accountability for what the costs actually were for our commodity programs. As a matter of fact, just a few years ago we were still picking up net realized losses for as far back as the years 1961, 1962 and 1963. Largely because Senator HOLLAND over in the other body and I had been harping on this subject, we did for the first time this past year appropriate sufficient funds to bring the books of the CCC into balance and I thought this was particularly significant because we had just enacted a new farm bill for a 3-year period. It was my feeling then and still is today that if we continue to bring the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation into balance each year through this appropriations process we will be much better able to tell what these commodity programs are costing us in dollars and cents.

Notwithstanding the action we have taken in the House, I would hope that the other body would fully fund this capital restoration and that in conference we would agree to their figure, for as I said, this is the only way we are going to be able to keep in close touch with precisely what this overall program is costing us so far as commodities are concerned.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I reserved in the subcommittee and full committee on the subject of the \$216 million increase in rural electrification loan authorizations, and I would like to take a few moments to discuss this subject.

The REA electric program has had 35 years to become established under the Government's 2-percent loan program. Most rural electric borrowers are going business organizations and fill a vital role in the Nation's electric industry. Some, it is true, still require 2-percent Federal loans, but there is simply no

reason in fact that the majority should remain dependent on Washington. The Rural Electrification Administration itself admits this year's budget is tight, but that with prudent management, the \$329 million budget recommendation is adequate to meet fiscal 1972 needs. Furthermore, REA is on record with the statement that "any impression that electric borrowers are generally without funds is simply not factual."

So, I would warn members that jacking up REA funds to this very high level is like holding out a carrot. It will deter the responsible efforts of borrowers to make this program less dependent upon Government.

Second, many borrowers have joined in forming the Cooperative Finance Corporation which, while it is now in its infancy, is beginning to provide substantial amounts of capital to meet the needs of present REA borrowers.

This move toward independence is admirable, and should have the support of Congress. Providing excessive 2-percent loan funds to REA, however, puts CFC in an impossible competitive position. No borrower will want to pay higher rates for capital when—if this \$545 million loan authorization is approved—REA will be loaded with cash.

So, I am concerned that this increase will undermine the CFC.

Third, as the Members are aware, appropriations are a process of allocating an increasingly scarce Federal resource—money—to meet the Nation's needs. While we must meet the real needs for rural electrification funds—I have supported the program all during my service in this body—we must ask, "Is the \$216 million added to this appropriation needed more for rural electrification—or for health care, education, ghetto rehabilitation, or a host of other pressing national needs?" REA itself has answered the question by maintaining it can conduct its program adequately and responsibly with \$329 million.

So, I am concerned that an unreasonable increase for REA could lead to resentment by supporters of other programs who, rather than an increase, must somehow eke priority programs through with, in some cases, budget decreases.

Fourth, this vast increase in REA electric loan authorizations is based on highly questionable arguments. For example, much has been made of the assertion that lack of capital in the hands of rural electric borrowers is somehow responsible for the migration of the rural population to the cities. That is ridiculous. People have moved out of rural areas in spite of having plentiful electricity. The fact is that abundant electricity has contributed to rural migration by drastically reducing manpower needs. No, it is not the lack of electricity that explains the rural migration; the answer lies elsewhere. It has to do with things such as lack of medical care, lack of educational and cultural opportunities and lack of community services. These are the conditions that are drawing the rural population to the cities, and the Congress should reject as completely phony, all the efforts to justify this \$216 million increase on the theory that it will retard the flight of

rural inhabitants to the city. Such an increase could very well accelerate that flight by further reducing manpower needs and by misallocating resources.

For another example of the questionable arguments used in supporting this tremendous hike in REA funds, much has been made of the fact that REA's policy of calling upon the rural borrowers to hold their reserves at 8 percent of plant has placed the borrowers in a poor financial condition. The truth is that all this policy does is to require that borrowers devote a reasonable share of their resources to their own needs rather than putting it out in higher-yield investments. Why should Congress continue to put out 2 percent money for new loans so that borrowers can put their profits out at higher interest rates rather than reinvesting them in plant? One of the best financial investments borrowers can make is in their own plant expansion. REA has demonstrated that this 8 percent reserve program has been successful in assuring that loan funds are used in ways that meet the real needs of the greatest number of borrowers without abusing the generosity of the taxpayers. There is no case on record in which a borrower has been unable to provide adequate service to its members, or has been unable to meet cash operating requirements because of this policy.

So, I would say again that such specious arguments in the end will weaken, rather than strengthen, the program.

Fifth, this increase is supported by pointing to the total of loan applications received by REA as a direct measurement of the amount of funds it needs. It is simply not true that all applications need to be favorably acted upon. An application is a request. It is not necessarily proof of need, or even of the propriety for making a loan. This body does not grant every request made of it, and neither should REA.

So, I say that approval of an excessive increase for REA defeats sound management and could serve to discredit, rather than help, the program.

Sixth, jumping REA's budget to \$545 million—a 65-percent increase over proclivities of the other body on this subject and I shudder to think what this ultimate figure might be after conference. Where else can we find or justify a 65-percent increase in any item in the budget? If we can toss another \$216 million into REA, why not have a \$378 billion total budget. I do not believe this one—\$545 million for REA—is any more defensible than the other.

The Committee on Appropriations is always being pressured for more and more loan funds by the same vocal group of fiscal extremists, who apparently assume that the only way to keep borrowers in their organizational pocket is to increase the amount of 2 percent subsidized funds and inflate the REA budget. Until this year, the committee has held the line for reason and responsibility. Nothing drastic has happened to the situation of the rural borrowers in the past year that would warrant a sudden increase of \$216 million. As a matter of fact, REA advanced \$413 million to borrowers in fiscal year 1971, the larg-

est amount ever advanced in a single year. The committee has been suckered by one of the most intensive and irresponsible high pressure campaign efforts ever undertaken to influence the good judgment of the committee and the Congress. These extremists even brag about their high pressure lobbying tactics, and in the current issue of their magazine, they boast, "Rural electric leaders from throughout the country fanned out over Capitol Hill to spread the word—walking the long corridors, rally teams from 42 States visited the offices of virtually all the Members of the House and Senate."

It is well known that they initially urged an increase of \$459 million over the REA budget request, making a total appropriation of \$804 million. Against that preposterous figure, they hope to persuade Members that \$545 million is a reasonable compromise, but I say again—it is far too much.

One of the arguments made in behalf of the \$216 million increase is that the value of money has been depleted by inflation. But what could be more inflationary than increasing a budget request by 65 percent? This is not a defense against inflation; it is crawling into bed with it.

I thoroughly agree with the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor of this House on June 7, that "if America collapses on the fiscal shoals, if everyone goes down—labor, management—the REA, and all our industrial institutions likewise go down." I am convinced that a 65-percent increase in the REA budget or any major budget item is just such a step in the direction of fiscal collapse. If duplicated in other areas of national need, it would guarantee economic disaster. The distinguished chairman has said that the administration's request for REA may have to be "nudged" upward. With this I might agree, but an increase from \$329 million to \$545 million is much more than a nudge. It is a plunge toward fiscal recklessness.

Mr. Chairman, I have cited a number of arguments being used in support of this inflated REA budget, and some material to refute them. Since these arguments of the fiscal extremists do not stand up, what is the real reason behind this \$216 million increase? I hope it is not that 1972 is a presidential election year, and this action is aimed at embarrassing the present administration.

Members know that all agencies and the Office of Management and Budget must put together and maintain viable programs, and do so in a fiscally responsible manner. While some budget requests might need adjustments, extreme actions calculated to please certain special interest groups often end up with the Office of Management and Budget being unable to indiscriminately release the funds because to do so would injure the Nation's economy and its fiscal integrity. Thus, actions such as we are taking here to "shoot the works" are hardly courageous. They merely shift the sharing of fiscal responsibility by Congress and the Executive over so it is wholly on the back of the Executive. I doubt any-

one gains from such actions, since the onus can extend in two directions, to the Congress for acting irresponsibly and to the Executive for not releasing the funds. Someplace along the line someone has to do a proper job. I suggest facing up to our share of the responsibility. Congress should allocate the Nation's resources on the grounds of both reality and need, and not on political maneuvering. In the case at hand, REA should not be used as a political tool, for in the long run that can only damage the program.

Mr. Chairman, if this year's inflated REA electric loan authorization is to continue, then I suggest the time has come for Congress to put this program on a more businesslike basis. If we are going to start authorizing over a half billion dollars annually for this electric program, something should be done about increasing the 2-percent REA interest rate to a level on which the Treasury will receive as much interest on REA loans as it must pay to borrow money from the public for comparable terms.

Perhaps the time has come to return the REA interest rate to that set by Congress when it passed the Rural Electrification Act in 1936. This was eminently fair, since it was pegged to the Government's own cost of long-term money—up or down.

Our Federal Government is financed through its collection of taxes from citizens—including income taxes. Because cooperatives allege they make no income, they pay no Federal income tax, while enjoying benefits over and above those who do pay it. Here again, if we are going to start appropriating half a billion dollars a year for this program, some system of payments in lieu of Federal income taxes should be devised so that borrowers under this program will pay their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer an amendment to cut this \$216 million increase back to \$100 million, but I will surely offer it as a substitute for any amendment that might be offered to increase the figure over and above what the committee has recommended.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MIZELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the subcommittee, the chairman, and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) from our side of the aisle, on the good job they have performed in bringing to the House this appropriation bill and in taking some significant steps toward meeting the needs of rural America.

The committee has, in my estimation, shown great wisdom in providing immediate funding to initiate operation of a new Rural Development Service within the Department of Agriculture, as had been suggested recently by the distinguished and capable head of that Department, Secretary Clifford Hardin.

This new Rural Development Service, which incorporates the Soil Conservation

Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and Farm Credit Administration, is a major step toward a greater national consciousness and Government concern for the future of rural America.

I welcome this step taken by the Nixon administration, and supported by the committee, to concentrate and coordinate current efforts to improve the quality of life in rural America.

The funding level recommended for these four programs, \$932,847,000 for fiscal 1972, is generous, but I believe more must be done, both in terms of reorganization and money, if the true potential of rural America is ever to be fully realized.

This is not to underplay by any means the efforts that have been made thus far by the administration toward this end, or the fine work done by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in reporting this bill.

The Agriculture Department has recognized the great need for improvements in electrification and telephone services, water and sewer systems, land and resource development, and housing in rural areas, and has recommended a level of funding that can go a long way toward getting the job done.

Improvement in these areas is essential to any overall plan of rural development, and the committee has wisely seen fit to propose ample funds to provide those improvements.

As noted in the committee report on this bill, studies show that most rural young people aspire to "prestige, white collar jobs, college education, and a middle class, urban way of life."

Those aspirations can be realized in rural America, but not without the opportunities for jobs, adequate housing, education and vocational training, health care, and environmental protection that have too often been lacking in rural areas and medium-sized communities.

As I have said many times in this Chamber and in other forums, what we really need is one agency of the Government dedicated solely to providing all of these needs and opportunities.

Properly administered and adequately funded, such an agency could become the means for recreating rural America in an image of progress, but still securing the free spirit and beauty of the land that is so great a part of our national heritage.

And this revitalized rural America could well serve as a cornerstone for building a whole new Nation. If we can increase the productivity and improve the quality of life for the 65 million people living in rural America today, we will have made a valuable contribution to the overall wealth and well-being of the 140 million who live in the cities, and thus of the Nation at large.

Rural America and metropolitan America are, after all, in partnership together. What helps one also helps the other.

The bill reported today acknowledges that basic fact, and it is to the credit of the Agriculture Department, and of the Appropriations Committee, and its Sub-

committee on Agriculture, that the message is so clear.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first I should like to make something other than an ordinary statement of congratulations, not only to the chairman of this subcommittee, but also to the chairman of the full committee and to the Appropriations Committee itself.

At the beginning of this year, several of us tried to change the rules of this committee, to provide for open hearings on all of our subcommittees unless we decided before each meeting to have an executive session. We were unsuccessful. But I want to tell the members of this committee that most of the hearings we had on the Agriculture appropriations and on appropriations for the Environmental Protection Agency, for the Food and Drug Administration, for the Federal Trade Commission, and so forth, were open public hearings.

I believe this is to be commended. I hope it is going to be continued in the future, for these problems which are faced under these headings are serious problems affecting the future of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to give special recognition to our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for taking the initiative to make the request that these meetings be opened to the public.

Second, I should like to comment briefly that we have had differences of opinion in putting together the figures in the bill before you. It is true the subcommittee did not always agree. But may I say we have, I believe, worked out a good compromise on the figures that are brought to you in this bill.

One of the most difficult things for us in this subcommittee has been to determine what would be appropriate for the Environmental Protection Agency, what would be appropriate for the Food and Drug Administration, and for the Federal Trade Commission. It was an awesome responsibility to be put on our shoulders at the same time we have the responsibility of recommending to you expenditures for the Department of Agriculture.

Basically, we are giving these various agencies those sums which were requested by the administration, and I believe the sums are reasonable and that this committee and the House should support them.

Last, I should like to comment in regard to what the committee has done in terms of the black land grant colleges, those land grant colleges created in 1890. We have significantly increased the appropriation for these colleges, and I wish to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for recognizing the historical deficiency which these colleges have suffered. I hope this committee will keep these funds in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the agriculture, environmental, and consumer protection bill now before the House is not only

massive in scope, but it has taken many dramatic steps forward in improving the Government's ability to take strong action in each of the areas of our subcommittee's jurisdiction.

However, its very complexity and size may cause us to overlook important innovations because the funds allocated are less dramatic, though no less important, than funds in other parts of this bill.

One of the most important areas in which there has been increased funding is for the land-grant colleges created under the Second Morrill Act. I would like to detail the factors that led to our subcommittee's request for increased funding for these critically important schools.

These 16 land-grant colleges plus Tuskegee university for 80 years have been citadels of college education for blacks, particularly in the agricultural and mechanical sciences.

In fact in the last full survey in 1969 it was found that approximately one-fifth of all black college undergraduates were enrolled in these schools. Almost all of the college-educated black farmers received their agricultural training in these schools, as black enrollment in the white land-grant schools has always been and continues to be extremely limited.

But despite the historic and continuing commitment of the predominantly black land-grant colleges to the agricultural training of students and particularly those of disadvantaged and minority backgrounds, these institutions have been notoriously bypassed in the allocation of Federal funds.

These schools in the past have been starved for Federal funding from all sources including the Department of Agriculture.

William Payne of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, pointed out the imbalance in the amount of Federal aid given to the various land-grant colleges in an article in 1970 on the predominantly black land-grant colleges entitled "Forgotten But Not Gone." The article stated that:

In fiscal 1968 the USDA gave \$60 million to the predominantly white land-grant colleges, 150 times the figure of less than \$400,000 it gave to the 16 predominantly Negro land-grant colleges in the same states.

Payne further noted that this imbalance could not be explained by relative school enrollment, as the white land-grant schools had only 5½ times more students than the black land-grant schools, where there was both a predominantly white and a predominantly black land-grant school in the same state.

This disproportionate funding went on despite the fact that the USDA admitted that these 1890 land-grant colleges had a rapport and unique channels of communication with "the unreached and hard to reach" in rural areas of the South.

Unfortunately the Federal Government was unable to take advantage of these unique capacities because of a failure to provide adequate funds to

these schools. In 1970, for example, the last year for which there are available figures, when Federal obligations from the 12 Federal agencies which provide 95 percent of all Federal support to colleges and universities, including the land-grant schools, are looked at, it is seen that more than two times as much per capita Federal aid from these sources went to the predominantly white schools in the States in which there is both an 1862 and 1890 land-grant institution. And in the 3-year period between 1968 and 1970 there was almost a 12-percent drop in per capita aid to the predominantly black land-grant colleges from these sources, while Federal aid to the white land-grant schools from these sources continued to rise.

These figures take on heightened meaning when we look specifically at general Federal funding for these 16 predominantly black land-grant schools. In 1970 these schools received only slightly more than \$23 million from all the major Federal funding programs, while their 16 white counterparts were receiving approximately \$71 million from agriculture programs alone. In other words in the 16 States in which there are both predominantly white and predominantly black land-grant schools, the white schools were receiving approximately three times as much from the Department of Agriculture alone as the predominantly black schools were receiving from all major Federal programs.

It should be noted that while the gap between Federal per capita aid to the white land-grant colleges and the predominantly black land-grant colleges was increasing, State financing policies only further exacerbated this problem. In 1970 when Federal aid and State operational aid is treated as a bloc on a per capita basis, the white land-grant colleges received \$805 more per capita from the State and Federal Governments than did the predominantly black land-grant colleges.

The predominantly black land-grant colleges have been particularly starved for research and outreach funds. The land-grant colleges have traditionally been the heart of the research and extension station programs. These programs of course are intended to aid the farmers in the States in which the land-grant college is situated. But these programs are also of enormous aid to the educational programs of the land-grant colleges.

There is almost always large-scale overlap between researchers in the experiment stations and teachers in the land-grant schools. In other words, the research centers and the Extension Service stations centered at the land-grant colleges do, in fact, provide great benefits to the land-grant colleges in terms of prestige, facilities, and ability to draw faculties and students.

But all of these research and extension stations are located at the predominantly white land-grant schools. These research and extension facilities attract enormous amounts of Federal funding. In fiscal 1971, for example, these pre-

dominantly white colleges were allocated approximately \$87 million by USDA through the Hatch and Smith-Lever Acts alone, while the main source of Federal agricultural funding to the predominantly black colleges has been—Public Law 89-106—funds in which the predominantly black land-grant colleges received last year \$286,000 in grants ranging between \$22,000 and \$12,000, which comes to an average of only \$17,687 for each black institution.

The USDA has indirectly admitted that such disparities in funding are injurious to the black land-grant colleges. In a joint study carried out by USDA and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, entitled "A People and a Spirit" it was stated that:

Excellence in Extension requires excellence in teaching and in research. Therefore, the committee recommends the appropriation of sufficient additional funds by the proper Federal, state, local and private agencies directly to predominantly Negro colleges to substantially strengthen their overall capacity in these areas.

As one of the presidents of the predominantly black land-grant colleges stated so well:

It is important to remember that all of the 1890 black land-grant institutions are 80 years behind in sharing Federal funds for research and extension work. "Catch-up money" is desperately needed by all these institutions.

It is for reasons such as these that the committee has decided to allocate increased funds to give impetus to the development of these land-grant schools which could mean so much in improving the lot of the black farmer and the rural poor. Such increased allocation though still only a small amount is the only way to assure that the ideals of the Morrill Act begun in the 1860's are finally to be fulfilled in the 1970's.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take this opportunity to commend this committee on several items, but particularly on the handling of the rural water and sewer program appropriations.

We have heard in this country for a good many years about urban problems and about people moving to the big cities or rural areas and why we should try to do something to permit people to live in the smaller cities and in the rural areas. Of course, any kind of a program of rural development will depend upon the smaller cities and the smaller communities having adequate water and sewer systems so modern homes can be built in those areas. That is basic.

Two years ago the appropriation for grants was \$46 million. Last year the administration made a request for only \$24 million, a big reduction in that program. I offered an amendment to make it \$100 million and the committee approved it

so \$100 million was provided. The administration then did distribute \$44 million, almost twice what it had requested.

This year, the administration did not request any new money for grants. But the committee again this year is making \$100 million available for grants for this program, in addition to the loans under the program. I believe this is very necessary to rural development and commend the committee for its action.

Many times a committee is criticized in respect to one item out of 100 in a bill which someone thinks is not quite adequate, but seldom does anyone mention the good work things they do about the vast majority of other items in the bill. I believe this is one place where the committee has been sensitive to basic needs and in seeing the need for adequate funding of this grant program, and I want to commend the committee especially for its position and attention to this need.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, let me express to the House my sincere pleasure in serving on the Committee on Appropriations and particularly under the able leadership of our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITEN). I have also appreciated the knowledge and the contributions made by my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), the ranking minority Member, as well as those of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and all of the other Members on the majority side. Particularly I have appreciated the tremendous job that the staff has done assisting us in putting together this piece of very vital legislation. It has been an extreme pleasure to me particularly because so much was done on a nonpartisan basis with the primary interests of agriculture and the people of this country foremost in everyone's mind.

I should first give a little background as to where we are in agriculture today. We lose on an average, and I think this will be news to many, about 600,000 farmers a year, every single year. They leave rural America and migrate to our cities. Since 1948 we have lost 23 million people off the farm. At the present time we comprise around 5 percent of the total population of the entire country. This is a very interesting figure which many people use, because 5 percent may seem insignificant. However, when you attribute this figure to the Midwest, we do not represent 5 percent of the population of the Midwest. It is much closer to 40 percent. So, we do not consider ourselves very insignificant at all, in that part of the country. When you consider the country as a whole, agriculture and related business constitutes 35 percent of the country. Farming is the largest industry in the United States.

You want to talk about minorities? Well, we are a minority in America—the American farmer. This is true not only populationwise but also incomewise. The average income received by the farmer in

1970 was \$5,500. That was the net income in 1970. Let me give you an example of what happened in the 2 years of 1969 and 1970. A good friend of mine, a farmer, in 1969 paid \$9,000 in total income tax to the Federal and the State Governments. In 1970, which was not a very good year on the farm, he paid only \$800 in income tax. In other words, he went from a tax of \$9,000 in 1969 to a tax of \$800 in 1970. How many of us here could be in a position to withstand such an enormous reduction in our net income? It is totally incomprehensible, but that is exactly what happened in rural America in the last 2 years.

As another example, for instance, in 1948, I sold corn for \$2.65 a bushel. Last year I bought corn for \$1 a bushel. This is \$1.65 less than the net which I sold corn for in 1948, and that was when a dollar was worth a dollar, gentlemen. Perhaps we are the greatest victims of inflation in the country today, and there is nothing we can do about it, because when we sell we are at the mercy of the marketplace, and everything we buy has a fixed price attached to it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for accepting my suggestion that \$200,000 of additional funds be added to the Agricultural Research Service's Animal Disease Laboratory in Ames, Iowa, to study major livestock diseases. Fifty thousand dollars will be spent on transmissible gastroenteritis—TGE—and \$75,000 each for porcine stress syndrome and bovine vibriosis and related diseases.

Consumer and producers both benefit from the research and technology contributions made by our land-grant colleges and the State cooperative services.

Mr. Chairman, because of our outstanding ability to produce we have perhaps become slaves to our own efficiency. Agriculture has been and will always be the backbone of the U.S. economy regardless of our numbers. Those people who ignore the plight of the farmer, perhaps, some day may find grass growing on the streets of every city and town of our Nation. Everyone should certainly hope that that time never comes.

Mr. Chairman, this is more than just a bill for rural America. There is not a single segment of our society which will not profit from this legislation. This bill is about \$126 million under the budget request for fiscal year 1972, if the House considers the President's recent pledge to spend the \$104 million in the special milk fund.

Of particular interest to me was the decision by this committee to raise the Farmers Home Administration operating loans from \$75 million to \$350 million, to grant \$2 million for corn blight research, and to earmark \$200,000 in Agriculture Research Service funds for research on the dreaded swine and beef diseases.

The No. 1 ecologist is the American farmer. Clean air, pure water, and rich soil have long been the hallmarks of good agriculturists. For the past years, rural Americans have been hard at work preserving our environment through the watershed programs. These

programs have been funded at \$1 million more than the budget request, and \$43 million more than was spent this year.

An extremely informative pamphlet by the Sperry-Rand Corp. is included at this point in the RECORD:

#### AMERICA'S No. 1 ECOLOGIST

##### INTRODUCTION

Ecology—is it a jet-age concept? A breakthrough in man's quest for knowledge? Not really. There have been "ecologists" around for a long time.

The dictionary defines an ecologist as "... one who is concerned with the interrelationship of organisms and their environments." Until the last few years, few people had ever heard the word. Yet the three million farmers who produce this country's abundant supply of food and fiber have long been the foremost practicing ecologists.

Each day, farmers combine the elements of nature—sun, water, soil, air, plants, animals—to efficiently produce the world's greatest food supply. Their crops, through the photosynthesis process, cleanse the air and are great producers of oxygen. Therefore, who could better fit Mr. Webster's definition?

Let's take a look at some facts and figures that show "Farmer-Brown" is the nation's Number One ecologist.

##### SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

During the 1930s, the great dust storms, which plagued parts of this country, made it absolutely necessary for the American farmer to master the techniques of conservation if he had any hope of saving his land.

Soil and water conservation are inseparable. Without water, land will turn into deserts. Without properly managed land, the rains will run quickly to our streams and rivers, carrying the soil with them.

Experts estimate that in the giant dust storm of May, 1934, more than 200 million tons of topsoil were carried away. Today, through proper management, the "dust bowl" area now loses far less soil each year than it lost in just one storm in 1934. And what's more, the modern farmer knows not only how to keep his land and water in place, but also how to improve the soil.

For example, he knows that if he follows the contour of the land as he plants the crops, erosion from falling rain and wind will be reduced to a minimum. He knows that by following the same principle and interspersing row crops (corn, soybeans, etc.) with broadcast crops (wheat, oats, alfalfa, etc.) he can further protect his soil. On areas that are most vulnerable to erosion, modern farmers plant grasses and legumes, with a thick webbing of roots to hold the soil firmly in place. A dam at the end of a gully catches run-off water, thus preventing erosion. And there is the soil itself. Well-conditioned soil absorbs water quickly, reducing run-off—hence, less erosion.

##### FOOD

The end product of most agriculture is food—meat, milk, eggs, fruits, vegetables, cereals. Nowhere in the world, at no time in history, has a nation had a more abundant, low cost, high quality supply of foodstuffs.

The average American spends only 16.7% of his income on food, compared with 37%–39% in Western Europe and Japan, and 60% in India. Each farmer produces enough food to feed nearly 50 people. Modern American agriculturists have obtained their success through their application of science and technology or "... the study of the interrelationship of organisms and their environments."—ecology.

##### RECREATION

Outdoor recreation is an important new use of agricultural land. The Outdoor Recrea-

tion Resources Review Commission says Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before.

This demand for more outdoor recreation areas gives the nation's farmers and ranchers the opportunity to divert land not presently needed for food and fiber to uses in greater demand. It gives them a means of increasing income without adding to the stockpile of crops already in surplus quantities.

Farms and ranches often provide opportunities such as hunting, fishing, hiking, picnicking, camping, and sightseeing.

Public agencies—local, state, and federal—cannot keep up with the demand for more public recreation, nor can they be expected to.

While our total acreage set aside for public recreation makes an impressive figure, its geographic location makes most of it inaccessible to the general public.

Of the 283 million acres of public land now devoted to outdoor recreation, one-sixth is in sparsely-populated Alaska. Seventy-two percent of the remainder is in Western areas where only 15 percent of the people live.

This imbalance is being offset through the establishment of private recreation on the farms and ranches that make up three-fourths of our private land.

Many farmers and ranchers have started recreation areas on their land. Many more plan to do so. These enterprises include vacation farms, fishing waters, hunting areas, camping and picnic sites, shooting preserves, and building sites for summer homes.

##### WILDLIFE

Our farms and ranches—and the ponds, lakes and streams on them—provide an ideal habitat for a huge variety of animals and birds. It's a rare farmer who hasn't made friends with a deer or rabbit or thrush that makes its home on the farmstead. It's an even rarer farmer who doesn't provide food for his bird and animal neighbors during rough winters and extreme drought. Yet, in the past few years, some have cast farmers in the role of wildlife destroyers. The facts refute the charge, and show that farmers and ranchers are helping wildlife thrive.

A good example of this is the wild turkey, which was near extinction in the early 1930s. Through carefully controlled conditions, the wild turkey has increased to a point where hunters could bag a total of 128,167 birds in 1967–1968 without jeopardizing the population.

The mourning dove is an important "product" of the cultivated fields and pastures. Populations of this bird have done so well under present land management practices that hunters bagged over 41 million birds in 1965.

The ruffed grouse, a denizen of our northern forest margins, has not only managed to sustain high population, but in many states it has increased in number.

Wildlife thrives where there is a variety of crops and other plants. Many people think that wildlife abounds in areas that are completely forested, but scientists say that more wildlife, and a larger variety, will be found on the edge of the forest. The same is true of farms and farming areas.

##### WATER

One of the charges frequently leveled against the farmer is that he pollutes the water. Actually, modern farming techniques prevent water pollution caused by the soil itself. One leading misconception is that nitrogen runoff from agricultural land is primarily responsible for excessive growth of unwanted plants, mainly algae, in lakes and reservoirs.

The fact is, rain water contains .70 parts per million (ppm) nitrogen, and it takes only about .30 ppm to stimulate algae growth. Properly managed cropland contributes no more nitrogen to waterways than forest lands.

The farmer has at least as much interest, if not more, in pure water as does the city-dweller. Most humans require about the same amount of water. But the farmer needs good water for his livestock and crops—thus his livelihood. As an example: he requires 37 gallons of water to produce the grain for one slice of bread. It takes 3,750 gallons of water to raise a single pound of beef and 200,000 gallons are required to raise one ton of alfalfa. And the water he drinks usually comes from his own wells which he wants to be safe for his family.

CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Farmer Brown and his colleagues know that as the size of their operations increase, problems also grow accordingly. Fortunately, the modern farmer has a team of experts from the land-grant universities, the State and Federal Departments of Agriculture and agribusiness to help him solve those problems.

A good example of the kind of problems that can occur is that of handling animal wastes that accumulate in large poultry or livestock operations. In the past, each farmer had a comparatively small number of livestock and poultry. The waste they produced was spread on the land for fertilization. Today's large operations, where thousands of animals and birds are confined to a relatively small space, requires a system every bit as sophisticated as those found where large numbers of people live. This is a new problem and teams of experts are hard to work developing waste disposal systems to fit the new circumstances. Perhaps, as with many other situations in the past, the answer to this problem will solve the similar problem city planners are facing.

The U.S. farmer has been working on an increasingly small margin of profit which he has been trying to off-set with efficiencies in labor and production. Three of his most valuable tools have been commercial fertilizers to increase the yields, pesticides to protect his crops, and stimulants to increase the efficiency of his animals.

All have been under heavy attack by some outside the agricultural community. Although it is very true that these tools must be handled carefully, it is also true that their dangers and abuses have been exaggerated. Without pesticides our annual harvest of grains such as corn and rice and fruits and vegetables would be reduced an estimated 20-30%. Commercial fertilizers can add an estimated 20% increase in crop production. Low-level antibiotics used as growth promoters make hogs, chickens, and beef cattle grow about seven percent faster. Again, his team of experts has been helping Farmer Brown learn how to best handle these tools. The goal: To provide abundant, nourishing supplies of food at as low a cost as possible. And to do this, Farmer Brown must have these tools. Without them, food prices could rise significantly.

Farmer Brown, the ecologist, has proved over and over that he is a good neighbor to his friends in the towns and cities of America. The great environmental issues of the day are among his great concerns. In our complex, modern life, few have a greater knowledge or appreciation for nature than does our Farmer Brown. In his work, the farmer sees and deals with the miracle of life each day. Farmer Brown is, and must continue to be, an expert ecologist so that he, and all the rest of us, can survive.

Very frankly I personally told the President earlier this year that his original budget estimate for Agriculture was woefully inadequate. Since that meeting, to the President's credit, the budget for Agriculture has been increased by \$314.58

million. In addition the President has agreed to spend the \$104 million which this bill appropriates to the special milk program.

The figures follow:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BUDGETARY CHANGES RESULTING FROM THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE OF MAY 2, 1971, RELATING TO AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

	1971	1972
[In thousands]		
Agricultural Research Service:		
Additional pesticides research in existing laboratories (including \$1,000,000 in H. Doc. 92-93, dated Apr. 19, 1971).....		\$4,081
Research on nonchemical means of pest control (including \$500,000 in H. Doc. 92-93).....		800
Research on corn blight (submitted in H. Doc. 92-93).....		500
Research on cottonseed proteins and on the dogfly:		
To be released from reserve in 1971-1972 program (the research on dogflies would be continued in 1972 in the 2d item above).....	\$235	200
Research on methods to control the fire ant, gypsy moth and other miscellaneous pests. (In 1971 the amount is proposed to be provided by transfer from control).....	2,000	2,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	2,235	7,581
Soil Conservation Service:		
Conservation operations, technical assistance to districts.....		+12,000
Watershed works of improvement (new starts in 1972 would be increased from 60 up to 75).....		+28,000
Foreign Agricultural Service: Market development.....		+1,000
Farmers Home Administration:		
Farm operating loans, program will be increased in 1972 when Congress enacts pending legislation to insure these loans. This would be in lieu of the existing \$275,000,000 direct loan level.....		
Farm ownership loans, insured (increase from \$210,000,000 to \$350,000,000).....		140,000
Water and sewer loans, insured (total loan funds available in 1971 would be \$260,000,000 and in 1972, \$300,000,000).....	100,000	111,000
Watershed loans (legislation to be submitted to shift from direct to insured basis and increase program level from \$5,000,000 to \$20,000,000).....		15,000
In addition in June 1971, the President approved for the special milk program.....		104,000

For these actions and others President Nixon is to be commended. This is proof that President Nixon will respond to rural America if he is informed. All that the producers of this country want is a chance to be treated fairly and equally with the other segments of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, this is a good bill. It is something that is needed not only by rural but also urban America, and those living in the suburbs as well. This committee has done a tremendous job in providing this House with the type of legislation it can and should support. I am proud to have had a part in the deliberation of the drafting of this legislation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the appropriation in the bill for the Consumer and Marketing

Service. I wonder if someone on the committee could reply to a question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would be glad to answer the gentleman to the extent I can.

Mr. MELCHER. I note that in 1970, actual, as compared to the 1971 estimate, the increase is from \$83.3 million to \$94.4 million for meat inspection, an increase of \$11 million. The appropriated amount in the bill for fiscal 1972 is \$103.7 million which is an increase of slightly over \$9 million.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is this: Will the increase as projected be sufficient to take on the added needs of the meat inspection service as it takes over some of the inspections of the States and also to provide for the increased needs of inspectors because of the increase in plants and the increase in the number of animals slaughtered in those plants under Federal inspection?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Montana that in the judgment of the subcommittee it definitely would take care of all of the contingencies we can foresee. When I say that, that is our best judgment.

As the gentleman will recall, meat inspection is compulsory, and whatever it takes to properly handle it we must provide. The law does provide that in those States that fail to come up to the Federal standards within a certain period of time the Federal Government has to take over, and is charged with the full responsibility of supervising and handling meat inspection. But how many of those States there will be, how many will come up to the Federal standards and maintain their own systems, and how many of them will turn it all over to the Federal Government is not an exact figure. So this amount of money represents the best judgment of the Department and the subcommittee as to what it probably should be.

I would say to the gentleman from Montana further that, should it develop that it takes a turn different from that which we provide, then we shall have to provide for it in a supplemental or by some other means. But as I say, we do think this probably meets every contingency we can foresee.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I have another question on meat inspection.

About a year ago I told the House of the loss of veterinarians in the meat inspection service of Consumer and Marketing Service, because of resignations or retirement. And the attrition rate was plainly, I believe, the result of the low pay scale for the veterinarians, in the Meat Inspection Service, which is completely out of line with their earning capabilities in other areas of their professional work.

I direct this question to the chairman, and ask for his response for the subcommittee, if it is the intention of the subcommittee to correct the situation, because I do believe that having veterinarians in the meat inspection service is the backbone of the very system itself.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the

matter of civil service ratings, and things of that sort, not only is beyond the control of this committee, but actually it is beyond the control of the Congress under existing law. The Civil Service Act provides that the Civil Service Commission determines on its own whether to raise the rating of employees. These decisions are based upon their training and their qualifications. So this is a matter that is not within the reach of this committee. However, if it were, I do not know what we would do to correct the problem which the gentleman mentions.

By way of illustration, if you get a veterinarian to come out to see a cow or a mule, or a horse, it has a definite value, or to see a hog, there is a definite monetary value over those things, and you can establish your charges accordingly. But when that veterinarian sets up an animal hospital at the edge of the city, or the edge of your town, and people with pets come out there, the veterinarian can charge them just as much as the man who owns the pets can afford to pay. There is no limit on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. WHITTEN. You cannot hope to meet, under civil service pay scales, the amount of money that these young veterinarians are making with their pet hospitals. I do not know what we can do. There is one saving thing in it, though, and that is that most meat inspection is not really done by the veterinarians. The veterinarians supervise them. You have to have them there, but most of the people who do the actual work are lay people who are trained and supervised by veterinarians.

But at any rate, the problem which the gentleman mentions is one that we cannot handle in this committee because we do not have the authority.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the chairman for his answer, but I think the gentleman is all too modest. I think the Consumer Marketing Service and the USDA is very much interested in what the views of the chairman are, as to what should be done, and I appreciate the assurance of his intentions.

Mr. WHITTEN. All I am saying is that the pay scale of veterinarians is fixed by basic law, and not by this Subcommittee on Appropriations which appropriates a lump sum. So when the gentleman says we should pay them a higher scale, that is something we do not have the authority to do. I recognize the problem.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman.

My last and final point, Mr. Chairman, pertains to the amount of money designated in the committee report for further research or expanded research on bovine vibriosis.

I notice in the committee's report \$50,000 is suggested to be the increase for this disease and marketing stress in pork.

I asked the chairman if the intent of

the committee is to expedite further the research in this serious livestock disease (bovine vibriosis) and, if so, what additions we could expect could be pumped into this research because I do feel this is a very needed and necessary research program that is being underfunded currently.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will turn to page 20 of the committee report, he will see that \$200,000 extra is being provided for several diseases, of which this is one. The \$50,000 referred to is for transmissible gastroenteritis—TGE.

What we provided is what the Department said it could reasonably use in an expanded research program. Of course, you cannot do the research without dollars, but the dollar figure is not completely representative of getting the job done. You have to have qualified personnel. So we gave them the increase that they said they could use.

Mr. MELCHER. Do I understand the chairman correctly—that of the \$200,000, \$50,000 will be for TGE and the other \$150,000 would be for bovine vibriosis?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is one other item I mentioned there.

Mr. MELCHER. That is the marketing stress in pork?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; marketing stress in pork.

Mr. MELCHER. Then it is the intention of this subcommittee that the department has at least an increase of \$150,000 for bovine vibriosis or marketing stress in pork.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that we are adding everything they can use. We do not want them to spend the money just because they have it. They have a special \$2 million fund for research, and if they make a breakthrough and can really use it, then they can use that \$2 million. I do not want to get this so that it is tied down too much. Just because they have a certain amount of money does not mean they should spend that amount whether or not there is a use for it.

We had made available our best advice, and we have made money available to them, and we hope they can use it.

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERLE. I have contacted Dr. Chester Manthei, the director of the Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa, and he assured me that funds appropriated will assure that a three-man research team will continue to research bovine vibriosis and other related diseases. He also stated that this amount of money will be all they will need and this is the desired level at which they can operate most efficiently.

Mr. MELCHER. Would that mean, as I understand it, that the research effort would be doubled from 1.5 man-years to 3 man-years?

Mr. SCHERLE. If the figures that you gave me initially are correct, then this bill will double the amount for research of this disease and other related diseases.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman

for his information and his efforts on the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman who I know has been really active on this problem of the importation of meat whether we have had proper Federal overseeing of meat products coming in from foreign nations. Has the gentleman been satisfied with the findings in his research with relation to adequate funding for veterinarians and inspections overseas?

Mr. MELCHER. I would tell my friend from Texas that I have not been satisfied. I think this is an area where the Consumer Marketing Service is not doing a sufficient job to assure all our consumers in this country that the meat we do import is adequately inspected when it arrives in this country and before it is sold to consumers.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell by the amount of money that is in this bill what amount will be spent—and perhaps we could ask the Chairman what amount of money will be spent for the inspection of meat coming in from foreign nations?

Mr. MELCHER. I do not have that information. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee can supply it.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, I do not have the exact information, but I will be glad to supply it to the gentleman. We will have to look it up. We have tried to provide adequately for it, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. MELCHER. I have not been able to determine the cost of inspecting imported meat because it is so mixed in with the inspection of domestically produced meat. Many of the inspectors who inspect foreign meat also inspect domestic meat, and the work is divided between the two areas. It has been very difficult for me to try to arrive at separate figures.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) the ranking Republican, MARK ANDREWS, and the committee for putting together what I feel is a fine bill, a bill, however, which I feel has a few inadequacies. I am going to speak about an amendment that I shall offer later on, but this in no way reflects on the high esteem I hold for the chairman of this committee. I say that in all sincerity. There are very few men in this House for whom I have greater respect, for his ability and his conscientiousness, and the way that he labors over this very difficult piece of legislation. I wish there was some way that would make it unnecessary for me to offer the amendment because of my close friendship and admiration for him, but I have deep feelings in this particular area and I feel that I am compelled to do so.

Mr. Chairman, later today, when I in-

roduce my amendment to limit subsidy payments to \$20,000 per crop for each producer, I will deal more specifically with the reasons why I believe this amendment should be adopted.

At this point, I want to speak more generally about the background to this reform effort; why I feel it is clear that such a subsidy limitation can be adopted without damage to the legitimate purposes of this farm program; and, finally, why the present budgetary situation simply cries out for this reform.

The reform I seek today is essentially a reaffirmation of two prior actions of the House. In 1968 this Chamber adopted my amendment for a \$20,000 ceiling by a vote of 230 to 160. That 70 vote margin was increased by 12 votes when my similar amendment was adopted in 1969.

When the question came up again last year, the picture had changed. In response to the rising pressure for this reform, this administration became the first to support a payment ceiling. Understandably, many of my colleagues believed that the \$55,000 ceiling was a step in the right direction which deserved their support.

Later I will detail the reasons why this hope was not fulfilled, as many of my colleagues and I had wanted.

Let us take a moment to review the reasons why agricultural experts have concluded that a reasonable subsidy limitation, such as this \$20,000 ceiling, can be implemented without adverse effects on our basic farm program. Dr. John A. Schnittker, former Under Secretary of Agriculture, has produced a study, finding that present subsidy levels are far in excess of amounts needed for an effective production adjustment program. And Secretary Hardin himself revealed that in 1968 nearly two-thirds of all subsidies to cotton growers, for example, were, to use his own words, "income supplements." In other words, the department has also acknowledged that those funds are not needed for crop adjustment.

So the record is clear that a reasonable payment ceiling will not harm our farm program. On the contrary, it can only improve it by restoring some balance, some measure of equity, to a badly distorted program that benefits only the wealthy few. And, in addition, it can make possible savings up to \$200 million, badly needed for other priority needs.

We must not ignore the importance of this chance to achieve these savings. While we still have yet to vote on many important appropriations bills, already, according to estimates in last Friday's Wall Street Journal, a deficit of \$20 to \$22 billion is projected for fiscal 1972—nearly double the projections made by the administration in January. And the deficit for this fiscal year has been projected to reach nearly \$20 billion—a billion and a half dollars over the President's earlier estimates.

With such drastic possible deficits facing us, we cannot expect this action today to have a great impact. But the figures are a grim reminder of the urgent need to trim fat where we can. And I know of no better place to start trimming than on this runaway program.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen that it is a reasonable proposal that will not adversely affect this program, but can only improve it. We have seen too that last year's effort at reform was a hollow victory. And finally, we have seen that our budget picture compels us to curb spending wherever possible. Let us reaffirm the past judgments of this House and restore some measure of sanity to this discredited program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me this time.

I followed with interest the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) regarding payment limitations. I would suppose, if that is not subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill, I might vote for such a limitation, because in my district there probably are not enough people who get that money to have a bridge game.

We have discussed the problem, and this brings up the problem of getting money to the rural areas. I guess that is what this is about, on limitations.

I know what I think about when the Penn Central needs \$200 million, and that seems to many to be a good idea; and when Lockheed needs \$250 million and that seems to many to be a good idea; and perhaps Boeing will need \$500 million, or a little more, I am not sure.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was interesting, also, that 2 years ago, within 2 hours after we had a vote on a limitation on an agriculture bill, we had the identical kind of amendment proposed on the Treasury bill, for a limitation on the subsidy to magazines in the Northeast. One hundred fifty-five Members who voted for a limitation on the farm program we changed were opposed to such a limitation on subsidies for magazines.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Some Members can try to make this a facetious amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. I hope the gentleman does not think I am being facetious.

Mr. CONTE. No. I meant the reference to the magazines. Surely there is a method for doing that. It is through legislation. If we can do it I will be glad to vote for it.

I want to state my position loud and clear. I voted against the SST. I plan to vote against any subsidy to Lockheed. I would be pleased to vote against any subsidy to the Penn Central. I hope you will join me in voting against this farm bonanza.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for a good part of his contribution.

We have talked about the various corporations and large companies. Some of us think that you cannot let somebody

fail if they get big enough. I wish many of you had time to drive through my district and other rural districts and look at some of the almost deserted villages and farmhouses from which people have just slipped away. They are in a state of disrepair because these people were not able to make a living there. Those people just fade out quietly. They are not gathered in large groups, making disturbances about these tragedies, but when you lose the people from these large areas, when you lose the rural flavor of your country, you lose a great deal, as Thomas Jefferson said.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota from the other body, Senator HUMPHREY, made a statement where he said that when the immigrants came to this country, they did not stay in the big cities. He wondered why they did not stay in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and some of the other large cities. Why did they go to North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, and Montana? The answer is that we had a program in the country then where you could get free land if you went out and homesteaded the land. You could get free education for your children, because the Federal Government set up land-grant colleges. We provided rural free delivery so that these people who homesteaded could get mail delivered to them. So, as a result, the people went out into the country and we all enjoy the benefits of that today. What happens now, however? When you go to town, you find that the fellow wants to leave the farm in order to go to town, in order to get the things that he cannot get on the farm: recreation in town that is not available on the farm, better paying jobs and businesses in town—and when you lose your job or business in town, you find that you will get higher welfare payments and other benefits. These are things you just do not get if you stay on the farm. I believe we have to take a hand in reversing this direction.

We are concerned here about the small percentage of people on our land, and we want to keep developing our American rural areas as well as our American urban areas. When we talk about the Census Bureau and the figures that they give out, let us just take a careful look at it. I believe we do not look at the Census Bureau's figures carefully enough or long enough. In the Bureau of the Census, when you get the figures showing the people living in the cities, and in the urban areas, they say that you are in a city when you are in a place that has 2,500 people or more, and with less than you are in an urban area. In my district, when you drive from a town of 2,400 to a town of 2,600 people, you do not feel very much as though you have gone to a city from a rural area.

The Farmers Home Administration, Mr. Chairman, I think has done a great job, regardless of what party has been in power. At least, in our State of Missouri, we have had great administrators in the Farmers Home Administration. We had Mr. Everett Jose, and Mr. Mendel Cline, and others who are greatly concerned with fighting the problems of water pollution, of providing rural water

and sewer systems and making the land habitable. In the Farmers Home Administration they can serve areas that have 5,500 people. They have raised this bill to 10,000. So, Mr. Chairman, when we think of this bill, with the funds that are provided in it, and think of whether it will help rural America, and think of the differences between rural and urban America, we have to realize that we are helping areas that have small numbers of people, in some instances 2,500 people or less. The Bureau of the Census thinks that people are living in an urban area if they have 2,500 people or more, but we can have 10,000 people in our districts, and it will still be in rural areas. Those rural areas and cities up to 10,000 are served by Farmers Home Administration through funds in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding further to me. I should like to see, in carrying out this fight against pollution, the Farmers Home Administration given more money to carry out the programs in this field. There are other programs that should be supported also by all Members of this body. The Rural Electric Cooperatives have done a fine job in providing power and lights for rural areas. I believe that this should be mentioned. I hope that we keep on supporting that program. I commend the committee for what it has done there. Someone mentioned the co-op income taxes. We think that we should be concerned about income taxes, no matter where they come from, and to see that the burden is fairly shared, whether it comes from private citizens, private utilities, co-ops, corporations, or a Governor of one of our larger States.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking Republican, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, as well as all of the members of the committee, and, indeed, especially commend Mr. MICHEL, the gentleman from Illinois, and the others who have offered amendments. While I do not enjoy voting on them, and may not agree with them, nevertheless I believe it is like a trip to the dentist. It makes you a little uncomfortable, but it may be good for you. These amendments sharpen up the issue and that is really good for the body politic.

Mr. Chairman, I want to save the watershed program. The amendment introduced by my colleague Mr. REUSS would scuttle it. His proposed halt to all projects that contain the practice of channel improvement would cause unwarranted delays in needed watershed action in almost every State. Even channels to convey irrigation water and those to protect urban and residential areas would be affected.

Mr. Chairman, these Chambers have witnessed repeated requests from both sides of the floor that the watershed program under Public Law 566 be acceler-

ated. It has been one of the most popular programs that this Congress has instituted, and the Soil Conservation Service has developed a sound and sensible technology to implement the act. This is not the time to slow down.

Watershed projects have proved to be a sound investment on the part of local communities and the Federal Government. They not only serve their initial purpose of flood prevention and watershed protection eminently well, but they also spur community growth in many ways. Many of the structures built to prevent floods create sparkling lakes that bring new opportunities for recreation, increase the supply of water for farm and home and industry, and enhance the beauty of the landscape.

Conservation treatment and careful use of the land to manage water and control sediment bring better quality farm crops and make the community more attractive. And this land treatment phase of watershed projects has not in any sense been abandoned in favor of rushing the water off the watershed. Actually, acceleration of land treatment is a requirement in these projects. This is a strong part of the effort in any of Missouri's watersheds.

The resource conditions as well as the benefits vary a great deal among the various watersheds. The planning process is a complex one. Aims of the local people differ widely. To suggest that channel improvement is not needed in any project, just as to say that it is needed in every project, does not square with the facts. In some watersheds in low lying regions, stream channel improvement is the only effective way to bring about the desired flood protection.

Sponsors of these projects, in the strong belief that they will be improving the environment in their own home areas have obligated themselves for land rights costs and other financial responsibilities. Anyone with 5 minutes experience in dealing with real farmers will tell you that when they grant easements on their land and vote to tax themselves for a project which is in their own community, they do not take such actions lightly. If those of us who make decisions in Washington gave them half as much careful attention and half as much consideration to the human welfare involved as do the men and women on America's farms, then utopia would have arrived several years ago.

We, in Missouri, carry the notion that decisions affecting the environment and well-being of Missourians should be made by Missourians and certainly this should be done when those decisions do not adversely affect our neighbors in Illinois, Iowa, or Wisconsin. The proposal for a moratorium on Soil Conservation Service channelization activities seems to carry the implication that the further you get away from a problem the better you can solve it. But in Missouri, it seems to us that if you get far enough away, you do not even see the problem and that certainly seems the case with those who propose this moratorium.

All in all, watershed projects serve to make the watershed community a better

place to live and a nicer place to visit. There are more jobs and wages are higher. To further delay construction would place an intolerable burden upon them.

This vital program needs to move ahead more rapidly to meet America's resource needs and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Last year Members of this Congress in their wisdom saw fit to increase the President's budget request for Farmers Home Administration grant funds for water and sewer projects by \$60 million. The President did not accept the recommendation of the majority of the Members who supported that increase and to date the Office of Management and Budget has only released \$40 million of the amount appropriated for this purpose.

I offer the following information to my colleagues as a short reminder of the work that has been accomplished through funds for the Department of Agriculture, and in particular, the Farmers Home Administration. On a national basis, approximately 5,000 water and sewer systems financed by this agency are in operation providing water and sewer service to over 1 million families. This does not take into consideration the loans and grants which have been approved in the last few months but which facilities have not yet been completed. Records maintained by the Farmers Home Administration show that at the present time there are 168 water and sewer systems in operation in Missouri alone which were financed by FHA with about \$36 million of loan funds and \$4 million of grant funds. These systems are giving water and sewer service to approximately 40,000 rural families.

I am told that the FHA has on hand at the present time over 2,500 applications for loans representing requests for about \$500 million.

In addition, they have over 1,300 applications for grants indicating a need for about \$100 million. Furthermore, communities submitting over 7,000 applications for funds have been notified that the FHA will be unable to finance their projects due to the lack of funds available.

The Farmers Home Administration advises that approximately 23.6 percent of the cost of all projects financed last year required some grant funds in order to install facilities which will deliver adequate water and sewer service at a reasonable user rate. The need for grants is increasing since the proportion of applications for sewerage facilities as compared to those for water systems is increasing. In fact, in fiscal 1970, grants represented about 37 percent of the development cost of sewerage facilities.

An economic research service survey reveals that there are nearly 34,000 rural communities in the Nation without central water systems, and 44,000 such communities without central sewer systems. The survey also indicated that about 30,000 rural communities have an immediate, compelling need for central sewerage facilities or improvements to existing facilities. Based on current construction

costs, these facilities will require nearly \$12 billion to install. In Missouri, the survey indicated a need for approximately 700 water systems and 686 sewer systems representing a cost of nearly \$290 million.

At a time when so much emphasis is given to improving and preserving our environment, I would urge my colleagues to consider the far-reaching benefits of adequate funding for the badly needed water and sewer facilities in this country. Let us take this opportunity to indicate our support for this meritorious program.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### DEATH OF VINCENT MONZEL

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of sadness that I announce the death of my administrative assistant, Vincent Monzel. He was much more than an assistant to me; he was a great friend during the 8 years in which we were associated.

I know that his many friends in North Carolina and Washington will join Mrs. Broyhill and me in extending to his wife, Edith, his daughter, Catherine, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Monzel, our deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

Vince Monzel was born on August 13, 1920, in Alton, Ill. and was educated in the public schools there. He was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1942 and served honorably in the U.S. Army in World War II. Upon his discharge, he worked for the War Department as an occupational counselor and was subsequently employed by the Dow Chemical Company in Texas as an editor and public relations specialist. He came to Washington in 1948 as a civilian employee with the U.S. Army and in 1950 joined the professional staff of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

He began his career on Capitol Hill in 1952 as a staff member with the Small Business Committee. In 1955 he joined the staff of Congressman John Henderson of Ohio as administrative assistant and later served his successor, Congressman Tom Moorehead, in the same capacity.

When I came to Congress as a freshman Member in January of 1963, it was my good fortune to hire Vince Monzel as my administrative assistant. His knowledge of Capitol Hill and the Federal Government has been invaluable to me. His service to me and to the people of North Carolina whom I represent has been outstanding in its dedication. No problem was too small or insignificant to receive his complete attention and concern.

During his career on Capitol Hill, Vince Monzel earned the respect and admiration of Congressmen and staff members on both sides of the aisle. His willingness to be of help to new Members and their staffs was well known and appreciated. His opinions were highly valued and his advice was often sought.

I know that my office will not be the same without him; his loss is a sad one for many on Capitol Hill.

Funeral arrangements remain incomplete at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, reportedly later this afternoon the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is going to introduce an amendment relative to channelization or the prevention of same. I cannot vote for an amendment which says we are going to channelize everywhere all over the United States. I cannot vote for an amendment which says that we are not going to channelize anywhere in the United States. I recognize that in the next political campaign the policologists and many sincere but shortsighted environmentalists are going to blacklist anyone who votes against the Reuss amendment as being anti-environment. This is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place channelization comes in many shapes. Channelization can promote a desirable environment just as it sometimes can retard it. The answer is not in opening the door wide and not in closing it completely. There is a way to solve this problem but it is not through an amendment of this kind.

I say that channelization can be a good thing. Very few crops, natural and otherwise, can be grown on waterlogged land. When areas that dispose of sewage with septic tanks are inundated with water, contamination is picked up and moved through the stream system. Surface litter such as garbage and refuse, animal wastes and even dead animals, floats off, contaminates the water, and is deposited in the most undesirable places. When water is permitted to stagnate on the land in shallow pools it loses its dissolved oxygen and can become putrid. When water is allowed to stand on the land and is only removed by evaporation, salts accumulate in the soils.

Waterlogged land is notoriously a breeding area for mosquitoes. The control of mosquitoes is important to good public health and particularly to the control of malaria and encephalitis. The recent restrictions on insecticides makes the control of mosquito-breeding areas a necessity.

Mr. Chairman, I think the best way to put this whole matter into focus, the business of stopping all channelization, is by looking at one of the biggest channelization projects we have ever had in this Nation. That is on the Missouri River which, of course, flows through the Midwest. Let us see what happened to that river before we started channelizing it.

In the first place, there were floods every spring which created tremendous environmental damage. There is no question about that. It was said that a good farm flowed under the Omaha Bridge every day. And it did. The States of Nebraska and Iowa did not know where the State lines were from one year to another and the farmers did not know where their property lines were, because

of changes in the river's course—because of alluvium and accretion.

Today you can walk along the east side of the Missouri River, which is supposed to be the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska, and though you are supposed to be in Iowa, you cross Nebraska area more than 20 times.

I recall that they started to build a bridge across the Missouri River between Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa. They got it underway. The river rose and it changed its course and, you know, the river was one-half mile east of the east approach to the bridge. The gentleman who represented that district at that time tried to get the money to put the river back under the bridge, but could not do it in the House. A couple of good-hearted Connecticut Senators got the money to channelize the Missouri under the bridge at that time, under the foreign aid appropriation bill. I say they were bighearted, but we found out a few months later that New Haven Insurance Co. held the bonds on the bridge.

Environmentalists do not want us to build dams. We have navigation on the Missouri, but not slack-water navigation. The only way we can have navigation on the Missouri without dam is through channelization.

The Corps of Engineers has done a tremendous job. They have learned how to make the river channelize itself, so now it is controlled. Now it is useful for navigation, it is useful environmentally, and those old ox bows which were removed by straightening the once meandering stream, have been plugged. They are full of water. They have created tremendous ecological, environmental, and recreational areas, all as a result of channelization, which, as I have said, comes in so many different forms.

I know that it is dangerous to oppose any amendment of this kind in these days. The opposers are called the enemies of the environment, the dirty dozen, and other things, the practice designed mainly to affect political campaigns. But we are going to have to sometime put a little emotion in the background and get a little intelligence and a little logic into these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I say again I would not vote and you would not vote for a measure which said we are going to force channelization in every county in the United States. It is also just as foolish to say that no Federal money shall henceforth be used anywhere in the United States for any channelization project.

Every project must be considered on its own merits. We can provide the machinery to do the proper kind of a job, but we cannot do it through a hasty ill-considered amendment such as that which is proposed today.

Mr. Chairman, channelization becomes a necessity in many small watershed projects. Small watershed projects im-

prove the environment for people in the following ways:

Provide flood protection on upstream flood plains in the watershed area for agriculture, business, and industry, and local townspeople.

Provide water for agricultural purposes.

Remove excess water from the watershed's agricultural and urbanizing areas. Without this, much of the Nation's prime agricultural land would be either unsuitable or uneconomic for its present use, resulting in major dislocations in the economy.

Provide water for municipal and industrial purposes, when this is a recognized need of the area.

Reduce sediment loads in waterways, resulting in better water quality, reduced channel aggradation, less sediment in navigation channels and harbors, and reduced rate of fill in major reservoirs.

Provide water-based recreational opportunities for swimming, boating, and fishing, when this is desired by the community.

Improve fish habitat on many streams by increasing low flows; small watershed projects do not adversely affect the fishery resource on most streams on which channel improvement measures are carried out, because of the low original quality of the fishery resource.

Special fish and wildlife developments can be included to improve fish and wildlife habitat and feeding areas when local and State people consider this a desirable aim.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the Department of Agriculture—environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill, H.R. 9270, legislation which is of vital importance to all Americans.

These appropriations not only affect the Nation's supply of food and fiber, but they affect the health of the domestic economy and the pocketbooks of every citizen.

Agricultural appropriations have increased the American farmer's efficiency, thus freeing manpower for business and industrial development and economic expansion. Today, the American farmer provides food and fiber for himself and the needs of over 44 other persons. American food costs require a smaller percentage of the consumer's disposable income dollar than in any other part of the world at any time in history.

In effect, these appropriations have annually provided a "consumer subsidy" enabling the American housewife to spend more of her disposable income for nonfood items, 83.3 percent in 1970, than any consumers in any other country in the world.

The reduction in the percentage of disposable income required for food since 1957 saved the American consumer approximately \$19.7 billion in 1970 alone. This money has been diverted to nonfood items boosting economic growth in nonfood industries and increasing employment opportunity. This is quite a return compared to an annual investment of less than \$3 billion.

It is also important, I think, to con-

sider agriculture's total impact on our national economy in considering agriculture and related appropriations. Agriculture generates jobs for nearly 40 percent of our employed workers, either by providing the raw material on which they work or by providing the market for the projects or commodities that they produce. Agriculture employs more people than the steel, auto, utilities, and transportation industries combined.

Farmers annually spend more than \$36 billion for goods and services just to produce their crops and livestock. Each year, the farmer buys products containing 320 million pounds of rubber, enough to put tires on nearly 7 million automobiles. The farmer uses more electricity than is consumed in the cities of Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, D.C., combined. Every year he uses 5 million tons of steel in the form of machinery, trucks, cars, fencing, and building materials. Farm use of steel accounts for 40,000 jobs in the steel industry.

However, even though agriculture is America's largest industry, the farmer is in desperate need of income. I am hopeful that these appropriations will in part be a short-term aid in our efforts to bring new economic life to rural and small-town America.

Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that the Appropriations Committee recommendations provide additional funds for direct assistance and loan programs for farmers. One of the more significant recommendations includes \$932,847,000 to fund our commitment to rural development and to provide many of the fundamental requirements for rural development including electrification and telephone services, water and sewer systems, land and resource development, and rural housing.

The committee recommendations include a \$545 million loan level for REA to move to improved service and area coverage for electricity, and \$30 million for the capitalization of the new telephone bank and funds for a loan level of \$125 million under the regular telephone program.

A total of \$100 million for planning and development grants and \$300 million for insured loans are included to assist the 32,000 rural communities that require new or improved water systems and over 30,000 that require new or improved sewer systems.

I am also most encouraged that the appropriation for conservation operations of \$150,146,000 represents an increase of \$10,986,000 over fiscal year 1971, and will help restore a substantial part of the 1,200 personnel eroded by personnel ceilings of the last few years.

The committee also recommended \$132,099,000, an increase of \$4,500,000, for watershed and flood prevention operations, which are an essential part of the rural soil and water conservation effort.

The committee's directive regarding \$195,500,000 for operating the rural environmental assistance program, one of the most successful programs to protect the quality of our environment, is also good news for the farmer.

A relatively new program that has been very successful in Kansas is the

resource conservation and development program, administered by the Soil Conservation Service. I am pleased to see this appropriation increased \$738,000 over fiscal year 1971 to an appropriation of \$15,691,000.

While this bill does not include the level of appropriations for certain USDA programs that I had recommended, I would like to commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their forthright recommendations and judicious distribution of funds. I feel that the recommendations in this bill will help improve farm income, will help revitalize rural and smalltown America, and will help solve the growing population distribution crisis affecting conditions in rural and urban America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM).

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the members of the committee are to be commended for the exceptional work and proposed legislation they have presented to the House today.

I want to briefly refer to the magazine that the chairman of the subcommittee had in his hand when he was addressing the members of this assembly today. The chairman effectively and eloquently described the existing circumstances in rural America.

Much of the information referred to in the story in the magazine is a report of the facts existing in my home district, the eastern part of the State of South Dakota. It is characteristic of what has happened in rural America in the last two and a half to three decades. The economic-forced movement of people in this country from rural to urban America has caused great hardship to rural people in the Plains States.

The abandoned homes and exodus of people from the economic depressed rural areas has introduced a new socioeconomic concept—the "cost of space" concept which is reflected in higher costs in education, housing, health care, water, sewer facilities, and rural electrification programs.

The idea of lighting the rural homes, barns and buildings was a right effort for America. The cost of doing that has almost doubled in the last 5 or 6 years. I think the increasing costs of facilities and services due to a national trend of inflation is a primary cause for the essential increase in the appropriations in this bill.

Further, in 1944 the REA cooperatives were confronted with an "area coverage" concept that was imposed upon the directors and managers of every rural electrical cooperative system. The provisions of the "area coverage" covenant compelled the cooperatives to extend facilities and services to every applicant and to the last man in the wilderness.

The performance of cooperatives in complying with the obligation of the "full area coverage" covenant has resulted in the construction and service of almost 53 percent of the total miles of lines of the entire electrical industry of this country but only about 3 percent of the total electric utility market of this Nation.

I commend the directors and managers of electric cooperatives all over the United States for an unprecedented record of business principles and management throughout three decades of prudent stewardship of an infant rural industry in a highly competitive market wherever density of service developed or existed. The rural electric cooperatives have braved all adversities from the boundaries of Maine to the borders of Mexico.

Extensive research supports the argument of the burden thrust upon directors and managers in the administration of the financial affairs of REA cooperatives because of circumstances beyond their control as follows, to wit: Abandonment of services, national inflation, obsolescence.

In South Dakota alone the statistical data available reflects that "disconnects" total an original capital outlay of \$11 million at a rate-absorbing cost of \$500,000 annually to remaining consumers on the lines in our State for debt service requirements. The management of the local cooperatives does not have any control over national policies of depression and inflation reflected in fewer and fewer consumers and more and more costs. Obsolescence is a characteristic of the industry that is always anticipated and can not be prevented.

So I say that all of these things have had a devastating effect on the economy of rural America while agricultural policies and programs have tried to sustain it.

I urge the adoption of this appropriation bill in its entirety and I urge every Member of the House to support it because America is made up of rural communities.

America is a continuity of communities like a chain is a continuity of links. If this Congress further pursues policies that permit one community after another to be destroyed—we will eventually destroy our country.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to vote for the appropriation bill as submitted by the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) who is chairman of the subcommittee for again having done a superlative job in guiding this very important appropriation through his subcommittee and also to pay tribute to the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, my good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. ANDREWS, and all members of the subcommittee including my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. SCHERLE, for successfully bringing to the floor a very significant piece of legislation which is of great importance not just to agriculture but to the entire Nation and, indeed, to the world because a healthy American agriculture is one of principal hopes of maintaining freedom and economic security throughout the world today.

President Nixon recommended to the

Congress substantial increases in many areas of agricultural funding where it was deemed necessary. I am happy to say the subcommittee and the full committee have in a number of instances improved upon his recommendations and I certainly want to support them in those increases.

We see really forward looking steps in a number of increases in agricultural appropriations for such things as agricultural research, the extension service, the agricultural stabilization and conservation service, and the soil conservation service. I am going to have more to say about the soil conservation service when as I understand an ill conceived so-called "anti-channelization" amendment apparently is going to be offered this afternoon. If it is passed it might very well cripple the great work which has been done in soil and water conservation in this country during the past 35 years.

You know, ever since the days of the early thirties, our farmers, through sound soil and water conservation practices, have been the true ecologists of this country. They have done more to protect our environment through sound soil and water conservation practices than all of the johnny-come-lately recruits to the cause of ecology.

Our watershed program is a program that has worked, is working, and will continue to work if we do not hamstring it by the addition of the so-called channelization amendment today. But more about that mischievous amendment later on when it is offered.

There are also very justifiable increases in this product of the subcommittee for the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and Rural Environmental Assistance Program. These are only a few of the areas that have been given very constructive and beneficial attention by the subcommittee and the committee, and I believe our distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee and the committee certainly deserve the support of the House today.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. LINK).

Mr. LINK. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Appropriations for bringing to this House a very good bill.

Mr. Chairman, rural renewal plays an integral role in urban renewal and in achieving a more realistic population balance in the United States. Therefore, I urge support of H.R. 9270, the appropriations bill for agricultural-environmental and consumer protection programs for fiscal year 1972. This measure provides funding for basic agricultural programs of proven value without which rural renewal is impossible.

H.R. 9270 makes funds available for electricity in rural areas, for the rural telephone program, for farm credit, for rural water and sewer grants, for soil conservation, Great Plains conservation, the rural environmental assistance program, and the new water bank program.

The bill provides funds for such other priority programs as the Extension Service, the educational arm of rural devel-

opment; Food for Peace; the special milk and school lunch program; the Statistical Reporting Service; the Farmer Cooperative Service; the packers and stockyards regulatory programs; and Federal Crop Insurance.

Ongoing programs, as well as the new and accelerated environmental programs, embodied in H.R. 9270, are of concern and importance to nonfarm and farmpeople alike.

Farmers have a good record of cooperating with conservation programs and carrying out the necessary environmental practices that will save the Nation's productive resources.

Our American owner-operated farm unit is the production marvel of the world. Nowhere do so few people as American farmers produce the food and fiber for so many at so reasonable a cost. Fewer than 3 million farmers literally feed 205 million Americans. This success is due in large part to such key programs as rural electrification, rural telephone service, and other programs which promote efficiency, productivity, and desirable living conditions.

These and other programs generate business in many related fields beyond the boundaries of agricultural areas. Weakening such basic programs generates economic distress throughout America.

Mr. Chairman, rural America is in economic distress now. In the Plains States farm income dropped 3½ percent in 1970. An even sharper drop in North Dakota caused my State to be the only State to decline in personal income last year.

To arrest the depression in agriculture, we must strengthen the backbone of rural America through adequate funding of these programs. In so doing, we will strengthen farm income and make rural America a more attractive place to live, thus slowing and hopefully stopping, the exodus of rural people to our already congested cities.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have asked for it in order that I might direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee or to the ranking minority member or to others familiar with this legislation, as to what is provided in this bill for research on the cereal leaf beetle. Out in the Midwest this has become a very serious problem and for the past several years we have been carrying on considerable research at Michigan State University at East Lansing, Mich.

As the chairman of the subcommittee knows from my contacts with him in the past, I am advised they are in urgent need of additional funds to continue this important research. Could the gentleman give us some information as to what is contained in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. First may I say that we on the committee all know of the gentleman's deep interest in the cereal leaf

beetle, and properly so. It accidentally got into this country in 1962 and, as the gentleman has pointed out, it has spread to Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, and New York and has been tremendously destructive. The committee has recognized that. This committee has provided funds for research on this problem and does consider it a serious one.

As to the particular point to which the gentleman addresses himself, as to the funds earmarked for this pest: in 1971 there was \$445,800, and that has been increased in the bill before us by \$132,400. The increase will largely be spent in trying to find alternate means of dealing with the pest.

In addition to this money that is made available to the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, we have the Cooperative State Research Service working in this general area.

I might add further, in respect to the foreign currency provisions—that is, the sales of American commodities for foreign currencies—we have worked out a system of using those currencies, which have to be spent in those countries, for research trying to find out natural enemies and things of that sort not only for the cereal leaf beetle but also for many other pests.

There is quite a substantial general increase in research, especially in the foreign currency program, and certainly some of this increase should be directed toward this pest. In addition, there is a flat \$132,000 increase directly earmarked for this purpose.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As the gentleman knows, I handed him a letter earlier this week which stated it was felt \$225,000 was urgently needed. "Absolutely essential" were the words used to describe the need in the letter to me, which I provided to the gentleman, for the program to be continued at the proper level.

Do I correctly understand from what the gentleman says that this money will be made available for this purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. In the first place, may I say I have the highest regard for the writer of the letter. But if this committee brought in a bill in which we added up the sum total of money called for in the letters received, all told I think the bill would be about twice what it is.

We have to talk to the Department to see what they can properly use. May I say also that now there is a \$2 million fund in here available to meet emergencies of this type. There is ample money in here to meet this problem, but we just cannot come in and accept each applicant's estimate of what they can use, because there is just not enough money in the country to meet all of the needs of what everybody says they would like to have. There are perhaps four different places, I believe, where we can certainly meet this need. I think that we have the solid dollars tied down for this purpose now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his assurance.

Mr. MICHEL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I also appreciate my colleague bringing this very important question up at this particular point in the debate. As the gentleman from Michigan well knows, we have engaged in several colloquies in years past on this pest. In the early days, it was confined to the home State of the gentleman from Michigan. We did express a great deal of concern in subsequent years at finding that it was moving over into Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Witnesses before our committee expressed concern that it may spread to the breadbasket of the country into Illinois and west of the Mississippi. The cereal leaf beetle has now moved into the Midwest and we find it in my own home district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MICHEL. As a member of the subcommittee we have time and time again attempted to get the Department to increase their efforts to combat this cereal leaf beetle pest. If I could have the Chairman's attention on this particular item, since the Chairman mentioned this \$2 million of emergency fund money, which is available, as the gentleman who wrote Mr. CHAMBERLAIN suggests, I believe we have got to move and move now in order to combat this pest. Somebody has to put on the pressure, and I would like to see it done, if in no other way than in this colloquy here on the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. The subcommittee is well aware of what has been done in this field. We know that Mr. MICHEL has felt this way in the past, and we know that he still feels that way. I talked to the gentlemen who are in charge of this program, and we have gotten them to agree that they will go ahead full speed. You cannot do this without money, but even if you have the money, you have to have the people who are qualified to do it. We will give adequate attention to this, and we hope to be able to meet the problem.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would like to point out to my colleague from Michigan that the subcommittee urged the Department not only to step up their work in this field domestically but also through counterpart funds abroad, to find out what is going on there, and to attack the problem there as well, mounting a double attack on this serious problem in order to lick it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have one final question. I note on page 19 of the report a statement to this effect:

The committee regrets the failure of the Office of Management and Budget to immediately release \$1.8 million provided above the budget for 1971, especially the additional \$1 million provided to test the effectiveness of certain non-chemical means of pest control.

I would ask the chairman or the ranking minority member, or the members of the committee, if they can tell me whether or not this means that funds for this research have been held up by the Office of Management and Budget?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Unfortunately they have been, yes. That is the reason for the language in the report here. The subcommittee is sounding a warning, urging the Office of Management and Budget to release these funds. We appropriated them for the next year, and we hope that they will be made available.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Can the gentleman give me his assurance that he is satisfied that if the money is appropriated the Office of Management and Budget will make the funds available for this most important research?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I certainly cannot speak for them. We have been frustrated time after time with them, so, I cannot give any assurance or speak for them here on the floor. But we will certainly continue to urge them in the future to try to take responsible action in this most important field.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am grateful to the gentleman for his response.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has recommended for fiscal year 1972 spending \$104 million on milk for our Nation's schoolchildren and others in nonprofit institutions. It is right for the committee to restore the special milk program, recommended for deletion in the budget and it is right for Congress to approve this recommendation.

The recommended \$104 million will provide about 3 billion half-pints of milk to about 17 million school children, but it will, in addition, provide inestimably better nutrition standards for many of our youngsters.

It has been the practice of the past three administrations and the Department of Agriculture to leave the special milk program out of the annual Federal budget. The justification as outlined in the 1972 budget is that milk can be provided through the growing school lunch program. The school lunch program, however, provides meals only in schools and institutions where hot lunch facilities are available or where eligible children can be reached by catering such lunches. Many children and needy adults are still not covered by the school lunch program.

The Secretary of Agriculture has recently announced he would reverse his

position and continue to provide milk to the needy through the special milk program if Congress would appropriate money for it. I strongly recommend we do so here today, for the special milk program is one of our most efficient and effective nutrition programs, benefiting those receiving the milk and the rest of us, too, for stronger, healthier children contribute to our Nation's prosperity.

Until we can insure that all of the Nation's schoolchildren, particularly those living in poverty, will receive nutritionally adequate meals which will include milk, no effort should be made to eliminate this proven program designed to provide badly needed dietary supplements. I anticipate overwhelming approval of continued funding for the special milk program. Every Congress since the inception of the program has supported funding, and I trust we will, too.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to commend the chairman and members of the subcommittee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

It has been thoroughly prepared and excellently presented. I rise in support of the bill and I ask consent to revise my remarks.

The \$545 million for rural electrification loans included in this bill is a welcome and healthy step toward keeping our rural areas strong.

More and more I think we are beginning to understand the link between a healthy rural America and a healthy urban America. And this is especially so in the case of rural electric cooperatives, where now seven out of eight new cooperative customers are not farm connected, and in light of the recent census finding that the nonfarm population outside standard metropolitan statistical areas increased 20 percent between 1960 and 1970.

Rural electrification has also opened a whole new world of advanced techniques to our farms, helping them to produce more products more cheaply, and has opened up a market for electrical appliances and equipment now estimated at \$1 billion per year.

Behind all this is the REA and the rural electric cooperatives, which have raised the percentage of farms served by electricity from 10.9 percent before the REA was created to 98.4 percent, or more, today.

More than \$6.6 billion have been advanced to rural electric cooperatives—but, unlike other governmental programs, every cent of this money is coming back into the Treasury—with interest. More than \$3.5 billion on principal and \$1.2 billion additional funds for interest payments had found their way into the Federal Treasury from this program by January 1, 1971.

I applaud the committee for their leadership in pressing home the fact that, in spite of all this progress, our rural

electric cooperatives are currently strangling to death financially. For 6 years running we have appropriated about \$350 million for loan authorizations. Yet, in this time the demand for power per customer has doubled. In this time we have been adding around 150,000 to 200,000 new co-op customers per year. In this time inflation has drastically cut the worth of that \$350 million.

In our rural areas 98.4 percent are electrified—but the easily hidden or forgotten fact is that the job is far from done. To handle those hundreds of thousands of new customers, to handle power demands that double on the average of every 8 years, to maintain and replace equipment that is now getting old, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual survey turned up an expected \$530 million in new loan requests for this coming fiscal year 1972. And stacked on top of that is a 6-year loan backlog of around \$360 million or more, by REA estimates, and an estimated \$100 million in loans which were reduced in amount or simply dropped from the roster due to the pressure of scarce funds. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we are not talking about grants here, but about loans, loans which come back with interest.

Our co-ops have had to dip into their own reserve funds to make ends meet. I quote the committee report:

By calendar year 1965, this percentage had been forced down to 12% or \$597 million on an investment of \$4,979 million. By 1969 . . . this reserve had been forced down to 7.8% or \$515 million on a \$6,592 million investment.

In 1971, the overall reserve levels are considered to be at an all-time low. I know some of my own co-ops are having to operate on an even lower reserve level.

In their search for funds, our co-ops formed the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corp.—a fine testimony to the determination of our co-ops to pull their own weight. But the CFC, as it is commonly called, as of yesterday had \$56,268,426 paid in by member cooperatives—hardly enough to cover the vast loan needs of the coming year. And they have as yet been able to make only two loans, totalling \$139,000.

I praise the committee for its urging of the deferment of principal concept, to help build the CFC so that some of the loan burden can be removed from the U.S. Treasury. But as yet this administration has not allowed a single deferment under the committee recommendation.

With all this in mind, I think the committee recommendations of \$545 million—to cover the new applications in fiscal year 1972, and to start chipping away at that 6-year backlog—is a welcome sum, a reasonable sum, and a needed sum. I am glad to see it in the bill.

Recently my colleague JOHN MELCHER and I held a special order in which we called attention to the Appropriations Committee and the other Members of Congress the great need for increased appropriations for the REA loan fund. Over 80 House Members participated in

this order and I believe that they now stand ready to do battle for these funds.

I am proud to have helped organize that special order which has been termed by our Texas NRECA organization as the most thorough and effective examination of the REA loan program in the last 30 years. I compliment the Members who participated with me in that special order and I again want to call attention to the Members of the House the pressing needs of our rural electric co-ops.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts which would impose a payment limitation of \$20,000.

The Agriculture Committee agreed to a reasonable payment limitation last year when the farm bill was enacted. It was obvious at the time that a limitation would be imposed, and the committee supported a limitation which would not be so burdensome as to completely destroy our farm programs.

This is, of course, the real motive of those who offer amendments to further limit farm payments. I, for one, do not feel that the House of Representatives should be a party to the destruction of our American system of agriculture. It is far from perfect, but our people are the best fed and best clothed of any people at any time in history, and all of this has been provided by the American farmer at a reasonable cost. The reasonable cost is, in part, made possible through the subsidy system.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman WHITTEN of Mississippi, for the manner in which it has approved and recommended budget requests for programs in which I have been deeply interested and with which I have been closely associated.

First I want to express my appreciation for the fact that the entire budget amount of more than \$2 billion has been recommended for the food stamp program, an increase of a third of a billion dollars over amounts appropriated for fiscal 1971. I have said it before, and I am happy to reiterate it, that the Whitten subcommittee has in almost every single instance since 1961 provided every cent the Kennedy or the Johnson or the Nixon administration requested for the food stamp program. From time to time the gentleman from Mississippi has been attacked unfairly for not being concerned about hunger in this country. Not only has he been concerned but he has been effective in fighting hunger by the manner in which he has supported programs to feed the needy in this country—not by dumping surplus commodities at some central depot but in making the food stamp program operate successfully.

As the committee report points out, the vast expansion in the food stamp program in recent years has been accompanied by enforcement problems in preventing violations and abuses of all kinds. Anyone who cheats on this program should be punished for it and punished severely for serious offenses.

People in the United States have been willing, by their taxes, to support a program which would assure a needy child, or any needy person, the opportunity to enjoy a kind of diet necessary for adequate nutrition. The grocer who accepts food stamps for nonfood items, the individual who attempts to buy nonfood items with the stamps, those who steal the stamps, and those who wink at such violations are not only flouting the law but are jeopardizing the continuation of a humane Government program intended to help those who would otherwise not receive enough to eat.

So I not only commend the gentleman from Mississippi and his subcommittee for their continued support of the food stamp program but I join them in an insistence that it be vigorously enforced to eliminate abuses we know have occurred in many parts of the country.

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCIES

This is the first year in which the Whitten subcommittee has had responsibility for appropriations for major consumer agencies of the Federal Government not connected with the Department of Agriculture. I have been impressed with the manner in which the members of the subcommittee have worked to familiarize themselves with the consumer problems and the programs of Government agencies intended to help solve those problems.

I am delighted that the Food and Drug Administration has received in this bill its full budget request of nearly \$100 million—actually \$99,681,000, or more than \$14 million more than appropriated for 1971. When I came to Congress in 1953, the budget for this agency was \$5 million. I am sure it could use far more than \$100 million but I certainly have no complaint about the action of the subcommittee and of the Appropriations Committee on this item.

The Federal Trade Commission, which has been doing an outstanding job in recent years in the area of consumer protection also is receiving the full budget amount of more than \$25 million for fiscal 1972. This action by the subcommittee is an endorsement, I feel of the renewed emphasis in the FTC on consumer protection. The FTC has the principal burden of enforcement in truth in lending and in the new Fair Credit Reporting Act, along with many other consumer activities.

I particularly want to thank the subcommittee for approving the \$625,000 necessary to complete the work of the National Commission on Consumer Finance. This study commission, created by the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 to make a comprehensive investigation of the entire field of consumer credit and recommend changes in Federal and State laws to bring about a better, more informed, more effective use of consumer credit at reasonable rates, was not implemented until late in 1969 and must complete its work by July 1, 1972, a period of 30 months. The Commission consists of three Members of the U.S. Senate, Senators SPARKMAN, PROXMIRE, and BROCK; three House Members, Representatives SULLIVAN, GONZALEZ, and WILLIAMS; and three public members ap-

pointed by the President. The Chairman is Attorney Ira M. Millstein of New York. The other members are Prof. Robert Johnson of Purdue and former Minnesota Attorney General Douglas Head.

The Commission yesterday and today has been holding public hearings into enforcement of Federal and State consumer credit protection laws. A set of hearings last year spotlighted some of the worst abuses in credit collection practices. We have other hearings planned but the main emphasis of the Commission's work is in research into areas in which reliable and conclusive data have not previously been available.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank Congressman WHITTEN and the members of his subcommittee for what I think has been a good job—a fine job in the evaluation of programs of Government in the consumer field which were not previously under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, on many occasions I have spoken out against the President's policy of impounding funds appropriated by Congress. It was, therefore, reassuring to note the Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 9270. The report again expresses concern for the administration's violation of the will of Congress—the withholding of rural and urban water and sewer facility funds already appropriated.

As stated in the report:

Congress has determined that urban and rural sewer systems, water systems and waste treatment facilities should receive priority attention to protect its citizens and enhance the environment. This determination should not be ignored or avoided.

Yet the Office of Management and Budget has determined that many of the funds already appropriated by Congress for these programs are to be set aside for the proposed "special revenue-sharing plans" for urban and rural community development—the value and future of which are extremely questionable.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of basic water and sewer facility grants, the Appropriations Committee has recommended that the Office of Management and Budget be directed in fiscal 1972 to utilize the impounded \$200 million already appropriated by Congress for this program plus an additional \$150 million, bringing the fiscal 1972 total to what Congress authorized and appropriated last year.

I trust that my colleagues share the view that the release of these impounded funds and the adequate funding of this important program are of utmost importance. Thus, I trust they will vote to support at least the level of appropriations recommended by the committee in the area of water and sewer facilities. Such action will show the Nixon administration that Congress intends to assure that its will be fulfilled in this area.

Further, I trust that the administration will interpret this action by the House to mean that we expect no further impoundment of funds contrary to the expressed intent of Congress.

Let me reiterate the principle underlying this question: Administration policies such as the impoundment of appro-

riated funds are not only destructive of our constitutional separation of powers, but also detrimental to our established governmental procedures and social goals. They must not be allowed to continue.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Chairman, many times in the short period that I have been honored to be a Member of this body, I have spoken out in behalf of the interests of agricultural America. I have done so for many reasons, not the least of which is my belief that it is in the national interest to reverse the farm-to-city migration. There are a number of programs which I feel would help achieve this desirable goal. We must seek more effective supply management programs in order to improve farm prices. Across-the-board aid to improve the quality of life in rural America is just and in the national interest. Farm bargaining mechanism can be improved, as can farm credit institutions. There is a crying need for more credit availability, especially for younger farmers. And we must seek to halt the corporate domination of agriculture.

I have introduced or cosponsored many bills designed to bring about these ends. But I have encountered, as have many of you, who share my interest, two obstacles. One is a matter of funding. We can pass programs until we are blue in the face, but without adequate funding they are worthless. In this matter I would commend the Appropriations Committee. While I must say that there are areas in which I would like to have seen even more, on the whole I think this year's appropriations bill reflects an increased concern with the needs of agricultural America, especially in the area of rural development programs.

But the second obstacle is, in some ways, an even more difficult one. It is a question of attitude. For too long our urban colleagues have looked upon farm programs as giant boondoggles. And given the manner of fund distribution this has in some cases been hard to deny. The \$20,000 payment limitation discussed here today, will not work a hardship on the small family farmer. But it will make the whole concept of farm assistance more palatable to many.

It is for that reason that I supported the amendment which would provide for a \$20,000 limitation. I can with a clear conscience ask my urban colleagues to support bills designed to help all of rural America when they know that I do not favor aid which will benefit only the corporate farmer and the well-to-do farmer who are not likely to need help in the first place.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely encouraged by the \$12 billion of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Consumer and Environmental Protection Agencies which are provided in H.R. 9270. Approval of this bill will greatly benefit the dairy farmers of Lake and McHenry Counties by providing a dairy indemnity program, price supports for dairy products, and increased funds for agricultural research.

Mr. Chairman, under the Agriculture Act of 1970, the dairy and beekeeper in-

demnity programs were expanded to include not only indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own suffer losses due to residues of poisonous pesticides, but also similar indemnification for manufacturers of dairy products and beekeepers. The committee has recommended \$2.5 million to continue this worthwhile program. This sum, together with the \$3.5 million appropriated on May 25 of this year should adequately meet the program's needs.

To maintain the level of price supports for dairy products currently at 85 percent of parity, the committee has recommended an additional \$3,613,331,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation. These additional funds will insure that the present dairy price support at \$4.93 per hundredweight will be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely heartened by the committee's recommendation of an additional \$277 million for agricultural research. This represents an increase of over \$1¼ million over the fiscal 1971 level. If our agricultural production is to remain satisfactory, it is necessary to continue developing new methods, and modernizing old methods of production. Certainly this substantial increase in the appropriations for agricultural research provides clear evidence of the committee's recognition of this fact.

The bill before us also contains appropriations of more than \$3 billion for environmental protection including funds for soil conservation programs and the construction of water and sewer facilities. Certainly this will be money well spent. In addition, the bill provides \$2,763,023,000 for consumer protection and consumer services such as the food assistance programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This program includes the food stamp and special milk programs as well as the Department's regulatory activities such as inspection of meat, poultry, and eggs.

Mr. Chairman, as our Nation's industrial might has soared to undreamed of heights, there has been a tendency to overlook the remarkable job done by our agricultural producers. No country has ever eaten so well, and certainly our farmers deserve commendation for seeing to it that we are provided with the finest quality fruits, vegetables, grains, dairy products, and innumerable other foodstuffs in such abundance. The bill before us gives dramatic proof that the Congress recognizes both the fine job that the agricultural industry has been doing and the necessity for making certain that it receives adequate funds with which to continue its outstanding work. Mr. Chairman, I urge speedy passage of the Department of Agriculture—environmental and consumer appropriation bill for 1972.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express some specific disappointment with this appropriation, and to make clear my desire for future changes. I rise also to make it clear that I will support amendments to this bill which increase the appropriations in the important area of water and waste disposal grants.

My disappointment stems from an ap-

propriation that has been left out and my feeling that prompt action could have prevented this omission. Specifically, I am speaking of an appropriation of up to \$800,000, which would have assisted in the construction of an incinerator and trash facility in Barrow, Alaska.

Before my comments begin to sound too much like special pleading, let me elaborate on the situation. First, as many of you know, Barrow is the northernmost community in this Nation, and is subject to year-round permafrost, long cold-weather periods, and general disability to effectively dispose of waste materials. In addition, the improper disposal of waste is extremely harmful to numerous aspects of the Arctic environment.

For some time, the solution to this situation has been known. It is to construct a large waste disposal facility which will incinerate both solid and liquid wastes, and compact for disposal the innumerable empty fuel drums which must be left about since no workable alternative exists.

The Department of the Navy, which has an installation in this area, has been well aware of this solution, and has completely cooperated. This year they assisted in gaining a \$1.2 million appropriation for an incinerator facility toward a total cost of \$2 million. The remainder was to come from other sources.

Since the needs of this area were so obvious, and the possible solutions almost equally obvious, the remaining funding seemed very possible. The best source, I learned, would be the Environmental Protection Agency, for whom we are considering appropriations today. Immediate inquiries were started.

The period since that time is the source of disappointment. Action on this proposal, in spite of EPA's knowledge of the need, and of the short construction season, was halting and ambiguous. When EPA asked for the participation position of the Barrow and Alaska governments, full assurance of participation was given.

Still, the lack of coordination between EPA and the Navy and the various levels of Alaskan government was disappointing. I quite frankly expected that EPA would be the leader in this struggle since the clearest area of concern on this project was environmental.

My intent here is simple. It is to point out that delays, failures to cooperate and communicate, and lack of information were responsible for the omission of this project. In no way will I vote or speak to impair the EPA appropriation. In fact, I fully plan to argue and vote for increased funding today.

I do want to reemphasize that good and necessary projects like this should not be hampered by the sort of action I have described. The people of Barrow are the losers here, and they should not be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the most pressing need in environmental protection is substantial research into every aspect of pollution. Congress, has attacked businessmen, cajoled local and State governments, and criticized individuals for their lack of social concern with the pollution issue. Congress has

taken action on enforcement and regulation, tax subsidies, and grants. Congress has repeatedly voiced its concern for doing something in this matter. Yet all this is meaningless without the absolute necessity of research. The measure we vote on today will provide that research.

The necessity of research is unquestioned. Before industry can devise methods of control, for instance, they will want to know exactly what will be expected of them. In addition, the regulatory powers vitally needed by the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce standards is meaningless if a proper background of research has not been accomplished. The private sector of the United States will act responsibly only if the Government does so first. That is why we must have research.

The proposed Environmental Health Center in Cincinnati will meet the needs of the Nation in providing this research. In fact, Congress has indicated since the Kennedy administration its intent to build this research facility.

Cincinnati has not waited. After the authorization was approved, the city government thrust its efforts and money into establishing the preliminary steps. First, the city offered the Federal Government several sites for the center. Second, the city began purchasing land and relocating families. This effort is now almost complete. And, third, the city has, to date, spent \$2,143,400 on this project, with a commitment to the Federal Government to spend a total of nearly \$4,500,000. The authorization has been made. Cincinnati has acted on this and accomplished all that it can at this stage. We are ready for a responsible Congress to act.

Why is Cincinnati the best location? Because, Mr. Chairman, Cincinnati has the greatest concentration in the Nation of trained personnel to handle pollution research. The new research facility will be located adjacent to the University of Cincinnati, which has graduate programs in environmental health, air pollution, industrial hygiene, occupational medicine, environmental health engineering, water pollution, and industrial solid refuse management.

There are now 13 separate programs in Cincinnati employing 1,043 people dealing with pollution research. Obviously, the most practical thing would be to put all this under one roof. To move the center elsewhere would mean a delay in the program of an additional 1.5 to 2 years. It is imperative, therefore, that in this vital issue, Congress should respond in a positive manner.

Congress must meet the needs of the people and on an issue so obviously and explicitly defined as this, it seems imperative that the Government should appropriate this \$28 million for research facilities. The people cannot lose confidence in the ability of its Government to act.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues will be interested in the following information which compares the prices of choice cattle at retail with the costs of goods and services, hourly earnings, per capita disposable income and other items.

It graphically illustrates the cost-price squeeze which affects all farmers:

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, Omaha, Nebr., June 21, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: We are confident you will be interested in the comparison of choice cattle and beef prices with costs of goods and services, hourly earnings, per capita disposable income and other items as contained in the enclosed document. Similar comparisons have been made by this Association on previous occasions and this table has been up-dated to include the first quarter of 1971 or March, 1971, as figures are available.

The data is being sent to you for your personal use in any manner that you choose. As usual, you have our best wishes and kind regards.

Respectfully yours, DON F. MAGDANZ, Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF CHOICE CATTLE, WHOLESALE BEEF, AND CHOICE BEEF AT RETAIL WITH COSTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES, HOURLY EARNINGS, PER CAPITA DISPOSABLE INCOME, AND OTHER ITEMS

Food Prices, and notably meat prices, have come under attack at times with the charge being made that prices were "too high". The following comparisons indicate such a charge to be absolutely unfounded—in fact, the very opposite to be the case, when compared to increases in such meaningful benchmarks as the Consumer Price Index, Earnings of Non-Agricultural Employees, and Per Capita Disposable Income.

	Amount	Percent change from 1960
Farm value per retail pound choice beef (byproduct credit included) (cents):		
1960	\$ 56.7	
1970	\$ 66.3	+16.9
1st quarter 1971	\$ 69.1	+21.9
Average price of choice steers, Omaha, per hundredweight:		
1960	\$25.18	
1970	\$ 29.34	+16.5
March 1971	\$ 31.81	+26.3
Average price carlot choice steer beef, Chicago wholesale, per hundredweight 600-700 carcasses:		
1960	\$ 42.05	
1970	\$ 47.33	+12.6
March 1971	\$ 51.45	+22.4
Average price per pound, choice beef at retail (cents):		
1960	\$ 81.0	
1970	\$ 98.7	+21.9
March 1971	\$ 102.3	+26.3
Consumer Price Index, all items:		
1960	\$ 88.7	
1970	\$ 116.3	+31.1
March 1971	\$ 119.8	+35.1
Average cost all food purchased by consumers:		
1960	\$ 88.0	
1970	\$ 114.9	+30.6
March 1971	\$ 117.0	+33.0
Average cost all consumer services:		
1960	\$ 83.5	
1970	\$ 121.6	+45.5
March 1971	\$ 126.6	+51.6
Average cost all consumer services less rent:		
1960	\$ 81.9	
1970	\$ 123.7	+51.0
March 1971	\$ 128.9	+57.4
Average hourly earnings non-agricultural workers:		
1960	\$ 2.09	
1970	\$ 3.23	+54.5
March 1971	\$ 3.37	+61.2
Average hourly earnings manufacturing workers:		
1960	\$ 2.26	
1970	\$ 3.36	+48.7
March 1971	\$ 3.52	+55.8
Average hourly earnings construction workers:		
1960	\$ 3.08	
1970	\$ 5.22	+69.5
March 1971	\$ 5.51	+78.9

	Amount	Percent change from 1960
Average hourly earnings retail trade:		
1960	\$ 1.52	
1970	\$ 2.44	+60.5
March 1971	\$ 2.54	+67.1
Per capita disposable income:		
1960	\$ 1,937.00	
1970	\$ 3,344.00	+72.6
1st quarter 1971 (annual rate)	\$ 3,466.00	+78.9
Per capita expenditures for food:		
1960	\$ 388.00	
1970	\$ 558.00	+43.8
1st quarter 1971 (annual rate)	\$ 567.00	+46.1
Per capita disposable income spent for food (percent):		
1960	10 20.0	
1970	10 16.7	-3.3
1971 1st quarter (annual rate)	10 16.4	-3.6
Per capita expenditures for goods and services other than food:		
1960	\$1,412.00	
1970	\$ 2,453.00	+73.7
1971 1st quarter (annual rate)	\$ 2,558.00	+81.2
Percent disposable income spent for goods and services other than food (percent):		
1960	11 72.9	
1970	11 73.4	+5
1971 1st quarter	11 73.8	+9
Food consumption per capita:		
1960	6 12 96.4	
1970	6 12 102.4	+6.2
1971 indicated	6 12 103.3	+7.2
Pounds of beef consumed per capita:		
1960	4 85.0	
1970	12 113.8	+33.9
Price per pound, hamburger at retail (cents):		
1960	13 66.2	
January 1971	13 65.7	
March 1971	13 67.3	
Average price frankfurters at retail (cents):		
1960	13 82.7	
January 1971	13 81.3	
March 1971	13 81.3	
Price per pound, rib roast at retail (cents):		
1960	13 111.7	
January 1971	13 111.5	
March 1971	13 114.4	

1 "Price Spreads for Beef and Pork," revised series, 1949-69, U.S. Department of Agriculture, miscellaneous publication No. 1174, p. 18.  
 2 "Marketing and Transportation Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 1971, p. 29; May 1971, p. 25.  
 3 "Livestock and Meat Statistics," statistical bulletin No. 333, U.S. Department of Agriculture, July 1963, pp. 261, 221, 275, 279.  
 4 "Livestock and Meat Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, March 1971, p. 22; November 1968, p. 26.  
 5 "Livestock and Meat Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 1971, p. 29.  
 6 Index.  
 7 "National Food Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 1971, p. 28.  
 8 "Economic Indicators," Council of Economic Advisers, December 1970, pp. 26, 15; April 1971, pp. 26, 15, 5; December 1969, p. 5.  
 9 "Survey of Current Business," U.S. Department of Commerce, May 1971, pp. S-8, S-15.  
 10 "Marketing and Transportation Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, August 1970, p. 11, May 1971, p. 2. (quarter figures—seasonally adjusted annual rate).  
 11 Calculated from "Per Capita Disposable Income and Per Capita Expenditures for Goods and Services Other Than Food."  
 12 "National Food Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 1971, pp. 9, 12.  
 13 "Estimated Food Prices by Cities," U.S. Department of Labor, 1970; January 1971; March 1971.

Source: Prepared by National Livestock Feeders Association.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, since 1947 the number of Americans living on farms has dropped more than 15 percent. In large measure this may be attributed to the widespread abuses that are built into the farm subsidy program. In 1968, for example, the Department of Agriculture mailed checks to 2,371,634 farmers. Of these, two-thirds were for less than \$1,000, a skimpy 18.7 percent of the total \$3.5 billion, while the remainder were divided among only 785,242 big farmers. These payments helped the big farmer finance land acquisition and faster mechanization, in turn, making competition by the little man all but impossible. Thousands of them simply

closed down their farms and joined the already-crowded unemployment rolls.

The simple fact, Mr. Chairman, is that farm subsidies have only intensified the problem they were designed to cure: Rural poverty.

Meanwhile, the American consumer, in addition to the \$3.5 billion he pays annually for the subsidies, must pay higher and higher prices for the subsidized foods he eats. One of the major ideas of the program is to prevent a surplus, and thereby guarantee high prices. Now, if the program spread the wealth around like it was supposed to do, the public might tolerate the higher prices. But the plain truth is that a few big landowners are getting rich at the expense of the little farmer and the American consumer.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have long opposed the farm subsidy program. I was pleased last year to see the passage of a \$55,000 ceiling on per crop payments to any one farmer. It was long past due.

Still, I do not believe that measures strong enough, and I am supporting Mr. CONTE's amendment to limit those payments to \$20,000. In the absence of legislation designed to abolish the whole outmoded system, this amendment, Mr. Chairman, seems to me the fairest alternative on all counts.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot protest more vigorously to this amendment which would limit subsidy crop payments to American farmers to \$20,000. If we were to adopt it, American farmers would have every right to accuse us of acting in bad faith.

It was only last year, Mr. Chairman, after a bitter fight during which many concessions were made that we agreed to limit subsidy payments to \$55,000 per crop. That authorization bill was to continue this policy for 3 years.

The American farmer has gone ahead accordingly and made his plans and investments in the faith that Congress would live up to its word to him.

He has prepared his land, planted and borrowed money from the banks accordingly to the regulations established by the Department of Agriculture based on the 1970 Farm Act.

This amendment would ruin the farm economy of my area as well as throughout the country, to say nothing of the credibility of this body.

The farmer had every right to plan after we went ahead last year after full consultation, full committee hearings, discussion on the floor and the most long and considered deliberations in the House and Senate to expect that our appropriation would match that of the authorization.

Is it any wonder that people are asking if the Government is responsive? In this case, it would be downright deceitful. We would ask the American farmer to switch horses in midstream.

What is so reprehensible about this whole move is that we Members of Congress who represent agriculture went to our constituents last year and informed them that they would have to take less than they wanted. They were convinced on our word that this was the most reasonable approach that could be expected. If agriculture is to support legislation for

the solutions to urban problems, then legislators from the cities must live up to their word to the farmers.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I will support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) when it is offered to provide \$700 million for grants for basic water and sewer facilities authorized by section 702 of the Housing Act of 1965.

Day after day, we talk and we hear about pollution—air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, and now even population pollution. The newspapers carry story after story describing horrible situations in Lake Erie, the Potomac River, San Francisco Bay, and even Biscayne Bay. The administration sends bill after bill to the Hill for our consideration on these subjects. However, when it comes time to do something about it, the administration stumbles and falls.

It is totally inconceivable to me that a program as vital and urgently needed as this one should be treated with the neglect that it has. After freezing and withholding the funding for this major environmental program, the President recommended no funds for the water and sewer line program in this year's budget.

In H.R. 9270, the bill before us, there is included appropriations of \$2 billion for the sewage treatment plant construction program administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. As recently as 2 years ago, we were talking about \$214 million, and it has been a tremendous effort to raise this amount to \$2 billion. However, one program cannot be successful without the other. It is sheer folly to build treatment plants and at the same time to ignore the necessary storm and sanitary sewer systems which are complementary and necessary for the successful carrying out of a total program.

The \$700 million proposed in the amendment is in my judgment an absolute minimal figure. There are applications backlogged in the various HUD field offices involving legitimate requests of over \$1 billion. Anything less than a \$700 million appropriation would be folly.

In my judgment, this minimal amount is satisfactory but only if the President signs and requests appropriation under the Public Work Acceleration Act which is now before him. That act gives special emphasis to programs that would improve the quality of living which includes sewers, waste treatment and water distribution facilities. The Public Works Acceleration Act would permit eligible communities to obtain grants up to 80 percent of their cost as contrasted with the 50 percent of eligible land and construction costs under the HUD program. In fact, in some hard-pressed communities, grants could go as high as 100 percent.

I urge the adoption of the proposed amendment.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois strikes at the backbone of this Nation—the American workingman. By making food stamps unavailable to a family which has become destitute due to a strike, it would go a long way toward destroying the right to bargain

collectively—a right which Americans have fought for throughout the last century.

The worker who goes on strike after collective bargaining has failed is exercising the only weapon he has to render his bargaining power equal to that of his employer. Such an individual is saying, in effect:

I am willing to have my family and myself suffer some hardship for the moment so that we may enjoy a better life in the future.

This proposal constitutes an outrageous attempt to discourage working people from exercising their rights. It is an attempt to stack the deck for the employer by starving out strikers and their families. I urge its defeat.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, the arguments and actions taken today have certainly treated the farmers of America in a country cousin fashion. It is difficult to understand how those who produce our food and fiber can be equated to welfare recipients. The farmers produce a necessity for all, while the welfare recipients produce for no one. If these assaults against our agricultural sector continue, one day soon our city dwellers, who for several generations have been educated to believe that farmers are deadhead tax riders, may learn from experience that the food they have grown accustomed to seeing on their supermarket shelves is not made by the grocer in his back room—nor by the wholesaler, the distributor, nor even the canner.

Should the farmers of America continue to be harassed and short changed, the day may arrive when recipients of guaranteed annual income and food stamps will understand that buying power means nothing if there is nothing to buy. And food is an essential commodity to life.

It is a strange paradox that at a time when the voices of fright are expressing concern over population explosion, family control, and food shortage, as well as devising ingenious programs to encourage work from unproductive people, some colleagues of this same philosophy would undercut the financial incentives of one of the largest primary production segments of our society—the working farmer.

It was this body that placed the farmers of America under strict regulations for production and market controls. Now we breach our faith with them on financial commitments. A better job of setting the stage for a planned famine and food shortage could not have been accomplished had we so planned.

The recent food strikes under the controlled economy of Poland must have left little impression on our big city friends who continue to regard it politically advantageous in big cities to continue attacking farmers. Should a food shortage befall this Nation it will not be those from the rural and urban areas who will suffer the pains of want from this body's mistakes. Sewerage plants, public housing, and prestige projects would mean little to large deserted cities. That is, unless our city dwellers are ready to plant victory gardens in their penthouse planters and flower boxes.

The same hazy thinking has brought us to the crossroads we face today. Farm

production was placed under controls and support to insure a ready supply of food and fiber at a reasonable price to the consumer. The rigidity of controls worked against the family farmer and the mechanization, labor costs, and competition produced the corporate large farmer, the only one who has been able to scientifically withstand the Government controls and price competition.

The \$20,000 payment limitation will not reduce taxes nor make foodstuffs cheaper to the consumer. The corporate farmer is a businessman. If he cannot make a profit, he is not going to invest his time and money in a losing enterprise. He can be expected to close his farming operation or utilize his land for another purpose. As we lose more farmers, we lose more income to raise revenue and there will be less abundance in our food warehouses. There will be less tax money to support the guaranteed annual income recipients, and under any theory of supply and demand, the prices of food and necessities produced by agricultural means must increase.

Perhaps the unannounced intention is a planned food shortage to attain the full environmental controls desired by some, which support the theory behind abortions, euthanasia, and family limitation. When the hour of decision arrives in which the number of people exceed the amount of available food, who will make the determination as to who survives and who is expendable? Man can survive without money, but not without food. Food can replace money during a famine, but the reverse is not true. He who controls the food of a nation can become more powerful than he who controls the money. If both are controlled by the same person or group, they are all powerful.

As for me, I feel that the farmer who struggles against weather, insects, the mortgage, and all of the other threats from nature, without any guarantee of any return on his investment, is one of the most important citizens in our land. We can hire bank presidents, chairmen of the boards or directors, politicians, and can always find labor leaders, but no one can hire or make a farmer.

I intend to cast my people's vote in favor of this bill, H.R. 9270. Our farmers need as much help as we can possibly give them.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am still opposed to placing a \$20,000 limitation of payments on our farmers. Agriculture is one of the very few industries left in this Nation that continues to increase in productive efficiency. One reason for continued increased efficiency is the larger farming operation. An end result of this is that the consumer continues to pay a smaller and smaller percent of his income for food and fiber. To impose a \$20,000 limitation is going to be a disincentive for production on our highly mechanized and capitalized farming operations. I could make a number of other arguments against this limitation, all of which have been made on previous occasions by me and other Members of the House. I will not repeat them at this time.

Let me just mention, however, a couple of things that come to mind in the pres-

ent debate. It seems so ironic to have a sizable number of Midwestern agriculture district representatives supporting this limitation. The reason for this is that they represent the wheat and feed grains farmers that are not quite reached by the \$20,000 figure. But just wait until next year or the following year if the amendment passes today. You can be sure we will be back then with a proposal from our city friends to reduce the limitation to \$10,000. Then these farmers will begin to squirm and we will see their representatives zealously presenting compelling arguments that the limitations should not be lowered to \$10,000. Then they will be making the arguments that they reject today. A few years from now the position taken by these representatives will not only appear ironic, but highly paradoxical as well.

The other matter that should be mentioned, Mr. Chairman, is our unfair and unconscionable reneging on last year's action, if this amendment should become law. Last year we authorized a 3-year farm bill setting the limitation at \$55,000. This was the first time that a limitation had passed in a farm program. By taking this action we were telling our farmers that for the next 3 years payment limitations would rest at \$55,000. Many of our farmers started this farm year on that reasonable assumption. On the basis of it, they have planted their 1971 crops. If the amendment passes today, this House is not keeping faith with the farmers, nor with the farm program passed late in the second session of the 91st Congress. The Conte amendment should be decisively voted down.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For expenses necessary to perform agricultural research relating to production, utilization, marketing, nutrition and consumer use, to control and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases, and to perform related inspection, quarantine and regulatory work: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations thereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250, for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of construction of any one building (except headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed \$40,000, except for six buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$80,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$15,000 or 15 per centum of the cost of the building whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to a total of \$100,000 for facilities at Beltsville, Maryland:

Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products; agricultural marketing and distribution, not otherwise provided for; home economics or nutrition and consumer use of agricultural and associated products;

and related research and services; and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100; \$167,432,000, and in addition not to exceed \$15,000,000 from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, pursuant to Public Law 88-250 shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, except that \$200,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for matching with funds utilized for research on cottonseed proteins under Public Law 89-502: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to formulate a budget estimate for fiscal 1973 of more than \$15,000,000 for research to be financed by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, and pursuant to Public Law 88-250;

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 5, line 24, strike out "\$167,432,000", and insert "\$169,532,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the President recently announced a major drug program and sent budget amendments totaling \$155 million, of which \$2,100,000 is for research to be conducted by the Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with research institutions in foreign countries. This research will be directed at developing: first, alternative sources of farm income and second, means for detection and destruction of narcotic plants.

Mr. Chairman, the committee met on this part of the budget proposal. We were unanimous in our support of it and ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this figure was in the budget supplement. The chairman states correctly the fact that the committee was unanimous in favor of it and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY PROGRAMS

EXPENSES, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301-1393); Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1101-1161); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(d), 16(e), 16(f), 16(i), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g-590q); subtitles B and C of the Soil Bank Act (7 U.S.C. 1831-1837, 1802-1814, and 1816); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$165,086,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed \$77,256,000 may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund (including not to exceed \$33,386,000 under the limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expenses): *Provided further*, That other

funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds, appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 17, line 2, strike the period and insert the following: *And provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 to formulate or carry out any single 1972 crop-year price support program (other than for sugar and wool) under which the total amount of payments to a person under any such program would be in excess of \$20,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents this House today with a challenge and an opportunity: A challenge to face squarely the plain fact that our present farm program is not accomplishing the goals which we have set for it; and an opportunity to correct this situation, and reform this program, while at the same time, achieving savings of about \$200 million for the hard-pressed taxpayers of this Nation.

Last year, when we proposed a similar amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1970, it was defeated in this body by a narrow margin. At that time many who voted against the amendment believed that the \$55,000 limitation included in the bill should be given a chance to prove itself.

Mr. Chairman, the \$55,000 limitation has been given that chance, and the reports on its administration are anything but favorable. Despite the ceiling, there was in fact an increase in total subsidies from \$3.5 billion in 1969 to \$4 billion in 1970, and it is now probable there will be no savings at all realized from this limitation.

For example, on March 9, 1971, the Wall Street Journal published an article by Burt Schorr under the heading "Saving to the United States from crop subsidy limits, once put at \$30 million, now seen far lower," in which he reported that even Agriculture Department staff members now admit that—and I quote:

The limit will save the United States no more than a few million dollars—if anything at all.

On March 16, I wrote to Secretary Hardin asking about certain statements in the Schorr article and requesting a progress report on the effect of the \$55,000 ceiling as soon as possible after the 1971 sign-up was completed in April.

At that time I pointed out that the number of producers receiving Government checks in excess of \$55,000 had increased from 1,100 in 1969 to 1,300 in 1970. This means that we should now be able to save a possible \$69 million, instead of the \$58 million savings estimated last year. But, as I have said, the shocking fact is that we will probably not save anything.

I asked the Department in its report to include information on the number of producers applying for a reduction in set-aside payments, because of the limitation, a preliminary estimate of the reduction in payments, and changes in leasing and cropping practices of all producers who had received payments in excess of \$55,000 in 1970.

A month later I received a reply from one of Secretary Hardin's aides saying that—

Such a report would be very expensive to compile and issue and we would be reluctant for this reason to do so.

Mr. Chairman, here is a program that costs \$4 billion and he could not get this report to me because it would cost too much money.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me on the basis of press reports, and the unwillingness of Secretary Hardin's staff to collect and analyze information on the effects of the \$55,000 ceiling, that the administration is putting only a minimum of effort into its administration.

Yet, the information on 1970 farm payments made available in April is simply shocking:

First: Federal farm program payments reached nearly \$4 billion last year—up another half a billion dollars from 1969.

Second: Payments of nearly \$40 million went to just 23 farmers.

Third: More than \$1.5 billion in payments—nearly 40 percent of all subsidies, went to barely 5 percent of the farmers.

Fourth: Payments continued to go to many unusual farm factories including heavy payments to a farm—

Listen to this—can I have your attention because this is really something that I am sure you will all want to hear.

Heavy payments went to a farm in which the Queen of England and her family are major investors. We hear occasional reports of the rising costs of upkeep for Buckingham Palace, but I think the American taxpayer would have grave misgivings about this form of foreign aid.

Fifth: Over 10,000 producers received checks in excess of \$20,000—two and a half times the number receiving checks of this size in 1967, an increase of 50 percent over 1968, and an increase of 18 percent over 1969.

This growth in the number of producers receiving checks in excess of \$20,000 in the past 4 years is little short of scandalous, in view of the many other priority needs for Federal funds. From 6,900 such producers receiving \$267 million in 1968, we went to 10,400 receiving \$409 million in 1970. This \$20,000 limitation would make possible maximum savings of \$200 million—three times the possible savings under the \$55,000 limitation.

I offer this amendment not only to reduce Government expenditures, but also because I am convinced that a lower ceiling

on these excessive Government payments to wealthy landowners and corporations will result in better farming opportunities for smaller farmers. Large operators, with their subsidies limited, will find it more difficult to outbid smaller producers in competing for available cropland in the community.

In summary, I believe the record now demonstrates that a payment limitation at a reasonable level, such as \$20,000, will not adversely affect the average farm family or the average producer. Less than one-half of 1 percent of all producers in these programs will be affected by my amendment. And it will actually benefit the small farmer by limiting the competition of corporations and other large producers.

Mr. Chairman, it would be tragically ironic if this chamber were to reject this opportunity today, when only yesterday it took steps to reform our welfare system. I was proud to support yesterday's bill. I submit that we are equally obliged—if not more obliged—to put an end to this scandalous, runaway farm program.

Let us meet that obligation today. Let us restore the faith of all those Americans who are disturbed by the present order of our priorities. And finally, let us decide—here and now—to redirect this program to its original purpose by truly helping the small farmer, and ending this dole to a tiny handful of corporate farming giants.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I might add that all of the polls I have seen show that 80 to 85 percent of the farmers in the United States favor a \$20,000 payment limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) which would further reduce farm subsidy payments from \$55,000 to \$20,000 per crop for any single producer.

I have supported this amendment on the two previous occasions it was approved by the House, in 1968, and again in 1969 when we were able to impose the present \$55,000 ceiling.

My support is certainly not an attempt to weaken our farm economy, but a positive move to save our taxpayers, including thousands of small farmers, money. As my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts has pointed out, we are faced with critical deficits in the Federal budget this year and next year.

Last week I took the floor to offer an amendment myself which would have saved the taxpayers over a half billion dollars in the Defense Department research and development program. This amendment could result in savings of more than \$200 million without adversely affecting our farm economy in the slightest.

The point is, when we can save money without hurting the national security or in a program which benefits only the wealthy few, it is incumbent upon us to do so. This amendment will not effect

the thousands of hard-working farmers, such as those who operate dairy farms in Vermont, except that it could assist in saving them from the further tax increases to pay for the mounting Federal debt.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman will recall, earlier I reserved a point of order against the amendment. The amendment would go toward controlling the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is a question that has been before the House on other occasions. I am familiar with other decisions. I am so convinced that I am correct, having participated in the writing of the original act and having participated in agreements reached by Members of the Congress to create a corporation which would be permitted to carry on the prescribed functions, I do not give up my belief that the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Let me briefly state why. The Government Corporation Control Act, which the Congress passed, came at a time when a great many corporations did not even give us an accounting of their operations. Among those was the Commodity Credit Corporation, which at that time was incorporated under the laws of Delaware, just like many other corporations. It was a corporation rather than a Government department or agency, because the Congress wanted to give it the right to sue and to be sued, and the right to engage in corporate functions that a Government department or agency cannot engage in.

Later that same corporate structure was changed by act of Congress, by which we granted to the Community Credit Corporation a charter, in which not only was the authority of the corporation set out, but also their responsibilities. One of their responsibilities was to make price support payments and things of that sort. The corporation is now incorporated and has a capital structure, after this bill is passed, in excess of \$14 billion. I make that statement to indicate the magnitude that our Government must give to the responsibilities, the assignments, and the task which we gave to this corporation.

Later we found out some of the operations of the American Spruce Corp. and others. At that time I was on the subcommittee handling corporations, a subject which is now under independent offices. Our chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) was also on that subcommittee. At that time we brought under the wings of the Government for annual review these corporations which up until then were accounting to nobody. We wanted to be sure that in our looking at the books and seeing that they were properly discharging their functions, in the process we did not defeat the intent of Congress when we set them up in the first place.

So in the colloquy with Mr. Whittington, who handled the bill on the floor, he quite clearly said—and this appears in the debate which occurred on May 1, 1968:

Section 104 of the Corporation Control Act provides the corporation shall not be deprived of the exercise of any functions now authorized by law.

So the Corporation Control Act, which is the only way in which we attempt to control this corporation, makes an exception where any action would prevent the corporation from carrying out its responsibilities and its duties under the charter.

I respectfully say that when language is offered here which would say that the corporation's employees, the folks who work for them, the administrative personnel cannot do a thing which is set out in the charter as being a part of their responsibility, that we are going counter to the intent of Congress in the Corporation Control Act, which is the only reason it comes before us in the first instance.

Mr. Chairman, I realize in presenting this point of order that I am asking you to reverse prior precedent. It is said that the value of any rule is being smart enough to make exceptions when the time comes. In my honest opinion not based on my knowledge from having been there, but based on the record which I have quoted, the corporation has a charter. It has responsibilities. It has duties. The only way it is before us today is because we have brought it before us. But in the act of bringing it before us, we said that nothing in the annual review of this corporation shall prevent the corporation from carrying on its responsibilities and duties, one of which is price supports.

I respectfully urge the Chair to reverse the prior rulings of the Chair in this instance so that we may carry out the original intent of the Congress. An error oft repeated remains an error still.

I repeat, this point or order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order. This is the same argument that has been raised by the gentleman from Mississippi on several previous occasions. One such occasion was January 26, 1965; another was June 6, 1967, and still another such objection was made to an amendment which I offered on May 26, 1969. On all of these occasions the gentleman was overruled. In fact he was again overruled a year ago on June 9, 1970, volume 116, part 14, page 18998. I suppose we should commend the gentleman for his persistence, but the plain fact is there is no substance to his point of order.

On each of those occasions the limitation went to the entire act, as does this amendment. It stated on each occasion that "no part of this appropriation shall be used," or "none of the funds appropriated by this act," language of that sort. The language applies to administrative salaries of USDA organizations. The limitation is clearly negative on its face. It clearly shows retrenchment, the reduction in spending and, therefore, is entirely within the Holman rule, and I believe it is completely in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts and freely acknowledged by the gentleman from Mississippi, similar points of order have been made to

similar amendments on numerous occasions previously.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has offered an amendment against which the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) makes a point of order on the grounds that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The gentleman from Mississippi emphasizes particularly in his point of order that it would impose an additional burden and obligation upon the Commodity Credit Corporation and argues that the House lacks the power to impose this kind of restriction on that organization in the expenditure of funds.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would the Chair permit me—and I apologize for asking permission—to interrupt at this point to put it in my own words?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be happy to hear the gentleman further.

Mr. WHITTEN. In my own words, the point I am making is by the action, if this is held in order, we would amend the charter of the Corporation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and we would amend the Corporation Control Act, because in the charter of the Corporation this is not possible and in the Corporation Control Act we made clear that this is not possible. So this amendment would have the effect of repealing or of amending the charter as well as the act which provides for its review.

I thank the Chair for permitting me to interrupt the train of thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the further elucidation by the gentleman from Mississippi as to the precise nature of his argument on the point of order.

Consistent with decisions previously rendered, going back as far as 1959, when Chairman Kilday ruled on the same point of order; Chairman Harris, January 22, 1965; Chairman Corman, June 6, 1967, and on May 1, 1968; and two decisions by the present occupant of the chair in 1969 and in 1970; the Chair would cite that it has been consistently held that an amendment to a general appropriation bill which is negative in character and which prohibits, during the fiscal year covered by the bill, certain uses of the funds therein is in order as a limitation even though its imposition would require additional duties on the part of those administering the funds.

Now, as to the specific point that such an amendment might have the effect of amending the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Chair in carefully examining the amendment is of the opinion that the amendment does no more than to limit the application of funds which are made available in this appropriation bill, and, therefore, is consistent with the precedents cited to the effect that amendments to appropriation bills which do no more than limit the application of funds therein are negative in character.

The Chair therefore rules that the amendment is a limitation; it is in order and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when the House of Representatives and the other body approved the Agricultural Act of 1970, I thought for a period of at least 3 years that this issue of how much a payment limitation should be had been decided. It seemed to me that this was desirable; that there should be some finality in order for the Department of Agriculture and in order for the farmers of America to know with some degree of certainty what the payment limitation would be for a 3-year period.

Let me add, however, that during the consideration of the legislation in 1970, I voted for a lower limitation; I voted for the amendment that would have limited the payments to \$20,000 per farm—per crop. However, those of us who felt that way lost, and the Congress in its wisdom or lack of it made the decision that we should have the current limitation in the Agricultural Act of 1970 for \$55,000. In my judgment it would be very unwise and unfair at this point on this particular appropriation bill to change the rules of the game now, less than a year after the basic law was approved. It would be breaking faith with the farmers of America who had good reason to believe that during the term of the basic legislation, they could operate under a limitation of \$55,000. Therefore, I am personally opposed at this time to a lower limitation on an appropriation bill, and I am here to urge that the Conte amendment be defeated.

I have in my possession, Mr. Chairman, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clifford M. Hardin, which I would like to read to the Members of the House. The letter is dated June 23, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1971.  
HON. GERALD R. FORD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FORD: We understand that an amendment may be offered in connection with the Agriculture Appropriations Bill which would have the effect of further limiting the payments to farmers under the Agricultural Act of 1970 for cotton, wheat and feed grains.

We have not seen a copy of the proposed amendment but we are assuming that it would not apply to 1971 crops since the government has already entered into contracts with producers for this year's crops.

Even if 1971 crops were exempted, a lowering of the limitation level would be extremely disruptive and costly to many farmers. Since December, when the Agricultural Act of 1970 was passed and signed by the President, many farmers have entered into leasing contracts, have revised their crop rotation programs and made arrangements for credit on the assumption that the payment limitation level of \$55,000 would stay in effect for the full three years. It seems to me that farmers have the right to rely on the provisions of an Act which the Congress debated and passed and the Administration approved.

I feel certain the majority of the Members of Congress will realize that to make a substantial change in the rules at this time would be grossly unfair.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
Secretary.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge on the grounds of equity and fairness that we not change the rules in the middle of the game. I reiterate and reemphasize the fact that

a year ago when we were debating this issue I felt that a lower limitation was right. However, the Congress acted and the farmers of America have acted in good faith in their relationships with the Department of Agriculture. Contracts have been signed; commitments have been made.

Mr. Chairman, Congress at this time to change the rules of the game would be inequitable and unfair. I therefore urge defeat of the Conte amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the House that I am a little hoarse. However, I cannot let this opportunity go by without saying a word about this amendment.

The basic law of the land contains for the first time since we have had an agricultural appropriation a limitation, a \$55,000 limitation.

I do not and have never subscribed to the theory that a limitation was a good way to control production and to stabilize price and demand which is, after all, the purpose of general farm legislation.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we have a statute on the books which the gentleman from Michigan has described. We have made a commitment to the farmers and the farmers have acted accordingly.

In many parts of the country planting is done before the winter comes around. In many parts of the country plans are made just as early as farmers know what the program is going to be. Operating loans are made accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, we have a \$55,000 limitation. We have a law that we gave the farmers and the people of this country. But, to go beyond that to a lower limitation, it seems to me will destroy the farm program altogether. This is a cruel and inhumane amendment that will in my opinion start a depression in the United States and would destroy the livelihood of at least 100,000 farm families in America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the distinguished Speaker and say that I agree with him, that we have in the basic law a limitation of \$55,000. Now, shortly after having done so and after most of the farmers have contracted and have started planting some of these crops, for this Congress now in this House to turn around to a lower limitation, one which would encourage the very thing the distinguished Speaker speaks of, I feel we will have a greater depression in our farm economy which concerns the dickens out of me.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Boston, Mr. CONTE, that I think the ramifications of this amendment will affect Boston as much as they will affect the great wheat-growing areas of Kan-

sas, Colorado or Nebraska, or any of the cotton-growing States.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished Speaker for yielding to me, and I want to join wholeheartedly in the position he takes. He has just touched upon a point that I thought should be emphasized, and that is that this amendment will not only create havoc among the farm people of our country, but in the long term it will injure the consumers and the families in America who rely upon a sound agriculture for the food on their tables.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Speaker for yielding, and to remind him and the chairman of the committee that my district is one that is 95 percent urban and that I have severe doubts about the efficacy of the price support system. Indeed, I voted against the last farm bill that passed this House, and I have voted in the past for some limitation on the amount of the payments, although reluctantly, because I recognized that a limitation on the amount of payments to an individual farmer really does not make any economic sense in terms of the price support system. It will not hurt only those whose payments are limited, it will hurt all of the small farmers who rely on the price support system to hold up the price of the products they sell in the private market. They are hurt just as badly or worse than the large producer whose payments are reduced.

I therefore do not intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) on this occasion.

I commend our Speaker for his very factual and appropriate comments on this subject.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much for his remarks.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the \$20,000 limitation payment amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

I think our Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) brought out the basis of what we are talking about regarding this amendment. I think it would be heartless and most unfair now, as the Speaker said because the Federal Government has given its word to the farmers of our Nation and the checks are in the Agricultural Department ready to go out as of July 1. On the basis of existing law, farmers have gone to their banks, they have borrowed the money, they have planted crops that they are now tending in good faith, that they knew what they were doing because the law was on the books. They knew that they could depend upon Federal assis-

tance for they were legally entitled to it. And now for us to renege upon legislation we have only months ago passed into law I think is shocking. No wonder individuals are losing faith in their government, the ink is hardly dry on the books and already this body is trying to go back on its solemn enactments.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, and as a Representative from a rural district of the Nation, I know full well the dynamics of the delicate relationship between the Federal farm program and our food fiber supply. As one who helped bring the new farm program into being, a program which placed a payment limitation of \$55,000 per farmer per crop, I know full well we have stretched this delicate relationship between farm program and producer to the breaking point. To adopt this amendment would be to rupture this relationship beyond repair. Given the cost-profit squeeze in agriculture today, many individuals are leaving the farms and seeking their livelihood elsewhere. As evidence of this, in the last 20 years the population in this country has increased by 36 percent while the farm population has decreased 50 percent. During this same period, the number of farms has dropped from 5.7 million to 2.9 million and the decline continues.

The current condition of the American farmer can also be well depicted by examining his earning position relative to nonfarm sectors of the economy. Since 1950 the hourly earnings of manufacturing workers have risen by 131 percent. Since 1950 corporate dividends have increased 235 percent. In contrast to these success stories, the farmers' average return in 1967 to 1969 was 3 percent below what it was 20 years ago using 1947 to 1949 as a base period. Moreover, modern-day prices received for the three major farm crops: corn, wheat, and cotton, are actually considerably lower than those received two decades ago. For example, the average price received for corn last year was \$1.12 per bushel. Twenty years ago it was \$1.68.

The ability of the agriculture sector to provide the underpinning and momentum for our economic growth depends on the courage, resourcefulness, and initiative of the hardy few who are willing to risk their lives and their fortunes in the risky business of farming. To survive in the face of mounting costs for equipment, land, labor, facilities, and supplies, farmers have had to expand their operations and take every advantage of the economies of scale. As a result in many areas of the country, such as the Texas Panhandle, it is common for man to farm whole sections of land where in his father's time, men normally described their operations in terms of acres.

It is this fact, that farming has become big business, that the prime sponsor of the amendment to limit farm payments to \$20,000—Mr. CONTE and others, seem singularly unwilling or unable to recognize. Perhaps his vision is limited to the farming conditions in his State, a State that has only 126,219 acres tied up in farming. In Texas, we farm 35,778,092 acres. If this is the case I would suggest the gentleman expand his horizons.

Mr. Chairman, the plain unadorned

fact of the matter is that if this amendment were adopted and a \$20,000 ceiling set on farm payments, the larger, more efficient producer would be unable to participate in the Federal farm program and still cover his overhead, much less make a profit on his investment. He would have no other choice than to determine what crops he could grow most efficiently and plant them fence to fence. This would force the smaller farmers who were participating in the farm program to economic ruin. It would destroy the delicate bonds of the farm program which match farm production with the consumption needs of this Nation. It would create new gluts on the market. It would dislocate the farm economy in so many ways the economic tidal wave that would be created could well swamp the rest of the economy and drive the Nation smack into a devastating depression.

The history of the United States is fairly clear that nationwide depressions begin on the farms. When I was growing up there was an old saying that went like this:

Depressions in this country have always been farm bred, farm led, and farm fed.

I predict, and I hate to be a prophet of doom, but I predict that if this Congress adopts the amendment to limit farm payments to \$20,000, it may well have sown the seeds of our economic ruin.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this proposal.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been put together very carefully in an effort to be fair and helpful to all segments of the population of this country and to all areas of this country.

As you know, this is not just an agriculture bill—it is a bill providing appropriations for agriculture and for environmental and consumer protection. We have tried to attend to the needs of the cities and the countryside alike and we have done the very best we could.

The Committee on Appropriations in dealing with appropriation bills—the public works appropriation bill and others—is nonpartisan and seeks to be helpful and cooperative with all Members regardless of party affiliation. The committee tries to do what is best for the country. We have done the very best we could to do a good job on this bill for the House and I just want to plead with you now to join in voting down the Conte amendment and give the new farm law a chance to operate. The present law is not even 1 year old. It is a 3-year law and there is a \$55,000 limitation in it. We have not had a limitation before and we have not even had a full year of experience with it.

In the interest of all consumers and in the interest of fair play and in the interest of all of us working together for the welfare of the entire country, I would hope that we can join together in voting down this amendment.

After we had drafted this bill, one of the Members from an urban area came to me and said, "We need some additional money for this summer nonschool feeding program. A shortage has devel-

oped, and there is not enough money to adequately carry out this program."

Mr. Chairman, we have agreed to put additional funds in the bill for that purpose, and we are going to try to direct that those funds become immediately available.

We are trying to work together. The people from the country and from the city have to work together if we are going to sustain and increase the strength of this country.

Members are familiar with the issue before us. It has been the subject of extended debate over a period of years. So, I do earnestly hope that we can stay together and vote down this amendment and pass what is perhaps the best agriculture appropriation bill we have ever passed, and the first bill that we will ever have passed that includes agriculture and environmental and consumer protection.

So let us stay with the bill as it is written. Let us not disrupt the operation of the new farm bill in its first year. Let us give the new farm program with the \$55,000 limitation a chance to work. Chaos would reign if this limitation were imposed at this time.

I would deeply appreciate your support of the committee and your opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I am taking the liberty of quoting from a statement I made in the House on the farm debate last August 5:

The direct payment to farmers was set up by Congress to help cover the cost of production and make room for a possible profit. There was no guarantee of a profit but the system made allowance for a possible profit.

I considered the direct payment system to be extremely dangerous and it was largely because of this dangerous innovation that I voted against the 1965 act.

#### OPPOSITION TO PAYMENT LIMITATION

It is now being proposed in the amendment that a \$20,000 limitation be put on the payment to the farmer on any crop.

This would force the larger producers who do the principal job of providing food and fiber to consumers at a minimum price to do one of two things.

First, the large producer could stay out of the program and produce to the full extent of his capability. This would inundate, this would engulf the small producer, causing a drastic reduction in his allotment because of the overproduction of the larger producer who was no longer in the program. It would put the smaller producer out of business, or it would require an increase in the government payment to an extent that would be impractical.

On the other hand, if the larger producer decided not to increase his production of his customary crop, he would go into other fields of crop production.

And you may be sure that he will do one of these two things because he has the land, he has the equipment, and he has an investment of many thousands of dollars.

If he shifts to other crops, and remember that this is a big producer with a lot of land, this would violently disrupt the markets of producers of other crops. This would create an imbalance which would be highly damaging to farmers generally, especially the small farmer. Is that not obvious?

And it would be damaging to consumers who would now be confronted with chaotic conditions in the supply of agricultural products.

#### UPSETTING THE BALANCE OF AGRICULTURE

Today it is popular, indeed necessary, to talk about the environment, to talk about

ecology. We do not want to see the balance of nature upset. We are told, and correctly so, that this threatens our very survival. We are warned of the dire consequences of disturbing the delicate balance of nature.

What then are the proponents of this amendment undertaking to do? What would be the result of their effort?

Under the payment limitation as provided in the amendment, a tremendous imbalance in agriculture would occur. Millions of acres are involved and this payment limitation amendment would have a devastating impact on the finely tuned balance of American agriculture. Do not forget that American agriculture has done a tremendous job in meeting our requirements both at home and abroad and in keeping us at the top in a field where it is essential that we stay on top.

To create an imbalance in agriculture by a deliberate action of the Congress would be intolerable, inexcusable, and unacceptable. It would bring chaos in farm-related industry and labor involving billions of dollars as well as millions of workers.

No Member is detached from this program just because he lives in the heart of a great city. Every Member is heavily involved in what would happen as a result of this amendment and he cannot afford to see an imbalance created which would jeopardize his constituents and the industry, the labor and the consumers which he represents.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conte amendment, which provides a reasonable limitation of \$20,000. The much larger payments under which this program has been laboring for many years are discrediting it in the eyes of the American people. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the vast majority of my farm constituents, these huge payments are jeopardizing the continued existence of the program for the family-sized farmers for whom the program was originally designed.

The taxpayers of this country rightfully resent tax funds being drained off in individual payments of hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars, and part of this resentment is unfairly rubbing off on the small- and moderate-sized farmers for whom this program was intended. These large payments are jeopardizing the very existence of the entire farm program, and must be eliminated now if the program is to command sufficient public support for continuance on a reasonable basis.

Annual payments of more than \$20,000 are hurting, not helping the family farmer. They are subsidizing the gigantic agricultural combines, corporate and otherwise, which have been gobbling up family-sized farms and driving farmers from the land by the hundreds of thousands. We should not be misled by arguments that payments of over \$20,000 are helping small- or medium-sized farmers in any way.

Large payments are accelerating the growth of larger and larger farm units whose owners are encouraged to acquire more and more of their neighbor's land through the use of large subsidies. Government checks are being used as the downpayment to buy up family-sized farms with more and more farm families being driven from the land. Many of them then move to great cities where

they are ill equipped to make the necessary adjustments to the complexities of urban life.

Mr. Chairman, this will be the fourth consecutive time I have voted for a \$20,000 limitation on payments when the issue has been presented to the House. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "aye" on the Conte amendment.

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

Mr. MAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding. At least I can say one thing: We brought the big guns out here. I ask every one of you to look at the rollcall or the RECORD that I have submitted here and see the ones who got up here to speak today. How much do the big farmers in their districts get not to plant cotton? This is where the ball game lies—with cotton. There is little concern on their part for food stamps for undernourished babies and other poor people—the people who are going to bed hungry every night. The gentleman who just took the podium here had the third largest amount of money going to his district—over \$110 million for 1969—going for farmers for not planting cotton. This is one of the most scandalous programs that has ever been foisted on the taxpayers of this country, and one of these days the whole roof will cave in. The people are not going to stand for it.

It is said here on the floor that the farmers show good faith. With a \$55,000 limitation, sure they have shown good faith. They accepted the checks and they cashed the checks. They showed good faith. How many of your people who are trapped in poverty, earning less than \$3,800 get a subsidy from the Federal Government of \$50,000 or \$20,000 a year not to plant crops? Tell me where the logic and the reason is in all of this.

Do you know how this program came about? It came about in the early 1930's, during the depression, to help the little farmer.

You know, I promised myself that I would not get too heated up on this question, but I could not hold back when I saw all the big guns come forward, including my leader, who generously gave me the opportunity in 1968—and if it had not been for him I would never have had it—to offer the motion to recommit on this bill with instructions for a \$20,000 limitation, which he supported. Now it is \$55,000. And we have not saved a plugged nickel.

I am trying through this amendment to send a message to Secretary Hardin saying, "Look, Mr. Secretary, we want a \$20,000 limitation to prevent farmers from subdividing their land to get around this particular law." I say if you want to go back and face the taxpayers in your districts this coming election, vote for the \$20,000 limitation. If you want to vote for the big fat cats, you should vote against my amendment.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I am a farmer, and most of the Members of this House know it. I rise in opposition to the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

A \$55,000 limitation was passed in good faith. As was mentioned earlier, the farmers who operate their farms have made their loans. They went to the bank and indebted themselves in the hope that the \$55,000 limitation passed here in the House was the amount that would be guaranteed for the length of the program. The gentleman from Massachusetts made the statement a short time ago that there is no money saved. No one knows.

There is no way in the world of knowing at this time how much money has been saved. For instance, in my county alone 958 farmers have registered to participate in the program. There is no way of knowing how many farms have been broken down or how much of the land was transferred.

For once I am going to stand up and back the Department of Agriculture in saying that to analyze the situation before the end of the crop year would be entirely foolhardy, and tremendously expensive.

I ask my colleagues in the House to vote down the amendment and to stay with the agreed amount.

I am sure if you want to turn the thumbscrew down on the farmers of America just go ahead and vote for this amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to my city friends, sitting back and enjoying this situation, and to my friends whose farmers apparently do not fall in the \$20,000 category, they are making one basic mistake.

What is going to happen if we impose a \$20,000 limitation? The big farmer is going to get out of the subsidy program entirely, and the corporate farmer is going to outproduce all of the little farmers put together, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) is going to find his little farmer has been nailed, and my city friends will find that the people in their communities, who have a hard time to pay for groceries now, will find their grocery bills all of a sudden accelerated horrendously.

Whoever is responsible for this situation, I sympathize with his feelings of guilt. But this is not the way to purge a conscience, by condemning the small farmers and the poor consumers to a situation of increased debt and higher bills.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, I am sure, did not intend to mislead the Members, but he made a statement which is not in accord with the facts.

This program is to help the farmer who grows cotton to recover the cost of production and hopefully, make a return

on his investment. It does not subsidize anybody for not growing cotton.

There are certain set-asides, of land which the farmer has to comply with in order to qualify for the program, but that is not what he is paid for. He is paid on the basis of the cotton he grows.

I submit to the House it is to the interest of the American people that we continue to grow cotton. We need it.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I believe we have to look at this from another standpoint. If we had a bill before us this afternoon to appropriate a billion dollars to take farm land out of production, to put it in grass or in some other better environment than a cropping system, it is my opinion that the gentleman from Massachusetts and a lot of others who propose this amendment today would be here arguing just as vociferously for the appropriation to accomplish that purpose. The Agricultural Act does accomplish that purpose.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) to limit farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 per producer. I have advocated similar amendments in the past. In fact, the House has voted twice to limit farm subsidy payments to \$20,000.

At this time last year, a ceiling of \$55,000 was accepted by the Agriculture Department and the House Agriculture Committee. Then they projected a savings of \$69 million. Unfortunately, this has not materialized. The Department of Agriculture officials now concede there will be virtually no savings.

The present subsidy system, which now sets a limit of \$55,000, remains a boon to the large corporate farmer; a drain on resources desperately needed for the poor and the disadvantaged—and in this group are thousands upon thousands of small farmers who derive no benefit from farm subsidies; and a perversion of our priorities.

The rationale for the farm subsidy program is that it provides a guaranteed income for the American farmer. No one denies that thousands of farm families are in very serious need, much as are many thousands of urban families. The irony is that the subsidy program does not really benefit the poor marginal farmer. Rather, it is a support mechanism for the large, mechanized farm operations.

Few programs maintain such a skewed sense of priorities. Not only are most of those whom the program ostensibly assists—the farmers—denied its benefits, but those equally in need but who do not fall within its direct scope—that is, the families of our cities and towns—are denied urgently needed Federal funds.

The savings the amendment now before us could generate would amount to some \$200 million. Anyone who can deny that there are not a hundred—a thousand—more pressing needs in this Nation for that \$200 million simply is not aware of the state of this Nation. We need billions for housing, for education, for health. Two hundred million dollars will not sat-

isfy those needs, but it would certainly make a start. And we have delayed and delayed and delayed in making that firm, aggressive start to solve the domestic needs of America. Passage of the amendment to limit farm subsidies to \$20,000 per producer—an amendment which, by the way, has twice before been passed by this House only to be rejected by the other body—is a particularly apt appropriate juncture at which to begin.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Members want to vote. I shall not delay.

I want to say to begin with, I opposed this type of farm program at its outset because it was apparent to me then that the farm producers—and that is what they are today—would end up annually dependent upon act of Congress for part of their cost and all of their profits. I opposed it at that time because I could see that this day would be an annual day, and it has been.

There are two or three things I wish the Members would think about, which ought to be remembered by all of us. The biggest market for industry and labor is agriculture. In order for agriculture to operate today, it all has to operate on a large-scale basis, because one cannot operate any other way today. If one does not operate on a pretty good-sized basis one cannot operate.

May I say again that the payments made are made so that the farm producer can sell at world prices while he pays American prices for machinery and all of the things that he uses.

I wish to call attention to these facts.

Since 1945-49 farm income has gone down, it has dropped during that period from 7.1 percent of investment, to only 3.3 percent on the investment, including payments. Not only that but, for the last 6 years, we have had an average of from 500,000 to 600,000 people who have quit farming altogether. Now perhaps in the cities, when businessmen go out of business, we can afford to have them quit, but, in the case of the farmer, we cannot afford to have them quit, because they are the people who feed us. We are the consumers.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will all vote this amendment down, because it is unsound. In addition to that, it amounts to violating a commitment which was made to farmers, and upon which they acted in good faith. I hope that you will join with us in defeating this amendment. This subcommittee has worked very hard on this bill to balance the interests of the consumer and producer and the environment. We are in this thing together. With farm income down so very low now throughout the Nation, let us not do something to further the downward, because, as our distinguished speaker said, you could very well set in motion another depression.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CONTE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, and Mr. MAYNE of Iowa.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 214, noes 198, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

#### AYES—214

Abourezk	Frey	Poff
Abzug	Fulton, Pa.	Powell
Adams	Fulton, Tenn.	Price, Ill.
Addabbo	Gallagher	Pucinski
Anderson,	Gaydos	Quie
Calif.	Gialmo	Railsback
Anderson, Ill.	Grasso	Randall
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	Rangel
Aspin	Gross	Rees
Badillo	Grover	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Gude	Reuss
Barrett	Haley	Riegle
Begich	Hall	Robison, N.Y.
Bennett	Halpern	Rodino
Biaggi	Hamilton	Roe
Biester	Hanley	Rogers
Bingham	Harrington	Roncallo
Boland	Harsha	Rooney, N.Y.
Brademas	Harvey	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Hastings	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Hawkins	Roush
Brotzman	Hechler, W. Va.	Rousselot
Brown, Mich.	Heckler, Mass.	Roybal
Brown, Ohio	Helstoski	Ruppe
Broyhill, Va.	Hicks, Mass.	Ryan
Burke, Fla.	Hogan	St Germain
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Sandman
Burton	Hosmer	Sarbanes
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Saylor
Byron	Hungate	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Hunt	Schmitz
Celler	Jacobs	Schneebeil
Chamberlain	Jarman	Schwengel
Chisholm	Johnson, Pa.	Scott
Clancy	Kastenmeyer	Shibley
Clark	Keating	Smith, N.Y.
Clawson, Del.	Keith	Snyder
Cleveland	Kemp	Springer
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Stafford
Conable	Lent	Stanton,
Conte	Long, Md.	J. William
Conyers	Lujan	Stanton,
Corman	McCloskey	James V.
Cotter	McDade	Steele
Coughlin	McDonald,	Stokes
Crane	Mich.	Stratton
Culver	McEwen	Sullivan
Daniels, N.J.	McKevitt	Symington
Danielson	McKinney	Terry
Delaney,	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mass.	Tierman
Derwinski	Mailliard	Van Deulin
Devine	Mayne	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Metcalfe	Vanik
Dingell	Mikva	Waldie
Dow	Miller, Ohio	Ware
Drinan	Minish	Whalen
Duncan	Minshall	Whalley
du Pont	Mitchell	Whitehurst
Dwyer	Monagan	Widnall
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Wiggins
Ellberg	Morse	Williams
Erlenborn	Mosher	Wilson, Bob
Esch	Moss	Wolf
Eshleman	Murphy, Ill.	Wylder
Fascell	Nedzi	Wylie
Flindley	Nix	Wyman
Fish	O'Konski	Yates
Ford,	Pelly	Yatron
William D.	Pettis	Young, Fla.
Forsythe	Peysner	Zablocki
Fraser	Pike	Zwach
Frelinghuysen	Pirnie	
Frenzel	Podell	

#### NOES—198

Abbutt	Bell	Buchanan
Abernethy	Bergland	Burleson, Tex.
Albert	Betts	Burlison, Mo.
Alexander	Bevill	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson,	Blackburn	Caffery
Tenn.	Blanton	Camp
Andrews, Ala.	Blatnik	Carney
Andrews,	Boggs	Carter
N. Dak.	Bolling	Casey, Tex.
Archer	Bow	Cederberg
Arends	Bray	Chappell
Aspinall	Brinkley	Clausen,
Belcher	Brooks	Don H.

Collier	Jones, Tenn.	Poage
Collins, Tex.	Karth	Preyer, N.C.
Colmer	Kazen	Price, Tex.
Daniel, Va.	Kee	Pryor, Ark.
Davis, Ga.	King	Quillen
Davis, S.C.	Kluczynski	Rarick
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Reid, Ill.
Dennis	Kyl	Rhodes
Dickinson	Kyros	Roberts
Dorn	Landgrebe	Robinson, Va.
Dowdy	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Downing	Latta	Roy
Edmondson	Leggett	Ruth
Edwards, Ala.	Lennon	Satterfield
Evans, Colo.	Link	Scherie
Evins, Tenn.	Lloyd	Sebellus
Fisher	McClory	Selberling
Flood	McClure	Shoup
Flowers	McCollister	Shriver
Flynt	McCormack	Sikes
Foley	McCall	Sisk
Ford, Gerald R.	McKay	Skubitz
Fountain	McMillan	Slack
Fuqua	Mahon	Smith, Calif.
Galifianakis	Mann	Smith, Iowa
Garmatz	Martin	Spence
Gettys	Mathias, Calif.	Staggers
Gibbons	Mathis, Ga.	Steed
Goldwater	Matsunaga	Steiger, Ariz.
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Meeds	Stephens
Gray	Melcher	Stubblefield
Green, Oreg.	Michel	Stuckey
Griffin	Miller, Calif.	Talco
Griffiths	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Calif.
Gubser	Mills, Md.	Teague, Wis.
Hagan	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Hammer-	Mizell	Thomson, Wis.
schmidt	Mollohan	Thone
Hanna	Montgomery	Udall
Hansen, Idaho	Morgan	Ullman
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, N.Y.	Veysey
Hathaway	Myers	Vigorito
Hays	Natcher	Waggonner
Hébert	Nelsen	Wampler
Henderson	Nichols	Watts
Hicks, Wash.	Obey	White
Hillis	O'Hara	Whitten
Hollifield	O'Neill	Wilson,
Hull	Passman	Charles H.
Hutchinson	Patman	Winn
Johnson, Calif.	Patten	Wyatt
Jonas	Pepper	Young, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Zion
Jones, N.C.	Pickle	

#### NOT VOTING—22

Ashbrook	Denholm	McCulloch
Ashley	Dent	Madden
Baker	Donohue	Purcell
Broyhill, N.C.	Dulski	Runnels
Cabell	Eckhardt	Taylor
Clay	Edwards, La.	Wright
Davis, Wis.	Ichord	
Dellenback	Long, La.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLFF moves on page 1, line 7, strike all after the enacting clause.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill, is a legislative monstrosity. By combining such diverse and unrelated programs as agricultural subsidies, consumer protection and environmental conservation in the same appropriation we are faced with a multi-faceted monster.

For years I have come before my colleagues and protested against the expensive, wasteful program of farm subsidies by which we pay great sums to large commercial farmers for not tilling the soil. This program of giveaways is as much a "welfare" program as any we ever vote upon and is especially galling since it helps sustain already inflated food prices.

Every year we give away billions of dollars to corporations which exploit a program started with the responsible goal of helping small, family farmers. Unfortunately the original purpose of farm subsidies has long since been for-

gotten and we have instead an annual multibillion-dollar appropriation which can charitably be called a boondoggle.

Obviously the growing sentiment against these costly, unnecessary subsidies has caused its proponents to seek protection behind the guise of much more worthwhile programs of consumer protection and environmental conservation. But the truth is that there is much more in this appropriation that robs the consumer through higher food prices than there is to aid the consumer.

The only responsible action would be to separate these appropriations so they can be considered individually on their own merits, or, in the case of the agricultural supports, demerits.

How absurd, Mr. Chairman, to lump together in a single appropriation money for dairy and beekeepers indemnity programs, on one hand, and funds for National Commission on Consumer Finance on the other. Or consider the mismatch of combining grants for sewer facilities—something we should truly need—and the Commodity Credit Corporation. Perhaps we should stop throwing so much money down the sewer of agricultural giveaways.

Incidentally, the irony of this appropriation is shown quite clearly when it is considered that there is only \$150 million of new money for sewer facilities while our waterways are polluted and local governments cry out for help, and \$3.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is a convenient attempt, I suppose, to gain support for an overfed agricultural program by tying it to unfortunately lean programs of consumer and environmental protection.

Not only is this an attempt to have the tail wag the dog—the tail and dog do not even fit together.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I think I would be delinquent in my duty as a Representative if I did not take exception to one of the major arguments of the gentleman who has just spoken, the argument in which he charges "inflated food prices" to support programs. I will not engage in expressing any of my opinion. I will deal only with a few facts, and then let the Members of this House decide if the support program is responsible for "inflated market prices."

If you, I, a group of us, went downstairs to the House restaurant immediately after I finish speaking and we drank 100 pounds of milk, we would pay \$30 for that 100 pounds of milk—exactly \$30—a pint is a pound. I do not know anywhere in the United States today where a dairy farmer gets more than \$6 a hundred for the milk he produces. Not \$30, but \$6. And he gets no support above that figure.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Is it not true that the

price depends on the ultimate use to which the milk is put? In other words, if the milk is produced for a commercial use, there is one price paid for that milk, and if it is sold as fluid milk, there is another price paid for it?

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is exactly correct, and I am so glad that he mentioned that point, because no farmer gets even \$5 for milk that is not grade A drinking milk, and the price is often lower than that.

Let me continue. The farmer in the United States is getting about \$17 a hundred for pork, for the pigs he produces. That price is \$10 or more less than he got 5 years ago, 10 years ago, or 20 years ago. Can you blame an inflated price of pork at the market on the farmer who gets less for that pork than he did 20 years ago? It is ridiculous. That price is only indirectly supported through purchase programs.

Look at the price of corn. That is up a little from what it was a year ago and 2 years ago. Today the farmer gets the magnificent sum of \$1.30 a bushel for the corn he produces, in spite of the fact that his production costs have increased every year. He makes far less money today on a bushel of corn than he did 20 years ago. If the price of cornmeal on the market is up, can you blame it on the farmer, who gets less for what he produces?

There are some products that are not subsidized. Some of those have been subjected to a greater rise than those which have been controlled.

I want to move to one other point. The gentleman from New York is extremely interested in the business of pollution control. The gentleman speaks about indemnification for dairy products. Let me cite one case. I will state no opinion, just the facts.

In my State now there is a dairy farmer. For 6 months the milk produced by his cows has shown, through a gas chromatography analysis, the presence of a pesticide residue. That pesticide cannot be found by analysis in any of the feed that he feeds his cattle, in the water supply, or anywhere on the farm. He has not used the pesticide. No one knows where it comes from. But an inspection of the milk shows there is a pesticide residue.

So the Government takes that milk off the market. Why? Is it to protect the farmer? No, indeed. It is to protect the consumer.

Through no fault of his own this man, raising dairy cows and producing milk, has milk with a residue of pesticide. Is this indemnification for his protection? Of course not. It is for your protection, for my protection, for the protection of the children in this country.

If the public is being served by that withdrawal, should we expect the farmer who, so far as we can determine, is totally innocent, to stand the loss?

No, Mr. Chairman; we cannot blame increased cost for food or fiber in the consumer's marketplace on the Agriculture Act. The facts speak for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the

gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of \$6,300,000, together with such additional funds as may be necessary to be derived from general administrative funds available to the Administrator, is appropriated to enable the Administrator to obtain, except where there is determined to be an imminent hazard to human life, in advance of determination of action to be taken or recommended from those agencies of Government or other entities, governmental or private, which are required to file reports on major Federal actions determined to have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, reports as to the probable adverse effect on the economy, including employment and unemployment, if such action is taken and the project or proposed action is delayed or terminated. And, if necessary, the Administrator is authorized to reimburse the affected agency of Government or other entities for the reasonable costs of preparing such reports, if additional work is required.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a point of order with regard to the language appearing on page 28, lines 8 through 24, of the bill, which constitutes, in my opinion, and also in the language in the report, legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore is violative of the rules of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order and say, if I may, the committee agrees as to the point of order on the bill. Of course, we do not agree as to the point of order in the report. We wrote this in the report and, if I may pursue this a little further, we were asked to appropriate all of this money through the agency without any safeguard being written around how it would be handled. We did not ask for a rule on it, but until the gentleman in the well and others who are responsible, on very fine legislative committees, get around to writing some kind of a restriction or a guideline for this environmental protection agency and for the administrator, we are in a bad way, in my opinion, unless we have this language in here. It was for that reason that we wrote it in here trying to hold the line until the legislative committees could act. We readily concede that it is subject to a point of order, and if the gentleman or others insist on knocking it out, all they have to do is make the point of order.

However, I do not concede as to the point of order as to the language in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), concedes the point of order to the language appearing between lines 8 and 24 on page 28 of the bill on the ground that it does provide funds for carrying out a function not previously authorized by enabling legislation. Therefore it does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of \$2,500,000, together with such additional funds as may be necessary to be derived from general administrative funds available to the Administrator, is appropri-

ated to provide for an independent grant and contact review board made up of qualified persons selected to review the agency's priorities and to assume that such contracts and grants are awarded only to qualified research agencies or individuals consistent with national economic and environmental needs.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order on which the Chair has just ruled, namely, that the language beginning on page 28 at line 25 and continuing through line 8 on page 29 again constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill, and so is violative of the rules. Again I renew my point of order in that this appropriation has not been previously authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee takes the same view and concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order, so the point of order is sustained.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know my good friend from Mississippi is distressed by what I have just done. He and I have been in discussion on the first point of order that was raised by me. I had not previously raised the second point of order, but in my recent research on the legislation I became aware of the language appearing on page 28, line 25, and at the end on page 29 down to line 8. I would ask unanimous consent at this time to be permitted to revise and extend my remarks in order to explain with some reason some of the motives that compelled me to make these two points of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this: The gentleman from Mississippi has dealt openly and fairly with me on these matters. I believe he and the subcommittee handled a difficult piece of legislation well.

As the gentleman points out, the legislative committees have not yet acted on the matters on which the points of order were raised.

I would like to state to the House that the gentleman from Mississippi has behaved in an entirely gentlemanly and proper fashion and I hope that because of my insertion of these points of order I have done nothing to reflect any discredit or lack of affection or respect upon him or toward him. The gentleman from Mississippi has been very gracious and has handled this bill in my view very well.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan yielding. May I say our committee felt we needed to point these matters up in the bill. We expected them to go out on objection, thus,

we used substantially the same language in the report and we will expect this agency and others to follow this language.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say at this time that this subcommittee was asked to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency without any limitation or restriction upon his action. Each and every business and every person in the whole country is in his control with reference to this particular program. No one is questioning his abilities. However, there is not anything to hold him in check. The man, in my opinion, has more power than a good man would want and more power than a bad man ought to have. But, we felt we could not in all fairness bring in all that money, with all of that power, without making some limitation.

Mr. DINGELL. As I am sure my good friend from Mississippi knows, I am chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the National Environmental Policy Act. We have tried in that bill, and I believe successfully so, to come forward with a piece of legislation which provides for this opportunity for consideration of environmental problems and to observe and consider the effects of the actions or the failure to act insofar as economic consequences are concerned. It is our intention later this year to attempt to go further into that matter and review the whole of the Environmental Policy Act and ascertain what future changes are necessary with regard to the particular points about which my good friend from Mississippi is concerned and to which he has addressed himself.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I hope the gentleman will expedite the action of his committee because in the meantime I think a great, powerful individual—and he impresses me as being a very fine man—will have almost carte blanche authority in the administration of this law.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say that every single air and water pollution statute we have passed requires the actions of the Administrator of the Environmental Agency to reflect the limits of technology and capability as well as the economic consequences, and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi in his consideration of this matter will view the actions of the Administrator in the light of the language of the statutes to which I have alluded.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would like to point out that by making these points of order my good friend from Michigan who is a great friend of conservation and environment has not only stricken the language but also some \$8.8 million in funds that were in the budget.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to my friend from North Dakota I am well

aware of that. It always pains me to do this. I will further say with reference to the last point of order that I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of setting up another advisory commission without proper committee action. When there are at least two such advisory commissions or boards dealing with water quality, and one dealing with the quality of the entire environment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that I am in sympathy with the objectives of the gentleman from Mississippi, and that I do feel that the economic implications of going ahead with or of halting Federal projects with environmental implications should be clearly identified as early as possible in the decision-making process.

I raise the point of order, not to prevent this evaluation process from taking place, but to permit it to take place where it belongs. While the Environmental Protection Agency is an organization for which I have a great deal of respect and admiration, its connection with the process of balancing of environmental costs and benefits by agencies of Government is at best remote. EPA acts as a regulatory agency and as a research agency. It has no responsibilities for injecting new economic factors into agency decisions, nor should it.

There is an agency which does have these responsibilities, and which has ample authority to develop procedures whereby other agencies of Government shall take economic factors into account in considering whether or not to go ahead with a given project or proposal. That agency is the Council on Environmental Quality, and its authority in this respect is provided by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—an act which resulted from legislation coming out of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

I would refer the members of the Committee to the language of section 102 (B) of that act, which requires all agencies of the Federal Government to—

Identify and develop methods and procedures—(to) insure that presently unquantified environmental—values—be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations.

The Council on Environmental Quality has recently adopted amended guidelines to assist agencies of Government in developing their planning processes pursuant to section 102(2) (C) of the act. My staff has been in contact with the Council, to urge them to develop supplementary guidelines to assist the agencies in carrying out the purposes of section 102(2) (B) of that act. I understand that the Council is in agreement with this proposal, although it is not presently able to tell us how soon such supplementary guidelines might be forthcoming.

I do agree entirely with the gentleman that the economic implications of projects which affect the environment must be considered. I do not feel that the language suggested in the measure before us is the proper route to that objective,

and this is why I feel it necessary to raise this point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Michigan give these assurances. The committee, in its report, gave similar directions to the chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality. So, with both the legislative and the appropriations committees expressing concern, I am sure that the will of Congress is clear and the economic impact of these decisions will be considered. I would also repeat my point that, in spite of this action, the committee also expects Mr. Ruckelshaus to do the same.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of directing a question to our good Chairman.

Earlier this afternoon I mentioned the fact that I had received a telephone call from the vegetable growers or processors. It seems that in Madison, Wis., there is a research center and that a request had been made for money to go for research in the area of vegetable production, pest control, and what have you.

Now, I am wondering about the points of order that have been made. I notice that research is included. I was earlier assured that money would be in this bill to deal with research. I am just wondering if the Chairman has any view on this, because they are very concerned about it. It was my understanding earlier that money would be available for research in this area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the bill does provide for the type of research the gentleman is interested in. This is primarily in the funds for the Corporate State Research Service, in conjunction with the land-grant colleges and the Federal Government.

There is \$82,034,000 in the bill for the Cooperative State Research Service. In addition to that, the Agricultural Research Service has over \$184 million for research. If there is any phase of vegetable development, from the seed form on up until the vegetables are eaten or inspected that is not covered, I cannot think of where it could possibly be. I said vegetables, and that is a rather broad term because vegetables can cover so many different items, but I will say to the gentleman that they are certainly adequately taken care of.

There is another thing we should not overlook, and that is that we do have this reserve fund of \$2 million.

If there is anything in here that is not covered, we have this \$2 million emergency fund to cover it. So I do not believe the gentleman has anything to worry about.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his response.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out at this juncture three items in this bill relating to the very serious problem of southern corn leaf blight.

In the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1971 passed just a short time ago, we provided \$1 million which has been directed to the State experiment stations for immediate efforts to combat this disease.

In the bill before us, our committee has provided an additional \$500,000 for the Agricultural Research Service to study the transmission of corn blight and to develop resistance to it. As we point out in our committee report, this effort will be fully coordinated with the research being conducted by the experiment stations.

Also in the committee report we point out that ARS scientific activities overseas should include studies to undertake discovery of badly needed new resistant varieties of corn.

In addition to these funds, our committee has provided another \$500,000 in the Cooperative State Research Service appropriation to fully fund the budget estimate for corn blight research.

Mr. Chairman, the latest reports I have indicate occurrences of blight in localized areas in 52 counties in 12 States. The State of Illinois has at least 20 counties in which infections have been confirmed. At this point we do not know how extensively it will spread and damage our corn crop this year, and because of all the unknowns we face, now is not the time to let up in our efforts to combat this disease. On the contrary, we must continue to press ahead, and the funds provided in this bill will give us a good base from which to work.

We intend to watch this situation closely as we move further into the crop season, and I hope we will be able to move quickly to take whatever steps are necessary to deal with this critical problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102), \$350,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which \$200,000,000 shall be derived from the unexpended balance of amounts appropriated under this head in Public Law 91-556.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEPHENS

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEPHENS: On page 30, line 11, strike "\$350,000,000" and insert "\$700,000,000".

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering is an amendment cosponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL). We are asking for \$350 million more to be put into the 702 program of the housing bill. You ask what the 702 money is for. It is for water facilities. It can be spent for a water plant, for pipelines, and sewer lines. It is on a 50-50 basis, 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local government.

It is a program that has been in effect since the Housing Act of 1965. The program is for the purpose of correcting the

basic pollution problems in America which are water and sewer pipelines and sewer treatment plants.

To give you a little history of this. Last year the House voted on a similar amendment I offered to increase the amount for this section 702 by \$350 million, making the amount to be appropriated \$500 million. The House voted for that by a great majority.

It went to the Senate, and was kept in the Senate, and the President vetoed the bill. When we finally passed the bill the last time, there was \$350 million placed into this act for this purpose.

The President has not spent but \$150 million. There is in the backlog some \$200 million. This is where the committee gets its \$350 million figure. The committee this year proposes \$150 million in new money and adds it to the backlog.

The present bill appropriates only \$150 million in new money then. We are asking for an additional \$350 million of new money, making \$500 million.

The story behind the need for this additional appropriation is right here in this 3-inch thick collection of applications that have been made all over the United States.

We have asked HUD to give us the figure on how much money and how many applications have been made since the inception of this program.

Let me read to you a little from this HUD report:

As of April 30, 1971, a total of 7,155 inquiries were received by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, requesting some \$4.4 billion in water and sewer assistance. Of this total 2,406 of these inquiries were converted to full applications covering requests of approximately \$1.2 billion. As of April 30, 1971, a total of 1,655 applications had been approved by grants totaling \$747.6 million.

During this same period, 4,613 inquiries were withdrawn or rejected, involving grant requests of some \$3.2 billion. At the present time there are 648 inquiries on hand in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, involving grants requesting \$336.5 million; full applications on hand totaling 239, for \$126.9 million.

It must be reiterated that inquiries seeking assistance under the water and sewer program have, in total, requested an amount of \$4.4 billion from the Federal Government. Due to a shortage of funding, roughly 75 percent of these requests have been either rejected or withdrawn, in many instances because of discouragement practices on the part of the administrators of the program.

There is no actual information of how much the demand is for this because when people make an inquiry, they are told—"No money." So, they do not pursue the matter.

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

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague now in the well of the House and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS. I appreciate the gentleman's support very much.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment.

In my own Baltimore County a water and sewer grant for \$2 million is desperately needed to protect the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Chesapeake from pollution. This grant has been held up for 2 years by all kinds of red tape and excuses. But basically, approving the grant has not been approved because the President has impounded the money.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out one other thing and you can put this down. Last year there was \$800 million appropriated for sewer treatment plants in the entire program.

This appropriation bill we are considering right now says that we are going to give \$2 billion for assistance for sewer treatment plants provided that amount is authorized in other legislation.

Now what good is it to have a sewer treatment plant if you do not have the pipes going into it—with the applications that are pending, this is one of the most priority programs in the United States. With the flood of applications that have been made for this assistance, it is a wonder that we should not have had recommended by the committee twice as much as I advocate in my amendment.

But there is one other thing I would like to point out. Someone said that if we put this in, the President would be sure to veto it again. But we should not legislate on the basis of whether the President is going to veto something or not. We ought to legislate on the basis of whether the legislation is good or not.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, I rise in its support.

The gentlemen of the House have, of course, long known my views, but let me review them. I consider this program absolutely vital to the Health and Welfare of America. Particularly do I believe this true when we consider the needs of the suburbs, the small towns, and the rural areas. But the program need not stop there. Eligibility is only restricted by the amount of the authorization and appropriation. This is something we are urgently attempting to correct at this very moment.

The water and sewer facilities grant program exists because there is a Federal recognition that:

First, the adequacy of these facilities is essential to the health and liveability of any community;

Second, many local governments do

not have the fiscal resources to provide these facilities on their own.

The overwhelming majority of communities presently participating in the program have populations under 50,000, with a substantial number having populations of under 10,000. At present, 71 percent of the available funds are going to towns 50,000 and under. If the population figure is raised to 100,000 the percentage figure rises above 90 percent.

The program is unique among HUD administered categorical grant programs in that it is not urban oriented, but rather directed toward communities in the process of growth, the capacity of whose water and sewer facilities is constantly being overcome by their increasing number of users.

For communities under 50,000, typically, a water and sewer facilities grant will be an isolated instance of that community either requesting or receiving assistance under any HUD grant program.

At present in the water and sewer program, there has been: \$1 billion authorized, \$500 million appropriated and vetoed, \$350 million appropriated and passed, and \$200 million held back by the executive, leaving \$150 million presently available.

HUD's unfulfilled and denied applications total \$3.5 billion, constituting a legitimate backlog.

As I have told Members of the House before, there are twenty applicants for every available dollar. At a time when we are universally concerned with the ecology of this country, at a time when we are waging both a private and public war against red tape, we can do nothing more in these common causes than to make readily available the dollars needed for the water and sewer program.

Some idea of the legitimacy of our cause can be obtained from the fact that the funds we are about to appropriate for sewer and water are on a matching basis. If the hard-pressed applicants are willing and able to put up not 10, not 20, not 33 1/3, but in all practicality, 60 to 65 percent of the funds to better their communities, the Federal Government should not quibble over the money that goes to benefit so many citizens of the country.

This program is dwarfed by the funds made available to groups of much smaller size and of less urgent need. As I have said before, the water and sewer program is absolutely vital to the Nation and should be so recognized.

I urge all my colleagues—practically every one of whom represents a district which has applicants for this program—to vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New Jersey are performing a real public service in bringing this amendment to the floor. I hope that the amend-

ment will receive enthusiastic and overwhelming support. In the small towns and rural areas throughout West Virginia and the Nation, these water and waste treatment projects are badly needed, and can only be constructed with the kind of assistance provided in this amendment. The additional funding provided by the Stephens-Widnall amendment will enable many areas to conquer very serious pollution problems. I urge adoption of the pending amendment.

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

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment to the appropriations bill for agricultural, environmental, and consumer protection which has been offered by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS). This amendment would increase from \$150 to \$500 million the amount of new money provided as grants for the construction of water and sewer lines, pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, we have for too long failed to heed the vehement cries of our local communities for Federal assistance in the construction of vital sewer and water lines. I have contacted mayors and selectmen throughout my district and have found that the transmission of waste to treatment plants, which these lines would accomplish, remains one of their primary problems. Yet we have done little to facilitate progress in this area.

The inequities of the present system of Federal grants for sewer programs are readily apparent. Under this system, a community must demonstrate that it has a workable plan for transmitting sewage to the treatment plant in order to qualify for a Federal grant for construction of the plant itself. But the construction of lines for this transmission is usually as expensive as building the plant itself. Many communities have, therefore, been unable to obtain Federal funds for a plant because they lack the necessary money to build the lines themselves.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that we must begin to deal with the problem of water pollution control in terms of a unitary, integrated funding system, the dual components of which—construction of sewage treatment plants, and construction of sewer and water lines to transport the sewage and surface water to the plants—are inseparable. It is incongruous for us to continue allocating Federal funds for the plants, but not for the sewer and water lines without which the plants cannot function.

The Environmental Protection Agency's sewage treatment plant program can not alone cope with the pressing problem of water pollution. Critical to the success of the EPA program is its supplementation by the Housing Department's section 702 grant program for sewer and water lines. This amendment is the nec-

essary first step toward that supplementation, and toward relieving our local communities of the burden of constructing water and sewer lines without Federal support.

This amendment, besides being necessary for the success of the EPA's sewage treatment plant program, will also give a significant boost to lagging economies in many communities. It will provide additional projects for contractors, and create new jobs on these projects. At a time when unemployment figures continue to soar, we must give serious consideration to a program such as this which will stimulate meaningful employment opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for us to sit here in Washington and speak in abstract terms of the critical need to solve our water pollution problems. But to our local communities, pollution is more than an abstraction—it is, rather, a grim reality, stifling their growth and beauty. The amendment proposed today, though falling at least a billion dollars short of meeting present needs in this area, is a minimal first step toward concrete action by this body to improve our sewage disposal systems and help alleviate water pollution. Rejection of this amendment would be a clear signal that our commitment does not match our talk.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word. The two gentlemen who have spoken on this amendment, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) have rendered great service in this area. I cannot differ in any regard with the objective or with the value of the program that they envision or with its size. I would say, speaking for myself as chairman, and not binding the members of the subcommittee, that the thing that counted with us was the question how far we could go in increasing money above the budget and get it used. So we agreed on \$350 million, \$150 million above the budget.

Last year, the amount was raised to \$500 million and the President vetoed the bill, which was his privilege. It came back, and \$350 million was provided, and the Office of Budget and Management released only \$150 million.

There is a question whether the entire amount in this amendment could be used in view of the showing the applicants have to make including putting up their share of funds.

I personally would be proud to see a \$700 million program, the question is can we get it released and get it used. This we doubt.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I should like to endorse the remarks of our distinguished chairman. He says it like it is.

I do not believe that anyone in this House or in America today does not want to do his utmost to seek to take care of

the pollution problems we face. What we want are programs which can be implemented out in the field.

Certainly what the chairman said expresses the thoughts of those of us on the subcommittee, and I commend him for saying it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I rise in opposition not because we do not need sewer and water treatment facilities in our country but because the present programs are perpetuating inefficiency.

In studies I have made of the overall problem of the treatment of sewerage and the distribution and treatment of water, it appears that we should be handling these matters on an areawide or drainagewide basin, perhaps a river-drainage basin. We should have a regional authority which provides one efficient treatment plant, and which contracts out the sale of its services to the various political subdivisions which lie within the drainage basin area.

It is regrettable we are, under present programs, subsidizing a large number of small and inefficient plants, when one large, plant would be the least costly and most efficient way to handle the problem.

I certainly will support the amount that has been recommended by the committee. The only reason why I oppose the increase is that before we push ourselves further into this field we should reexamine the whole nature of the problem and see what can be done to develop and encourage more efficient treatment methods.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important amendments to be offered to an appropriation bill. No other function of local government is suffering for money more than that of water distribution and sewerage treatment.

Every mayor in these United States and every Governor of the 50 States has either come in person or written by mail or called by telephone to urge upon the members of the Ways and Means Committee to pass \$5 billion additional revenue sharing. For what purpose? Water distribution and sewerage treatment are the basic services they are requesting. And these services are needed. None can deny this.

Here is a real opportunity to give true revenue sharing to the real base of need. I hope that the Members can take into consideration the fact that what my friend from Georgia, Mr. BLACKBURN, has proposed is probably, in the long run period of years to come, correct, but it is not going to solve the problems today of Junction City and Jasper, Ga., or of New York City or of Los Angeles.

This is an opportunity to attack the problem without awaiting the speculative outcome of revenue sharing and without delaying further the service that we ought to send to the localities.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of the Stephens-Widnall amendment to the bill, H.R. 9270, the agriculture-EPA appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. The bill under consideration appropriates a total of \$150 million for new grants for the basic water and sewer facilities program authorized by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The Stephens-Widnall amendment would appropriate \$500 million for this program instead of the \$150 million asked for in this bill, which means this amendment increases the authorization for this popular water and sewer program by \$350 million. As many of us recall in the appropriations bill last year, the House increased the amount to be authorized for the water and sewer program from \$150 million to \$500 million. The president subsequently vetoed the appropriations bill, which contained this sum and sent it back to us saying that he strongly objected to increasing the funds for this program. The Congress subsequently appropriated a total of \$350 million for this program. All we are asking to do this afternoon is to appropriate the same amount of funds which the House deemed necessary last year. I recall that we also passed the Emergency Community Facilities Act, Public Law 91-431, which increased the authorizations for this program by \$1 billion. We passed it in the House by a vote of 281 yeas to 32 nays.

The administration's budget has recommended an increase in appropriations for sewerage treatment plant construction from \$1 billion in fiscal year 1971 to \$2 billion in fiscal year 1972, but the same budget requests no funds for the water and sewer program. The water and sewer program authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local public bodies to finance public water and sewer facilities other than sewerage treatment works. We all recognize the absolute necessity for more sewer and water lines when the Federal Government is making money available for more sewerage treatment plants. The \$500 million in the Stephens-Widnall amendment will barely cover the backlog of applications that have been approved and are presently pending in the Washington office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are over \$1 billion in applications for this program pending in HUD offices. I have heard from numerous public officials in my district in Alabama complaining about the difficulty they are encountering in obtaining funds for necessary water and sewer lines. At the present time, there are some 22 applications pending at HUD totaling \$7,985,910.00 in grant funds.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Georgia, BOB STEPHENS, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, BILL WIDNALL, is a small price to pay for a suitable living environment.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS. In section 702 of the bill which we are talking about, it does

not have any limitation in it on cities of 10,000 like in the Farmers Home Administration. It applies to the big and the small cities, both. However, in the application of these funds it has been utilized more fully by the small cities, rather than the large ones of 10,000 population, the same as in section 702.

Mr. LANDRUM. My friend is correct. And, as always, accurate in his statement.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman will agree with me that in order to receive any of these funds, there must be comprehensive plans. There is a great deal of control by the Federal Government on the type of plans. If the Members will look at page 48 of the gentleman's report, they will see what it is necessary to have to receive these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. It seems to me that if we provide \$350 million, and they say there is sharing of 50 percent, that means there will be a total of \$700 million available in the next year for this sewer and water facility. That is considerably more than \$500 million that the gentleman from Georgia was discussing. It seems to me if we provide this \$350 million additional from the States and the various communities, we will have a total of \$700 million, and I say to my colleagues here today, if we look at this bill with these large sums, I wonder where the money will come from. We will just have to find some place for it to come from; \$700 million in the next year I am sure will do a great deal to solve the problems that some of these people are talking about. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, \$700 million is a very large sum for these programs particularly under the specifications that are set out on page 48 as a requirement for the distribution of the funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to keep in mind where the money is coming from and whether or not the \$700 million will do the job for the next year.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will just take a few minutes, but I want to say that I think we are doing a disservice to this House if we do not keep in mind the fact that we are talking about an existing situation here in which we have over \$2 billion worth of applications that are backlogged. Most of these applications have already been serviced with all of the requirements of the plan.

Mr. Chairman, a considerable amount of investment has been made at the local level to qualify for what they have been promised. I will tell you that the urging for the program came on strong and the performance came on very weak.

Mr. Chairman, there is a tremendous number of communities spread all over this land and \$350 million is not going very far in terms of servicing the needs of the great number of people that you and I in concert represent.

There is another suggestion that may be burdening on the minds of some Members of the House. It is true that this House has in the past appropriated

money for greatly needed services for our people but which the administration has not spent. There are great sums of money that are frozen. There are some who have the fear that these funds may have some political use and at the appropriate time some of this money will flow in the hope that it will bring an appropriate reaction in the election next year. I do not believe that is going to be the case. I do not believe the American people would react positively to that kind of approach. I do not think this President is the kind of man who will take the money which we have put into this type of program and make that kind of use of it. I think he will see it as we now see the need and apply it where we see it ought to be applied.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleagues Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. STEPHENS to provide \$500 million in new money for grants for basic water and sewer facilities authorized by section 702 of the Housing Act of 1965. The necessity for this increased authorization is so overwhelmingly clear that my remarks will be brief.

As you know, the President's original budget request called for an appropriation of \$2 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency's sewage treatment plant construction program, exactly double the fiscal year 1971 appropriation. While I commend this action by President Nixon, it is inconceivable to me that no funds were requested for the water and sewer line program. Obviously, new sewage treatment plants cannot solve the human waste pollution problem unless we also construct the necessary sewage lines.

The Committee on Appropriations recognized this inconsistency and reported out a bill containing an authorization of \$150 million for the 702 grants for basic water and sewer facilities. This is a step in the right direction, but \$150 million falls pitifully short of what is needed. The amendment before us will increase this amount by \$350 million, just enough to cover the backlog of applications that are approved and pending with HUD in Washington.

Localities in my own congressional district and across the country are in urgent need of substantial Federal assistance for water and sewer line construction. We must fully fund the 702 grant program until the job is done. Certainly \$500 million is the lowest acceptable appropriation when there are other programs in the Federal budget which deserve far less priority.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to honor our commitment to pollution abatement by supporting this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to bring to the attention of the Members something about which they may or may not be aware. That is the statement by George Romney of HUD made over national television last Monday, that either commu-

nities adopt procedures for installing in their communities low-income, taxpayer-subsidized housing, or these communities will not receive money for sewers and other vital community services. This is blackmail pure and simple. It is an attempt to impose on communities a social order which they may not want but HUD considers desirable.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared an amendment which I had hoped would be a limitation on spending which would have stated: "No part of the funds contained in this act shall be withheld from any political subdivision because of failure or refusal of that subdivision to accept or make provision for low-income Government-subsidized housing."

I am not going to offer that amendment because after talking with the chairman of the committee, he feels that this is not probably a limitation on spending and would be subject to a point of order.

However, I do want Secretary Romney to know that I, for one, feel that sewer money and other money which goes to the communities should be based on the merits of the individual case and that he should not set up as criteria the requirement of the communities to adopt certain social goals such as socialized low-income taxpayer-subsidized housing in order for these communities to be eligible to receive some of their own tax money back for much needed services such as sewers.

To force a community to accept something they do not want as a condition for approval of sewer grants is blackmail. It is blackmailing the people with their own money. It is a blackjack tactic. I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will let Secretary Romney know that we do not support and will not stand for such blackjack tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EMERGENCY CONSERVATION MEASURES

For emergency conservation measures, to be used for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as funds appropriated under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, to remain available until expended, \$12,000,000, with which shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for emergency conservation measures.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to discuss the legislative history and intent of the Water Bank Act.

The purpose of the Water Bank Act is to preserve and improve the habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources. The act also has as its purpose to reduce runoff, soil and wind erosion; to contribute to flood control and improved water quality and subsurface moisture; to reduce stream sedimentation; to promote comprehensive and total water management planning; and to reduce the number of acres of new land

coming into production and to retire certain lands now in agricultural production.

In achieving these purposes, the act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 10-year agreements with owners and operators of wetlands in the migratory waterfowl nesting and breeding areas of the United States, which occur principally in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

In general, the agreements would provide that the owners and operators could not drain, burn, fill or otherwise destroy the wetland character of the lands under contract and could not use such lands for agricultural purposes during the contract period. In return, the Secretary would be required to make annual payments to owners and operators agreeing to place such lands under a water bank program.

Although the waterbank program will not facilitate the acquisition of land for the waterfowl production area program, certain waterbank provisions have great potential for increasing the waterfowl production of both the wetlands protected by the Department of the Interior easements and additional wetlands which landowners place in the waterbank program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the program to be carried out under the Water Bank Act is to be carried out in harmony with the land and water conservation activities now carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture. The ends sought are similar, such as wildlife conservation, soil and water conservation, pollution abatement, and the encouragement of farmers to refrain from converting wetlands into croplands. However, in achieving these purposes, the act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with the Secretary of the Interior and take appropriate measures to insure that the waterbank program is carried out in harmony with the wetlands program administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's principal wildlife conservation officer is the Secretary of the Interior, and it is he who is charged with the primary responsibility of carrying out programs for migratory waterfowl. Consequently, if the waterbank program is to be successful, it is essential that the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior work closely in carrying out the program authorized by the act. Since this is the first year of the 10-year program, I would like to see this program get off to a good start. In this regard, I think the record should clearly show that the Congress expects the Secretary of Agriculture to closely coordinate this program with the Secretary of the Interior. It is only in this fashion that migratory waterfowl can receive the benefits to which they are entitled under this act.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 37, immediately after line 25, insert the following:

#### "Stream Channelization"

"No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for engineering or construction of any stream channelization measure under any program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless (1) such channelization is in a project a part of which was in the project construction stage before July 1, 1971; or (2) the Governor of the State in which the channelization is to be located certifies to the Secretary of Agriculture, after consideration of the environmental effects of such channelization, that such channelization is in the public interest."

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) makes a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in reading the language in the amendment it provides:

2. Unless (1) such channelization is in a project a part of which was in the project construction stage before July 1, 1971; or (2) the Governor of the State in which the channelization is to be located certifies to the Secretary of Agriculture, after consideration of the environmental effects of such channelization, that such channelization is in the public interest.

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this language is not a limitation on an appropriation bill, but carries with it the requirements of certain duties by the Governors of the States for certain actions and certain determinations as to whether or not they can be properly made, and therefore brings them within the point of order, which I insist upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REUSS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is clearly and squarely within the precedents. It constitutes an appropriation limitation on an appropriation. The statement of the Chair reported in volume 7 of Cannon's Precedents at page 704, is squarely in point.

In that matter on May 21, 1918, an amendment was offered to the agriculture appropriation bill saying:

No part of this appropriation shall be available for any purpose unless there shall have been previously issued the proclamation by the President.

It then refers to the kind of proclamation that the President may offer.

Mr. William H. Stafford, of Wisconsin, who, incidentally, was my predecessor in my congressional district, made the point of order that the amendment was legislation, and hence out of order on an appropriation bill.

The Chair held:

A different principle from that of germaneness is involved in the point of order to this amendment. If the Chair understands the amendment it is intended as a limitation on the payment of any money under this paragraph until the President has issued a certain indicated proclamation which in his discretion he may or may not issue. This amendment does not compel him to issue it, but so long as it is unissued the House does not propose, if the amendment is adopted, to allow the Agricultural Department to have the benefit of the appropriation in this paragraph.

This amendment does not compel the President to issue the proclamation referred to. He may issue it or refuse to issue it in his discretion. But the amendment in substance says to the Department of Agriculture: We propose to withhold from you the benefit of this appropriation during the full period of time during which this proclamation is unissued.

Mr. Chairman, this puts it on all fours with the amendment that I have offered, which leaves it to the Governor of the State to determine whether the channelization project proposed is in the public interest. It does not impose any duty on the Governor. If he acts under this, then the Secretary of Agriculture is governed by it, and there are no additional duties imposed upon the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, to the same effect there are numerous other precedents cited. February 24, 1916 there is reported at page 651 of 7 Cannon's Precedents a ruling in which the Chair ruled in an almost identical matter that a requirement of a certification by patrons of a rural mail route was not legislation on an appropriation bill, but a permissible limitation.

I would hope, therefore, that the Chair would overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has offered an amendment against which the gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, for that reason is in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The amendment provides that none of the funds appropriated in the act should be used for stream channelization by the Secretary of Agriculture unless the Governor of the State where the channel is to be located considers its environmental effect and certifies to the Secretary that such channelization is in the public interest.

The question involved is whether or not the amendment seeks to impose additional duties upon an executive or to require from that executive an additional certification not previously authorized in existing law; if it does so, it constitutes legislation under the precedents.

The Chair has examined the precedent cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin which arose on May 12, 1918. There is some similarity except that the amendment offered on that occasion by the gentleman from California (Mr. RANDALL) would have provided that no part of the appropriation shall be available until a previously issued proclamation had been made, and following the word "proclamation" in the amendment offered on that occasion appear these words: "authorized by Section 15 of the Act of August 10, 1917."

Therefore, it appears to the Chair that the precedent cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin is distinguishable from the present case in that the proclamation required in that amendment was one that was already authorized under existing law.

The Chair is not aware that the certification and finding required of a Gov-

error by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is required or authorized by existing law.

The Chair would refer the Committee to the decision by Chairman Jerry Cooper, of Tennessee, on March 30, 1949, which the Chair regards to be more in point with the present situation. On that occasion an amendment was offered to the Department of Interior appropriation bill providing that none of the funds might be used for the purchase of certain materials and the beginning of certain new construction unless approved by the Governor or by a board or by a commission of the respective State.

On that occasion, Chairman Cooper held that this was legislation on an appropriation bill in that it required a determination and imposed a burden upon the Governor which did not previously exist.

The Chair feels that that decision would be controlling in this instance and, since the present amendment would impose additional duties not existing in present law, in violation of clause 2, rule XXI sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an alternative amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 37, immediately after line 25, insert the following:

"Stream Channelization

"No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for engineering or construction of any stream channelization measure under any program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless such channelization is in a project a part of which was in the project construction stage before July 1, 1971."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to the practice of stream channelization. It is cosponsored by several of my colleagues, namely: BEN B. BLACKBURN, DANTE B. FASCELL, GILBERT GUDE, JOHN P. SAYLOR, CHARLES A. VANIK, GUY VANDER JAGT, BELLA S. ABZUG, JOHN E. MOSS, OGDEN R. REID, WILLIAM D. FORD, and PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

The practice of channelizing natural meandering streams has increased substantially in recent years. Channelization increases the width and depth of a natural stream and straightens out natural ox-bows. Thus, the physical shape of a stream is severely changed.

If this practice continues unabated, the ultimate result will be the destruction or serious degradation of valuable and irreplaceable natural resources.

The Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture is financing most of this channelization work today.

The SCS is one of my favorite agencies. I have long supported its practices to keep the rain drops where they fall through such agricultural devices as contour plowing, planting of hedgerows and trees, and upstream reservoirs.

But channelization works cause increased flooding downstream from the project area, add sedimentation and pol-

lutants to the waterways, lower groundwater tables, and are detrimental to fish and wildlife. The accelerated drainage of many thousands of acres of valuable timberlands, marshes, and other important wildlife habitat results from stream channelization.

The SCS has financed the destructive channelization of several thousands of natural streams. Many more thousands of miles are planned with little regard to the public's interest in the environmental effects.

The bulk of these channelization projects are financed by the SCS under its Public Law 566 small watershed program. All too often the local sponsoring organization and the SCS have selected channelization as the method of controlling floods and erosion, rather than building small dams and sediment reservoirs, because channelization may result in less initial expense. But the environmental costs that result are very great, even though not always readily measurable in dollars. Irreplaceable natural resources are being destroyed or severely damaged because alternatives to channelization have not been explored and utilized.

The SCS issued, on February 4, 1971, its Watersheds Memorandum 108. The memorandum provided guidelines for reviewing approved watershed work plans that include channelization not yet constructed, and for developing new plans. The initial review is being made by SCS's State conservationists. Under this memorandum, only those approved channelization projects where there is minor or no known adverse environmental effect can proceed to construction. As to all other projects, the SCS established a moratorium on construction. Unfortunately, this moratorium expires on June 30 of this year, before full review and studies are completed.

The memorandum also provides that a Watershed Environmental Quality Committee would be established to develop new policies and procedures for strengthening the environmental aspects of the watershed program. Unfortunately, these policies and procedures have not yet been developed. The committee itself has not even been established.

Earlier this year I urged that the House Committee on Appropriations not include funds in the bill—H.R. 9270—before us today until the Memorandum 108 review was completed and new policies and procedures adopted. The committee did not adopt the recommendation. H.R. 9270 includes funds for watershed projects, including channelization. It is estimated that about one-fourth, or \$45 million, is included for channelization.

The amendment continues the SCS moratorium as to any watershed project involving stream channelization measures or work, with one major exception.

Under the amendment, funds could not be used for the preconstruction engineering of approved projects not yet advanced to the construction stage, or for the construction of the channelization features of any project.

The amendment would except any project involving stream channelization

if any part of the project, whether it be the channelization or the reservoir or the flood retarding structure, or other land treatment measure, has moved into the project construction stage before July 1, 1971. According to the SCS, the "project construction stage begins with execution of the first project agreement or contract for construction of" the project.

The moratorium will give the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Water Resources Council, time to develop new policies to insure that future channelization work will not damage the environment.

The amendment is supported by numerous conservation, wildlife and industry groups, such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation, Izaak Walton League, National Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, American Forestry Association, Sierra Club, Wildlife Management Institute, Friends of the Earth, Wilderness Society, Wildlife Society, Sport Fishing Institute, Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Southern Resource Council—comprising the Forest Farmers Association, Southern Forest Products Association, and the American Plywood Association, and the Southern Forest Institute.

The International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners and dozens of State fish and game commissions and departments also endorse the moratorium.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Nathaniel P. Reed recently testified that stream channelization "is undoubtedly one of the more, if not the most, destructive water management practices," and urged a 1-year moratorium on such work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the Chair, in the other ruling, pointed up the section which was dropped. That being sufficient, I take it, the Chair did not feel any need to study the other parts. Since it was going out on one ground there was no need to study the others.

The part that is left says that "under any program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture."

The program, apparently, that this is directed to is the Soil Conservation projects. I would respectfully call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there are two things which must be done on these projects. The Department of Agriculture does not have any right of eminent domain in order to get ground on which to build these projects. Under the law there is required a local sponsor, who in most cases is a drainage or similar district, which in turn issues bonds or borrows money, with which they buy rights-of-way. Those rights-of-way having been bought, this comes under the administration of the Soil Conservation Service.

In this instance, with all these projects throughout the United States, in most cases they have to be approved by the local courts, which have to determine

whether all of the requirements of the law have been carried out.

This would be imposing upon the Secretary of Agriculture the duty to go into each of those instances and to see whether that project was, as we quote here, "A part of which was in project construction stage before July 1, 1971."

Those things do not come to the Secretary of Agriculture. They are handled, as I pointed out, in the initial stage at the local level with a local sponsorship and approved by local courts.

I say here this would be imposing additional duties on the Secretary of Agriculture not imposed on him by existing law. This again, although not pointed up by the Chair in the earlier ruling, would make it subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that goes to the appropriation item is one carried in Public Law 566. In that Public Law there are certain requirements which are made upon all of the political subdivisions which are participants under that existing law.

The Chair has just ruled that that requirement, the Cooper Decision, such as the Chair just ruled upon, would put an additional burden or an additional requirement on the administrative offices and would be an infringement upon the legislative function, which should not be carried in an appropriation act.

Here is the situation. The situation is such that this amendment goes into an infinite requirement.

Suppose the amendment had said, "The Soil Conservation Service should not use a soil depleting plant and it should require not fescue but say four-leaf clover." That would be just as sensible as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I do not know how the administrative officer assigned the duties under Public Law 566 is going to be responsible, when the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to tell him how to function, how much water to use, how much plant leaf, or how much for-estation, and all the varieties of programs that are employed in the total scheme and development of the overall program. It does not make sense to me that we are going to have amendments offered here that are going to tell administrative agencies how much they are going to employ in a certain area, for geographical distribution, and how they are going to develop a sound and sensible program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us aspire to develop all of the advantages of our resources. We are totally dedicated to the proposition. There is not a single one of us here who is not as anxious as he can be to accomplish this, or who wants to deplete, dissipate or misuse the water resources of our country. I think we are all in unity on that, but I would hate to see us come up here and fragment the total programs that have been

so far established by the various committees of the Congress and thereby lose our grip on the total water resources of this country. I cannot think of anything worse, or any situation that would create more disunity and create a greater loss of hope that we can work together in the development of these programs in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi to the amendment will be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I do desire to be heard, but very briefly, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is entirely germane. It is within all of the precedents as a limitation on an appropriation. It requires no duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture other than for him to show up at the office in the morning and find out what projects have been started. If they have been started, my amendment would not touch them. Accordingly I hope that the point of order will be ruled against.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels that the burden, if any, which is imposed on the Secretary of Agriculture or any administrator in the present amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is clearly different from that on the basis of which the Chair ruled that the amendment previously offered would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and would, therefore, be out of order. The Chair believes that this present amendment before the House follows the pattern of limitations on an appropriation bill, and that it does not constitute new legislation. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss).

Adoption of the amendment would ultimately destroy the small watershed program enacted in 1954. Public Law 566 has provided, small watershed projects which have long been recognized as one of the finest and most technically sound resource conservation programs in America.

Congress created the Soil Conservation Service in 1935 to give local people onsite technical assistance in protecting and improving their natural resources.

Down through the years Congress provided laws and appropriations to help our Soil Conservation Service equip itself to do a better job. Today in our service we have a staff of resource specialists recognized to be the best in this country. We have soil scientists, economists, agricultural engineers, irrigation engineers, hydraulic engineers, drainage engineers, sanitary engineers, specialists in agronomy, biology, recreation, forestry, plant materials, range management, geology, sedimentation and others.

With this staff of experts the Soil Conservation Service gives technical assist-

ance to individuals, groups, organizations, cities and towns and county and State governments in meeting a wide range of resource challenges.

Congress initiated the small watershed program in 1954 as a means of providing onsite technical assistance in watershed protection and flood prevention. It is a local effort with Federal assistance not a Federal program.

Our watershed program calls first for strong local initiative and responsibility. The application's originate with the local people.

This watershed program provides an excellent vehicle through which a community's water problems can be analyzed and rational decisions made for corrective action. It is technically and environmentally sound. It is one of our best investments. In order to feed and clothe our people we must protect our land. We only have so much good soil and we must protect it.

Adoption of this amendment would cause serious delays in projects in every State. It would kill the hopes for food protection in many communities where channel improvement is the only practicable means of providing that protection. It would increase costs of the projects. It would stop construction in watersheds where there never has been a single voice raised against the channel improvement practice.

Every Member of this body who has an interest in rural America, the small towns of America, the cities of America and the provision of an improved environment should vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request the Members of this House to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my good friend and colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for yielding. I want to state that I am 100 percent in accord with his viewpoint and with the permission of the Chair I want to insert in the RECORD a letter which according to my way of thinking states why this amendment should be defeated. The letter is from Berea College and is as follows:

Berea College,  
Berea, Ky., June 18, 1971.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,  
Seventh District,  
House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: For the past couple of years Berea College has been working in close association with the Red Lick Creek Watershed Conservancy District and other agencies in the development of a work plan for watershed protection, flood prevention and non-agricultural water management including plans for additional municipal water supply which should assure this community of an excellent source of water for the next 65 years. With our consulting water engineers having already advised us that we have passed the time when we could have run out of water in this town during a drought year we have felt that this project should receive the highest possible priority.

We are disturbed to hear that there is a growing movement on the part of some who are questioning the channelization of natural waterways to have a moratorium on vital projects like this and other similar projects. We are pleased to report that our work plan does not include any channels whatsoever. Therefore, in your judgment if a moratorium is proposed and you think it wise to have such a project held in abeyance we will be extremely grateful if you would make an effort to have projects like ours which do not involve any channelization excluded from such a moratorium.

Incidentally, our work plan was published in August 1970 and sent to the various Federal Agencies in Washington for review and approval. We understand that this project was held up in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for sometime but that about a month ago their questions were successfully answered. Any effort that your office could make to expedite the review and approval of the work plan will be greatly appreciated.

We continue to be thankful for the excellent way in which you are representing the best interests of your people here in Kentucky and our efforts to promote worthwhile projects like this one. Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

KARL E. WARMING,  
Business Vice President.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my friend and colleague from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and in support of the views of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, recently nothing has disturbed me more than the narrow viewpoint taken by a number of environmentalists.

We are all resource users. We need food, fiber, water, and land to live on. In addition, we want roads and superhighways, airports and shopping centers, factories and new housing developments.

We want places to hunt and camp. We want to go swimming, fishing, boating, and picnicking. We want scenic vistas to drive through.

The basic requirement for all of this is land and water. And we don't have an inexhaustible supply of either.

No one resource can serve all the needs of all interests. In small watershed project, it is the local people who set the priorities and make the decisions for the benefit of the entire watershed.

Where channel improvement is necessary, it is incorporated in the watershed work plan or positive reasons—to restore capacity of streams that have been silted in, to restore the effectiveness of natural and manmade channels in removing excess surface and subsurface water, and to reduce flood damage on both urban and rural land.

No one undertakes channel improvement to destroy wildlife habitat. This is utter nonsense. Over the long haul, the small watershed program has made a marked improvement in fish and wildlife resources throughout the Nation.

I am opposed to the proposal to declare a moratorium on all channel work. Such unrealistic action would delay erosion control, sediment reduction, flood pre-

vention, and needed community water supplies in all too many areas. It would add unnecessary hardships to local sponsors who have worked hard to get their projects ready for construction.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for the statement he has just made. I wish to associate myself with his remarks and join him in urging every member of this Committee to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I support the position of those who are in opposition to the amendment. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed by the Congress in 1954 and the small watershed program initiated to meet a need to preserve, protect, and enhance the environment. I consider this one of our most important and meritorious environmental programs for the conservation and use of our natural resources. It was approved after careful research and study and has become one of our proven programs bringing substantial benefits to the Nation and particularly to American agriculture. The program has been used throughout the Nation to halt soil erosion and excessive water runoff, protect against destructive floods, provide for more efficient water management, develop water for growing irrigation and municipal needs, preserve and enhance fish and wildlife resources, and provide new recreation opportunities. In my opinion, this move to place a moratorium immediately on construction of channels and other drainage measures in watershed projects would upset the entire program and would adversely affect the local economics in many areas.

No one will purposely set out to harm the environment or upset the ecology, but we are reminded every day that the pursuit of almost any good can have questionable side effects. Our task is to weigh the merits and, if necessary, decide in favor of one goal or another. Permit me to quote from a recent letter from one of my constituents:

I do wish that the Congressman who proposed to stop watershed construction due to his concern for fish and wildlife could see the problem through the eyes of the man whose wife and three children drowned in the Boxelder (Creek in Larimer County) during the flood of 1967.

Perhaps more consideration needs to be given to the channelization and drainage phases of this program and I would be in favor of this if it is accomplished in the proper way, but I am opposed to the "burning down the barn" approach that is advocated by this amendment. If a reevaluation is in order, then it should be accomplished through a new look at

the authorizing legislation and not by an amendment to an appropriation bill. All of us know that environmental effects are being given more attention in connection with the review of ongoing programs as well as in the planning of additional water resources projects. I understand that the watershed program is presently undergoing such review, and new development will reflect any adverse effects from channelization and drainage. I am sure that there will be changes in the watershed program as in other programs but such changes should come about through the authorizing processes and authorizing legislation. It is completely inappropriate to try to handle a matter such as this in an appropriation act.

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

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in opposition to Congressman Reuss' proposed amendment. It is not in the interest of the citizens which we, the Congress of the United States, have pledged our help in solving water resource problems by approving plans which they, the grassroots of our country, have worked so diligently in preparing. Nor do I believe this proposed moratorium is in the national interest of long range planning.

Watershed projects are initiated by local people, planned by the local people, and built by the local people with the help of Federal funds, which this amendment would deny. Not all construction cost comes from Federal funds. Local funds are used for land rights and cost-sharing of structures which will serve purposes other than flood prevention. Many of the local organizations have already raised their share of the construction cost. In all watershed projects, channels are not considered unless dams cannot be built or cannot, by themselves, give the protection the local people want. These projects are on small drainage areas less than 250,000 acres, and some of the planned channel work is on dry streams which flow only after a heavy rainstorm.

During project development, local sponsors have sought technical help from many sources to develop a plan which will fit their needs. These projects include purposes of watershed protection, flood prevention, irrigation, drainage, recreation, fish and wildlife development, industrial and municipal water supply, and others. In many of these projects, sponsors have solved other local problems before they could complete the development of their plan. In many watersheds, the overall justification is dependent on the channel improvement; therefore, if the channel is not built, other structural measures may not be built and entire multipurpose projects will not be developed. I believe we can say that these plans are plans of the people, by the people, and for the people. They were initiated by interested groups of local people, the decisionmaking during the plan development is by the local people, and benefits from the project are mainly for the people in the project area.

The review procedures for these watersheds included public meetings in which all interested people or groups could express their views to the local sponsors. All interested State agencies had an opportunity to review and comment on the plan before the Governor gave his approval. All interested Federal agencies had a chance to review and comment before the executive branch sent these plans and comments to the House Agriculture or Public Works Committees and the Senate Agriculture or Public Works Committees for approval. Hearings have been held on each individual plan, and we have approved these plans as being in the public's interest.

I hold the Soil Conservation Service in high esteem for its success in slowing down and in some cases halting soil erosion, and for doing it in such a manner that it has not slowed the economic development of our rural and agricultural areas; but instead, it has stimulated their development. I know of no other agency which has done as much to conserve a resource, and yet provide a stimulus for economic development. People on the Soil Conservation Service staff are highly trained to help meet the needs of the citizens of our country. They have soil scientists who give recommendations for our soils use in agriculture, and also for housing developments. They employ biologists to study fish and wildlife and to recommend mitigation measures where needed when a project unavoidably spoils natural habitat. They employ experts in the fields of sanitary engineering, hydrology, geology, civil engineers, hydraulic engineers, irrigation engineers, drainage engineers, agronomists, recreation specialists, plan material specialists, and the highly trained soil conservationist.

The small watershed program, which is administered by the Soil Conservation Service, and its review procedures, provide for an excellent balance of economic development and protection of the environment. The proposed amendment is an insult to the Soil Conservation Service, the citizens who planned projects with channel improvement, State and Federal review agencies, and the Congressmen and Senators who approved these projects. I therefore say "no" to this proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for his articulate and persuasive statement in opposition to the proposed amendment. I want to associate myself with him in all that he has so ably said here today. The Soil Conservation Service—SCS—has an excellent record of service in the public interest. The SCS has an excellent record of cooperation with coordinated efforts of private and public projects. The performance of the

Soil Conservation Service personnel has been superior in essential expertise of conservation practices.

Recently many, many domestic programs have been delayed and stopped by so-called budgetary reserve policies beyond the control and counsel of this assembly. We do not need a moratorium for any duration on essential policies and programs of land and water conservation practices. The amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin must be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request unanimous consent to subsequently extend and revise my remarks including extraneous matter in the RECORD in opposition to the proposed amendment accordingly.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment which, of course, would destroy a large part of the soil conservation program. It would lead to further delay in protecting people from the suffering caused by floods. I urge a vote against the amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

I believe that this program has done more than anything else in the field of environmental controls. In my opinion the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) would ruin the program.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL).

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised by the implication in this proposed amendment that the Soil Conservation Service ignores fish and wildlife resources in its conservation activities. Nothing could be farther from the truth. For the truth of the matter is that ever since its formation in 1935 the Soil Conservation Service has been assisting farmers and ranchers plan and apply conservation practices that improved and developed habitat for fish and wildlife.

The effect of soil and water conservation upon fish and wildlife is appreciated only if the role of agriculture in wildlife production is understood. About 76 percent of the U.S. mainland is in farms and ranches. These are the acres that produce the wildlife crop commonly referred to as "farm game": The squirrels, rabbits, quail, pheasants, doves, ducks, and other species commonly hunted on farms

and ranches. More than 75 percent of our game and wild fur is produced and harvested on agricultural lands. It is obvious that the welfare of this agricultural wildlife is determined by the way that the land operator uses and treats his land.

Wildlife is generally favored by soil and water conservation practices. Strip-cropping, stubble mulching, field borders, windbreaks, and hedges are a few of the conservation practices that have resulted in more wildlife. And such practices have been applied by the millions of acres. Farm and ranch ponds are among the most spectacular of these.

With the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, farmers and ranchers are building ponds at the rate of almost 50,000 a year. There are now 2 million such waters in the United States and they are recognized as an extremely important element in wildlife habitat. Farm and ranch ponds have brought permanent waters to places where such water did not exist or was available in only small quantities. Many kinds of wildlife have benefited from these ponds and they have been directly responsible for increased production of migratory waterfowl.

As part of its coordinated program of soil and water conservation, the Soil Conservation Service has always recognized an opportunity and responsibility for wildlife habitat improvement. Many of the practices that the SCS assists land operators to plan and apply are specifically designed to benefit wildlife. In the 35 years of its existence, it has helped farmers and ranchers to improve wildlife habitat on millions of acres.

The Soil Conservation Service is the principal Federal agency dealing with wildlife conservation on private land. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of its contributions to welfare of wildlife in the United States.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. NATCHER), for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement in opposition to the amendment that invokes a moratorium on stream channel improvement. There seems to have developed the mistaken notion that every time standing water is removed from the land, any land, a great wildlife resource is destroyed. I wish to present some examples of where our society cannot tolerate flooding and where we must take every practical means to prevent flooding or remove the floodwaters in the shortest practical time. The damage, the anxiety, and the dissatisfaction associated with flooded homes, businesses, and streets and roads is so spectacular that I need not go into that. Very few crops can be grown on water logged land—this is another important reason for water removal from the land. There are other less understood reasons. When areas that dispose of sewage with septic tanks are inundated with water, contamination is picked up and moved through the stream system. Surface litter such as

garbage and refuse, animal wastes and even dead animals floats off, contaminates the water, and is deposited in some most undesirable places.

Nature has endowed flowing water with a wondrous ability to purify itself. Flowing water entrains oxygen which supports biochemical processes of water purification. When water is allowed to stagnate on the land in shallow pools, it loses its dissolved oxygen and it can become putrid. Water needs to keep moving and be aerated to be clean.

When water is allowed to stand on the land and is only removed by evaporation, salts accumulate in the soils. Entire civilizations depending on irrigated agriculture have declined because their soils became salted. In the irrigated valleys of our Southwest, salt balance is extremely important and can only be handled through stream management.

Waterlogged land is notoriously a breeding area for mosquitoes. The control of mosquitoes is important to good public health and particularly to the control of malaria and encephalitis. The recent restrictions on insecticides makes the control of mosquito breeding areas a necessity.

I have outlined the problems that stem from poor water control. Good channels are a part of good water management. When channels are not good enough, we must make them better. I have served on the Public Works Committee for nine terms and I can assure everyone that Public Law 566 has been a good program and should be accelerated not stopped. What we do not need in this program is more redtape. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) and in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

This amendment would do great disservice to the watershed development program of the Soil Conservation Service. It should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS). While I agree with the gentleman that we should preserve the environment for future generations, I would also assert that we must not lose sight of what the environment does to our present generation.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that under the five-point criteria set forth in the Environmental Protection Act that the public interest is in fact protected, and that through compliance with that act the interest of the future generations will be served.

Again I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) for yielding.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield

to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLOWERS).

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement in opposition to the proposed amendment.

The Soil Conservation Service through the Department of Agriculture has been involved in the protection and improvement of our environment for over 36 years. Their contribution and achievements in this field are outstanding. They have developed a highly trained staff of professional conservationists who have a broad understanding of the interrelationships of people, plants, soil, water, animals, et cetera. Their engineers are not only engineers, but are trained professional conservationists; likewise for their other specialists. This is a unique organization in our Federal Government.

To place a constraint on the funds appropriated to this agency which would stop all engineering studies or construction on projects involving stream channelization which were not under construction prior to July 1, 1971, would be a serious mistake in my judgment. It would be an insult to local people who desperately need flood protection, have participated in the planning of these projects, made financial and legal commitments, and who are most concerned about the quality of the environment in which they live.

The watershed program is a unique program. These are not Federal projects. They are local projects with Federal assistance, locally initiated, require local financing and responsibilities, and are designed to meet local objectives and needs. There have been over 2,900 applications for assistance in the watershed program. Over 1,600 of these have progressed to the planning stage, and 1,033 have been approved for operations—installation—as of June 1, 1971. Construction has been started or is complete on over 700 of these projects. The value of this program has most recently been recognized by the President who has recommended an increase in the appropriation for installation of watershed projects. It must be remembered that stream channelization is only a minor part of many of these projects. Plans will include such other practices as water-impounding reservoirs, stream-bank protection, grade-stabilization structures, debris basins, recreation and fish and wildlife developments, irrigation facilities, and a variety of land treatment practices for watershed protection. The procedures for development and processing of a plan for installation requires input from many sources and review and comment from a variety of agencies representing a broad spectrum of the Nation's natural resource interests. The program has built-in safeguards such that specific constraints as the proposed amendment are not necessary or even wise.

Channel improvement, which may include stream channelization, is only one tool in watershed planning. We must

leave the decisions as to whether this is a necessary and desirable measure in a particular project up to the professional planners and local people who are intimately acquainted and knowledgeable of the needs and objectives in the entire watershed. They do not represent special interests but have as their goal, a net improvement of the total environment of the watershed, realizing that some compromises and trade-offs may be necessary. Constructive assistance in this planning process from special interest groups is welcomed.

Congress as a body, through amendments to Public Law 83-566, has broadened the watershed program to more nearly meet total needs for a water and land resource plan in a watershed. Congressional committees in their review of specific projects have provided additional guidance. It has been the intent of Congress that stream channelization be utilized in watershed projects as one of the means of providing flood protection, removing excess water from and providing irrigation water to existing cropland, and for control of erosion and sedimentation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the proposed amendment on the grounds that it is unnecessary. This amendment can only add further delays to a vital program in protecting, improving, and developing a Nation's water, land, and related resources. It will damage local peoples' confidence in the judgment of Congress regarding their land and water problems.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, nature is a wonderful thing, and so is the human body. Both were designed by an infinite intelligence to perform their functions efficiently and effectively. But just as the human body can get out of balance and require corrective surgery to perform its functions properly, so nature itself also can get out of balance and require the surgical help of man to perform its intended functions efficiently, effectively, and most beneficially in the interest of both nature and man.

This amendment would halt all work on needed channel improvements. Its ostensible aim is to aid the environment. But this would be as ironic as halting the manufacturing and distribution of penicillin under the guise that doing so would help to control infection in the human body.

The Soil Conservation Service was waging an uphill and often thankless fight for conservation and environmental improvement a full generation before the latter-day dilettantes and self-proclaimed authorities discovered that conservation had become a popular issue.

The professional channel improvement work of the Soil Conservation Service, along with concomitant land treatment measures, have reclaimed literally millions of acres for productive cropland

and saved hundreds of thousands of farms and homes from the destructive ravages of periodic flooding.

Surely these are positive environmental effects.

The upstream watershed program has stopped the runoff of silt, by volume the greatest pollutant of our streams, and preserved existing reservoir space for many billions of gallons of pure water by preventing our larger downstream reservoirs from filling up with silt.

Surely this is a positive environmental effect.

Each year the Nation spends \$125 million to dredge silt from our waterways. And each year we lose approximately \$100 million of irreplaceable reservoir space to siltation.

Surely it is an act of conservation and sound economics to spend a portion of this amount to hold the land in place, where it is a boon, and not a curse, to mankind.

Channel improvements have augmented low flows downstream and thus improved the quality and purity of the water. They have prevented the collection of stagnant pools which heretofore served only as malodorous breeding grounds for disease-laden flies and mosquitoes.

Unless we are to weep tears over the mosquito as an endangered species and elevate his survival above that of man, we surely must chalk this up as a positive environmental improvement.

For those who are concerned about the runoff into our streams of chemical pesticides and fertilizers, I ask you to bear in mind that it is only the beneficial work of the Soil Conservation Service—terracing and cover-cropping, carried out as an integral part of the upstream dam and channel improvement program—which can retard and prevent that runoff.

Certainly, this is a positive environmental effect.

While we welcome the enthusiasm of the new conservation converts who have so recently discovered the ancient Greek word, "ecology," we do think they could make a more constructive contribution if they will abandon the scapegoat syndrome and try to understand the interrelations of man and nature in a bit broader perspective.

A sound ecology and a sound economy are not mutually exclusive. To find the proper balance between conservation and commerce has been the goal of man since the Creator commanded us to subdue the earth and husband it in wise stewardship.

Faithful to that mandate, we certainly should not make scapegoats of those very programs and agencies by which enlightened society has at long last begun to fulfill this mission.

The work of the Soil Conservation Service including its channel alignment program is clearly a help and not a hindrance to the environment. If our interest is in helping the environment, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the amendment proposed by our colleague, Mr. REUSS. I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not speak out in opposition to it.

First, I believe that it is obvious that this proposal to provide moratorium on stream channelization by the Department of Agriculture is aimed at curtailing the activities of the Soil Conservation Service and the watershed program administered by it. Before we condemn the work of the foremost environmental organization in this or any country, we should consider the record.

In May of 1934, the worst dust storm in the Nation's history swept eastward from the Great Plains to the Atlantic Ocean. This catastrophe aroused the public and Congress to the urgent need for soil and water conservation work. As a result, Congress adopted and the President signed, the Soil Conservation Act of 1935—Public Law 46—as a law of the Nation. The act set up the Soil Conservation Service as a permanent agency of the Department of Agriculture and charged it with establishing and applying an action program of soil and water conservation measures including better land use. Since that time, we have called on the expertise of this organization for other activities. In 1954, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566—was enacted. Under its provisions, the Department of Agriculture provides technical and financial assistance to local people living in small watershed areas by helping them plan and carry out a program to protect, improve, and develop water and related land resources and enhance man's environment in rural America.

The Soil Conservation Service has assembled an organization with technical skills in all facets of resource planning including the fields of agronomy, biology, agricultural engineering, civil engineering, economics, soil science, forestry, and geology. During the development of a watershed project all of these technical disciplines are integrated to help the sponsoring organization develop a project that will best meet its objectives and the resource needs of the area. The practice of channelization is used as a last alternate to control flooding. In most cases, it is used in conjunction with floodwater retarding structures to provide the level of flood protection desired.

A moratorium on channelization would prohibit the residents of projects already approved by the Congress from obtaining the benefits they are entitled to under the law. Many of the local organizations have borrowed funds to purchase the land rights on which to construct these improvements. All of these projects were previously reviewed and approved by State agencies, the State Governor, and other concerned Federal agencies. To delay or cancel these projects would constitute a breach of faith of the Congress with the people living in rural America, the State governments, Federal agencies,

and the Department of Agriculture. Gentlemen, we cannot permit this to happen.

The proposed moratorium would halt construction of irrigation canals included in watershed projects. It would deny flood protection to rural communities in flat areas where enlarged channels are the only methods of providing protection. It would prohibit the construction of new channels in areas where they are desperately needed.

Approval of the moratorium would seriously jeopardize the watershed program and the work of an organization which is a leader in the field of land and water resource development. No project seems to be the only alternative to channelization in many cases. This is no solution in areas where flood protection is desperately needed. We should strive to develop projects for the overall improvement of man's environment in rural areas.

For the reasons I have given, the amendment should not be permitted.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE).

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically oppose the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I think that every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the full committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and all of the majority and minority members.

In my capacity as chairman, Subcommittee on Watershed Development, Public Works Committee, I have an opportunity to become familiar with many of these projects. My subcommittee holds hearings on each proposed project which includes a reservoir that has a storage capacity of 4,000 acre-feet or more.

I have noted that, even though a high percentage of the watershed area in many projects is controlled by detention structures, channel improvements are still necessary to safely conduct the floodwater release from these reservoirs through the flood plain areas, without causing prolonged flooding of low-lying areas. Often the detention reservoirs and the channels are so closely interrelated that one cannot be built without the other.

A moratorium on all stream channel work would not only halt channel construction but would also stop and definitely delay or destroy the construction of many reservoirs. Some of these reservoirs will provide needed water for towns, such as Princeton in my home county. Some will protect urban and rural residential areas from floods which could cause loss of life. Most of them will protect agricultural land from frequent damaging floods. In many areas good land suitable for farming is limited to the flood plains. This restriction would deny

farmers a means of improving their economic conditions. In many areas, such as Appalachia, this improvement is long overdue.

Watershed projects stimulate economic activity. They provide jobs. They improve the environment in which people live. They protect towns from flooding. They help farmers use their lands and equipment more efficiently. They increase the total fish and wildlife potential of an area. They provide recreational opportunities to local people. They benefit town and farm people alike. They make communities a better place in which to live.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal to amend the agricultural appropriation bill is absurd. We cannot countenance such an action. It would be a slap in the face to local people who have worked long and hard to get their watershed projects installed. Just 2 weeks ago at the National Watershed Congress in Tampa, Fla., I stated very strongly my opposition to any moratorium on Public Law 566 work. I am just as strong in my conviction today that this proposal is unwise, unjust, and unwarranted. I ask all my colleagues to join me in opposing this action.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that many things have to be done to enhance our environment and provide flood control in this Nation of ours. They involve a number of different techniques that can be put together only as the need of that particular specific area would call for.

If by this harsh amendment, totally eliminate the possibility of using channelization where, as and when it is needed in conjunction with dams or retention structures or bank stabilization siltation control or reservoir construction or grassland management, or reforestation or any other SCS practices or conservation of them, we actually would hold back the enhancement of our environment that we need so much in our Nation.

I think our subcommittee wisely put into the report a sensible explanation of the need for proper channelization when needed and I would hope that this House turns down the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), which would impose a 1 year funding moratorium on the Department of Agriculture's small watershed program.

At the outset, though, let me commend the gentleman and his supporters for their interest in promoting sound ecological practices. I share these interests fully. This notwithstanding, I would suggest to my colleagues that imposing a 1-year funding moratorium on the small watershed program would be using a meat axe rather than a scalpel to approach the ecological problems of channelization.

The proponents of the amendment con-

tend that, and I quote the words of its chief sponsor:

Channelization is destroying America's streams and wetlands and seriously polluting the Nation's waterways.

This contention is supported by statements issued by several State agencies and other public interest groups. The underlying theme of these statements is that dredging, modifying, and channeling of rivers and streams conducted by Federal agencies has destructive effects on game, wildlife, woodlands, and downstream flows.

Mr. Chairman, I do not contend that these assertions are groundless. What I do contend is that this particular amendment is a very inappropriate and extremely harmful way to get at the heart of the ecological problems of channelization.

In many areas of the country like Texas, the vast majority of watershed projects do not involve dredging, modifying, or channelizing rivers or streams in the sense the proponents of the amendment are concerned with.

In Texas, most of the projects which fall under the auspices of the Soil Conservation Service involve such things as preventing soil and water erosion. In many areas, especially in major portions of west and north central Texas which are flat and have little natural cover, building water retention dams and terracing creates additional water reservoirs and promotes natural forage growth. These projects, if anything, benefit wildlife. But when saying this I must point out that our area of the country, unlike certain others, does not have much in the way of natural wildlife habitats. It is too flat. It is too barren. It is too dry.

As you are all aware, my area of Texas has been experiencing a severe drought. The effects of this condition are very destructive both economically and ecologically. Many farmers and ranchers are facing bankruptcy. For the most part, wildlife in the area has either died or migrated elsewhere in a frantic search for water. Both these problem areas could have benefited and benefited handsomely if a sound watershed program were in operation.

To give my colleagues a more vivid idea of the magnitude of the drought effects, I call attention to the USDA report issued just minutes ago to the effect that the Great Plains region of the United States has suffered its greatest amount of wind damage since 1956-57, 14 years ago. Nearly 5 million acres of plains land, mostly in the Southwest, have been heavily damaged by wind erosion. This damage could have been reduced through effective watershed systems.

The possibilities of future wind erosion damage will continue unabated unless Congress addresses this problem directly and stops talking about stopping watershed development in critical areas such as the Great Plains States and speeds up the watershed implementation program.

Texas is not always dry, though, when the rains come, they bring with it erosion with all its problems and flooding. The erosion is caused by land cultiva-

tion practices; plus, range land is devoid of natural growth. Floods, in turn, are the result of insufficient water retarding structures. The only thing that has kept erosion and flooding from causing even more damage are area small watershed programs.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be of some benefit for those of my colleagues who are not fully acquainted with the watershed program to acquaint themselves with its operation in a particular area. As I am obviously most familiar with the region I represent, I will confine my remarks to conditions pertaining there.

Five watershed work plans have been developed and approved for operation in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Two others have been planned and are awaiting approval. A total of 110 flood water retarding structures have been planned in these projects; 44 have been constructed. Channel improvements amounting to 24.6 miles have been planned and 7.5 miles have been constructed. In this regard I would point out that land treatment measures for each specific watershed area, including erosion control from both water and wind and for improvement of soil conditions, is an integral part of a watershed program.

As for channel improvement, specifically it is planned only when needed and as an addition to other structural measures in the project. For example, the Lakeview watershed project consists of 25 flood water retarding structures and 17.1 miles of channel improvement. In view of the amendment before this body, I emphasize the fact that the channel improvement is located in areas where no natural channel exists and in most cases where the water flow from heavy rainfall goes in many directions across valuable agricultural land, rural communities, and ultimately to the Salt Fork of the Red River. There exists no natural flows in any area where channel is now planned. There are no valuable environmental features and no valuable wildlife habitats.

I would also emphasize that our area watershed program provides storage waters that can be used for many purposes in addition to its value for enhancing fish and wildlife. These uses provide a major improvement to the environment in addition to the esthetic value of impounded water in an area that is considered to be drought stricken during periods of each year.

As I stated earlier, a drought in an area of these watersheds prevents crop production and in the case of periods of high winds loss of valuable topsoil. Periods of intensive and excessive rainfall also bring about substantial loss of valuable topsoil. Thus, without the watershed projects, our area may suffer a total loss of crops. But with the project installed, including proper land use, land treatment, storage of water in the reservoirs, and the proper removal of excess water flows, the conditions would be such to more adequately relieve water needs in drought stricken conditions.

The SCS works through conservation districts and with the local interests who

are sponsors of all watershed projects. The SCS also relies on the assistance of many local and State agencies and as a matter of course considers the total environment fish and wildlife aspects and effects upon all improvements and projects prior to scheduling for the construction of any part of measures included in the work plan.

What this means is that this amendment which would impose a moratorium on all projects in which channel improvement is planned prevails, it would take the watershed activities out of the hands of local interests who assist in making the decisions and place the whole watershed program at the mercy of parties other than those who live and enjoy the environment in the watersheds.

A moratorium would also cripple the total conservation program in Texas, since the watershed program is an integral part of the total program operation. Construction on 35 to 40 of the 69 approved projects in the State would be stopped. In addition to severely crippling the conservation program it would create severe discouragement among local sponsors and supporters of conservation work. In addition to the structural slowdown, the application of land treatment measures would be adversely affected since they are important parts to the watershed program.

As can be seen from this brief overview, a 1-year moratorium would have devastating effects for the economic and ecological development of the 18th Congressional District. My district is not unique in this respect, I have been contacted by officials from soil and water conservation districts throughout the State and have been assured that any moratorium would have equally adverse effects in their areas as well. Moreover, I know the situation Texas finds itself in on the basis of this amendment is shared by many of her sister States.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would emphasize that ecological conditions vary greatly throughout the country. Thus while imposing a generalized moratorium on small watershed programs would perhaps fulfill the objectives of the amendments supporters, it would actually create new ecological problems for thousands of communities and millions of Americans.

The ends to which this amendment is directed are simply not justified by the means it uses. I urge my colleagues to reject the proposal.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN).

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to report some very serious and knowledgeable opposition to this amendment to require a 1-year moratorium on the use of Federal funds for new stream channelization.

During the past week, I have received numerous letters from persons whose interest in protecting the environment is unquestioned and whose position I respect.

Each of these men writes with detailed knowledge of this subject and I, therefore, insert four letters at this point in the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Trenton, N.J., June 17, 1971.

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: The State Soil Conservation Committee has observed with amazement the unfavorable publicity directed to the so-called channelization provisions of the PL 566 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention program. Since the passage of this Act in 1954, the Committee has actively supported watershed improvements which would have been otherwise impossible without Federal assistance through this Soil Conservation service program.

The Committee, for which I serve as chairman, has observed no detrimental environmental effects from the 12 projects in this State which are completed or in operations. Furthermore, complete coordination between all environmental interests has been maintained and the State Fish, Game and Shell Fisheries Division of the State Department of Environmental Protection has sponsored over half of the projects. Fish and wildlife enhancement has been an integral part of projects wherever feasible.

A nationwide moratorium is now threatened which will curtail this much needed environmental program. Such action is without justification, particularly in New Jersey, because painstaking evaluation of environmental impact is already taking place. All project sponsors, the Soil Conservation Service and State Soil Conservation Committee staff are involved and no projects are pursued without full accord by all environmental interests.

By unanimous vote, the State Soil Conservation Committee urges your support for the continuation of the PL 566 program with environmental determinations being made at the local level. In the pursuit of its assigned natural resource conservation responsibilities, the Committee urges that no moratorium be imposed.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP ALAMPI.

SALEM SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,  
Woodstown, N.J., June 16, 1971.

Congressman CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANDMAN, JR.: Recent hearings on stream channelization before the Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources House Committee on Governmental Operations, appear to have shown only one side of the problem. The improvement of small stream channels is sometimes necessary in small watershed projects.

Channelization is not always necessary in small watershed projects. Conservation practices installed on the land, above the flood damaged areas, and flood-water-retarding dams may provide the needed level of protection. The flood water-retarding dams are usually designed for multipurpose use including wildlife, recreation, and water supply. However, many times these practices are not enough to do the entire job and the improvement of the stream channels is necessary to obtain the needed protection.

The work done under the Small Watershed Projects results from requests by the local people to the Soil Conservation Districts. After reviewing the problems and the resources involved, proposals are submitted to the local people for approval. Following approval by the local people, the work plan is submitted to various State and Federal agencies for their approval. The agencies represent fish and wildlife, planning, and engineering interests. If objections are raised, the proposals are reevaluated and modified in order to satisfy the needs of the various interests.

As Supervisors of the Salem Soil Conservation District, we feel that a one-year moratorium on channel work in watershed projects would not be wise. If channelization is completely taken out, many areas will be damaged, deaths, and personal injuries could result by not controlling flooding.

Yours truly,

NEWTON S. LAYTON,  
Chairman.

CUMBERLAND SOIL  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,  
Bridgeton, N.J., June 18, 1971.

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANDMAN: It has come to my attention that the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, House Committee on Government Operations, has proposed that channel work in watershed projects be halted temporarily pending a complete review of the watershed program (Public Law 566). Hearings concerning this were scheduled for June 3, 4, 9, 10, and 14.

As you know, watershed projects are initiated by local people in response to a flood control or water management problem. Approval to spend federal funds on these projects is granted only after review and agreement by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Corps of U.S. Army Engineers and state agencies as well as (in our case) the Delaware River Basin Commission. Recently a wider review has been provided according to Budget Bureau Circular A-95. Consultations are currently being held between Soil Conservation Service and state and federal fish and game representatives to assure compliance of all projects with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Many watershed projects are cost-shared by local sponsors. The effect of a complete shutdown of watershed operations would place an additional and unreasonable expense on these people. Watershed projects must be justified economically, not by bringing additional land into cultivation, but by making for greater economy and efficiency. A shutdown would eliminate or delay any such economic stimulus.

We are not opposed to any amount of review or study of watershed projects, for this would serve to remove any doubts concerning them. However, we are opposed to a moratorium on watershed work and we cannot view this other than as an undisguised attempt to emasculate the PL 566 program for flood prevention, water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement and economic development. We hope you will take whatever action you feel is appropriate to correct the misunderstandings that have arisen concerning the flood prevention program.

Very truly yours,

DAVID GERL,  
Chairman.

THE NEW JERSEY STATE ASSOCIATION  
OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,

June 16, 1971.

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SANDMAN: As president of the New Jersey Association of Soil Conservation Districts, I wish to express extreme concern over the threat of a restrictive moratorium on PL 566 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention programs throughout the nation. On behalf of my 73 fellow supervisors who conduct natural resource conservation programs in New Jersey through our fifteen soil conservation districts, I urge your vigorous support for continuation of this essential program administered by the United States Soil Conservation Service.

In view of recent criticism of the PL 566 program, I should like to emphasize that all watershed projects under this program are requested and sponsored by local agencies with our local conservation districts acting as primary sponsor in all cases.

In this State, all such projects are closely coordinated with all governmental agencies having any interest in existing or resulting environmental conditions. In fact, over half of the projects now in operation are co-sponsored by the State Fish and Game Division of the Department of Environmental Protection. In no cases have channel modification measures been advocated or embarked upon except as a final alternative to extreme water management problems.

Furthermore, with eleven projects currently in the planning stage, a critical reevaluation is being conducted by the local sponsors and the United States Soil Conservation Service. All impacts upon the environment are evaluated and, as with past projects, only those projects with positive benefits will be pursued.

I wish to further emphasize that in this rapidly urbanizing State, the proper development of our watersheds under this program will serve in many cases to retain agriculture for a longer duration, thereby preserving much needed tax paying open space. A probable and much less desirable alternative is the drainage and commercial development of flood plain areas with little regard for other than economic advantage. In addition, all PL 566 watershed projects completed or under construction as of June 30, 1970, are providing average annual benefits of over \$1,182,000 and have returned nearly 9.5 million dollars of federal construction and development funds to this State.

In conclusion, it is the position of the New Jersey Association of Soil Conservation Districts that the only solution to conflicts over channelization is for all concerned agencies and people to work together in a cooperative spirit to resolve differences. In our desire to achieve the best possible resource use, we are counting on your help to defeat any proposal for a nationwide moratorium.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH ROEHRICH,  
President.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment. This would be a classic example of overkill.

In my district we have a good example of why this is not a clear issue. We have one project where channelization has been authorized and where the work is badly needed. On the other hand we have a study under way on the Miami and Little Miami Rivers. If channelization is recommended in this latter case I would have severe reservation.

The answer to this problem is to study each case on its own merit and to balance the price of ecological damage against the possible improvement to the area involved.

The Mill Creek is presently a polluted stream which serves one of the industrial centers of Cincinnati. The channelization program will help clean up this body of water which has become a cesspool. It will also provide for 620 acres of recreational area along the banks of the stream which are presently vacant due to the filth that is in the stream.

I would urge the Agriculture Department and the Army Corps of Engineers to

carefully study each channelization program but it would be counterproductive to summarily stop all such programs.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER).

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my strong opposition to the proposed moratorium on "stream channelization" for the reasons which are outlined in letters I received from the chairman of the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Commission, the director of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, officials of the Tazewell, Va. Soil and Water Conservation District, officials of the Skyline Soil and Water Conservation District, Pearisburg, Va., and a member of both the State conservation committee and the board of supervisors of the Southern Soil Conservation District.

I have also received a communication from the Natural Tunnel Soil and Water Conservation District and the Scott County Board of Supervisors.

I include these communications, as follows:

VIRGINIA SOIL AND WATER  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION,  
Richmond, Va., June 18, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAMPLER: Our Commission and the Executive Committee of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in joint session today discussed at length the proposal made by Representative Reuss to the House Appropriations Committee, U.S. Congress, for a one year moratorium on all small watersheds developed under Public Law 534 and 566 which include channel improvements.

As a matter of practice, we are making an extensive evaluation of all channel work in connection with these projects. We believe that an across the board moratorium is an improper and unrealistic approach in considering channel improvement work. We endorse a project-by-project evaluation, as has been our procedure.

We strongly oppose the one year moratorium as recommended by Representative Reuss, and urge you to use your influence in having it defeated.

Sincerely,

E. L. FELTON,  
Chairman.

To: Congressman WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Senator HARRY S. BYRD, Jr., and Senator WILLIAM B. SPONG.

We have been advised that the House Appropriations Committee has been asked to include a provision in the 1972 fiscal year appropriations bill to withhold funds for one year from P.L. 566 Watershed projects that include channel alterations.

The Soil and Water Conservation Districts in Area IV consisting of 14 counties in Southwest Virginia strongly oppose this provision and any other means that would cripple these important projects.

Watershed projects reduce erosion and sedimentation; impound water for boating, fishing, and swimming; create new fish and wildlife habitat; improve agriculture and forest management; prevent flood; beautify landscape. They are environmental projects. To provide this it is necessary on some projects but not to make channel alterations.

When viewed in the light of how these projects serve the many needs of many people with varied interests in many communi-

ties, we can find no sound reason for curtailing any part of the watershed operation.

The Soil Conservation Service has from its very beginning planned and designed all of the projects and program in such way that the work done would reduce pollution and lead to cleaner and healthier environment for all the people.

We would greatly appreciate all possible effort on your part to prevent the proposed moratorium on channel work and any other proposal that would slow down these important projects.

Sincerely,

E. N. UMBARGER,  
Area IV Director, Virginia Soil and Water  
Conservation District.

TAZEWELL SOIL AND WATER  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,  
Tazewell, Va., June 15, 1971.

Congressman WILLIAM C. WAMPLER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAMPLER: The Town of Tazewell, the Tazewell County Board of Supervisors, and the Tazewell Soil and Water Conservation District, the three sponsors of the Upper Clinch Valley Watershed Project, along with the Tazewell County Steering Committee of the Mountain Dominion Resource Conservation and Development Project would like for you to give urgent consideration and favor to the continuation of work under Public Law 566, the small watershed project on the upper stream tributaries.

Tazewell County is vitally interested in this project as the first contract on the Lincolnshire Dam, of the Upper Clinch Valley Watershed Project, was awarded last week. We have learned that there is proposed legislation in Congress concerning a one year moratorium on channel work in watershed projects. If this should go through it would have a detrimental effect on our project. The town has invested over \$100,000 in this project along with many hours of work by Soil Conservation Service personnel and other local people interested in this project.

We, the above, as sponsoring organizations and interested groups appeal to you on behalf of the people of Tazewell County that the watershed project be continued as scheduled.

Respectfully yours,

T. J. HIGGINBOTHAM,  
Chairman, Tazewell Soil & Water Con-  
servation District.

W. J. HANKINS,  
Executive Secretary, Tazewell County.

WILLIAM T. PERRY,

Acting Mayor, Town of Tazewell.

CLYDE BOWLING,  
Chairman, Tazewell County Steering  
Committee Mountain Dominion R.  
C. & D.

W. JACK LITZ,  
Mayor, Town of Bluefield.

SKYLINE SOIL AND WATER  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,  
Pearisburg, Va., June 16, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM WAMPLER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We of the Skyline Soil and Water Conservation District Board, which includes the counties of Bland, Wythe, Montgomery, Pulaski and Giles, would strongly urge your support in rejecting Representative Reuss' provision to withhold funds for small watershed projects under Public Law 566 for the next year.

The Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the Soil Conservation Service have been in the work of conservation of our environment for almost 40 years. The projects under P.L. 566 help in flood prevention, water development, improves stream flow, expands

recreation facilities and reduces siltation in our streams. We feel this view has not been completely conveyed to the Appropriations Committee. We have proposed projects being planned under P.L. 566 and hope you will give due consideration to our interest.

Very truly yours,

GARNETT AGER,  
Wytheville, Va.  
RICHARD L. TOWNSEND,  
Giles County Extension Office.

PRINCETON, W. VA.,  
June 14, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAMPLER: As a member of the State Conservation Committee and as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the Southern Soil Conservation District, I want to voice a vigorous protest against the proposed moratorium on "stream channelization" as proposed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Daniel P. Reed and supported by Representative Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, House Committee on Government Operations. Such a moratorium, in my opinion, will cripple the small watershed program in West Virginia and Virginia, as well as do irreparable harm to many other worthwhile water resource projects.

As you know, stream channel improvement is a complex subject with potential for both good and evil. However, in the experience of nearly all conservationists with whom I am familiar, the good has far outweighed the bad. Channelization is a useful and necessary tool in water management, but each individual project should be judged by its own merits. Without channelization few flood prevention and flood control projects could be feasible in West Virginia and Virginia. I, therefore, urge you to oppose this moratorium with all the vigor at your command.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL HALE, M.D.

JUNE 17, 1971.

Strongly opposed to Congressman Reuss' move for one year moratorium on SCS stream channel work improvement, Public Law 5-66 projects provide flood protection, reduction of sediment, improves recreation fish habitat by increased low flow, provides water supply and economic development stream channel repair work in Scott County Virginia, and eliminated flood damage on May 6 and 7, 1971, as compared to flood damage on April 28, 1970, which destroyed and damaged homes, businesses, crop land, highways, railroads, and endangered lives.

After channel work, trout habitat rapidly returned to normal, and environmental conditions were improved.

Natural Tunnel Soil and Water Conservation District; Mr. O. H. Culbertson, Mr. F. S. Noblin, Mr. W. J. Franklin, Mr. Oadle Fraley, Mr. Frank R. Wagner, Supervisors; Mr. Billy W. Frazier, Mr. R. A. Farmer, Mr. Cecil Fletcher, Mr. Sam McConnell, Mr. K. E. Pearcey, Mr. C. P. Gross, Mr. Melvin Minton, Scott County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Reuss amendment. I wish to commend the distinguished gentlemen from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), his subcommittee, and the entire Committee on Appropriations for their continued support for soil conservation programs. Their concern for conservation efforts is clearly reflected in this

agricultural appropriation bill as reported by the committee.

Six weeks ago, in his address to the American people on the subject of agriculture, the President cited the importance of the Soil Conservation Service and requested an additional \$12 million for SCS conservation operations. The Appropriations Committee has improved on this by recommending an increase of almost \$15 million.

Likewise, President Nixon requested a \$26 million increase in watershed construction funds. The committee responded with an additional \$34.5 million for watershed construction and flood prevention programs.

All conservation minded citizens who are truly interested in preserving our environment will applaud the wisdom and foresight of the President and the committee and welcome their recommendations. These funds are urgently needed to fund the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, Public Law 566, the most successful conservation legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

No other program has done more to further conservation efforts in this country. Since its passage in 1954, it has become the legal framework for a vast network of small upstream watersheds. To date, over 1,000 watershed projects have been funded and are in various stages of completion; another 2,000 project applications await approval.

In my State of Iowa alone, farmers with the assistance of Federal watershed funds have built 33,000 farm ponds, 56,000 miles of terraces and planted 200,000 acres to grass and shrubs to serve as wildlife habitat. The concept of planning and coordinating conservation efforts over the entire watershed has become a universally accepted and established conservation practice.

But now we have before us this ill-conceived and I believe mischievous amendment, the so-called antichannelization amendment which if adopted may well jeopardize our entire watershed program in the name of ecology. The amendment would deny funds for the engineering or construction of any "stream channelization." But what is the meaning of "channelization" in this context? I submit to my colleagues that the language of the amendment is so broad and imprecise that it might well be interpreted, if enacted, to stop the construction of terraces, grass waterways and other soil and water practices which have proved their worth. Inasmuch as they, too, channel or divert the flow of runoff water, who is to say they are not included in the prohibition against "channelization"? This would seriously cripple the work of the Soil Conservation Service.

Watershed projects include a combination of terraces, grass waterways, dams and levees all designed and engineered to fit the topography of the individual watershed. As a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit, which has jurisdiction over watershed approvals, I have had the opportunity to review the plans for a good many watershed projects. Judgments

must be made on a project-by-project basis depending on local conditions and the needs of the local people.

The watershed organization is locally organized and controlled but has available the expert assistance of many governmental and private organizations. The local sponsors have official working relationships with most agencies of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. Many work closely with the Corps of Engineers and other key Federal agencies. They have memorandums of understanding with State health departments; fish and game commissions; and State departments of agriculture, highways, commerce, natural resources, water resources, forestry and economic development. The Soil Conservation Service is without question one of this country's major natural resource agencies. It is indeed a tragedy that its great contribution to preserving our environment and the work of our soil and water conservation districts are so grossly underrated and misunderstood in some urban sectors of our society.

The substantial progress against pollution under Public Law 566 since 1954 is largely unknown to city folk, who are belatedly now swept up in a tremendous upsurge of ecological concern. The farmers of America welcome their urban compatriots to the battle against pollution, but they plead with us as responsible legislators—"Don't let Johnny-come-latelys to the ecology movement destroy years of solid achievement by our soil and water conservation districts." The farmers and landowners actively planning and coordinating conservation in such districts should be encouraged to continue their important work free from harassment. They deserve our protection from this obstructive antichannelization amendment, which would severely curtail the entire watershed program.

It is ironic that those who have only recently begun to voice concern for the environment should find fault with the efforts which farmers have been undertaking for more than 35 years. Since the dust bowl days of the 1930's, the farmer has been the Nation's No. 1 ecologist.

Since 1935, local farmers have been cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service in carrying out a series of highly successful programs to conserve our land and water. Today, over 2.2 million farmers and landowners are actively participating in 3,025 conservation districts which they have voluntarily organized in 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that a proposal with such far-reaching consequences as this amendment should not be acted upon in haste. Many of our colleagues have not had the opportunity to discuss this matter sufficiently with farmers and soil conservation technicians. The telephonic inquiries which I have made reveal the Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Service are adamantly opposed to such an amendment. Also in opposition is the National Association of Conservation Districts which represents some 18,000 volunteer soil conservation district officials in 50 States.

This is no way for a responsible Congress to amend a program which has for 36 years been the standard bearer in the crusade against pollution.

There are all too many questions which have not been resolved to our satisfaction.

Of even greater concern is our lack of information regarding the effect this amendment will have on the overall watershed effort. Watershed projects are years in the planning. If any of the projects which are now awaiting funding include the slightest amount of channel work, would not this amendment jeopardize the entire project? As a result of this uncertainty, thousands of acres of watershed improvements which are vitally needed could go unfunded. It would surely be shortsighted of us to force a halt to all watershed construction while professing to be advancing the cause of ecology.

There have been instances in the past where stream channel improvements have been used in lieu of other preferred practices. The Soil Conservation Service recognizes this and has taken steps to correct the situation. The Department of Agriculture is currently reviewing and analyzing potential environmental problems in every watershed project in the country. In the State of Iowa, the SCS is presently reevaluating plans for 11 watershed projects which call for substantial channel improvements. Careful consideration is being given to alternatives which are more acceptable.

It is obvious to anyone familiar with the problem there is no simple "yes" or "no" answer to the question of channelization. The key to the solution to the conflict is for all agencies and individuals concerned to work together in a cooperative spirit to find the best possible solution on an individual project basis.

The outright moratorium invoked by the Reuss amendment will render irreparable damage to soil and water conservation efforts for years to come. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the amendment. Let us defeat it and follow the wise recommendations of President Nixon and the Appropriations Committee to substantially increase funds for the SCS and watershed construction.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss). I admire him as a conservationist. I believe in conservation as much as he does. Let me add also that I am just as much interested in the maintenance of a clean environment as he is.

Mr. Chairman, the very purpose of Public Law 566 was to bring about an improvement in the environment yet if this amendment is adopted it may very well impair and impede one of the most

valuable and productive conservation programs ever inaugurated in America.

In recent years the Congress has enacted many different pieces of legislation designed to protect and enhance our environment. Public Law 566, or the watershed program is administered under the Soil Conservation Service. That Service was created by the Congress way back in 1935 for the express purpose of dealing with environmental problems. Its purpose was to reduce erosion and sedimentation damage. These concerns should be just as important today as they were in 1935.

Some of the organizations which have written to us, such as the League of Conservation Voters and a Citizens' Committee Against Channelization, contend that the development of the watershed programs will adversely affect fish and wildlife by the elimination of some water areas that if left alone would provide for wildlife habitat.

Now I believe that this is an argument that should be answered straightforwardly without pulling any punches. So far as I know, there is no channelization in the State of Missouri which they object to. On the other hand I can substantiate with examples where a completed watershed district has actually created several small impoundments which have resulted in a greater habitat for wildlife than before the watershed project existed.

It is an established fact that today one of the concerns stated by the Soil Conservation Service which administers the watershed program is to provide for larger areas for fish and wildlife development.

Let us never forget that a watershed project creates more than just one single benefit. For example, a city can use a watershed impoundment to store water for its municipal supply. That very impoundment also at the same time prevents flooding of both agricultural land and perhaps city land downstream. If the impoundment is not used for drinking water supply, then it will still serve as a tool for flood control but at the very same time this area of water can be used for water sports such as boating and water skiing. The impoundment not used for drinking water can be stocked with fish. Is not this a newly created habitat for fish and other wildlife? I thought that was the objective of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He now offers an amendment which could cripple a program which has been contributing to the alleged objective of his amendment.

If the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin should be adopted, it could very well result in the loss of the multi-purpose benefits of the watershed program. To adopt this amendment might yield a very narrow benefit to very small water areas and at the same time it is certain to hurt a program which has created impoundments of much larger water areas with benefits much greater than those promised by the proposed amendment.

The paramount benefit from Public Law 566, watershed program, is the prevention of erosion of our topsoil. What

could be more important to a conservationist? The very name of the Conservation Service indicates its objectives. But, Mr. Chairman, while the preservation of our soil is important to future generations, the avoidance of flood control is very important to our own generation. We must continue the production of food on bottom lands, which are usually fertile and which produce high food yields.

The gentleman's amendment may have emotional appeal but makes no reliance on the facts. The facts are that most of the channels he refers to were dug not by the Soil Conservation Service but by private drainage districts as far back as the 1920's and 1930's. If an area needs to be drained, I know of no way the Government can prohibit private land owners to band together to form a drainage district, and thus dig a drainage channel.

To prove my own concern for the environment it was only a few minutes before this amendment was offered that I had supported another amendment to double the appropriation from \$350 million to \$700 million for funds authorized by section 702, being grants for basic water and sewer facilities. I believe just as strongly in the need for conservation of our water supply as the gentleman who offered the amendment. I am just as strong in support of antipollution legislation as he is.

Perhaps both those who support the amendment and those of us who oppose it may have the same purpose in mind, but the soil conservation program and Public Law 566, the watershed program it administers have proven their worth over a long period of years.

This restrictive amendment could cancel some of the benefits of the finest multi-purpose conservation program ever passed by the Congress. The amendment must be defeated.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to the Reuss amendment. A moratorium on channel work at this time would cripple one of the most positive approaches to resource conservation that Congress has ever enacted.

Many of the environmental novices preaching today would have us believe that all Public Law 566, the small watershed program, amounts to is the total destruction of our streams and the fish and wildlife associated with them. This is just not true.

The primary objective of the small watershed program is to curb upstream floods. In addition, many projects have been developed for municipal and industrial water supply, recreation opportunities, and to enhance fish and wildlife resources.

Much of the channel improvement is confined to manmade channels that have become silted in and overgrown with trees and brush. These channels were never intended to be fish habitats and many only flow after storm periods.

When channel improvement is neces-

sary on natural streams, the Soil Conservation Service makes an all-out effort to protect fish and wildlife values to the maximum extent possible.

Channel work, Mr. Chairman, is an integral part of the small watershed program. A moratorium on this work would halt watershed construction in many critical areas and add greatly to the cost and inconvenience of local people. The moratorium is unnecessary and unneeded.

Improvements under Public Law 566 have had remarkable success. Federal funds for the support of this work constitutes capital investment and has, as past records will indicate, paid returns many fold.

This amendment will needlessly interfere and impede the progressive accomplishments under Public Law 566. I urge the defeat of the pending proposal.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. At the conclusion I am going to ask permission for all Members to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD. I will make that request later, so my colleagues will realize that permission will be requested for them to revise and extend their remarks.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have discussed this proposal at length with the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, and they feel, as do my constituents, that the proposed restriction on channelization would be disastrous to the arid Southwest, a portion of which I represent.

Undoubtedly, there have been some streams in this Nation which have been channeled, to the detriment of their natural beauty, and with a consequent loss of wildlife habitat. On a specific stream-by-stream basis, I might join the gentleman from Wisconsin in opposing specific instances of channelization, but to place a blanket restriction on all channelization would be disastrous.

Let me give you one specific example. One of the watershed projects authorized by the legislation we are considering is for Sanderson Canyon, in my district. Sanderson normally has an annual rainfall of about 9 inches. Most of that 9 inches is concentrated in the summer months. Six years ago this month, during my first term in Congress, more than 7 inches of rain fell in 1 day. With sun-baked rangeland and little vegetation to hold back the water, the flood surged down Sanderson Canyon and into the town of Sanderson. It claimed 27 lives, destroyed many homes and seriously damaged others. Many businesses of the town suffered severe damage, railroads and highways were washed out, and the raging waters tore up the town cemetery, carrying the bodies of the dead downstream with some who were still living.

This is what can happen to water in the arid Southwest when it has no channel to follow.

The Sanderson watershed is not primarily a channelization project—but making a proper channel for flood waters is a part of it, to carry the waters downstream to the Pecos and the Rio Grande, and prevent the flood waters from seeking a channel through homes and valuable property.

There are several other watershed projects in various stages of preparation in my district, and channelization may or may not be a part of them. Where they prove to be necessary, they should not be hindered by a blanket prohibition of all channelization.

The Soil Conservation Service, in charge of our watershed projects, is, itself, one of the prime environmental protection agencies. It plans the proper placement of water-retarding vegetation. It helps to develop proper habitat for wildlife. Its purpose is to make maximum beneficial use of the meager water supplies, and to preserve to utmost degree the meager topsoil of our water-scarce land. Where this involves channelization, we should welcome it as a part of a wise program.

There are instances all over the irrigated West where the building of the right kind of a channel for the meager available waters can spell the differences between the success or failure of our farmlands. Every agency charged with using our waters is now also charged with the responsibility for protecting our environment. Let us not handicap their efforts with a proposed blanket prohibition on all channelization work.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my position in strong opposition to the proposed amendment which has been offered by my colleague from Wisconsin. I think that any amendment which would jeopardize the programs within the Department of Agriculture that are engaged in carrying out needed soil and water conservation and development measures, is shortsighted, inappropriate, and totally unwarranted at this time.

It is apparent that the thrust of this proposed action is directed primarily against the Soil Conservation Service, with particular concern over stream modification as being planned and installed under Public Law 83-566.

Through the 17 years that the small watershed program has been in operation, I have observed that it offers local people one of the greatest opportunities to join together with State and Federal agencies in developing a program to meet the specific resource needs of the watershed community in which they reside.

One of the great strengths of this program is the manner in which local people must take the initiative in planning and carrying out these multiple-purpose watershed projects with assistance from the Federal and State governments. Thus, they are locally oriented, and the local interests must make significant contributions in funds and services.

I can recall no other Federal assistance program that has received such broad

biartisan support through the years. The fact that more than 1,300 watershed applications for assistance, or about 44 percent of those received by the Department, still await planning assistance, attests the favorable attitude of the public toward this worthwhile program.

This widespread support is understandable because watershed projects have had a major impact upon the communities and areas served. In my own State of Texas, as across the Nation where projects are installed, the economic and social benefits derived from these have been outstanding. These projects have provided the stimulus for economic stability and growth of many small rural communities. Flood protection and an adequate water supply are often the key to the economic and social betterment of these communities. A strong and healthy rural America is necessary if we are to reverse, or at least check, the out-migration of people from our rural areas to the large urban centers.

In closing, I strongly oppose the proposed amendment and feel that it casts an unjust, adverse reflection on one of our most effective resource action programs, and the highly respected agency, the Soil Conservation Service, which administers it, together with the hundreds of concerned local organizations sponsoring watershed projects.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take too much time. To those who oppose the amendment let me say it is quite clear that the pending amendment does not repeal any act, particularly the Watershed Act. We are not modifying any law.

The fact is, what has happened, as with so many other programs in this country, is a new awareness of a good program. The whole question of environmental impact has caught up with everything, including this program.

In one State every single river but one has been channelized. There is almost nothing left to channelize. With 3,000 soil conservation districts around the country, we have suddenly begun to realize, in an effort to save the local farmer and the rural areas, that we are doing something in total to the environment that we had not contemplated. That is all that is involved in this issue. We are just beginning to realize what upstream damming does to lakes, gulfs, and the ocean.

Here was an existing self-imposed moratorium. To do what? To take a new look, at this turning point in our history, at a good program and to make it better; in order to have sufficient environmental consideration into the program; so that we would limit the adverse effects; and so that we would include in the benefits of the program all possible environmental benefits.

None of these things have been yet adequately accomplished under the present self-imposed moratorium which soon expires. So, to extend it for some time, until that can be done, seems to me only

logical. The testimony today, which is being accumulated, is overwhelming on the issue, Mr. Chairman, that a good program, when examined in totality, is beginning to have contrary effects. We are not preserving the rain where it falls, we are rushing it away; we are not preserving the habitat of wildlife, we are destroying it; we are only beginning to see and understand the effect of farmland nutrients and pesticides on related waters.

All we are saying with this amendment is that the time has come to establish procedures for satisfactory and adequate environmental considerations.

Projects which are ongoing are not affected. But new projects, of which there are many and in every State, should not be started until there is adequate assessment of adverse environmental impact. Procedures for assessment and input into project consideration must be received and established in light of the awareness in this country, which has placed a new value on environmental preservation.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to achieve a new balance. Our very survival depends on it. We do not seek to kill the soil conservation program or the Watershed Act, or related programs. But we should take the time contemplated by the amendment to move confidently into the future with these programs. Too many questions remain unanswered, and thereby a good program may suffer. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972 which prohibits appropriations for 1 year to any stream channelization project not under construction by July 1, 1971.

The legislation which originally authorized channelization is now archaic in that it looks at the problem of flood prevention and protection from a purely economic viewpoint and gives no consideration to environmental impact questions.

The Department of Agriculture's original cost benefit formula, when applied to the question of whether or not to channelize a stream, considered only factors such as the actual cost of the project against the amount of land which would presumably be placed in safe cultivation as a result of the flood plain drainage brought about by channelization. However, the present public concern with the preservation of the environment in general and ecological systems in particular, is clearly inconsistent with the concept of channelization as developed by the Soil Conservation Service.

Channelization projects involve the cutting of all trees along the proposed watercourse and the clearing of stream bank vegetation along with the digging of long, straight, flat trenches, all of the

purpose of increasing the flow of the stream and hence, the drainage and runoff on surrounding land. Needless to say, the damage to plant and wildlife systems is extensive. As an example of the harmful effects of channelization, the grading of the streambed eliminates irregularities which cause the stream to break its surface and thereby oxygenate itself. Channelization also destroys the hollows and pools which are the main breeding ground for aquatic life. As a result, it has been estimated that all of the bottom life of a stream is eradicated for a decade or more by channelization. It has also been found that even after long periods of time the variety of stream life never reaches over 50 percent of that present prior to grading or dredging. In addition, the destruction of the plant life along the streambanks deprives wildlife of what is sometimes its only breeding ground in the midst of extensive reaches of farmland. Finally, the rapid crainage of large areas of swamp and marsh land negates one of the major functions of the Nation's watercourses: the process whereby water is passed through plants and soil slowly enough to naturally filter out impurities and pollutants which would otherwise be transported downstream.

Even if environmental factors are not considered, there is some doubt as to whether even the original justifications of channelization are valid.

First, such programs give their primary benefit to farmers in terms of increased workable acreage and better flood control. However, aside from the fact that it is the stated policy of the Department of Agriculture to reduce acreage in cultivation, there is mounting evidence that channelization only transfers the danger of flooding to downstream areas through the increased rate of water runoff and stream flow. Furthermore, the initial cost of channelization often exceeds the value of the land reclaimed and protected. Lastly, the continuing cost of maintaining a channelized stream, plus the loss in hardwood resources and the destruction of any esthetic value the water course might once have possessed, tend to outweigh any continuing benefits that channelization might have.

I find this subject particularly urgent in light of the fact that Ohio is the only State which actively participates in stream channelization with the Federal Government. Last year, both State and county projects resulted in over 250 miles of channelized streams and rivers in my State. Since the destruction caused by such projects is, in effect irreversible, I believe the need for a halt to stream channelization is vital. I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, let me first say, I yield to no one in my desire to protect our environment. I have

done this all my life as a farmer and during 23 years of legislative experience.

Channelization, like pesticides, has become a dirty word. Each is emotional and has developed an oversupply of instant experts and pseudoscientists. Many statements are being made that simply cannot be substantiated scientifically.

The small watershed program is one of the better ones in the Department of Agriculture.

As was already stated, today's farmer is the true ecologist. With him it is a matter of survival.

As a member of the subcommittee reviewing proposed small watershed projects I can assure the membership of this House ecology and environment are always foremost in our consideration. Practically every proposal has some provision for recreation. We consider flood control, water supply, irrigation in some instances and every other beneficial or harmful angle.

Several years ago we visited several proposed projects in the West. I believe it was in Wyoming. The spring thaw was on. Acre after acre was flooded and good meadowland was carried away.

No small game could have competed with the force of that water. Ground nesting birds would have had absolutely no chance of survival.

Are proponents of this amendment telling me that channelization in this case would not have been desirable?

Why, I ask, do not the instant experts oppose highway construction? I submit to you that every time a 100-foot cut is made in a hillside, far more pollution and silting occurs than through the channelization we are discussing today.

In the case of highways, in too many instances no attempt is made to replenish the vegetation. This is definitely not the case with small watersheds. Protection is provided wherever possible.

Let us defeat this amendment, continue a good program and refine and improve it wherever possible.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the light of the overwhelming expression of opposition from Members who oppose the Reuss amendment I rise to bring a fresh change in view to the discussions which have preceded mine.

I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for so eloquently pointing out that the process of channelizing for the Soil Conservation Service needs a review. If the Reuss amendment serves only one purpose, if it serves only the purpose of alerting the Members of this body and the American public to the fact that the Soil Conservation Service program does desperately need a review, does desperately need hearings on the procedures whereby these programs are developed and approved, then it will have served a worthwhile purpose.

I first became interested in the process of channelizing in soil conservation projects some 2 years ago. I studied the whole process of planning and development.

Let me make this observation. There are two aspects of the Soil Conservation Service which need investigation.

One is the method whereby the cost-benefit ratio is computed. My own investigation indicated that in many instances channelization is conducted not because of engineering necessity but because the actual cost of channelization is very low and it is possible to throw in on the benefit side of the ledger very high benefit figures and thereby justify under cost-benefit comparisons which otherwise might not be authorized under current computation methods.

What is needed is to develop new standards of the computation of cost-benefit ratios, in all these water drainage projects, so that the more worthy projects—those which deal with municipal water supply and those which do protect lands which need to be drained because of flooding problems—can be carried out but so that those projects which do not especially need channelization can be avoided.

Secondly, we find in the whole process from planning through the execution of soil conservation projects there does not exist in the process a place for some individual or committee to stand up and say, "No, this project should not be approved." Everybody involved from the initial planning through execution has every incentive to approve the project, while no one involved is in a position to say "no."

Changes are necessary if we are going to preserve some natural environment aspects of our country. Believe me, once the streams are channelized, we do not know whether it will take 50 years, 100 years, or 200 years before they return to their natural state. It is essential that we develop a process for planning a project whereby those who have a concern, a valid concern for the preservation of our natural environment will have a proper voice and a proper chance for consideration. I will not delude myself into believing that the Reuss amendment will pass, but I will support it with the hope that it will alert members of the Committee on Agriculture and Members of this entire body to the fact that the whole process of channelization is receiving considerable attention from the American public which cannot be forever ignored by this body.

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, today the House considers the Agriculture Appropriations bill, in part authorizing millions of dollars of stream channeling projects which, unless we act in a prudent manner, will further diminish this country's already dwindling treasury of water and soil resources.

Accordingly, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) proposes an amendment to the bill which I fully support and urge my colleagues to support.

There is simply no reason to approach environmental problems on a regional basis. On the contrary, I believe that we who are not necessarily in the direct shadow of a proposed action have an even greater responsibility to speak out and to vote on an informed basis, and thereby to demonstrate in the most practical

way that all environmental programs have national implications, whether for good or ill.

The proposed amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill would place a moratorium for fiscal year 1972 on stream channelization by the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. During this period, the Department and interested conservation groups would undertake further studies of the long-range consequences of stream dredging and channeling to determine which of the proposed projects should be banned altogether, which might safely and usefully proceed, and whether alternatives could be employed to achieve the proposed benefits of stream channelization without plundering the environment.

Last week, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) reported to the House the testimony of the U.S. Department of the Interior and of various conservation authorities favoring such an amendment.

The evidence displays the extent of the essentially unexamined use of Federal funds to straighten and deepen streams in order to drain lands, and thereby increase their value for agricultural cash crops—this at the very time when the Government is also spending money to withdraw land from cultivation. Every year as much land in the United States is converted to reservoirs and flood control use as for urban and suburban development. Already, nearly half of the Nation's original 127 million acres of fresh water wetlands have been lost as well as millions of acres of flood plains.

The result has been that sometimes flooding is reduced in the immediate area where a straightened channel has been chiseled out of a formerly meandering stream. Then the land near the banks can be bulldozed, or the hardwood cut down and the land sold to the producers of cash crops. If we calculate the cash value of the land's new use as opposed to the so-called flood control expenditure, the result may appear to favor stream channelization.

But like most of the traditional methods of resource allocation, the cost-benefit approach to stream channeling has been notably insensitive to broader ecological consequences—to the effect, for instance, upon the water cycle of streams, and upon the life cycles of the animals and fish which depend on the streams for their existence. The wetlands are drained, the fish in the streams die, flooding occurs downstream from the dredging, and the bulldozers roll in to cut down trees and prepare the land for agriculture.

Stream channelization turns out to be a kind of riparian strip mining. I do not think any of us should be very surprised if in a few years we have to consider a "new" type of conservation program. It will be known by some clarion title, such as "war on the degraded environment" and we shall all be asked to appropriate millions—or will it by then be billions—of dollars for some massive national effort to repair and restore the channelized rivers and wetlands.

Conservationists tell us that except for

the passage of time much of this channelizing damage is irreversible. We cannot buy new hardwood trees or soon replenish the subtle forms of microscopic life which have been nurtured along meandering riverbeds over dozens of years. No crash program, no remedial legislation, no massive infusion of Federal funds can redress the results of our unreasoned use of nature.

Since we now have the opportunity to step back, with all that we are learning about the consequences of man's heavy hand on the natural balance, since we can pause in this channelization for a year and thereby avoid repeating past mistakes, surely we cannot conscientiously continue along the present blind path.

Although the principal benefit of stream channelization is said to be the control of flood damage to agricultural land, very often flooding occurs downstream, and in the meantime, in the words of the executive vice president of the Audubon Society, Mr. Charles H. Callison, we have converted "beautiful streams that are rich in natural life into sterile and unsightly ditches."

These are the essential reasons I support this amendment: The harm it would avoid is basically irreversible, and the purposes of the present program are at best unclear and are probably attainable by methods which do not result in drastic ecological costs.

The amendment would not affect water and soil conservation programs other than stream channelization. Nor would it halt ongoing channelization programs. It would only suspend any new operations in the coming fiscal year. Now, when we are acquiring more comprehensive information on the further effects of previous channelization, is an excellent time for this moratorium. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that channelization, in some selected areas of the United States, has caused destruction of fish and wildlife habitat, degradation of water quality, and increased flooding downstream. Many of my Wyoming constituents agree that where such damage is taking place to our environment there is need for further study of the effects of channelization.

However, no such damage has been caused in my State of Wyoming, and it does not seem necessary to eliminate channelization programs for the entire United States because of problems found in only selected areas.

Channelization programs have actually benefited water users in Wyoming, and have resulted in greater irrigation efficiency, less soil erosion and better crop yields. I am deeply concerned about the environmental damage that has been done in some areas of the United States, but as Wyoming's one and only Congressman, my first duty is to represent the interests of my State.

To demonstrate how important the continuance of channelization programs are to Wyoming, I would like to insert at this time the following letter from Mr. Floyd A. Bishop, Wyoming's State engineer.

THE STATE OF WYOMING,  
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE,  
Cheyenne, Wyo., June 21, 1971.

HON. TENO RONCALIO,  
The Congressman for Wyoming, House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TENO: Recent testimony presented in hearings scheduled before the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources contained severe criticism of channel improvements in P.L. 566 programs. Witnesses at these hearings apparently stated that they favored among other things, consideration of a complete moratorium on all such projects. I do not feel that there is evidence in Wyoming that indicates such a drastic proposal is warranted or that limitation of the Watershed protection and Flood control program is justified. P.L. 566 projects have benefited Wyoming farmers, ranchers, and other water users, and have improved water management practices over much of the State with no appreciable disruptions of environmental quality.

During the past year, for example, sprinkler irrigation systems have replaced flood irrigation practices in several areas of the Snake River Basin. These projects by the Soil Conservation Service have resulted in greater irrigation efficiency, less soil erosion and the extra production benefit of better crop yields. P.L. 566 Projects in other parts of Wyoming have regulated water supplies for multipurpose uses including irrigation, municipal, recreation, and other beneficial uses, plus creating significant flood control benefits.

The State of Wyoming supports and is actively participating in the P.L. 566 program. I would like to see this program continued and expanded using the same organizational skills and expertise that has been so successful in the past. I can think of no other program that has been as effective in achieving a proper balance between environmental and developmental factors. Certainly this is a program which should be favorably considered and continued on the basis of an outstanding past performance record.

Respectfully submitted,

FLOYD A. BISHOP,  
State Engineer.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. With respect to the statement that you just made, are you aware that projects of this type are not only reviewed at every level of government and by the State government also, but they are reviewed under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act for their environmental impact with public hearings held in the localities involved?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am thoroughly familiar with the process. I am familiar with the fact that the initial planning is usually done by someone employed by the Soil Conservation Service who has a vested interest in having a constant inventory of projects being planned. When he goes to the local landowner and asks if he is willing to sign up and join the program, the local landowner usually finds that many acres of his land will be improved at no cost or at very little cost

to himself. Of course, he is willing to join in it. The sponsors also have a financial and a vested interest in the project. Yes, I am thoroughly familiar with the review process, and I feel that it needs correction.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Reuss amendment, and I want to tell you about the channelization program in Ohio. They have gone channelization crazy out there. I have heard a lot of people say, this amendment will destroy the Soil Conservation Service. Are you telling this House that that is the only thing the Soil Conservation Service does? I thought they built dams, diversion terraces, grassland waterways, and 100 and 1 other things. If you do not think what I am telling you is right, then go out and take a look at some of the pictures in the hall. That is typically what over-channelization is doing.

They channelize and go away and forget about it. I know some people want it, and some people build houses in swamps. I had a woman call me just 3 weeks ago when we had a little rain out there. Her house was in a swamp. She said:

The water is all around my house. What are you going to do about it?

I said:

I am going to wait for it to go down. What will you do?

Mr. Chairman, a lot of the channelization is completely unnecessary. I do not think 1 year's delay will hurt anything. I do not think that a year's moratorium will hurt anything. We had a moratorium on it. The Soil Conservation Service is not out of business either. Far from it. They are in business up to their ears, and this will not put them out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit surprised at some of my friends from Texas standing up here and saying that they are against this amendment. I have been to Texas a half dozen times this year and every time I have been there, they have said that it has not rained for a year down there. If they ever got a rain, I would have thought they would want it to remain and not be channelized so that it will get into the Gulf of Mexico in a hurry.

Mr. Chairman, some of this channelization is doing violence to the very fact that we need a water table, and this channelization is lowering it. I do not think there is anything wrong with having a moratorium over leaving streams as they are until we see what channelizing will do over the long run.

Mr. Chairman, if we go in with a bunch of bulldozers and clamshells, and what have you, and dig up the land, we are going to create problems. I am for soil conservation, but if you think that channelization is soil conservation, again I invite you to go out and take a look at the pictures out in the Hall.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have had a part in the watershed and flood prevention programs. I was on the com-

mittee when we set up without a budget request, 62 pilot projects scattered over the entire United States. Now the program has grown to where it has been and is our greatest step toward environmental protection, for by building more than 2 million dams we have held back billions of tons of sediment, our greatest pollutant, but we must be able to get the water away and it is here that we must in many cases have channelization. As we pointed out in our report:

It has come to the attention of the committee that requests have been made to cancel for one year all channeling work by the Soil Conservation Service. The effect of this would be to greatly increase erosion, sediment, and pollution. Such a move would cause streams to meander, which quite clearly would cause bank caving and would have a terrifically adverse effect on the environment in that it would cause tons of polluted sediment to fill streams and would undo the benefits which come from upstream dams.

The committee takes strong issue with such proposals and hereby directs the Soil Conservation Service to proceed, substantially as planned, with all projects authorized by Congress or approved by the Soil Conservation Service. Actions to modify this work program would help destroy rather than improve our environment. A restudy would result in approximately two years delay.

Now the Soil Conservation Service is studying all its projects as required by the various environmental acts. Channelization will be only where it is needed.

If you prohibit channelization you are not only are letting the water run wild and create pollution—and I tell you that billions of tons of sediment would be washed into our streams if that were to be allowed to happen.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is one of the greatest environmentalists in this country. The gentleman and I worked together on the wetlands legislation 15 or 20 years ago. I know that no one has the environmental question closer to his heart than does the gentleman from Wisconsin. But from the experience in handling this subcommittee for 20 years, the stoppage of all channeling which he sponsors here would greatly increase pollution, environmental destruction, in much of this country. I will not speak for all sections of the country. However, we should not channel where they do not need it but where they do need it every month's delay is aggravating a bad situation that already exists.

Why do we hire the engineers and specialists? Because they have studied this area and here we are a group of laymen, notwithstanding the fact that I have listened to testimony on thousands of these projects over the years. It is my opinion that this amendment would put a roadblock in the path of those who work in cooperation with the local specialists.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman's amendment mean that

there would be a moratorium placed on the establishment of all watersheds for 1 year?

Mr. WHITTEN. It means you could establish the watershed organization, borrow money and pay interest on it, but you could not do the channel work likely required. Of course, it means then you are out of your money but you cannot proceed.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I want to associate myself with the statement of the gentleman at the microphone.

My district is faced with a serious problem. If there is a moratorium on these watersheds, it means the flooding of hundreds of homes in my district and I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) has made his point. Certainly it is plain here and plain everywhere I go that folks want the environment protected, but I respectfully submit that his amendment would greatly damage the environment instead of helping it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement in opposition to the proposed amendment.

First, I must oppose the amendment since this would be but a first step in a campaign to eliminate in its entirety the channel improvement program not only of Public Law 566, but also that of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I cannot support an amendment which would eventually eliminate two sorely needed projects in my district, those of the Ottawa and Maumee Rivers.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed in 1954. It has been amended regularly since that time to expand its provisions to include assistance in alleviating all water-related problems in upstream areas except navigation and power production. Its popularity is nationwide. Every State and Puerto Rico, with the exception of Alaska, has benefited from its provisions. Every allowable purpose has been included in some project somewhere.

The Soil Conservation Service, which administers this program for the Department of Agriculture, is a highly competent agency. Its staff includes professional people from each discipline concerned with water, land, and plant resources. It employs ecologists, biologists, agronomists, range conservationists, foresters, economists, engineers, hydrologists, geologists, soil scientists, sedimentation specialists, recreation specialists, and people trained in farm and ranch planning, watershed planning, river basin planning, and resource development. Its planning and operational activities are interdisciplinary in every respect.

The SCS has another characteristic which is unique among natural resource action agencies. It works directly with the local people concerned, individual farmers and ranchers, local soil and water conservation districts, county gov-

erning bodies, special purpose districts, and municipal governing bodies. The decisions as to scope and scale of any development are made by the local people who have to live with and pay for these developments. Due to the nature and limitations of programs administered by the SCS, their impacts generally are local, with effects being either onsite or limited to the boundaries of the watershed concerned. This limited range of impact makes local decisions highly important since they significantly affect the environment within which these people live and work.

The small watersheds program is a nationwide program. I understand that the SCS has received about 3,000 requests for assistance under the provisions of this program. Of these, over 1,600 requests have been approved for planning assistance and over 1,000 projects have been approved for installation.

These projects include a wide variety of measures. Conservation treatment of the watershed lands is the initial planning increment. It provides for proper land use and those conservation practices which are needed to protect the land from excessive erosion and keep it in sustained production. These measures include erosion control practices on cropland, pastureland, and woodland, and wildlife plantings to improve the habitat for birds and small game, brush management for large game, and stocking ponds with fish for private and public enjoyment. These measures help to hold the raindrop where it falls.

The structural works of improvement include floodwater-retarding structures, multiple-purpose structures, recreation developments, fish and wildlife developments, channel improvement, debris basins and floodwater diversions. Projects are formulated using a combination of these measures with land treatment to alleviate water and related land resource problems, meet the economic and social needs of the residents of the watershed, and to protect and improve environmental values. All of these needs are given careful consideration before decisions are made as to the measures to be included in the project and their scope and scale of development.

This multidisciplinary approach, which considers all water and related land needs and utilizes the resources of the watershed to meet these needs, is second to no other agency in the water resource development field. Of significant interest and concern is the fact that the resources used in upstream watershed projects basically are owned by the people of the watershed. This is true even of most of the streams. Most stream channels in watershed projects are either intermittent or have very low volumes of flow. The landowners own and pay taxes on the streams and while State water laws may govern the use of water flowing in the streams, the land itself is in private ownership and subject to private decisions and trespass laws.

The SCS and watershed project sponsors invite State game and fish agencies, Federal fish and wildlife, and recrea-

tional agencies to assist in the investigational and plan formulation activities on a case-by-case basis. Too often there has been no response to these invitations until the plan has been formulated. Then objections are interposed to any measure which might adversely affect fish and wildlife values. They are made without any consideration of the many other needs, objectives, and considerations which enter into plan formulation. Since there are conflicts of resource use which can occur as a result of different interests, all considerations must be included in the plan formulation process in order that impacts and tradeoffs can be fully and carefully considered in making the final decisions. Therefore, timely involvement is essential.

I would like to enumerate a few of the benefits which have accrued to the people of this Nation, both urban and rural, as a result of SCS programs.

Erosion has been controlled on millions of acres of crop, pasture, and woodlands, streambanks, highway rights-of-way, and urban developments.

Sediment yields have been reduced resulting in better quality of water, reduced channel aggradation, less sediment in navigation channels and harbors, and reduced rate of fill in major reservoirs.

The land resource base on treated areas has been protected so as to keep it in sustained production and preserve its production capability for future generations.

Floodwater damages to agricultural values on upstream flood plains have been greatly reduced, often as much as 75 to 80 percent, thus permitting more efficient use of these highly productive areas.

Flooding in urban areas has been reduced to an expected average frequency of one flood per 100 years. This protects business and industrial investments, schools, churches, hospitals, streets and roads; protects residences; removes the hazard of loss of life or injury to the residents; and reduces many health hazards.

Municipal and industrial water is provided which improves the environment of the towns concerned and stimulates economic activity and more jobs for the betterment of all.

Water-based recreational opportunities are provided which make the area a better place in which to live.

Drainage of agricultural lands is made possible, permitting more efficient use of the land and other factors of production.

Irrigation water may be supplied for small local areas to stabilize farm economy.

Fish and wildlife developments are included for the enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat and to provide resting and feeding areas for migratory waterfowl.

The constraints on this program which would be imposed by this amendment cannot be tolerated. The dangers which would be imposed are numerous.

Land treatment measures which are dependent upon adequate outlet facilities could not be installed. Erosion would continue unchecked. Sediment yields

would continue at a high level carrying with it chemicals which pollute the streams and make them unsuited for fish and public recreational use.

Flooding of highly productive farmlands would continue in many areas, especially the coastal plains and river delta areas, where much of the most productive farmland occurs, and protection can be provided only through channel improvements.

Many small town and urban areas would continue to be subjected to frequent flooding with its high economic costs, social discomforts and inconveniences, threat of loss to life and property, and resulting health hazards.

People, rural and urban, would be denied the protection they have worked hard to get and, in many instances, now have in sight. This is unthinkable when they have voted bond issues, made individual contributions, and obtained help from State and other sources to meet their obligations.

Low-income farmers would be denied the help they need in draining their cropland so as to improve their incomes and standard of living.

Small rural towns often would be denied needed outlets for their storm drains. This prohibits effective drainage of runoff waters from even the smaller flash rains and creates nuisance flooding and health problems, which would result from interference in the functions of septic tanks and overflow of cesspools.

The discouragement which local people would encounter could set this program back for many years. It needs to be accelerated, not retarded.

This attempt to strangle a highly effective and productive local program which this Congress has supported on a nonpartisan basis for over 36 years cannot be countenanced.

We must move this program forward and not permit this delay. I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I have before me the Reuss amendment and I want to read it again for the benefit of my colleagues:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9270 OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

On page 37, immediately after line 25, insert the following:

"Stream Channelization

"No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for engineering or construction of any stream channelization measure under any program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless such channelization is in a project a part of which was in the project construction stage before July 1, 1971."

Now, Mr. Chairman, what this amendment provides for is not a moratorium but an absolute prohibition against construction of channelization projects from now on—ad infinitum.

The dictionary says a moratorium is "a period of permissive or obligatory delay." There is no period of delay in this amendment, it is an outright prohibition against any further channelization from July 1, 1971, indefinitely.

When I first heard of the Reuss amendment I was informed that it would delay any channelization project for 1 year pending a study to determine the

best methods and the desirability of continuing channelization. This I was inclined to support because I felt there was room for improvement in our channelization program, but to completely call a halt to the program forever is a very severe step to take with a program that has provided many benefits to our rural areas. I feel that Mr. REUSS' amendment certainly has placed those in charge of our channelization programs on notice that hereafter we expect better performance and more careful protective measures for our environment from them.

Furthermore Mr. Chairman since we passed the Environmental Policy Act last year any project that may have an impact upon our environment must be approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. Environmental impact statements must also be filed with various agencies of our Government concerned with the environment before the project can proceed. This affords the Fish and Wildlife Department an opportunity, and any other agency, to fully protect the environment before a project can be constructed. This added protection for our environment we did not have before and many of the projects which brought rise to the present criticism would have been revised or corrected to more fully protect our environment had this law been in effect before this year.

Certainly we can always improve our practices of channelization and flood control and we should strive continually to make these improvements, but to completely stop them for an indeterminate number of years is too harsh and too drastic a measure—particularly for a program that has so many benefits for so many people. Under these circumstances Mr. Chairman I must vote against the amendment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Environmental pollution is a major concern of the American people today. The better use of our soil, water, and air is an urgent and immediate requirement. No one can be more dedicated to good soil conservation and good soil management practices, but the Reuss amendment is not the answer.

One of the most effective programs to meet this aim has been the Public Law 566 small watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service. The program's aims are the multiple ones of flood prevention, soil conservation, sediment reduction, and the better use of an area's water resources.

The Public Law 566 watershed projects have scored notable successes in their multiple aims. During fiscal years 1969 and 1970 alone, they prevented almost \$59 million in agricultural flood damages, and more than \$11 million in non-agricultural damages; reduced sediment production by millions of tons; provided land conservation and development benefits of more than \$87½ million; provided water recreation opportunities for hundreds of thousands of people, and augmented the municipal and industrial water supplies for 16 communities.

Serious questions have been raised by

the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others, with respect to a relatively small phase of the small watershed program. I refer, of course, to the problem of the misuse of the stream channelization procedures. As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that this misuse occurs more often on flood control projects undertaken by the Corps of Engineers than on small watershed projects. Nevertheless, serious questions have been raised, and some abuses have been pointed out rather dramatically. I will readily admit there have been some abuses, and some poor judgments made with respect to the use of stream channelization. However, we should consider the fact that these decisions and judgments were initially made several years ago in most cases. Few of us were as concerned about environmental issues at that time. It seems somewhat hypocritical to now attempt to criticize those earlier decisions in light of today's new found environmental consciousness.

In this same regard, it should be noted that the small watershed program is basically a local program, formulated and carried out by local people. There is, of course, some Federal financial assistance. But, by and large, the decisions are all made at the local level. As these people at the local level develop more of an environmental awareness, it will be reflected in their decisions on small watershed projects. The net result will be much more effective and environmentally oriented use of the stream channelization technique. We simply cannot correct all of our environmental mistakes overnight.

To abruptly and arbitrarily cut off funds for channelization, would be a serious mistake. First, to arbitrarily stop channelization for 1 year is a direct slap in the face of the local landowners who make the decisions with respect to the nature of watershed development projects. To adopt this amendment is to say to these people that they are not sufficiently competent to determine whether or not stream channelization should be utilized on their own land. Second, while the amendment appears somewhat innocuous on the face of it, it would in fact, seriously disrupt the entire small watershed program. This would occur at a time when we should be proceeding as quickly as possible with the completion of the program instead of hindering and slowing it. The Department of Agriculture has stated that sediment produced by soil erosion is the most extensive pollutant of surface waters. The amount of sediment produced by soil erosion is estimated to be 700 times the volume of any solids in sewage distribution. This is especially important because of the fact the silt is not only a pollutant in and of itself. These soil particles are responsible for carrying many of polluting chemicals into our streams. In fact, some of these chemicals could not be carried into our streams if those soil particles were not around to carry them into the streams. The point is simply this, we need to "nail the rain drop where it lands." This is one of the most effective methods of cleaning up our rivers and streams. The topsoil is retained in place on the land, and thus

doesn't carry chemicals into the rivers. Second, the water filters through the ground filtering out and reducing the adverse effects of many of the chemicals which would otherwise be washed into the streams.

The point I make here has been dramatically supported by witnesses appearing at our Public Works Committee oversight hearings on pollution. Most of the witnesses have agreed that even after we have effective secondary treatment of all industrial and municipal sewage, we will still have very serious problems of water pollution. The point being that the primary source of water pollution is solids, the major portion of which consists of sediment from soil erosion.

Mr. Chairman, the solution to this problem is to continue the program as it now exists, with a note of caution to those involved in the program to be more aware of environmental considerations when approving projects. It is impossible for the Congress to legislate as to whether or not channelization is appropriate in a given situation. We simply must have faith in our local citizens who own the land involved and who live on the waterbeds concerned. I am convinced that these folks have a new awareness of the need to give more emphasis to environmental factors. Let us give them a chance to prove it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment which would put a moratorium on all stream channelization projects, one of our most effective weapons against the disastrous effects of floods and soil erosion.

A number of projects in my district have used channelization as a means of controlling floodwaters thereby enabling residents of the area to live in homes and work in industries located in flood-prone areas.

My congressional district lies within a coastal zone in which water improvement projects are vital to the continuing development and growth of the entire area. Many of these projects, including Cedar Bayou, Clear Lake, and Clear Creek, Dickinson Bayou, Highland Bayou, and Taylor's Bayou, have involved some degree of channelization. While I realize these particular projects would not be affected by this amendment, I cite them as examples of the tremendous benefits these water improvement projects can produce at a cost of minimum or no disruption to the environment.

A moratorium on channelization would impose an arbitrary restriction on the efforts of local communities to protect themselves from devastating floodwaters and would severely curtail their efforts to attract new industries and jobs. It is a step in the direction of assuming all channelization to be detrimental and, if extended to other projects, this concept could block further development of such vitally important projects as the Galveston Ship Channel, the Texas City Channel, and the Sabine-Neches Waterway. All of these are absolutely essential to the continuing prosperity of southeast Texas. It would be a drastic mistake for the Congress to adopt a policy implying that the continuing improvement of

these channels is detrimental to the area.

Concern for our environment is nothing new to the local or Federal officials responsible for planning and designing water improvement projects. The Soil Conservation Service, with which the pending amendment is concerned, was established in the Department of Agriculture some 36 years ago as a result of the disastrous Dust Bowl days of the 1930's. The major objective of that agency is to preserve, protect, and improve our life-sustaining natural resources and one of its major programs is to assist local communities in water resource planning.

In resolving the watershed problems and meeting the objectives of the sponsoring local organizations, channel improvement is just one of a wide variety of measures used. Channel improvement is not used indiscriminately. Floodwater detention structures are used whenever possible and in many instances channel improvement is used in conjunction with dams to provide an acceptable level of flood protection. In all cases, careful consideration is given to the environmental impact of proposed project measures including channel improvements. Detrimental effects, as well as beneficial effects, are fully considered. Channel improvement is planned, designed, installed, and maintained in ways that minimize adverse effects.

A moratorium on all channel improvement work would constitute an unnecessary and counterproductive effort to solve one problem without regard for the consequences that would result from the destruction of proven concepts for dealing with very real and serious flood control problems.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the proposal to place a 1-year moratorium on stream channelization by the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture.

I have followed very closely the oversight hearings on stream channelization before Mr. Reuss' Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources. This well-intended conservation review regarding the need to protect and preserve our waterways and wildlife has nevertheless prompted what I feel is a most unnecessary and potentially damaging amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill and rural conservation and pollution control efforts.

I have always believed that self-help is best help. In this regard the USDA's Soil Conservation Service has acted in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190 and announced in March new policy guidelines for preparing and reviewing environmental considerations on proposed SCS projects. These statements cover all watershed projects, resource conservation and development measures, and other major SCS conservation efforts involving stream channelization.

In addition, as early as possible, and in all cases prior to a decision to take action, the Soil Conservation Service in

consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies plans to assess in detail the potential environmental impact of each proposed action. This assessment will strive to insure that adverse environmental effects are avoided and that environmental quality is restored or improved.

The effect of the proposed 1-year moratorium would not only delay limited project work that is already undergoing internal review by SCS in conjunction with other Federal, State, and local agencies, but would also unnecessarily delay worthwhile and environmentally sound projects.

Long before conservation became a popular political issue, farmers were restoring and improving our land for future generations. These pioneers in environmental protection know that a year's delay for all channeling work by the SCS would greatly increase erosion, sediment, and pollution. Of course, additional delay resulting from restudy would further compound the soil and water conservation problems in rural and small-town America.

This grassroots concern confirms my belief that approval of this recommendation would allow streams to change course, would accelerate bank erosion and bank caving, would cause tons of polluted sediment to fill rural streams, and would undo the many benefits which have been derived from upstream dams and related soil and water conservation efforts.

In view of the internal controls and interagency consultation regarding environmental quality in the Soil Conservation Service, I feel a strong sense of personal conviction that this amendment would be counterproductive to our efforts to protect our environment and would delay much overdue watershed and resource development projects designed to reduce soil erosion and water pollution.

I oppose any such proposal on this basis.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, over the years, I have been a consistent supporter of soil and water conservation work carried out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. Dedicated persons within the Service have joined with farmers in a common goal of keeping water on the soil where it drops, and soil on the place where it was first found. Their joint efforts have benefited every person in this country, predate the now popular environmental concern, and deserve the continuing support of the Congress.

However, on the practice of channelization within small watershed projects, I must take issue with my friends within the Service. Serious arguments have been raised against the practice, and they merit our careful attention. Channelization opponents charge that far from retarding flooding problems, the practice merely transfers the flooding problem from one locality to another locality downstream. Further, they hold that soil erosion is not retarded by such a practice, but actually increased. In the process of converting meandering streams into straight ditches, recreational values are sacrificed, and severe

damage done to fish and wildlife habitat.

Another perplexing problem associated with the request for channelization funding is that in this same appropriations bill we are asked to approve \$1 million for the new water bank program. The program will be operated by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for the purpose of preserving marshes and other valuable wetlands. A stark incongruity must be obvious to many of us. We are asked to support a Federal program which destroys wetlands, at the same time we are asked to support a Federal program which would preserve wetlands.

These are strong arguments against a Government agency charged by Congress with the express purpose of reducing flooding and slowing soil erosion. I believe a year's respite from more bulldozing and clearing of streams would be in order, so that appropriate procedures can be developed to assess the value of channelization practices—procedures which will insure that our environment is enhanced and not defaced by such practices. I do not believe, as some of the channelization proponents have argued, that a year's moratorium will halt all work on needed Public Law 566 projects, or that such a moratorium will ruin the Soil Conservation Service. Much to the contrary, such a pause, reevaluation, and redevelopment of procedures could do much to strengthen the position of the Service and its abilities to do the important work that remains to be done.

I make this prediction because in my own State of Wisconsin, channelization projects by law are required to receive approval from environmental specialists within the department of natural resources. This procedure has resulted in a minimum amount of damage to the environment from channelization projects, and insures that future damage will not result. Landowners and environmentalists have reached a truce, where each realizes that channelization is neither all good nor all bad, but only good or bad when applied to a particular stream or drainage area.

I will vote for my colleague's amendment because I firmly believe that the need for such a truce on the national level is also urgently needed. When proper evaluational procedures are developed for channelization work at the Federal level, I will again support use of funds for such projects.

Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as being opposed to the amendment to stop channelization and channel improvement.

In many agricultural areas, the present valley morphology is far different from that found by the first permanent settlers. Most streams had definite channels. Valley floor land, although often low and subject to occasional overflow, was perennially dry enough for cultivation. In fact, this level land was often the premium farmland. Clearing of forests, breaking of sod and planting the uplands to row crops, combined with poor soil conservation practices, produced erosion and stream sedimentation many times the geologic norm. Much of this sediment was deposited in the upper water-

sheds of stream systems. Channels were filled and valley floors were covered with sediment. Often stream levels were raised sufficiently to form wet areas and swamps on the valley floors, ruining the valuable farmland. Attempts of landowners to deepen the channels to their former depth and to drain the newly created backswamps usually resulted in failure because the improved channels were rapidly refilled with incoming sediment.

This process continued until after World War II. Since then a reduction in row crops and an increase in upland forests, combined with the implementation of soil conservation measures has greatly diminished erosion and sedimentation. However, the clogged channels and mosquito ridden backswamps remain. Channel improvement is needed, along with sound land use management and soil conservation practices, to restore this land to its former condition.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize my strong support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) to delete funds in this bill for stream channelization projects.

Many of us in the Congress have long opposed the obvious inconsistency of Federal sponsorship of both the wetlands reclamation efforts of the Department of the Interior and the wetlands drainage programs of the Department of Agriculture. This inconsistency has become even more grotesque with the Department of Agriculture itself maintaining both programs for the past 6 months.

The stream channelization projects that have been carried out under the Watershed Act have caused severe ecological damage to many watersheds, made hundreds of streams nearly uninhabitable for fish and riparian wildlife, and incurred costs far exceeding any benefits to be derived from the project.

Deletion of the funding for stream channelization will allow a moratorium on channelization projects during fiscal year 1972. Thus, an opportunity would be presented to explore the detrimental effects of the existing program and examine possible alternative efforts that might be undertaken.

There is no reason for a continuation of these projects now that we understand the environmental implication they entail. Hearings held by the gentleman from Wisconsin have clearly shown the ecological and economic problems that arise from stream channelization. It is important that we recognize the facts of the situation and take advantage of this opportunity to end the funding for stream channelization projects.

I am pleased with the strong support for this amendment from conservation organizations who have forcefully pointed out the dangers of stream channelization and have given their strong support to the effort to end these shortsighted projects.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must take this step forward to help preserve the environment, protect valuable fish and wildlife resources, and recognize the esthetic values of natural wetlands. The Reuss amendment can help accomplish these goals.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. Chairman, the question of procedures for Soil Conservation Service projects is being challenged by this amendment and certain statements are being made with regard to channelization and its effect on the environment.

No one can object to the gentleman's desire to advance his objective. However, I do not believe this is the proper approach to take by amending an appropriation bill. Rather I would suggest that he make his presentations before our Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee which is now in the process of holding hearings on all matters relating to programs and projects under our Public Works Committee jurisdiction.

If we have flagrant abuse to the environment on certain projects the committee would like to know about them. We must also permit local witnesses, State witnesses or any interested persons present their point of view either pro or con, on a given project.

I would admonish the Members that our committee has held hearings on the existing project evaluation criteria for all water resource projects and, in fact, adopted a sense of the Congress amendment that will expand project purposes and will permit more consideration for environmental quality control in all projects.

I relate to this point solely to remind the Members that the committees of the Congress are intensifying their efforts to improve procedures and criteria to minimize and eliminate adverse impact on the esthetics of a given area.

I would remind my colleagues that there are many variables in all projects and each must be considered on the basis of factors associated with the geological and hydrological conditions of a given area.

Therefore, I join in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the Public Law 566 small watershed program. The amendment introduced by my colleague Mr. REUSS would set back by another year a program of proven worth in the development of rural areas and upgrading our environment.

Placing a moratorium on channel improvement will of course stop completely projects in flat areas where dams cannot be built to slow floodwaters. What may not be generally realized is that a stop order on channels will also stop or slow work on dams for floodwater retarding, municipal water supply and recreation along with other water and sediment control measures.

Local people plan, and Soil Conservation Service technicians design these projects as integrated resource systems. To stop any one part for an arbitrary period of a year would bring many small watershed projects to a virtual standstill.

A great need today for both city and country is to slow migration of people to the cities as they search for ways to make a living. While not the whole answer, watershed projects have demonstrated success in this effort with some positive achievements. Dependable water sup-

plies in communities that have been without, frequently enable local businesses to expand, and occasionally attract new ones. I recall statements at recent appropriation hearings which indicated somewhat more than 50,000 new jobs have been created to date through these projects. Perhaps 20,000 man-years of employment of mostly local labor have resulted during construction—and almost every State has several now under construction.

Part of the reason for prosperous communities is that they are nice places in which to live. Certainly freedom from floods is important. Public Law 566 projects have prevented \$180 million in flood damages to date. In many cases improvement of a channel through town is the only practical alternative to flooded basements and businesses. The proposed amendment would needlessly hold some of these up for another year.

That kind of delay is intolerable in projects already long in the making while local residents were working out, through give and take, the measures needed to solve their resource problems. Many have waited additional periods for required Federal funds. Sponsors of these projects are trying to improve the environment right where they live. They must obligate themselves for land rights and a share of the costs for their projects. These people fully appreciate the need for wildlife habitat and the joys of fishing and hunting. Indeed, State and Federal fish and game agencies are asked to participate in the planning stage to be certain these aspects of the environment will be considered in balance with other resource problems.

In the years since its inception, the Public Law 566 program has been deservedly one of the most popular programs this Congress has started. A working force of environmentalists has been put together with expertise second to none in solving resource problems. In recognition of the need to move out and act concretely in solving these problems the 1972 fiscal year budget carries an increase of \$28 million, the first real step up in several years. Let us not amend away this hard won chance to move ahead.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and his colleagues on that committee, for their commitment to the great task of restoring our Nation's water resources and preserving them for all future generations.

The committee's support is particularly gratifying to those of us in the Congress who have long sought to alert the American people to the enormity of the pollution that has engulfed our rivers, our lakes, and our harbors. I believe it signals a great national awakening in which even the administration now shares.

The President of the United States, who only 2 years ago asked for \$214 million a year to clean up our waters, has now called for a \$2 billion annual effort; and the Appropriations Committee has accepted that as a starting point

while awaiting passage of authorizing legislation.

I believe it is clearly understood in this body, as it is within the Public Works Committee which I have the honor to chair, that the administration's request is a bare minimum when measured against the magnitude of the environmental cleanup that must be undertaken.

The Public Works Committee is now engaged in a top-to-bottom review of the existing water pollution control legislation and its administration in order to determine where we stand today and how best we can proceed from here to insure the success of this undertaking.

We are proceeding with careful deliberation because we are convinced that "more of the same" legislation will not get the job done, that a national effort on the scale of our gigantic highway program is needed if our waters are ever again to run clear and clean. I can assure this body that the Public Works Committee will build that concept into its forthcoming water pollution control legislation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), in opposing the proposed amendment to declare a year's moratorium on channelization work on flood control projects under the watershed and flood prevention program of the Department of Agriculture.

I consider this amendment ill-advised and would lead to long delays and increased costs under this important program.

Should the Reuss amendment unfortunately be approved, pollution may be increased as streams flood their banks and despoil adjacent farms and other areas.

All of the areas involved in these projects are carefully restored where construction occurs, so that the natural environment is protected.

I want to point out further that this program is important to many of our small cities. In Tennessee, for example, a channelization project in Overton County is providing flood prevention protection for the city of Livingston and industries which heretofore had been damaged by floods. This program has not only proven its benefits locally, but nationally.

I was pleased to support the committee appropriation of \$132 million for this program and again emphasize the importance and the necessity of continuing this important flood control program without interruption.

I urge the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin as I believe a 1-year moratorium to provide for review of channelization projects is in the very best interest of America's wetland and water resources. The SCS has an outstanding record in soil and water conservation particularly where it has used with great skill such techniques as terracing, contour plowing, diversion strips, small impoundments, and grass

waterways. I take pride in the part which SCS played in the Rock Creek watershed in my own congressional district and am pleased with SCS's plans for the Seneca Creek watershed. Neither of these projects involve channelization. But the rapid growth of channelization projects which have in so many instances degraded adjacent wetlands, downstream areas as well as the streams themselves have raised concern among professional conservationists as well as casual observers.

My State of Maryland has many soil and topography types but I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Maryland's secretary of natural resources serious reservations and recommendations concerning channelization as a water and soil conservation technique. Secretary Tawes' comments are expressed in a letter to Chairman Reuss of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Annapolis, June 9, 1971.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
Chairman, Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Congress of the United States, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your invitation to submit a statement for consideration by your subcommittee on various agency's programs related to the improvement, modification, and channelization of streams and rivers. During the course of the hearings you will probably receive testimony from governmental agencies such as the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service, stating their policies and procedures for considering the environmental effects of their programs and procedures and, on the other hand, statements from "conservation" associations charging adverse environmental impacts from various agencies' projects. My Department has enjoyed generally cooperative relationships with such federal agencies during the planning and implementation of their programs and projects. However, I wish to comment on one federal assistance program which is of particular concern to the State of Maryland: the Agricultural Drainage Program administered by the Soil Conservation Service.

Drainage of wetlands has been pursued as a program of significant national benefit for many years; with technical and financial assistance from the Soil Conservation Service in recent decades. The program goal is to minimize the adverse effects of excess water on agricultural lands; thus providing agricultural landowners a more certain annual income. The Soil Conservation Service's efforts have been highly successful. However, in recent years, two major policy changes have occurred. First, the Congress, reflecting recent public awareness of the value of wetlands, passed the Water Bank Act of 1970 which provides for reimbursement to landowners who agree to refrain from drainage activities. Second, public programs have been developed to retire or divert cropland from agricultural production as the nation's ability to produce has exceeded the market demand for food. There seems to be a conflict in policies when we as a nation subsidize the construction of agricultural drainage channels which significantly adversely affect wetland environments and increase food production, while at the same time, offer payments to encourage the protection of wetlands and to reduce crop land production.

Certainly there is reason to doubt any drainage project if the stand objective is to increase the national supply food. It is widely recognized that nutrient deficiencies, where

they are found in this nation, are not faults of the productive capacity of American agriculture. In fact, the land retirement programs make federal payments annually to prevent production on more than 50 million acres, and the federal government purchases large quantities of agricultural commodities at the legal support prices. Therefore, it is quite obvious that the drainage program can no longer be justified on the basis that the national supply of food is increased. Further, if national increases in food production are desired, they could be more efficiently achieved by application of a variety of agricultural science and technologies to existing well-drained lands—usually with less adverse environmental impacts than channelization projects.

Reduction of consumer food expenditures is, similarly, a questionable objective of the agricultural drainage program—questionable in light of agricultural price support policies and other public programs designed to artificially maintain the price of agricultural products, thereby increasing the income of agricultural producers. Although agricultural drainage projects produce minimal national benefits, benefits to individual landowners in terms of increased productivity per acre, do represent increases in income. The income increases result from reduced probability of crop losses, therefore, provides a definite incentive to channelize. I recommend that this incentive be eliminated.

My Department recognizes the problem that uncertainty creates for the farmer. We do not wish to see Maryland farms abandoned because natural conditions are so uncertain that profitable returns cannot be insured, since maintaining a viable agricultural sector is an objective of the State of Maryland. At present, the Soil Conservation Service administered program is the only available federal method for reducing the uncertainty of flood damaged crop losses. I would suggest that your subcommittee include within the scope of its investigation alternative means of reducing the uncertainty of farmers whose crops are periodically affected by flood waters. A national crop insurance program similar to the flood insurance program could be successful in relieving uncertainties. Alternatively, an expansion of funds for the Water Bank Act would allow farms to increase the acreage of land held as "wetlands" while maintaining an overall income.

We often receive petitions from farmers who claim they need a drainage project if they are to survive as farmers. The federal government does not presently offer agricultural landowners effective alternative means of obtaining the security of annual incomes. A federally subsidized crop insurance plan could provide such an alternative. To eliminate apparent conflicting public policy, to reduce the environmental loss from agricultural drainage projects, while at the same time provide the farmers with the certainty they need to remain in agriculture, I suggest your subcommittee consider amending federal law (PL 83-566) to eliminate federal subsidies to agricultural drainage projects and examine several programs, including a publicly subsidized crop insurance program, to reduce the uncertainty due to natural conditions, and ask to initiate the most feasible program as national policy. While the states can strive to reduce any adverse environmental impacts of agricultural drainage projects, the Congress has the opportunity to remove the federal incentive for such projects while instituting effective alternative programs to maintain or enhance the status of agricultural land owners.

Sincerely yours,

J. MILLARD TAWES,  
Secretary.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters and other communications from soil conservation groups throughout West Virginia urging me to oppose the pending amendment. One of these letters comes from our distinguished secretary of agriculture of West Virginia, the Honorable Gus Douglass, a good friend and constituent of mine. If I were merely to follow the winds of opinion as expressed in my mail, I would unhesitatingly vote against a moratorium on channelization. There are some very good watershed projects in West Virginia, and others are on the drawing board.

I have long supported the program of the Soil Conservation Service in its programs to prevent floods by contour plowing, plantings, small dams, and sediment control reservoirs. Only a few weeks ago, I testified in favor of the Mill Creek watershed project which will benefit Jackson and Roane Counties, in West Virginia.

We have recently received evidence from such individuals as Assistant Secretary of the Interior Nathaniel P. Reed, and others, to the effect that channelization run rampant can cause excessive damage. In fact, Assistant Secretary Reed testified that stream channelization "is undoubtedly one of the more, if not the most, destructive water management practices", and he urged a 1-year moratorium on such work. I have at hand a memorandum which lists some of the adverse effects of channelization:

#### ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF CHANNELIZATION

1. Elimination of fish habitat and lowered production of aquatic life. A study of 23 North Carolina streams dredged as a W.P.A. project 40 years ago showed that 90% of the fish population was lost, and there has been no recovery of habitat. Prior to channelization the Tappah River in Mississippi contained 240 lbs. of game fish per acre, whereas after channelization only 5 lbs. of tiny game fish per acre were produced. The stream bed does not naturally recover and bottom habitat for fish is ruined.

2. Destruction of wildlife habitat. Channelization eliminates streamside habitat for small game, waterfowl and fur-bearing mammals. Eventually after channelization, tangled briars and honeysuckle grow back but the vegetation is too thick to support wildlife. Herbicides are even used in some places to keep the growth cut back.

3. Degradation of water quality, increased erosion and siltation. With vegetation alongside the stream bank stripped away, more erosion can occur in a few days than would occur naturally over many years. Water becomes turbid, banks slump into the stream, and water temperatures are increased due to removal of shade cover.

4. Increased floods and damages downstream. Minnesota experienced all-time record floods in 1965 and 1969. The more than 70,000 miles of ditches can be blamed for accelerated runoff, compounding the downstream problems.

5. Lowered water tables. Channelization destroys swamps, wetlands, and floodplains which act as natural reservoirs to store nutrients, sediments, and flood waters and to recharge aquifers.

6. Destruction of valuable hardwood trees. Arkansas has lost over 1 million acres of valuable delta hardwoods during the past decade. Of the original 10 million acres, now

less than 2 million remain. Similar losses are occurring in other states.

7. Destruction of archeological sites. In Texas alone hundreds of sites have been destroyed by channelization. Valuable scientific data has been lost concerning prehistoric geology, fauna, soils and climate.

8. Complete loss of aesthetic values. No longer does the stream meander along. It has been turned into a ditch practically devoid of life.

9. Destruction of the habitat for rare and interesting creatures. Several Alabama projects have destroyed the habitat for some rare and unique mollusks and a declining salamander. Other rare species such as blind fish are threatened by a channelization project in Indiana.

The Soil Conservation Service itself apparently realized earlier this year that stream channelization was having adverse environmental effects. On February 4, 1971, the SCS issued "Watershed Memorandum 108" which provides guidelines for reviewing approved watershed work plans that include stream channel work not yet installed and for "developing new watershed work plans involving channel" work. Under the terms of this memorandum, no channel work may be carried forward except those that have "minor or no known adverse" environmental effects. SCS established a moratorium on all other projects involving stream channel work until June 30, 1971, when their initial field review of these projects is completed and reports thereon are submitted to SCS in Washington.

The complete text of Watersheds Memorandum 108 follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,  
February 4, 1971.

#### WATERSHEDS MEMORANDUM—108

Re: Guidelines for Planning and Review of Channel Improvement.

This memorandum provides guidelines for reviewing approved watershed work plans that include stream channel improvement not yet installed and for developing new watershed work plans involving channel improvement. This review is one of the steps to implement our declaration at Portsmouth, N.H., that "we can do nothing less than to reevaluate each of our programs and practices to make sure that its impact on the environment as a whole is a beneficial one."

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) states that it is national policy to "encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment." Congress directed that "to the fullest extent possible: . . . the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act. . . ." In the light of this and other directives, SCS has recently reexamined and, where desirable, modified and extended its policies and criteria relating to the planning, design, installation, operation, and maintenance of watershed projects with particular reference to channel improvement.

Much of the channel improvement work that is not yet installed was planned before the enactment of P.L. 91-190 and the recent changes in our planning policies and criteria. The purpose of this review is to determine what changes in work plans or engineering design are needed to further national policy and goals for the environment.

Guidelines for making this review and developing new watershed work plans involving channel improvement include:

1. Channel improvement is to be planned and carried out with minimum losses to fish and wildlife habitat (WS Memo-102). Losses are to be minimized by (1) selecting measures that are least damaging to habitat, (2) incorporating design features to reduce the damaging effect of the measures, (3) locating measures to avoid areas of high habitat value, (4) using construction methods that minimize disturbance and destruction of habitat, (5) vegetating denuded areas as quickly as practical, and (6) operating and maintaining measures in a way that is least damaging to the habitat. Unavoidable losses are to be mitigated to the maximum practicable degree. Opportunities for mitigation should be fully explored. Plans should provide the same degree of certainty that mitigation measures will be installed, operated, and maintained as they do for other structural measures.

2. Channel improvement is supplementary to floodwater retardation, not an alternative for achieving an adequate level of flood protection. (See Par. 105.0221c, WPH). Channel improvement should be considered only after it has been determined that land treatment and all feasible floodwater retarding structures will not provide an adequate level of flood protection. Except in watersheds where retardation is obviously impractical, this determination should be based on reservoir flood-routing studies, maximum use of all available storage opportunities in the watershed, and minimum practical release rates combined, where feasible, with two-stage inlets for the principal spillway.

3. Channel improvement is not to be used where its primary purpose is to bring new land into agricultural production. (See WS Memo-84, 84 Supp. 1, and Par. 101.10 WPH.) It is not to be used where floodwater retarding structures provide an adequate level of protection for land currently in agricultural production. Restoration of former productivity may constitute bringing new land into agricultural production if the land is not now used for cultivated crops or crops normally seeded for hay and pasture. (See WPH 101.101.)

4. In agricultural flood plains, the level of flood protection should be only high enough to permit profitable use of such land within its capabilities for sustained agricultural production (WPH 105.0221e). If the protection by floodwater retarding structures provides an acceptable level of protection but falls short of achieving the optimum goal, the environmental impact of increasing the level of protection by channel improvement should be considered carefully before including channel improvement in the plan. Consideration should also be given to the fact that many crops can withstand some flooding without consequential damage.

5. In nonagricultural flood plains, the level of flood protection should be sufficient to protect the principal residential, commercial, or industrial areas from a 100-year flood (WPH 105.0221f). Except in unusual cases channel improvement should not be used if its primary purpose is to make land suitable for nonagricultural development. In areas of expected development, serious consideration should be given to zoning, flood proofing, early warning systems, or other nonstructural devices to alleviate damage.

6. Channels are to be planned and designed so that they will be stable and can be maintained at a reasonable cost. This means that channels must be stable immediately after construction as well as after aging. The characteristics of stable channels are described in Eng. Practice Standard 582. Other guidance is available in ENG Memo-72.

7. Stability is one of the primary considerations in the location of channels. This usually means that improved channels should follow existing alignment approximately. But

realignment or relocation should be considered if it will not endanger stability and if project or environmental needs can be better served. (ENG Memo-72 and EPS-582.)

8. Even though they may increase costs, the least destructive construction techniques are to be used, including such practices as seasonal construction, minimum clearing, sectional construction, limiting excavation to one bank, using temporary sediment basins and other devices to limit sedimentation and other pollution during construction, and prompt vegetation of spoil, channel banks, and other disturbed areas. Plant materials should be selected for their ability to control erosion, and to provide food and cover for wildlife, and for beauty and ease of maintenance.

The state conservationist is to direct the review of channel improvement in his state. The review should be made by an interdisciplinary team of engineers, geologists, plant scientists (biologists, foresters, range conservationists, agronomists), economists, and others, including those from the RTSC as appropriate.

The initial objective of this review is to classify (usually by segments) the planned channel improvement (of both natural and artificial channels) into one of the following groups:

#### CRITERIA

##### a. Effect on environment

Group 1: Minor or no known adverse effect.

Group 2: Some adverse effect.

Group 3: Serious adverse effect.

##### b. Conformance to enumerated guidelines

Group 1: Clearly conforms or can be easily modified to conform. Modifications generally limited to minor changes in design and construction methods.

Group 2: Some modifications are needed and can be made readily to conform to guidelines or to reduce or eliminate adverse effects. In addition to changes in design and construction methods, changes may include realignment, greater stability, and additional mitigation features.

Group 3: Major modifications, possibly including reformation, and major changes in purpose or scope needed to reduce adverse effects to an acceptable level. Changes may include reduction in amount of channel improvement, substitution of clearing and snagging for excavation, smaller capacity where appropriate, and substantially more mitigation measures.

##### c. Economic justification

Group 1: Benefit-cost ratio clearly favorable, using current estimated costs and applicable interest rate.

Group 2: Benefit-cost ratio near unity but appears to be favorable, using current estimated costs for the project as modified and applicable interest rate.

Group 3: Benefit-cost ratio less than unity for measures otherwise in Group 1 or 2. Reevaluation necessary to reaffirm economic justification. For measures otherwise in Group 3, the benefit-cost ratio should be computed in the same manner, using the same criteria that are applicable to new plans.

Channel improvement is to be placed in Group 1 if it meets all the Group 1 criteria; in Group 3 if it meets any Group 3 criteria; and in Group 2 if it meets any or all Group 2 criteria and none of Group 3.

Any channel improvement planned but not installed that is no longer needed or not expected to be installed for any other reason need not be classified into one of the groups. However, the watershed work plan should be amended to delete such work.

In testing for economic justification, update all project cost estimates to reflect (1)

actual costs of work already installed, (2) current construction and other cost levels for work yet to be done, and (3) the applicable interest rate specified in WS Memo-92, as supplemented. Where reevaluation is necessary to reaffirm economic justification (Group 3), give special attention to the limitations stated in WS Memo-84, as supplemented, for using benefits from new land to justify channel improvement.

Complete the grouping of channel improvement measures as soon as practical and in any event by June 30, 1971. Although this initial review necessarily relies heavily on available data and experienced judgment, it should be carried out objectively. Carefully consider comments, reports, and recommendations of other agencies and the public.

As soon as you have completed the review, inform the state and federal fish and game agencies, preferably by personal discussions, of the manner in which the review was carried out and the resulting groupings. Make it clear that they will be invited to assist in modifying projects in Groups 2 and 3. In addition, obtain their comments on or concurrence in projects placed in Group 1. If they express major disagreement, you may wish to reconsider your initial decision and place such projects in Group 2 until further studies are made.

Charge time used for making the review to WP-08 or FP-03 funds. If necessary, state conservationists should request increases in the limitation on the use of such funds.

The channel improvement in the Group 1 can be implemented without further action except for minor changes of design and specifications and of construction drawings already prepared. Work plans with channel improvement in Group 2 are to be supplemented or revised before scheduling or proceeding with additional construction. Plans in Group 3 are to be set aside for complete restudy and reformulation before further construction. If a state conservationist believes that construction should not be delayed for the needed corrective action for any measures in Groups 2 or 3, he must request approval to proceed from the Administrator. Such requests should be limited to an absolute minimum and must be fully supported and justified.

After you have completed the initial review, submit a report of your findings together with enough explanation to make it clear that the review was carried out in accordance with these instructions and guidelines. Submit your report as soon as possible. Do not hold until the deadline date (June 30) if the report is ready beforehand. Submit interim reports as the study progresses if it is convenient to do so and if early construction is contemplated.

*Since the initial review will be based largely on an examination of approved work plans and basic data, it should be considered preliminary and subject to change as more detailed studies are made. For the present, any channel improvement that is on the borderline between two groups should be placed in the more critical group, subject to change with more detailed analysis. (Italics supplied.)*

*Within the near future, I will appoint a Watersheds Environmental Quality Committee. It will be responsible for developing policy and procedures for strengthening the environmental aspects of the watershed program. Its immediate task will be to: (Italics supplied.)*

(1) Provide consultation and additional guidance for carrying out the review of all watershed work plans.

(2) Review the state reports and recommend appropriate action to the Administrator.

(3) Review the need for and place of

channel improvement in the watershed program.

(4) Review and recommend appropriate changes in policy and in planning and design criteria to insure the preservation and enhancement of environmental values in watershed projects.

KENNETH E. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, if SCS has questioned their own policies and procedures and their own channel projects as to their environmental effects, I believe Congress should await the conclusion of this questioning period.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) continued the SCS moratorium through the next fiscal year, with two exceptions:

First, it does not apply to watershed projects where no channel work is involved.

Second, it does not apply to projects involving channelization where any part of the project moved into the construction stage prior to July 1, 1972.

Many of those who have spoken in opposition to the amendment admit that some channelization is environmentally unsound. The SCS has acknowledged that many of its policies and procedures on channelization may be out of date. This being so, 1 year is not too long a time to halt new channelization starts, until these policies and procedures are developed, proposed for public review, and adopted.

I urge adoption of the Reuss amendment.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record strongly opposing the proposed moratorium of all stream channelization under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Public Law 566. Such a moratorium is not a blanket protection of the environment as some would have us believe, because it fails to differentiate between those channel projects which affect the environment adversely and those which protect it. Furthermore, the moratorium on stream channelization totally ignores the multiple use approach of the Department of Agriculture. For years, this approach has guided local officials and the Soil Conservation Service in determining the maximum service potential of any channelization project. In our zealous efforts to protect the environment, it is an unwise policy to condemn categorically a program which, though it may have weaknesses, is making significant efforts to protect the environment.

In the State of Utah alone, three well-designed, environmentally conscious channel projects would be discontinued by a stream channelization moratorium. The planned work along Monroe Creek in the Monroe-Annabella watershed, for example, is a bank protection to culinary water lines, a powerplant penstock, and an access road to a major forest recreation area. Without this proper bank protection, erosion and other damage to these facilities will continue and eventually result in the complete closure of the access road, the powerplant, and loss of the culinary water. In the Dry Fork watershed, offset dikes to contain over-

bank flooding and sections of rip-rap to protect culinary waterlines, bridge abutments, and irrigation diversions are planned along Ashley Creek. Erosion from overbank flooding occurs frequently in this area causing serious damage to the environment. As it relates to this area, it is naive and unwise to halt construction of the offset dikes and rip-rap sections. Without this channel work, the damage to residential and agricultural areas will result in an undue burden on the people in Uintah County and on the environment. Similar conditions would exist if channel work was terminated in the Coal Creek watershed near Cedar City, Utah.

My objections to the moratorium does not suggest any kind of disregard for environmental protection legislation, but rather it is to point out and emphasize that many channel work projects which some are proposing we now stop, were specifically designed to protect the environment. Therefore, it is ridiculous to take the position that all channel work should be stopped. A moratorium on all channel work would be self-defeating since it fails to take into account those projects which are environmentally sound.

Proponents of the Reuss amendment should be reminded that in the more arid States, such as my own, channel work is vital to the entire economy, especially agriculture. Canals, water control, soil conservation, banking projects, and the like are not scars on the landscape, but rather logical, as well as necessary, conservation techniques. Today the State of Utah blossoms like a rose in the desert, because of the imaginative system of canals designed and constructed by early Mormon pioneers. To establish a moratorium on all water channelization in Utah and other arid areas would be an assault against the environment and not a protection of it. To permit erosion, to permit flood damage, to permit the loss of needed culinary water supplies are environmental crimes just as much as water pollution is. My environmental conscience spurs me to oppose the Reuss amendment.

Finally, I want to caution Congress against legislating extremes. For some time, we have neglected the environment and this neglect has allowed industry to rape the environment in the name of progress. But now we pin the title "Environmental Protection" to almost any legislation and expect it to be treated like a sacred cow. Progressive legislation does not necessarily mean leap-frogging from one extreme position to another every time a new political wind blows. Legislation which will benefit the people and the environment must take into quiet consideration the legitimate needs of the people, the constraints of the environment, and a genuine balanced set of priorities.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it would be most unfortunate should the House accept the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin. Stream channelization projects ini-

tiated by the Soil Conservation Service have been valuable conservation measures in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country.

The Reuss amendment is an ill-conceived, blunderous approach that would defer, and perhaps destroy, good projects along with the bad. The prestigious Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin has indicated its strong opposition to this amendment feeling, as I do, that the remedy is too severe and too general for the problem at hand.

Proponents of the Reuss amendment allege that during fiscal 1972 the amendment would eliminate about \$20 million of the \$45 million that the Department of Agriculture would otherwise spend for channelization projects. They further allege that the amendment would insure that plans for 20,000 more miles of channel improvement work planned would be subjected to intensive review and reevaluation.

Where were these figures obtained? They certainly do not jibe with figures provided me by the Soil Conservation Service. Soil Conservation Service advises me that the total costs of channelization in fiscal year 1972 would be about \$10 million, not \$45 million as alleged. They further advise me that in fiscal year 1970 only 404 miles of channel were improved, that a similar amount is anticipated for the coming year, and that all the projects completed to date total only about 6,000 miles of channel. Obviously the possibilities for a poor project are far less than proponents of this amendment would like to believe.

Actually, the channelization program has many built-in checks against environmentally damaging projects. There is a constant process of review and analysis at the local and State levels. At the Federal level, congressional approval of projects is required. In all, the planning process takes from 5 to 10 years, during which time objections can be raised and examined.

Local sponsors invest time and effort in these projects that should not be sacrificed because a few projects under someone else's supervision were poorly planned. The proponents of the Reuss amendment should turn their efforts to uncovering the few abuses of this fine program while allowing the Soil Conservation Service to continue providing the great conservation benefits of the channelization program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. REUSS.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers: Mr. REUSS, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. BLACKBURN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 129, noes 278, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]  
[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—129

Abzug Frelinghuysen Nedzi  
Adams Frenzel Obey  
Addabbo Frey Pelly  
Anderson, Calif. Fulton, Tenn. Pepper  
Annunzio Gallagher Peyster  
Archer Grasso Pike  
Asplin Green, Pa. Pucinski  
Badillo Grover Rees  
Bell Gude Reid, N.Y.  
Bennett Halpern Reuss  
Bingham Hanna Riegler  
Blackburn Harrington Rodino  
Boland Hawkins Roe  
Bolling Hays Rogers  
Brademas Heckler, W. Va. Rooney, Pa.  
Broomfield Heckler, Mass. Rosenthal  
Burke, Fla. Helstoski Rostenkowski  
Carney Hicks, Mass. Roybal  
Carter, Wash. Ryan  
Celler Hogan Sarbanes  
Chisholm Horton Scheuer  
Collier Jacobs Seiberling  
Collins, Ill. Karth Smith, N.Y.  
Conte Kastenmeyer Stafford  
Conyers Keith Stanton  
Cotter King J. William  
Coughlin Koch Steele  
Culver Lent Stratton  
Daniels, N.J. Long, Md. Sullivan  
Danielson McCloskey Symington  
Delaney McKinney Udall  
Dellums Macdonald, Van Deerlin  
Diggs, Mass. Vander Jagt  
Dingell Mailliard Vanik  
Dow Mazzoli Waldie  
Drinan Metcalfe Whalen  
Dwyer Mikva Wolf  
Eckhardt Minish Wydler  
Edwards, Calif. Mitchell Wylie  
Esch Monagan Yates  
Fascell Moorhead Yatron  
Fish Mosher Young, Fla.  
Ford, Moss Zablocki  
William D. Murphy, Ill.  
Fraser Murphy, N.Y.

NOES—278

Abbutt Collins, Tex. Hall  
Abernethy Colmer Hamilton  
Abourezk Colmer Hammer-  
Albert Conable schmidt  
Alexander Crane Hanley  
Anderson, Ill. Daniel, Va. Hansen, Idaho  
Andrews, Ala. Davis, Ga. Hansen, Wash.  
Andrews, Harsha  
N. Dak. Davis, Wis. Harvey  
Arends de la Garza Hastings  
Ashley Dellenback Hathaway  
Aspinall Denholm Henderson  
Baker Dennis Hillis  
Baring Derwinski Hosmer  
Barrett Devine Hull  
Begich Dickinson Hungate  
Belcher Dorn Hunt  
Bergland Dowdy Hutchinson  
Betts Downing Ichord  
Bevill Duncan Jarman  
Biaggi du Pont Johnson, Calif.  
Blester Edmondson Johnson, Pa.  
Blanton Edwards, Ala. Jonas  
Blatnik Ellberg Jones, Ala.  
Boggs Erlenborn Jones, N.C.  
Bow Eshleman Jones, Tenn.  
Bray Evans, Colo. Kazen  
Brinkley Evins, Tenn. Keating  
Brooks Findley Kee  
Brotzman Fisher Kemp  
Brown, Mich. Flood Kluczynski  
Brown, Ohio Flowers Kuykendall  
Broynhill, Va. Flynt Kyl  
Buchanan Foley Kyros  
Burke, Mass. Ford, Gerald R. Landgrebe  
Burlerson, Tex. Forsythe Landrum  
Burlison, Mo. Fountain Latta  
Burton Fulton, Pa. Leggett  
Byrne, Pa. Fuqua Lennon  
Byrnes, Wis. Galifianakis Link  
Eyron Garmatz Lloyd  
Caffery Gaydos Lujan  
Camp Gettys McClure  
Carey, N.Y. Giaimo McClure  
Carter Gibbons McCollister  
Casey, Tex. Goldwater McCormack  
Cederberg Gonzalez McDade  
Chamberlain Goodling McDonald,  
Chappell Gray Mich.  
Clancy Green, Ore. McEwen  
Clark Griffin McFall  
Clawson, Calif. Griffiths McKay  
Clausen, Don H. Gross McKeivitt  
Clawson, Del. Hagan McMillan  
Cleveland Haley Mahon

Mann Quillen  
Martin Rallsback  
Mathias, Calif. Randall  
Mathis, Ga. Rarick  
Matsunaga Reid, Ill.  
Mayne Rhodes  
Meeds Roberts  
Melcher Robinson, Va.  
Michel Robison, N.Y.  
Miller, Calif. Roncallo  
Miller, Ohio Rooney, N.Y.  
Mills, Md. Roush  
Mink Roussetot  
Mizell Roy  
Mollohan Rutpe  
Montgomery Ruth  
Morgan St Germain  
Myers Sandman  
Natcher Satterfield  
Nelsen Scherle  
Nichols Schmitz  
Nix Schneebeli  
O'Hara Schwengel  
O'Konski Scott  
O'Neill Sebelius  
Passman Shipley  
Patman Shoup  
Patten Shrver  
Perkins Sikes  
Pettis Skisk  
Pickle Skubitz  
Pirnie Slack  
Poage Smith, Calif.  
Poff Smith, Iowa  
Powell Snyder  
Preyer, N.C. Spence  
Price, Ill. Springer  
Price, Tex. Staggers  
Pryor, Ark. Stanton,  
Quie James V.  
Steed

Steiger, Ariz. Steiger, Wis.  
Stevens Stephens  
Stuckey Stuckey  
Talcott Talcott  
Teague, Calif. Teague, Tex.  
Teague, Tex. Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J. Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis. Thomson, Wis.  
Thone Thone  
Tiernan Tiernan  
Ullman Ullman  
Veysey Veysey  
Vigorito Vigorito  
Waggonner Waggonner  
Wampler Wampler  
Ware Ware  
Watts Watts  
Whalley Whalley  
White White  
Whitehurst Whitehurst  
Whitten Whitten  
Widnall Widnall  
Wiggins Wiggins  
Williams Williams  
Wilson, Bob Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Charles H.  
Winn Charles H.  
Wright Wright  
Wyatt Wyatt  
Wyman Wyman  
Young, Tex. Young, Tex.  
Zion Zion  
Zwack Zwack

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson, Edwards, La. Podell  
Tenn. Gubser Purcell  
Ashbrook Hébert Rangel  
Brasco Holifield Rannels  
Broyhill, N.C. Howard Saylor  
Cabell Long, La. Stokes  
Clay McCulloch Taylor  
Dent Madden Terry  
Donohue Minshall  
Dulski Morse

So the amendment was rejected.  
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.  
The Clerk read as follows:

REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COM-  
MODITIES (SECTION 32)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; (3) not more than \$3,374,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961; and (4) in addition to other amounts provided in this Act, not more than \$181,758,000 (including not to exceed \$2,000,000 for State administrative expenses) for (a) child feeding programs and nutritional programs authorized by law in the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, as amended; and (b) additional direct distribution or other programs, without regard to whether such area is under the food stamp program or a system of direct distribution, to provide, in the immediate vicinity of their place of permanent residence, either directly or through a State or local welfare agency, an adequate diet to other needy children and low-income persons determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be suffering, through no fault of their own, from general and continued hunger resulting from insufficient food.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 40, line 8, after the word "amended" insert

a comma and the following: "of which \$11,225,000 shall be available, in addition to other funds available, for the summer programs of the nonschool feeding program".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it was called to the attention of the subcommittee that funds were insufficient for the nonschool feeding program for the coming summer. This bill is for the coming fiscal year beginning July 1, and we can hope it will be signed before then. The chances are of course, it will not.

Whether it is or not, it was the belief of the committee that we should make additional funds available in the amount of \$11,225,000 from section 32 funds for the nonschool feeding program, which will bring the total available in this bill to the full amount authorized by law, which is some \$32 million.

It is to be hoped that this bill will be signed in time for us to meet the immediate need. If not, there is still reason for the committee amendment and the other matter will have to be handled in another way.

The committee is in agreement. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are in agreement, and we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the food stamp program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, \$2,001,184,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 42, line 9, delete the period after the figure "\$2,001,184,000" and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 to make food stamps available for the duration of a strike to a household which needs assistance solely because any member of such household is a participant in such strike."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order that the amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. May I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is obviously couched in the form of a limitation, and, like the other points of order that have been made today, the question before the Chair, of course, is whether or not this is a genuine limitation or whether it constitutes legislation imposing certain duties on the executive branch. In making that determination, the Chair will have to look at the question of whether the duties imposed on the Executive are purely ministerial, such as determining a date by which a project began, or such as receiving some sort of certification from the applicant for funds. In that case the duty would clearly be ministerial, and the point of order would not lie. However, I submit in this case the duty imposed on

the administrative officer is considerably more than ministerial in nature, and indeed is a duty and a burden of making a determination which probably in this case, Mr. Chairman, would have to be even preceded by an investigation.

Let me point out to the Chair why I believe that is the case. If you will look at the Michel amendment it refers to making food stamps available for the duration of a strike and the administrative officer has to determine exactly when the strike began, and when it terminated. It speaks of members of the household who are participants in such a strike, and he has to determine whether or not the absence from the work place of the particular individual was due to his participation in support of a strike or was due to the fact that the plant had been closed down by a strike in which he was not participating, or for some other reason.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think, and most critically, the administrative officer is asked to determine whether or not the need for assistance arises solely, solely, because any member of such household is a participant in such a strike. Obviously it would not be enough to determine that the application was from a household in which a member was a participant in the strike, but he would have to look into the qualifications of that household to determine whether that is the only reason.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment does impose additional duties on the Executive, and it is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation and should be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I contend that it is strictly a limitation on an appropriation bill prescribed by the Holman rule. To do so it must be negative on its face. It must show a retrenchment. It must not impose, the gentleman from Michigan implies, any additional duties on administrative officers of the Federal Government, and it must be germane. In reverse order, I submit that it is germane, and frankly, there are no additional administrative duties imposed on the Department, for it is simply a question of those at the local level either saying yes, it is qualified, or no, it is not qualified. If you qualify strictly on the grounds that a member of the family heretofore unqualified becomes eligible, because one member of that family is on a strike, then there is really no additional duty imposed here whatsoever. It is simply a question of whether or not the local people administering the program respond affirmatively or negatively in the response.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit it is a retrenchment and is certainly negative on its face and that the point of order should not lie.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment to which the gentleman from Michigan has raised a point of order. As the Chair reads the amendment, its language is completely negative. No affirmative duties are spelled out.

However, it is obvious that a certain screening process is required.

The question is: whether this duty of discerning whether the amendment is to apply in a specific case destroys the nature of the limitation. It is obvious that the application of any limitation which denies funds to a particular program or a particular beneficiary requires someone to determine in each case whether the language of the limitation is controlling.

The pending amendment appears to require no more than that.

The Chair has had the opportunity to examine several precedents wherein amendments were offered to impose certain qualifications upon the recipients of appropriations.

In one case, on July 31, 1969, Chairman HOLIFIELD held in order as a valid limitation an amendment providing that no part of the funds carried in the pending bill might be used for financing assistance to students who have engaged in force or have used the threat of force to prevent other students from carrying out their duties or studies.

In another case, on June 9, 1941, Chairman Lanham held in order an amendment denying payment to any person, concern or corporation who employs any person who is a member of any union which encourages a strike, or who employs any person who participates in a strike or any person who seeks to impede the operation of any industry engaged in the national defense.

In those instances the determinations, if any, which Executive officials were called upon to make were held not to destroy the nature of a limitation in the amendment.

The Chair feels that in this case, as in those instances, no substantial affirmative duties are sought to be imposed upon the Secretary which would constitute legislation in violation of clause 2, rule 21.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

(By unanimous consent Mr. MICHEL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most crucial policy questions regarding the food stamp program revolves around the issue of who the program is intended to help—for whom did Congress establish it and for what objectives?

This very basic policy question has become relevant because of the way the program is currently operating, with benefits going not only to those who do not have the resources to help themselves—the involuntarily poor—but also to those who, although having adequate resources to sustain themselves and their families, have chosen not to use them—the voluntarily poor.

Congress debated this issue last year when we considered and enacted legislation to revise and extend the food stamp program. At that time, we made a number of substantial changes designed to expand and redirect the benefits of the program to the genuinely needy, and to

prevent abuse of those benefits by those who can help themselves.

New regulations to administer and carry out the intent of this law have been proposed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and are currently being revised for implementation next month.

Although our efforts last year to focus the program more directly on the needs of the involuntarily poor were successful in many respects, there is one most glaring deficiency which existed in the old program, and, regrettably, has not yet been corrected in the new.

That is the practice of making food stamp benefits available to strikers.

It is unfortunate that the House was unable to speak clearly on this issue last year, for I believe a substantial majority of this body would have reaffirmed the principle and intent we affirmed in other parts of the bill—that food stamp aid should be channeled to the involuntarily poor, and not to those who have the ability to take care of themselves, be they strikers, students or those who simply choose not to work for a living.

The strike is a significant and necessary economic tool for U.S. labor, and has been used responsibly and well to improve the economic conditions of countless millions of workers in this country. But, this is not at issue here, nor is the fact that the strike has also, on occasion, been used irresponsibly and has contributed to our problems of inflation.

The issue is whether or not it is appropriate to make food stamps available to strikers. I contend that, for a variety of reasons, it is both an inappropriate and inequitable use of the food stamp program, and I propose that we take action today on this appropriation bill to correct this inequity.

There is no question that the program has been widely used by strikers throughout the country. Perhaps the best known example is the General Motors strike of last fall, in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that the value of food stamps issued to GM strikers, their families, and others who became unemployed because of the strike "could have been as high as \$6 to \$7 million per month in October and November"—a total of \$12 to \$14 million.

During that same strike, an official of the Ohio Welfare Department was quoted in a national publication as saying:

We're using \$10 million in food stamps a month, and the Federal agency is having trouble getting that amount of stamps printed and to us.

During the lengthy copper strike some 3 years ago, it was estimated that in Montana more than 3,000 families of strikers were certified for Federal food stamps. It is reported that strikers have applied for and have been issued food stamps in St. Louis from time to time, and that food stamps were distributed to Ford strikers and to lumber strikers in California.

In Akron, Ohio, in 1967, food stamp distribution jumped an estimated 200 to 300 percent during strikes in the rubber and construction trades, and a similar

pattern was observed in Lorain, Ohio, during a Ford strike that same year.

Prior to the GE strike in 1969, union leaders reportedly met with public social agencies to discuss in advance the problems strikers might run into during a long strike, and how they might be helped. The Christian Science Monitor, in December of that year, quoted an AFL-CIO official to the effect that food stamps and surplus commodities distributed to those in need were denied at first to GE strikers in Tyler, Tex.; Louisville, Ky.; Jackson, Miss.; and Hickory, N.C.; but that these problems were cleared away either through Federal-court orders or "the good efforts of the Department of Agriculture."

I am sure that many of my colleagues have other examples, but it is evident from those I have just cited that the use of food stamps by strikers is widespread, and has been for several years.

Providing food stamps to those who voluntarily stop work in order to improve their pay or employment benefits is not only contrary to the purpose of the program, it also constitutes an unwarranted intrusion by Government into the labor-management bargaining process. It tips the scales to labor's advantage in a situation where the Federal Government should remain as neutral as possible.

Besides that, it has the additional effect of reducing the total amount of program funds which could otherwise be made available to those who really need help and have nowhere else to turn.

It is well to note at this point that strikers are, in most cases, eligible for much more than just food stamps. They often qualify for public assistance, unemployment compensation, emergency aid, and other types of public help in addition to their union strike benefits.

In fact, one case has been cited where a worker in California could collect, through a combination of aid forms, \$41.65 in excess of his weekly net pay of \$91.35 prior to striking—From a study, "Food Stamps and Strikes: the Nature of the Problem."

It has really been only during the past 10 years or so that substantial benefits have been available to strikers. Back in 1960, a 16-day strike by steelworkers was underwritten by about \$45 million from public relief agencies. And, I have just given some examples of what has happened since the food stamp program was enacted.

The effects of the availability of this kind of assistance to strikers are extremely difficult to measure. Does it provide an incentive for workers to strike, and to stay out longer when they do?

A comparison of strike statistics for 1960—10 years ago—with statistics for last year—1970—is illuminating and not a little bit shocking.

In 1960, there were 3,333 strikes involving 1,320,000 workers or about 2 percent of the civilian labor force, and some 19,100,000 man-days were lost due to those strikes.

In 1970, there were 5,600 strikes involving about 3,300,000 workers or 4.2 percent of the civilian labor force, with an

estimated man-day loss of—get this—62 million.

In other words, the number of strikes has almost doubled between 1960 and 1970, the percentage of the labor force involved in strikes has more than doubled, and the loss of man-days has more than trebled.

Food for thought, is not it?

My amendment provides that no funds under this act can be used during the next fiscal year to provide food stamps for the duration of a strike, to a household which needs assistance solely because a member of that household is on strike.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the gentleman in the well on my time this question. Would the gentleman's amendment deny to the children of workers the benefit of these food stamp allotments?

Mr. MICHEL. If the family—if the breadwinner of the family is on strike—yes.

Mr. BURTON. So then the gentleman is proposing that children living in a family with income qualifying them for food stamps do without food?

Mr. MICHEL. Only if the breadwinner is engaged in a strike.

I made that specific that if a family normally otherwise is qualified for food stamps, there would be nothing to deny them.

But if then one of the breadwinners was on strike, the situation would be different.

Mr. BURTON. Is there anything in existing law that precludes management from applying for and receiving food stamps?

Mr. MICHEL. There is nothing to preclude anybody currently as long as he qualifies.

Mr. BURTON. Or is it not the point that management stays on the payroll and they can feed their family while a worker who is on strike runs the risk of his family starving to death.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman can very well make that point on economic grounds. I am just saying that if we are going as a national policy to make it a flat rule that anyone on strike can qualify, then it seems to me in the delicate labor-management negotiation we have to take that into account because it does upset the normal balance.

Mr. BURTON. I would think that a child in any family that has that much income so that they qualify for food stamps should not become a political or economic football. Those kids should be fed and that is the reason why a great number of us voted for the program to begin with.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) since I believe he had not concluded his statement.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I just had a couple of other points I wanted to make here.

Anyone who was eligible for food stamp benefits before a strike would not be af-

ected by the amendment—he could continue to be eligible during the strike as long as he met the program qualifications.

But, anyone who would become eligible for benefits under the present program only because his income is lowered due to the fact that he is on strike, would, under the terms of my amendment, no longer have food stamps made available to him.

As I pointed out earlier, this is a basic policy question, and one which needs a decision now. Do we continue to provide public support and assistance for those who can help themselves?

Do we continue to require the U.S. taxpayer to underwrite not only the responsible strikes called for legitimate reasons, but also the irresponsible ones which only add fuel to the fires of inflation?

Or, do we say to strikers what we have said to students, to hippies, and others—"Yes, if you really need food stamps, they are available to you, but if you are one of the voluntarily poor, you must look to your own resources for help."

I think this is what we ought to say, and we can do it by supporting this amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this statement and then I will yield back my time since the hour is getting late.

Several years ago I offered a similar amendment which was adopted. This was in those dear old days beyond recall when we had no recorded teller votes. The amendment was adopted and when we got to the record vote stage, and after the conference, it failed.

I think the gentleman in the well is exactly correct. I support his point of view and compliment him for the logic of his presentation.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment and to urge all my colleagues to oppose it whether they are pro-union and pro-labor or anti-union and anti-labor in their views.

Suppose a man goes to work in a factory. The employees vote on whether or not to have a union. He votes against it. However, the majority vote for it, and under the laws established by this Congress, a union would be in the factory.

Suppose, then, the union calls for a strike vote. He again votes "no," but the majority votes to strike. Again the union under the laws of the land would be on strike.

Should this man, his wife and children be denied food stamps? Eligibility for food stamps, as I understand, is determined on the basis of hunger and not on whether the man is employed, unemployed, striking or not striking. In fact, where the need exists, food is provided for the families of men who are in the penitentiary. It has never been the American tradition to starve those with whom we disagree.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Very rarely do I ask to take the floor of the House. I think I deserve a few minutes to voice my support for this amendment.

I want to say in regards to what was said a minute ago that I am not pro-labor or pro-industry. I have absolutely no objection to food stamps going to those who are actually in need. But I do object, and I object vigorously to giving aid to those who are idle because of their own choosing.

I have a letter from the president of a company in the State of Pennsylvania. This is a small company. I believe he said he employs about 400 individuals. His people went out on strike. At the time I received the letter they had been on strike 13 weeks. He said he had attempted to negotiate in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, I see my cheering section has just arrived. I am glad to have them here.

As I was saying, the president of this company has been attempting to negotiate in good faith. He was having absolutely no success in doing so. They were on strike for 13 weeks. But this is the important thing. The second day of the strike, solicitors from the local office were in the picket line signing up people for food stamps.

I submit to you that, to my way of thinking, at least, is not completely in order. The strike continues simply because they are getting the food stamps and they are still fed.

This president told me in his letter—I have not verified this, but I assume he knows what he is talking about—that some of those strikers were getting as much as \$106 for an outlay of \$2. I submit to you that is a pretty good deal for anybody.

Mention was made of the General Motors strike last year, and I mentioned this before on the floor of the House. The General Motors strike, as was just said by a former speaker, cost you and me as taxpayers and the taxpayers of America something between \$12 and \$14 million. The Teamsters strike that occurred just about the same time—I asked the Department of Agriculture the cost of that. They did not have it. But I do know that that strike, in which about 15,000 people participated, started early in May and continued through July. So that will give you some idea of how much that strike cost you and me as taxpayers.

Food stamps definitely do prolong strikes. One General Motors strike was settled last year. I quote a striker's words:

They cannot starve us out now. We are getting food stamps. We can go on forever.

Under this system that some are proposing collective bargaining now becomes food bargaining, and I do not think we want that in America.

I am standing here in vigorous support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee.

(On request of Mr. WHITTEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 7:15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. O'HARA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely significant amendment.

I should like to review briefly with the Members of the Committee some of the history which lies behind it. As the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) mentioned earlier, in 1967 the House voted on food stamp amendments and the House included, by a nonrecorded teller vote, a provision prohibiting strikers from participating under the food stamp program.

When the conference report was returned, that provision had been stricken by the conference. A vote was held on the question of insisting on the House provision. There was a rollcall vote. The House sustained the conference position. I was a member of that conference.

One of the strongest arguments against the anti-striker provision raised in the conference was raised by a Member of the other body, a member of the Republican Party, who said he could not support this amendment because he knew of many cases in his own State where workers who had opposed a strike were nonetheless forced out of work, when the strike was called by a majority of the locals in an international union. He thought it grossly unfair to deny all those workers and their families the opportunity for participation. The conference committee was persuaded.

The amendment now before us makes no distinction between strike supporters and strike opponents. It makes no distinction between members of one local opposed to an industrywide strike and members of locals supporting such a strike. It raises possible questions of interpretation and enforcement impossible to resolve except by a manifestly unfair lumping of all workers into a specially disadvantaged class.

We must remember that the strike is a legal instrument of bargaining in the United States. It is recognized as such in many Federal acts and statutes. No one likes to see a strike occur. It represents almost always a failure of collective bargaining. But a strike is usually legal and opinion is almost always divided as to its cause. Obviously, strikes can result from unjustified and excessive

union demands. But strikes can also result from proper demands unjustly refused. The implication behind this amendment is that the strike itself is an evil and all strikers are miscreants who should be punished, and not otherwise eligible. They alone but their families as well. We do not even treat criminals this harshly. Nothing in the Food Stamp Act prohibits any family from receiving food stamps if the head of the family has been convicted of a crime, if the head of the family has been incarcerated or imprisoned for a crime.

Yet the suggestion of this amendment is that somehow, although we allow families of convicts to receive food stamps, we allow families of those in jails and correctional institutions to receive food stamps, the family of a striker must be denied. Never mind how many children go hungry, never mind if the worker has any control or responsibility for the strike, never mind that in any case he is a law-abiding worker who has held a job, supported his family, paid his taxes—support the children of family deserters and criminals but starve the children of striking workers. And all this in the name of fairness? This is worse than nonsense. In its effect and consequence this amendment is malicious and vindictive.

If we approve this amendment why not go further and deny all public services to the striker and his family.

Or why not really be "neutral" as the sponsors of this amendment suggest. We could deny the corporate side some public benefits such as Government contract payments and strike loss tax deductions for a start.

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

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I agree with what the gentleman from Washington is saying.

I should like to call one more thing to the attention of the Committee. Collective bargaining has for years depended upon economic might. There is some question as to the total validity of this, but I submit that collective bargaining should not include the question of whether or not even bona fide union strikers can feed their families.

Mr. FOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

In the amendments offered to the food stamp bill last year the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, adopted, and the House later adopted, stringent work requirements which apply to those on strike. Those requirements require that every able-bodied person not exempt by reason of age or physical inability to work register and accept work at the minimum State or Federal wage, and in the case of strikers the only exception to that work requirement is that the worker may not be required to accept work in the struck plant. That is the only exception.

So now we have an entirely new situation that did not apply on previous

occasions when the House considered this issue. Every striker must now accept a job suitable or otherwise if available at a minimum wage and that income is going to be counted against his eligibility for food stamps. Because of the adoption of that amendment in the committee, sponsored by the distinguished chairman (Mr. POAGE), the Committee on Agriculture rejected in the committee a proposal similar to the one now offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I think most of the Members of this body know that the Committee on Agriculture is not one that is marked by a reputation for liberal philosophy. In fact, it is considered by some to be the most conservative committee of the House.

The Poage work requirement once adopted made an additional antistrike amendment appear to a majority of the committee to be both unnecessary and unfair.

When we considered the food stamp amendments on the floor in December, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT) to exclude strikers. That amendment was defeated. Now that was the proper place to consider any such amendment, not in this appropriation bill. The House acted wisely then; it should confirm that action today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the House really wishes to support a proposal which aims at holding for economic ransom the welfare and health of children.

The Congress has sought through food stamp legislation to provide nutrition to entire families. Indeed, the Family Nutrition Act was one of the suggested titles of a previous food stamp bill. This amendment cannot be justified by any public good that could come of it; none can. It is at its base mean-spirited, vindictive and vengeful. It will not bring better relations between management and labor or stop strikes or promote industrial harmony. It can only bring hunger and suffering, most tragically to children, so often the helpless victims of adult conflict and cruelty.

In their interest alone this amendment should be decisively, and I hope finally, defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) for this reason: All strikers are not engaged in some bad activity, so that we must punish them. Let us look at this in this way: It may be the point of view of some that all strikers are right, or by others that all strikers are wrong, but that is not the case. After a strike goes on for a while, the issue might even change. In that case, the question of justice on the part of management or labor might be altogether different from when the strike started.

At least there is a limitation on the length of time—6 weeks or 7 weeks—that strikers must have been out on strike

before they gain some benefits in some other programs as in the case of New York and Rhode Island for unemployment insurance. Also, as has been pointed out before, some of the people who are out on strike and belong to the union voted against it.

They do not want any part of the strike, but they are involuntarily out of work just as anybody else is who has been fired from his job and is unable to secure employment because of some Federal contract that has been taken away from a company. So I believe that this amendment certainly is imperfect and should not be adopted. If we want to look at certain instances where a striker should not receive food stamps, then we ought to address ourselves to that and limit it to that case as we did with students last year.

As has been stated by others, the Food Stamp Act passed last year was drafted as equitably as we could. A striker must qualify because of low income and assets just as anyone else in order to receive food stamps. He also must register for work and take the work offered him like anyone else. If he refuses, his whole family is refused the benefits of food stamps.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make this point: In this particular debate it is clear that the strike is an obsolete weapon in the economic conditions under which we have labored for some time. When something becomes obsolete, it distorts the relationships throughout the whole society and so it has come to be.

Mr. Chairman, I began in life as the son of a coal miner. My father was a worker in the union and I remember when he talked about the "brotherhood" in labor. But the brotherhood has broken down because now under the situation that exists, if you are in transportation and if the flow of goods is involved you have everyone by the throat. If you have them by the throat, you are in an excellent position to use the weapon of the strike even though it hurts your other brothers. As has been pointed out you get an advantage because of the way the strike as a weapon affects the interrelationships in our society.

What we are seeing here is simply a demonstration that the strike has reached the end of its time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I have been a corporate lawyer for 22 years and served 17 years as a member of the law department of one of the largest corporations in the world.

Every strike is a tragedy. Let us face the fact that the average striker is powerless to decide whether he will go on strike or not. How can we put ourselves in the position of penalizing his family and his children for what has been done by these huge contending forces over which he

has no control. The striker's rent goes on, his kids still need shoes, his doctor's bills still go on.

Mr. Chairman, at the very least we should see that his children do not starve.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, I doubt if there will be any new arguments presented in these closing minutes of the debate. So, I am concerned more about what this amendment tells America about the House of Representatives as much as I am concerned about the equities between the contending forces.

I cannot imagine how we could sit here at this hour at this point of the debate and have my good friend who offered the amendment say, "Well, if there are children in the family, they will not get any food stamps either."

Could the gentleman suggest to me what, precisely, are those children to do if their parent is out on a strike which he may not even have supported? Does the gentleman have any recommendation that we might carry back to the children of those families as we discuss this bill here tonight?

Mr. MICHEL. What do you suppose the children were doing before we had the food stamp program in a situation like that?

Mr. CONYERS. They were starving, sir; they were starving.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It imposes an indefensible hardship upon the families of workers involved in a work stoppage.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have not seen an iota of evidence or proof that the food stamp program has in any way either prolonged a strike or led to a strike. I believe the food stamp program has helped those families who very often are innocently involved in a work stoppage, people who might even be opposed to the strike themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield the rest of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) to explain the rationale in penalizing families involved in work stoppages when often they may not have anything to say about the strike itself?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in further answer to the question posed by the previous gentleman, for goodness' sakes, before food stamps there was a strike fund in the union to take care of situations like that.

Now, what you have done in the Federal Government by the food stamp program is supplant what normally was laid aside as a strike fund by the union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The whole concept of our Government is based on the fact that we are trying to improve conditions in this country, and the food stamp pro-

gram has been one of those programs to do that.

Mr. MICHEL. I am just saying that it is upsetting what traditionally has been that delicate balance in labor-management negotiations. If you are going to have a national policy on this, then I think in the future in negotiating the contracts that that should be taken into account as a heavily weighted factor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the sponsor of this amendment has referred to the experience of the General Motors strike of last year. Although this strike was felt throughout the United States, our State of Michigan, with its great concentration of auto workers, probably felt its impact more than any other State. But lest the record here be left with the implication that General Motors would support the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois, it should be made very clear that—and I believe my Michigan colleagues on both sides of the aisle will concur with me—that General Motors did not take this position. It is my recollection that when the issue of whether or not the General Motors strikers should receive food stamps in Michigan was raised, the spokesman for General Motors took the position that this was not a proper issue to be considered by labor and management, that this was not an issue for the collective bargaining process.

I believe that it was the position of General Motors that they had no desire to have a child's right to be fed affected by the strike, and they did not want the economic issues between labor and management settled on the basis of the hardship of hunger being imposed on children.

This was the consistent position of General Motors as I recall it. Whether or not it is reasonable to feed children was never an issue between labor and management.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply reiterate and underscore a point made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) and that is that the recent food stamp legislation we adopted had a very stringent work requirement in it. That work requirement is that every person who desires to receive food stamps, whether or not he is on strike from a job he formerly held or hopes to go back to, that every person who desires to receive food stamps must register for and accept work that is offered to him.

So the only difference that would be made in that requirement by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is that unlike the food stamp bill which does not require him to go back to that struck plant that he was working at, the only difference is that the Michel amendment would.

It seems to me that with the stringent work requirements we already have, that

the striker must register for and accept any employment that is offered him at the minimum wage, State or Federal, it would be inappropriate to add to it the requirement imposed by this amendment that he also be willing to go back and return to the struck plant from which he is presently out because of a dispute over wages and working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not a part of the bill, and as the chairman of the subcommittee, I should stand by the subcommittee's position. I also know that this is a highly emotional matter in some areas, and it is a highly controversial matter, and it was not considered by the committee. I feel that an issue of this type should be handled by a legislative committee, with a chance to hear all sides. For these reasons, I expect to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

## TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. MICHEL, FOLEY, WHITTEN, and SCHERLE.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were: ayes 172, noes 225, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

## AYES—172

Abbutt	Devine	Jones, N.C.
Abernethy	Dickinson	Keating
Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Kemp
Andrews, Ala.	Dowdy	Kuykendall
Archer	Downing	Kyl
Arends	Duncan	Landgrebe
Baker	du Pont	Landrum
Baring	Edwards, Ala.	Latta
Belcher	Erlenborn	Lennon
Betts	Esch	Lujan
Blackburn	Eshleman	McClory
Bow	Findley	McClure
Bray	Fisher	McCollister
Brinkley	Flowers	McEwen
Broomfield	Flynt	McKevitt
Brotzman	Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan
Broyhill, Va.	Fountain	Mann
Buchanan	Frenzel	Martin
Burke, Fla.	Frey	Mathias, Calif.
Burleson, Tex.	Fuqua	Mathis, Ga.
Byrnes, Wis.	Galifianakis	Mayne
Byron	Gettys	Michel
Camp	Gibbons	Miller, Ohio
Carter	Goldwater	Mills, Md.
Casey, Tex.	Goodling	Minshall
Cederberg	Griffin	Mizell
Chamberlain	Gross	Montgomery
Chappell	Grover	Myers
Clancy	Haley	Nelsen
Clausen,	Hall	Nichols
Don H.	Hammer-	Passman
Clawson, Del	schmidt	Pettis
Collier	Harsha	Pirnie
Collins, Tex.	Harvey	Poff
Colmer	Hastings	Powell
Conable	Henderson	Preyer, N.C.
Coughlin	Hillis	Price, Tex.
Crane	Hosmer	Quillen
Daniel, Va.	Hunt	Rarick
Davis, S.C.	Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Jarman	Rhodes
Dennis	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Derwinski	Jonas	Robinson, Va.

Robison, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.	Veysey
Rogers	Snyder	Waggoner
Rousselot	Spence	Wampler
Ruth	Stafford	Ware
Sandman	Steiger, Ariz.	Whalley
Satterfield	Stephens	White
Scherle	Stubblefield	Whitehurst
Schmitz	Stuckey	Wiggins
Schneebell	Talcott	Williams
Schwengel	Teague, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Scott	Teague, Tex.	Winn
Sebellius	Terry	Wylie
Shoup	Thompson, Ga.	Wyman
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Sikes	Thone	Zion

## NOES—225

Abourezk	Glaimo	Nix
Abzug	Gonzalez	Obey
Adams	Grasso	O'Hara
Addabbo	Gray	O'Konski
Albert	Green, Ore.	O'Neill
Alexander	Green, Pa.	Patten
Anderson,	Griffiths	Pelly
Calif.	Gude	Pepper
Andrews,	Hagan	Perkins
N. Dak.	Halpern	Peyser
Annunzio	Hamilton	Pickle
Ashley	Hanley	Pike
Aspin	Hanna	Poage
Aspinall	Hansen, Idaho	Podell
Badillo	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Barrett	Harrington	Pryor, Ark.
Begich	Hathaway	Pucinski
Bell	Hawkins	Quie
Bennett	Hays	Railsback
Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Randall
Bevill	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Biaggi	Helstoski	Reuss
Blester	Hicks, Mass.	Riegler
Bingham	Hicks, Wash.	Rodino
Boggs	Hogan	Roe
Boland	Hollifield	Roncalio
Bolling	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Brademas	Hull	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Hungate	Rosenthal
Brown, Mich.	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Roush
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Roy
Burton	Jones, Tenn.	Roybal
Byrne, Pa.	Karth	Ruppe
Caffery	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	Kazen	St Germain
Carney	Kee	Sarbanes
Celler	Keith	Scheuer
Chisholm	King	Seiberling
Cleveland	Kluczynski	Shipley
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Conte	Kyros	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	Leggett	Staggers
Corman	Lent	Stanton,
Cotter	Link	J. William
Culver	Lloyd	Stanton,
Daniels, N.J.	Long, Md.	James V.
Danielson	McCloskey	Steed
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Steele
de la Garza	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Delaney	McFall	Stokes
Dellenback	McKay	Stratton
Dellums	McKinney	Sullivan
Denholm	Macdonald,	Symington
Diggs	Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Mailliard	Tiernan
Dow	Matsunaga	Udall
Drinan	Mazzoli	Ulman
Dwyer	Meeds	Van Deerin
Eckhardt	Melcher	Vanik
Edmondson	Metcalfe	Vigorito
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Waldie
Eilberg	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.	Whalen
Fascell	Minish	Whitten
Fish	Mink	Widnall
Flood	Mitchell	Wilson,
Foley	Mollohan	Charles H.
Ford,	Monagan	Wolf
William D.	Moorhead	Wyatt
Forsythe	Morgan	Wylder
Fraser	Morse	Yates
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	Yatron
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Young, Tex.
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Zwack
Garmatz	Natcher	
Gaydos	Nedzi	

## NOT VOTING—37

Anderson,	Brown, Ohio	Donohue
Tenn.	Broyhill, N.C.	Dulski
Ashbrook	Cabell	Edwards, La.
Blanton	Clark	Ewins, Tenn.
Blatnik	Clay	Gubser
Brasco	Dent	Hébert

Howard	Mahon	Sisk
Ichord	Patman	Skubitz
Long, La.	Purcell	Slack
McCulloch	Rangel	Springer
McDonald,	Beld, N.Y.	Taylor
Mich.	Bunnels	Vander Jagt
Madden	Saylor	Wright

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 507. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the new House appropriation practice of combining so many diverse programs in this one appropriation bill, H.R. 9270, entitled Department of Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Bill, 1972.

This bill amazingly combines programs that impose on the consumer, the worker and his family, high prices, and high price supports on U.S. agricultural commodities and products, which are basic to his cost of living. This action causes more inflation and penalizes every U.S. citizen, old and young. Inflation particularly hurts citizens on fixed wages, salaries, earnings, pensions and social security which this bill forces higher. People with savings, insurance policies and low-income levels are driven near the poverty level. I have always opposed these programs that started out to help the family-type farmer and farm progress, but have turned out to be programs of the biggest aids and subsidies for the bigger type farms, and agriculture corporations. Pity the poor struggling family-type farmer and the consumer under this legislation.

Programs for the benefit of agriculture under this bill total for 1 fiscal year, 1972, the tremendous amount of \$5,258,671,050—that is \$5 billion, not \$5 million. Of this amount \$3,613,331,000 is to restore capital to Commodity Credit Corporation for losses already incurred, causing impairment of the Corporation's capital—then the committee report in this same paragraph outlining larger programs that hurt the consumer and the worker and retired people, points out only \$113 million for five small justifiable programs, which the Agriculture Committee states "Each of these programs and others serve interests far broader than agriculture." This is not the old story of proportion between one horse and one rabbit. But this disproportion for the big farmer and big subsidies and high price supports and against the U.S. taxpayer, the family-type small farmer, the workers, pensioners and all consumers is in the same relation as an elephant and a mouse.

Title II approximates about a million dollars; namely \$932,847,000 for rural development and administrative funds for the Farm Credit Administration. But throwing all these programs together in one big hodgepodge and combining them in one bill with title I certainly is aimed to insure passage of title I. I believe programs totaling \$1 billion in

appropriations deserve a separate appropriation bill and adequate specific debate. This is impossible today under this very cannily contrived procedure.

Title III appropriates about \$3 billion, specifically \$3,126,055,000, for environmental protection. These are programs aimed at improving our environment, including financing the new Environmental Protection Agency and HUD water and sewer grants, watershed protection programs, dams, stream channelization and sedimentary control to halt pollution. Surely these important programs of \$3 billion deserve a separate appropriation bill, to be carefully considered. Instead, they are combined in one bill with inflationary programs for the purpose of carrying the weight and the load of such huge inflationary and deficit-producing programs that have on their own, been running into more and more opposition, and beginning to wake up to the higher taxes, higher food and clothing prices, higher deficits, and higher inflation caused by title I.

Consumer protection and services are provided in title IV and, with what I have pointed out of the dangers in this combined bill, our U.S. consumers and taxpayers are certainly going to need the protection. Title IV provides \$2,763,023,000 for various programs, which I favor. The committee report states:

This chapter provides funds for the Food & Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the work of the Office of Consumer Affairs. It includes \$3.5 billion for the food assistance programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which this Committee has strongly supported including the food stamp and special milk programs. This chapter also includes funds for the Department's consumer protection and regulatory activities including the inspection of meat, poultry and eggs.

This omnibus bill containing all these varied programs brings up the question how a representative conscientiously doing his duty can vote one "aye" or "nay" on the whole lot. Is this bill what the legislative appropriations procedure has deteriorated to? No intelligent person can vote a single vote approving or disapproving the whole mixture of varied programs. So probably it will be worked out by the party leaders on both sides, that the whole \$12-billion-plus batch of conflicting, competing, and costly programs will be pushed through without an embarrassing record vote on final passage. Every appropriation bill should require a record vote so the taxpayers can place responsibility for the Federal spending and budget.

This hodgepodge of programs under this single omnibus bill today shows the definite need for Federal Government reorganization. I must compliment the House Agriculture Committee for its disarming frankness in its statement on page 1 of the report on H.R. 9270:

The bill is divided into four titles—a division which is designed to demonstrate the general impact of the appropriation. Such a division is by no means precise and is subject to individual interpretation because of the multiple benefits derived from the programs funded in this bill.

Believe it or not, I have not changed a single word. They said it themselves.

My reaction as a consumer, taxpayer, and concerned citizen can be summed up in one word: "Ouch."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSTENKOWSKI

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Page 45, after line 7, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make production or other payments to a person, persons, or corporations who knowingly grow or permit to be grown, marihuana, or other such prohibited drug-producing plants on any part of lands owned or controlled by such persons or corporations."

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. The gentleman in the well will be happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. As the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said on one occasion when an amendment was offered by an old friend: "We could not accept the amendment until he made his speech." When the speech is made, I expect to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I learned very early in life to quit when you are ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is that it would prohibit the distribution of funds appropriated under this act to "any person, persons, or corporations, who knowingly grow or permit to be grown, marihuana on any part of lands owned or controlled by them."

Mr. Chairman, my reasons for offering this amendment will be brief and to the point. In recent months, it has come to the attention of the State's attorney of Cook County, Ill., Mr. Edward V. Hanrahan, that in many places in Illinois and, in fact, throughout much of the Midwest, marihuana is growing like weeds on privately owned farmland. This marihuana is often picked by passers-by, and brought into the Chicago area where it is processed for sale or for personal use.

After considerable investigation, Mr. Hanrahan's office concluded that steps taken by local authorities had not been effective, and that Federal authorities have not received sufficient appropriations to permit them to adequately handle this growing problem.

Mr. Hanrahan's report also cited several cases where the private land on which the marihuana was grown benefited from the U.S. Department of Agriculture farm subsidy program.

In many cases, Mr. Chairman, these farmowners are reluctant to take the time or the energy required to eradicate this crop from their property even after they have been asked to do so by both local and Federal authorities. Considering the amount of support that has been given to these farms in recent years by the Department of Agriculture subsidy program, I do not believe it is asking too

much to have these farmers be responsible for what grows on their own land.

I have, in recent weeks, discussed this matter with several lawyers at the Department of Agriculture. They agreed with me that this problem could best be handled legislatively through an amendment to the appropriation bill which is presently before the House. And, after considerable discussion of this matter with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, my amendment was drafted.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment will go a long way toward making those who knowingly violate the law in this manner more cooperative and responsible. I am convinced that this amendment will greatly assist law-enforcement officials in their time-consuming efforts to limit the spread of the growth of the marihuana plant.

I hope that the Members of this House will see my amendment in a favorable light.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having assumed the Chair, Mr. WRIGHT, 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. 9270, making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 just passed and also on the Reuss amendment and that I may have permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5257) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children."

#### THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times case is now in the courts, and it is proper to suspend discussion of the precise legal issues involved. However, it is both timely and proper to underscore now the public policy issues which are raised and particularly to reflect on the role of Congress during the whole period of the war in Southeast Asia.

No lesson emerges more clearly from the Pentagon papers than the need for Congress institutionally to equip itself genuinely and persistently to analyze, interpret, and challenge recommendations and proposals which come to it from the executive branch. Congress must marshal every possible technique and especially adopt its committee operations so that it has footing at least roughly comparable to the executive's.

Congress has a working role and public responsibility different from the executive's. It has a critical and educative role which is unique. It cannot and should not seek an enormous establishment and a vast bureaucracy which somehow duplicates the executive branch.

But what makes no sense is when enormous disparities exist—about 4,000 computers in the executive and at best three in the Congress, mostly operating part time on payroll and housekeeping details. That Congress lacks any real data information capacity of its own is inexcusable. Even more distressing has been the very fragmentary and usually futile ability of important committees to develop independent sources of knowledge and expertise. The House Armed Services Committee for the most part

hears only administration and military spokesmen. The House Foreign Affairs Committee in its principal legislative hearings hears a few outside witnesses but these are usually pro forma or merely polemical without real give and take or sustained analysis.

The Pentagon papers should remind Members of Congress—and those of us on committees dealing with foreign affairs and national security in particular—that we must use the hearing and investigative process in such a way that there is a real confrontation of issues. All too often committee hearings have been echo chambers in which pat positions are rehearsed and ratified and in which no effort is made to draw on outside sources or to build up an independent perspective and body of knowledge. Knowledge, we learn again, is power. And the Vietnam war could have been shortened—possibly even prevented in its aggravated form—if the committees of Congress and the two Houses had been able systematically to test out the administration's contentions against non-governmental witnesses and authorities, and against information and conclusions which Congress had reached on its own.

#### REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO UPON INTRODUCTION OF EMERGENCY CITY RELIEF BILL

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to provide emergency aid to large cities confronted with serious fiscal problems. I offer this bill, H.R. 9335, not as a substitute for revenue sharing but as an emergency authorization to protect against the bankruptcy of large cities or the failure to achieve national objectives as the result of a fiscal crisis in our cities.

The legislation makes the Federal Government the revenue source of last resort for our major cities. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make emergency grants to cities with populations in excess of 500,000 where there is a showing of "serious financial need" and to smaller cities which face an "extraordinary financial crisis." The grants would be earmarked for education, health, housing, and welfare programs approved by Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of a master plan and budget submitted by the city seeking assistance. Housing programs would be cleared with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Cities applying for aid would have to exhaust alternative means for raising the needed revenue. The bill would make the Federal Government the revenue source of last resort for the Nation's large cities—over 500,000—on the basis of a congressional finding that these cities have a great impact on Federal programs and goals and the life of the Nation. For cities with populations of less than

500,000 the bill requires an additional determination by the Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary that there is an "extraordinary financial crisis which gravely threatens the commerce and quality of life of the Nation, where such crisis cannot be met in any other way."

My bill is not a substitute for revenue sharing but an additional program to assure that no major city in the United States will go bankrupt or cause the Federal Government to fail in meeting basic national objectives in meeting human needs. The bill contains an authorization of \$3 billion in emergency funds with a ceiling of \$100 per resident for any city.

Another section of the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake a study of the feasibility of statehood as a long-term solution to the fiscal problems of any city receiving aid under the program. I have supported the idea of statehood for New York City and have called on Mayor Lindsay to appoint a commission to study that proposal last month. The mayor recently announced he would appoint such a panel.

While I support revenue sharing, we must recognize that there may still be cities which cannot survive because of special fiscal emergencies and the lack of available alternatives such as taxing authority. The Federal Government should provide an emergency aid of last resort for those cities.

Mr. Speaker, I place the text of my bill in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues:

H.R. 9335

A bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make emergency relief grants to certain cities experiencing serious fiscal crises

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that—

(1) there is a growing fiscal crisis in cities with populations in excess of 500,000, and the impact of these cities on the life of the Nation is so great as to warrant national concern and emergency Federal aid, and

(2) there are serious fiscal crises developing in some smaller cities, with a similar impact on national goals, priorities, and concerns, and in extreme circumstances, these cities, too, should receive Federal aid.

Sec. 2. For purposes of this Act, "National City" means—

(a) any city with a population of 500,000 or more, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") on the basis of the most recent decennial census, together with updating population projections, in accordance with regulations to be established by the Secretary, and

(b) any smaller city which the Secretary determines to be experiencing an extraordinary fiscal crisis which gravely threatens the commerce and the quality of life of the Nation, where such crisis cannot be met in any other way.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any National City, upon his finding that such city is experiencing serious financial need and that alternative methods of relief have been unsuccessfully attempted. Each such grant shall be made to enable the recipient to carry out a master plan and budget approved by the Secretary as practica-

ble and consistent with the principles and policies of this Act; and each master plan shall specify whether the funds to be granted are to be used for education, housing, health, or welfare programs or some combination thereof. The total of all National City grants shall not exceed \$3,000,000,000 annually.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall, with respect to each master plan relating to housing, consult with, and obtain the approval of, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development before making any grant thereunder.

Sec. 5. No grant to any one City shall be greater than an amount equal to \$100 per resident, and the number of residents shall be determined by the Secretary according to the procedure, and the regulations promulgated, under section 2(a) of this Act.

Sec. 6. The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall conduct a study of any city which receives a grant under this Act, in order to determine the feasibility of statehood as a long-term solution to the fiscal problems of that city, and shall report to Congress the results of his study.

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

#### REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL TO OFFER A MOTION TO ACCEPT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531, THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I intend to offer at the appropriate time a motion to accept an amendment to H.R. 6531, the Selective Service Act Amendments of 1971, which adds a new title V—termination of hostilities in Indochina, the so-called Mansfield amendment.

I hope to have the House agree to this amendment in a separate vote so that we may be on record in support of this attempt to end the war in Vietnam.

The amendment to which I refer is Senator MANSFIELD's amendment to the Selective Service Act that declares that the policy of the United States is to terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all American military forces not later than 9 months after date of enactment of the legislation, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such government.

Mr. Speaker, this is an eminently reasonable, cautious, moderate and fair approach to setting a date for the total withdrawal of all American troops and at last an end to the war in Vietnam.

This section urges and requests the President to take those steps that will lead to an end to this tragic conflict and return of our prisoners.

On March 16, 1971, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, said:

We will maintain a U.S. presence in South Vietnam just as long as the North Vietnamese hold a single American prisoner either in Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam or North Vietnam. We will maintain a presence in South Vietnam until this prisoner of war question is resolved.

The Secretary of State has taken the same basic position, as has the President of the United States.

Regardless of the merits or the folly of the position that allows the enemy to direct our course of action rather than ourselves, we must deal with that position on the part of the administration if we are going to end this war and stop the killing.

I believe this is the vehicle for doing so.

Title V of the legislation is a statement of policy on the part of the United States. It calls for an end to the war subject to the release of all American prisoners of war. It calls on the President to set a final date for the withdrawal of all American forces in Vietnam contingent on the release of all American prisoners of war.

It urges and asks the President to negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for a concomitant phased and rapid withdrawal of all American military forces and the phased release of American prisoners of war.

This title is a positive step to bringing an end to the war without ending one American life and without allowing our prisoners of war to remain suffering and unaided in the hands of the other side.

We call upon the President to establish a final date. Yet we give him a great deal of leeway and I believe do not restrict him in his ability to negotiate nor to withdraw.

In this title we declare that it is the policy of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of all American forces not later than 9 months after the enactment of this act.

We are talking about the 9 months into the future.

If this act were passed and signed by the President next week, then this policy calls for an end to the war by March 30, 1972. No one could call that precipitous withdrawal. I doubt that one could even call it rapid.

Mr. Speaker, if this war cannot be ended in 9 months then I think we can realistically say that it could go on ad infinitum.

If, as Secretary Laird, Secretary Rogers and other administration officials have said, we are really to end the war, if we can guarantee the safety of our troops and of our prisoners of war, then it is inconceivable to me that it could possibly take more than 9 months to do.

I think this is a fair and extremely generous and inordinately moderate.

This does not bind the President into an untenable position. It merely says that it is the stated policy of our Government and the Nation's people to bring about an end to this war through a phased withdrawal and the return of our prisoners no later than 9 months into the future.

I doubt that anyone can quibble with this and if one can, I would like to know when he envisions the end of this war or if he envisions the end of this war.

I ask my colleagues' support for my motion at the appropriate time.

**THE INTEGRITY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM**

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recent attacks on the social security system have been directed toward the capability of the system to meet its commitments to the next generation and beyond. The young worker is urged to question whether his contributions will actually be available for his use in retirement.

His contributions along with the con-

tributions of other employers and employees are placed into three trust funds, the old age and survivors fund, the disability insurance fund, and the hospital insurance fund. As of April 30, 1971, these trust funds totaled \$43 billion, as set forth in the following portfolio of Federal securities:

*Statement of receipts and expenditures—  
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance  
Trust Fund, April 30, 1971*

[In thousands]

U.S. Treasury special issues:	
Certificates of indebtedness: <sup>1</sup>	
5 1/4 percent.....	\$45,203
6 1/8 percent.....	80,516

7 percent.....	20,640
7 1/4 percent.....	19,320
7 1/2 percent.....	48,454
7 3/4 percent.....	14,843
Notes: <sup>2</sup> 7 1/2 percent.....	2,786

Total special issues..... 231,762

U.S. Treasury securities, public issues.....	0
Total public issues.....	0
Total investments (face value).....	231,762

<sup>1</sup> Maturing June 30, 1971.  
<sup>2</sup> Maturing June 30, 1977.

	Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	Federal disability insurance trust fund	Federal hospital insurance trust fund	Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	Federal disability insurance trust fund	Federal hospital insurance trust fund
<b>U.S. TREASURY SPECIAL ISSUES</b>						
Certificates of indebtedness:						
5 1/4 percent due June 30, 1971.....	\$854,461,000.00	\$157,730,000.00	\$142,481,000.00			
5 5/8 percent due June 30, 1971.....	684,625,000.00	260,473,000.00	0			
5 7/8 percent due June 30, 1971.....	483,894,000.00	103,969,000.00	0			
6 1/8 percent due June 30, 1971.....	776,320,000.00	156,587,000.00	662,000,000.00			
7 percent due June 30, 1971.....	0	141,527,000.00	0			
7 1/4 percent due June 30, 1971.....	512,910,000.00	88,165,000.00	0			
7 3/4 percent due June 30, 1971.....	0	63,399,000.00	0			
7 7/8 percent due June 30, 1971.....	0	34,466,000.00	0			
Notes:						
4 1/4 percent due June 30, 1974.....	2,720,279,000.00	309,178,000.00	0			
5 1/2 percent due June 30, 1975.....	2,460,795,000.00	583,612,000.00	400,116,000.00			
6 1/2 percent due June 30, 1976.....	3,844,864,000.00	1,151,608,000.00	729,200,000.00			
7 1/4 percent due June 30, 1977.....	5,033,296,000.00	1,394,466,000.00	919,358,000.00			
Bonds:						
2 1/2 percent due June 30, 1972.....	1,080,011,000.00	0	0			
2 3/4 percent due June 30, 1973.....	1,080,011,000.00	0	0			
2 7/8 percent due June 30, 1974.....	1,080,011,000.00	75,144,000.00	0			
2 9/8 percent due June 30, 1974.....	0	20,738,000.00	0			
2 5/4 percent due June 30, 1975.....	919,934,000.00	132,894,000.00	0			
3 1/4 percent due June 30, 1975.....	160,077,000.00	20,738,000.00	0			
3 3/4 percent due June 30, 1976.....	1,080,011,000.00	153,632,000.00	0			
3 7/8 percent due June 30, 1977.....	0	153,632,000.00	0			
3 5/4 percent due June 30, 1977.....	1,080,011,000.00	0	0			
3 3/2 percent due June 30, 1978.....	658,444,000.00	153,632,000.00	0			
3 5/8 percent due June 30, 1978.....	421,567,000.00	0	0			
4 1/8 percent due June 30, 1979.....	1,080,011,000.00	153,632,000.00	0			
4 3/8 percent due June 30, 1980.....	1,080,011,000.00	125,606,000.00	0			
Total special issues.....	27,091,543,000.00	5,414,828,000.00	2,853,155,000.00			
Marketable securities:						
U.S. Treasury securities, see exhibit A attached (face value).....	2,457,146,250.00	314,995,000.00	0			
Agency securities and participation certificates, see exhibit B attached (face value).....	605,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00			
<b>U.S. TREASURY BONDS, NONMARKETABLE</b>						
2 3/4 percent of 4-1-75/80 investment series B.....	1,064,902,000.00	0	0			
Less: Unamortized premium and discount-net.....	-14,233,857.80	-1,577,320.99	0			
Plus: Accrued interest purchased.....	0	0	0			
Total investments (book value).....	31,204,357,392.20	5,778,245,679.01	2,903,155,000.00			
<b>UNDISBURSED BALANCES</b>						
.....	\$2,975,784,049.62	\$304,020,847.55	\$70,803,059.64			
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>						
.....	34,180,141,441.82	6,082,266,526.56	2,973,963,059.64			
<b>U.S. TREASURY SECURITIES</b>						
Notes:						
5 1/2 percent of 2-15-75.....	7,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0.00			
6 percent of 5-15-75.....	17,450,000.00	3,750,000.00	0			
6 1/2 percent of 5-15-76.....	22,180,000.00	0	0			
6 3/4 percent of 2-15-76.....	5,000,000.00	0	0			
7 1/2 percent of 8-15-76.....	33,000,000.00	0	0			
7 3/4 percent of 8-15-76.....	57,500,000.00	26,000,000.00	0			
8 percent of 2-15-77.....	15,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	0			
7 1/4 percent of 8-15-77.....	0	14,000,000.00	0			
6 3/4 percent of 2-15-68.....	0	2,000,000.00	0			
Bonds:						
2 1/2 percent of 9-15-67/72.....	250.00	0	0			
4 percent of 8-15-71.....	100,000,000.00	0	0			
4 percent of 8-15-72.....	0	2,000,000.00	0			
4 percent of 8-15-73.....	38,000,000.00	16,500,000.00	0			
4 1/4 percent of 2-15-74.....	61,934,000.00	10,000,000.00	0			
4 3/4 percent of 5-15-74.....	6,352,000.00	0	0			
4 1/2 percent of 11-15-74.....	24,500,000.00	5,000,000.00	0			
4 1/4 percent of 5-15-75/85.....	78,023,000.00	20,795,000.00	0			
3 1/2 percent of 6-15-78/83.....	60,200,000.00	0	0			
4 percent of 2-15-80.....	153,100,000.00	33,250,000.00	0			
3 1/2 percent of 11-15-80.....	449,450,000.00	0	0			
3 1/4 percent of 5-15-85.....	25,700,000.00	0	0			
4 1/4 percent of 8-15-87/92.....	33,000,000.00	80,800,000.00	0			
4 1/2 percent of 5-15-89/94.....	91,300,000.00	68,400,000.00	0			
3 1/2 percent of 2-15-90.....	556,250,000.00	10,500,000.00	0			
3 percent of 2-15-95.....	70,170,000.00	0	0			
3 1/2 percent of 11-15-98.....	552,037,000.00	5,000,000.00	0			
Total marketable issues.....	2,457,146,250.00	314,995,000.00	0.00			
Participation Certificates:						
5 1/2 percent F.A.L.T., GNMA 6-29-72.....	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0			
5.20 percent F.A.L.T., GNMA 1-19-82.....	100,000,000.00	0	50,000,000.00			
5.10 percent F.A.L.T., GNMA 4-6-87.....	50,000,000.00	0	0			
6.40 percent F.A.F.T., GNMA 12-11-87.....	75,000,000.00	0	0			
6.05 percent F.A.F.T., GNMA 2-1-88.....	65,000,000.00	0	0			
6.45 percent F.A.F.T., GNMA 4-8-88.....	35,000,000.00	0	0			
6.20 percent F.A.F.T., GNMA 8-12-88.....	230,000,000.00	0	0			
Total participation certificates.....	605,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00			

These trust funds earned \$2.1 billion in interest in fiscal year 1971. Under the provisions of H.R. 1, the Old-Age and Survivors Social Security Trust Funds would rise to \$80.8 billion, and the disability insurance fund would rise to \$14.6 billion in 1980. Twenty years later the Old-Age and Survivors Fund will rise to \$231.6 billion and the Disability Trust fund would rise to \$39 billion.

The growing work force increases at the rate of 1 1/2 percent per year. Today there are 95 million workers contributing to the social security system; by 1980, this will increase to 113 million workers, by the year 2000, 149 million employees

will be covered by the social security system. By the end of the century the covered work force will increase by almost 60 percent.

In any event, although there will be increasing numbers of beneficiaries, the increase in the work force will always be greater than the increase in beneficiaries. This is the basic element in social security financing. The system is as sound as reasonable men can make it.

**HOW COMMUNISTS NEGOTIATE**

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mich-

igan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I read the book "How Communists Negotiate," by Adm. C. Turner Joy, which has a profound significance in light of our present negotiations with the Communists in Paris. Since Admiral Joy was the senior delegate of the United Nations Command for the Korean war talks of the early 1950's he has written from experience and has given an eye-opening analysis of the Communist method.

It is no coincidence that to date we have held 116 meetings with the Viet-

namese Communists since 1968, nor should we be at all surprised by the roadblocks, the broken promises, and the intransigence that have characterized the style used continuously by the other side. These are all tools of a strategy skillfully developed and applied by the Communists and exposed with remarkable clarity in Admiral Joy's book.

Frankly, I considered asking that the entire text—178 pages—of "How Communists Negotiate" be printed in the RECORD but, since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk advises that this would cost approximately \$3,200, this request has not been made, even though the value of the message is beyond calculation. Nevertheless, I cannot recommend this book strongly enough to every American citizen who is concerned about the Vietnam war and our present negotiations in Paris. May I suggest that copies of the book are certainly available at local libraries across the Nation, and that the effort to read the book would be time well spent. To assist in locating the book it should be noted that the Library of Congress catalog number is DS921.7.J6—1955 ed. by Macmillan Co.; 1970 ed. by Fidelis Publications of Santa Monica.

As we begin our fourth year of negotiations in Paris to end the Vietnam war, I wish to summarize the profound insights and observations brought to light by Admiral Joy's book. The real truth and understanding of our frustrations stemming from this drawn-out war are revealed plainly in the pages of "How Communists Negotiate"—the main points are as follows:

**The stage setting:** From the very beginning, Communists try to stage the circumstances for a conference to their best advantage. This might include anything from the site location to the arrangement of the delegations at the conference table. Every attempt is made to get maximum propaganda value from meetings—to portray themselves before the world as the "men in the white hats," or the victors, the humanitarians, the hapless victims of aggression, and so forth—whatever image should suit the occasion.

**The Communist delegation:** Another point the Communists never take for granted is the picking of their negotiating team. Always the attempt is made to select the most skilled and shrewd delegates—those who are slavishly dedicated to the cause and committed to exploiting every weakness of the other side.

**The loaded agenda:** A key point in the Communist method of negotiation is to seek an agenda composed of conclusions favorable to their objectives. This differs from the normal method whereby opposing sides compose a general list of subjects to be discussed. The Communist tactic immediately puts opponents on the defensive, and might be illustrated by the following example:

Americans meeting to discuss arrangements for a ball game might adopt such an agenda:

- First. Place game is to be played;
- Second. Time game is to start; and
- Third. Selection of umpires.

While Communists meeting to discuss the same ball game might submit an agenda like this:

First. Agreement that game is to be played in Shanghai;

Second. Agreement that game is to be played at night;

Third. Agreement that umpires are to be Chinese officials.

**Incidents:** Another favorite tactic in the Communist strategy arsenal is to stage "incidents" calculated to give them a certain advantage in the negotiations. Such incidents are as variable as the imagination is limitless and might, for example, include the staging of an alleged bombing or raid by the other side which they would then denounce as a "breach of faith," and so forth.

**Roadblocks and delay:** For a variety of reasons, the Communists make considerable use of the tactic of delay. By stalling and endless repetition the Communists hope to wear down the resolve and morale of the opposition, to buy needed time for reinforcement of their military position, and to prey on the capacity of the Western nations for sympathy toward the victims of protracted conflict. In short, the Communists might propose that two plus two equals six, and then, by stalling, hope to eventually get the other side to agree that two plus two equals five.

**Watering down concessions:** Knowing full well that they must make certain concessions during negotiations, Communists make every attempt to minimize their losses. By making selective but minimal concessions the Communists achieve several advantages, including taking credit for "good faith"—to concede a few points "for the sake of world peace," also, warding off demands by the opposition for far greater concessions, and reducing the extent of damage done to their side by limiting the extent of the concessions.

**The veto:** When Communists are unable to weaken the magnitude of concessions that must be made, they make every attempt to secure a veto over all machinery of enforcement—by appealing to the lofty aspirations of "unanimous consent" and "universal cooperation" they in reality can effectively stifle all actions not to their liking. Their voting record in the U.N. Security Council is a case in point.

**"Red Herrings":** Indigenous to the Communist method is the technique of the "red herring"—to introduce spurious issues and then use them as bargaining points. This might best be illustrated by the example of the small town car dealer—assuming he had what amounted to a monopoly on all local business—who asked \$1,000 for a car with a true value of \$700. And then while the buyer was arguing about price the seller suddenly introduced an additional requirement that the buyer must further agree to purchase all future cars from this same dealer. Then when the buyer protests this new factor, the seller suddenly offers to drop his extra demand if the buyer will pay \$1,000 for the car. When the buyer refuses, the seller then points out

that he made a "concession" to the buyer to which the buyer must reciprocate or be guilty of "bad faith."

Facing the truth: Communists have two ways of dealing with truth that would work against them: they deny it, or more commonly, they distort it. Typical of the Korean negotiations, the Communists at one point admitted to capturing over 60,000 Allied prisoners of war, but later admitted to holding only 11,000 in captivity. This glaring discrepancy was explained away by pointing out that the remainder of the prisoners were quickly released in "humanitarian" consideration at the front lines. The Communists could thus boast of their military capabilities on the one hand, while covering up their handling of the multi-thousands of prisoners of war for whom they gave no accounting.

**Contempt for compromise:** While the spirit of compromise has long been revered in the United States as a gentlemanly way of concluding differences of opinion, Communists as negotiators regard concessions offered by the other side as a sign of weakness. Instead of surrendering a few of their points to further narrow the gap, the Communists will only stiffen their resistance, thereby hoping to secure even greater concessions from their opponents.

**The welters:** Finally, it is to be remembered that Communists negotiate and make agreements only when it is necessary and to their advantage to do so. Furthermore, Communists maintain a similar attitude toward living up to their agreements. By trumping up false charges as an excuse for reneging on their promises, or by claiming that the other side's interpretation of the agreement was incorrect to begin with, Communists quickly and without the slightest feeling of embarrassment stand ready to deny, reject, or alter any agreement that no longer suits their purpose.

Mr. Speaker, these observations of Admiral Joy as to how the Communists negotiate are entitled to great credence and, regrettably, they remain valid today, as evidenced by the current, tortuous negotiations in Paris. When the bombing halt was announced by President Johnson back in 1968, we had every right to expect, as we had been assured, that prompt and serious negotiations would take place. Now, 116 meetings later, we are still waiting.

As we attempt to evaluate the recent statements made by the chief of the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris to journalists and visiting officials, indicating that the prisoner-of-war issue can easily be settled, it would be well to keep their strategy in mind, as well as the fact that the North Vietnamese have so far refused to make any official offer at the conference table to change their stand to discuss the matter of prisoners if the United States would only set a firm withdrawal date. Surely there is nothing any of us wants more than an end to the war in Vietnam. While we all hope that the North Vietnamese will soon be ready to negotiate a peaceful settlement to that tragic conflict, let us

be mindful of what history has recorded and insist upon some quid pro quo at the bargaining table.

#### REVENUE SHARING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I had the privilege of testifying before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the administration's proposal for general revenue sharing. In the course of my remarks I suggested a number of ways in which the current proposal might be modified to take account of some of the valid criticisms offered by previous witnesses. I also presented to the committee a considerable amount of statistical data that I believe provides solid support for the changes I proposed, and would ask that a copy of my statement and the accompanying tables be included at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of those of my colleagues who might be interested:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1971

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee this morning. I do not think it would be at all an exaggeration to suggest that this series of hearings being conducted by your committee may be one of the most momentous of the 92nd Congress, and, indeed, perhaps for many more to come. At bottom nothing less than the very shape and viability of our Federal system of government is at stake. The decisions this committee will reach in the coming weeks will have consequences for the way we conduct our public affairs for decades. For this reason, I think we are particularly fortunate that this historic piece of legislation has come before your committee, the competence, dedication and farsightedness of which is truly second to none.

Mr. Chairman, in the last three weeks you have heard a long line of mayors, governors and other local officials describe in vivid detail the fiscal crisis that plagues state and local governments all across the land. There is certainly little that I could hope to add to the powerful case for revenue sharing they have presented. By now we are all thoroughly familiar—perhaps depressingly so—with the broad contour of the problem. It is simply that a pervasive "fiscal mismatch" has built up in our Federal system over the past three decades that we will allow to continue unchecked only at our own peril. Already we are beginning to see the early warning signs of breakdown: lay-offs of firemen, policemen and teachers, cutbacks of essential public services, oppressively mounting municipal debt burdens, and timidity and failure to strike out in new and innovative directions because of the ever present budget squeeze. As a result we are faced with a growing public discontent and lack of confidence in the capacity and performance of government at all levels.

Mr. Chairman, the President, the leadership of both parties, the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and for that matter, this committee, have given recognition to this problem. And it is equally true that this broad awareness has spawned no lack of suggestions and proposals as to how we might go about correcting the im-

balance. In light of this, the pressing task before us at present, it seems to me, is to move beyond mere generalities and trading of debating points and see if in some way it might be possible to shape a solution from the most promising and realistic elements of this variety of proposals all directed toward a common problem.

As members of this committee may know, I have been a strong supporter of the particular program for general revenue sharing that has been proposed by the Nixon Administration, and on more than one occasion have made an effort to respond to charges and criticisms leveled against it. For a time, I must confess, the constant hurling of charges and counter-charges lead me to fear that the great national debate on revenue sharing was on the verge of being transformed into a great national stalemate. Yet upon reflection, I think we would all agree that the tugging and pulling that inevitably develops around fundamental innovations like the revenue sharing proposal is a healthy and necessary part of the democratic process and something none of us need regret having taken part in.

But now I think the time for that is past. The idea of general revenue sharing was first seriously proposed almost 15 years ago. In the mid-sixties a high-level Presidential task force developed a concrete mechanism for incorporating the concept into our Federal system. During the last three or four years literally scores of bills with hundreds of co-sponsors have been submitted. In the last six months revenue sharing has been a major and persistent topic of national attention. The opening of these hearings therefore, both seals the culmination of this long process of public scrutiny and deliberation, and signifies the onset of a new stage in our legislative process: the stage at which all of us must be prepared to yield on the particular details of our own favored approach and move toward a resolution or compromise that can command the support of a majority of the Members of Congress and a broad spectrum of the American public.

In particular, there are certain aspects of the approach that I have strongly favored which have received considerable critical discussion—much of which I must concede is not without real merit—that I want to discuss in the spirit in which I have just spoken. These are first, the question as to whether the distribution formula for pass-through funds to local governments might be improved; second, whether or not it would be desirable to structure stronger incentives into the program for progressive taxes at the state level; and third, whether or not a greater effort should be made to avoid reinforcing the fragmentation and miniaturization that sometimes reduces the effectiveness of local government in many areas of the nation.

I

Probably no aspect of the Administration's revenue sharing has ignited more controversy than the "revenue only" formula for distributing pass-through funds among local units of government. The impression has developed that this formula will result in the funneling of funds to affluent areas where resources are already ample and in discrimination against communities where the problems and needs are greatest. As one senior member of the other party stated in a speech on the House floor some months back, "from him that hath shall be taken away, even that little which he seems to have" and presumably, I might add, giving to the affluent communities which already have more than enough resources to meet their needs. And, of course, we have been presented with a steady stream of examples

of communities like Beverly Hills, Shaker Heights, Winnetka and Newton slated to receive many times more per capita under the current formula than some of their less affluent neighbors.

I can understand that situations like these tend to raise questions about the equibilty and fairness of the formula, and in a moment I would like to propose what might be one possible way of mitigating this defect. But before moving into that I want to make one basic point about the current formula: simply that these examples constitute the *exception*, not the *rule*. The essential, undisputable fact is that central cities and other units of government with heavy service loads due to large low-income populations tax themselves much heavier than do more affluent communities, and as a result will receive proportionately greater per capita benefits under the Administration's formula. I have included a table (Table I) at the end of my statement which compares revenue sharing per capita for the central cities and suburban rings of 25 leading SMSA's. I think it presents clear evidence that the general revenue sharing funds under the Administration's formula would be strongly biased toward areas of need.

I hope all the members of this Committee will take a look at that table in detail, but let me now just cite a few examples. In my state, Chicago is slated to receive \$14.13 per capita while its outlying suburban communities will average only \$6.31. For St. Louis, the comparable figures are \$24.30 for the central city and \$4.36 for the suburbs. In the case of New York City, the spread is even more dramatic: \$24.06 per capita for the city and \$3.61 for the communities in the remainder of the SMSA. The Philadelphia SMSA exhibits a similar differential with \$20.41 slated for the central city and \$4.35 for its suburbs. I could go on to list other examples, but I think the point should be clear: the central cities tax themselves much heavier and as a result receive the greatest benefits in the "revenue only" distribution formula. Why these truths have been consistently overlooked by some critics, I cannot pretend to understand. Perhaps it is as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Murray Wiedebaum recently noted in this connection: "There seems almost to be a Gresham's law operating here—bad information drives out good."

The reason for this sharp difference in the amount of the per capita distribution of funds between the central cities and their suburbs, of course, is a direct function of tax effort; that is, central cities draw much more heavily upon their potential tax base than do more affluent outlying communities, and as a result raise considerably more revenue per capita. Assuming that aggregate personal income is one important measure of tax capacity, we computed a fiscal effort index for most of the municipalities above 10,000 population in the United States. By fiscal effort I mean simply local revenue raised as a percentage of aggregate personal income or the potential tax base. The results of this analysis, I believe, are quite dramatic and will certainly be of interest to this committee.

In brief, the analysis shows that most central cities make from a 200% to 400% greater, sometimes even larger, use of their tax capacity than do affluent suburban communities. Let me provide just a few illustrative examples. In 1960, San Francisco raised revenues equivalent to 7.01% of its personal income base. For Baltimore and Newark the figures were 4.75% and 10.83% respectively. In the case of New York City, the percentage was even higher—11.49%, and for Philadelphia it was 6.33%. Now compare these figures to those for some of the following well-known affluent suburban communities: Saratoga,

California, with a median family income of \$10,000 in 1960 raised revenue equivalent to only .29% of its personal income or potential tax base; Glencoe, Illinois, with a median income of \$20,000 had a fiscal effort index of .91%; San Marino, California, with a median income of \$16,000 had an index of 1.11%; and East Grand Rapids, Michigan, with a median family income of \$12,000 had an index of 1.13%. For the nation as a whole, the average fiscal effort for the 130 central cities of 100,000 or more was 4.99% compared to an average of 1.85% for the communities with higher than \$8,000 median income in the 10,000 to 25,000 population category, the category that includes most of the nation's affluent suburbs.

In looking through the evidence from this fiscal effort analysis that we have undertaken, I draw two important conclusions. First, because central cities have a tax effort that is on the average three and one-half times greater than the more affluent communities, they are going to receive significantly larger amount of funds even on a straight revenue formula in the current proposal, but, second, and perhaps more importantly, if this straight revenue formula were modified to reflect fiscal effort as well as revenues raised, the distribution would be even more favorable.

The reason for this is not difficult to grasp. Many affluent communities raise a large amount of revenue despite their low fiscal effort index because they have such a large potential tax base from which to draw. Let me give one illustrative example. Both Bellefontaine, Ohio, and Upper Arlington, Ohio, raised about \$1.4 million in revenue in 1960, and therefore would receive about the same

amount of funds under the current "revenue only" distribution formula. Yet Upper Arlington, with a median family income of nearly \$12,000, had an aggregate personal income base of \$133 million while Bellefontaine, with a median income below the national average, of \$5,533, had an aggregate personal income base of only \$21.1 million. Not surprisingly their fiscal effort index figures are 1.06% and 6.63% respectively, a difference of 500%. As a result the tax bite on the less affluent citizens of Bellefontaine is many times greater.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a simple way we can adjust the current formula to provide a more equitable treatment for situations like this without, as it were, throwing out the baby with the bath. That is to amend the distribution formula for pass-through funds to local governments by including some form of this fiscal effort index as well as revenues raised. In order to provide for your committee concrete illustration of what this would mean, we have developed an "adjusted revenue" figure for a sample of cities in five states and then plugged this new figure into the current formula. This adjusted revenue figure is merely the product of revenues raised and the fiscal effort index. Chart A which follows provides a comparison of the amount of funds that selected cities would receive under the current formula and under the modified formula I have proposed.

I would caution, however, that these figures were developed only for illustrative purposes and should not be taken as literal or exact dollars and cents amounts which cities might receive were this proposal to be adopted. They are probably slightly distorted

by two technical problems which we simply could not overcome at present. One is that we were forced to use 1960 census data on personal income because the results of the 1970 census will not be available for some months yet. In order not to distort the relationships between personal income base and revenue raised, we went back to revenue figures for the same year. However, the allocations contained in the Treasury Department publication, *General Revenue Sharing*, were for the years 1966-67, so in the case of cities in which revenue growth departed significantly either above or below the national average, there would be some distortion. But we think this would be minimal.

Also, we did not have the resources to compute the reallocation for an entire state, and although we did try to include a representative sample of cities, there might again be some distortion. But, these problems aside, the point of developing this chart was to provide some illustration of what this modification to account for fiscal effort would look like. The basic conclusion we draw is that it would modestly help units with higher than average fiscal efforts, substantially help central cities with unusually high fiscal efforts, reduce greatly the share to affluent communities currently making minimal fiscal efforts, and generally have only marginal impact on municipalities and other units of government that make average efforts. This would be the great majority of local government units in the country. Finally, I believe there might be more adequate ways to apply the fiscal effort than that which I have proposed and hope that this brief discussion will encourage you to develop and explore these possibilities.

CHART A.—DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE-SHARING FUNDS UNDER CURRENT AND MODIFIED FORMULAS

City	Median family income	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Revenue from own source (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	Revenue sharing funds		City	Median family income	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Revenue from own source (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	Revenue sharing funds								
					Current formula	Modified formula						Current formula	Modified formula							
<b>ILLINOIS</b>																				
Winnetka.....	\$20,166	\$109.4	\$858	0.79	\$151,720	\$27,123	Fresno.....	\$6,109	\$264.0	\$13,262	5.02	\$2,103,000	\$2,198,000							
Glencoe.....	20,136	76.6	656	.91	104,386	22,868	Chico.....	5,554	29.2	1,365	4.66	173,000	210,000							
Glen Ellyn.....	15,972	54.4	527	.92	84,822	19,728	Santa Cruz.....	5,292	53.0	3,460	6.52	492,000	744,000							
Highland Park.....	13,007	131.0	1,750	1.34	302,430	94,664	Hanford.....	5,242	16.6	1,080	6.52	156,000	232,000							
Park Ridge.....	11,187	123.0	1,694	1.37	320,858	93,068	<b>OHIO</b>													
Oak Park.....	9,131	223.0	3,217	1.44	598,801	186,668	Shaker Heights.....	13,933	211.0	2,813	1.35	472,217	145,083							
Mundelein.....	7,787	20.5	476	2.31	75,229	44,460	Upper Arlington.....	11,915	133.0	1,408	1.06	240,826	47,842							
Chicago.....	6,738	8,143.0	317,021	3.89	47,601,259	49,717,004	University Heights.....	11,073	66.0	845	1.28	117,672	34,618							
<b>MICHIGAN</b>																				
Grrosse Pointe Farms.....	13,119	73.6	1,065	1.45	135,922	51,241	Bexley.....	10,428	62.0	549	.89	84,015	15,558							
East Grand Rapids.....	11,957	53.7	606	1.13	101,494	22,570	Cleveland Heights.....	8,623	211.0	2,813	1.33	526,272	119,800							
Birmingham.....	10,723	103.0	2,035	1.97	308,366	132,678	Kettering.....	8,441	159.0	1,422	.89	287,869	40,452							
Oak Park.....	8,680	100.0	1,567	1.56	283,523	80,827	Cuyahoga Falls.....	7,738	110.0	2,967	2.70	395,724	119,800							
Livonia.....	8,243	149.0	3,487	2.34	683,375	269,932	Marion.....	5,854	133.0	3,453	5.15	567,833	579,051							
Detroit.....	6,069	3,350.0	159,221	4.75	24,901,847	25,037,764	Cincinnati.....	5,701	1,026.0	78,009	7.60	13,508,542	18,967,730							
Ecorse.....	5,479	28.9	2,409	8.33	287,408	664,306	Bellefontaine.....	5,533	21.1	1,364	6.63	261,351	289,387							
Hamtramck.....	5,345	59.0	3,375	5.72	471,557	638,991	Circleville.....	5,499	18.4	1,267	6.87	145,974	278,497							
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>																				
San Marino.....	16,728	98.8	1,115	1.11	132,000	40,000	<b>NEW YORK</b>													
Piedmont.....	12,825	67.0	813	1.21	114,000	32,000	Scarsdale.....	22,177	92.9	2,548	2.74	196,987	92,226							
Beverly Hills.....	11,977	233.0	6,314	2.71	812,000	565,000	Garden City.....	13,875	120.0	2,749	2.29	233,343	57,116							
Los Altos.....	11,033	66.9	975	1.64	200,000	53,000	Rockville Centre.....	10,922	104.0	1,923	1.85	162,981	46,992							
Saratoga.....	9,885	49.0	143	.29	57,000	14,000	Westbury.....	9,466	43.0	551	1.28	47,843	9,271							
Arcadia.....	9,526	159.0	2,577	1.62	345,000	138,000	Floral Park.....	8,463	49.1	888	1.81	74,931	21,258							
Palo Alto.....	9,132	163.0	5,428	3.33	793,000	596,000	New Hyde Park.....	8,155	25.3	282	1.12	20,952	4,156							
Downey.....	8,265	230.0	2,668	1.16	473,000	102,000	Massapequa Park.....	8,082	43.3	518	1.20	40,076	8,152							
San Francisco.....	6,717	2,006.0	140,701	7.01	23,955,000	32,559,000	Valley Stream.....	8,021	95.0	1,643	1.73	127,147	37,562							
							Syracuse.....	6,247	465.0	30,400	6.54	2,338,845	2,627,418							
							Yonkers.....	5,954	26.0	1,560	6.01	115,464	123,875							
							Buffalo.....	5,731	1,018.0	63,197	6.21	4,846,479	5,186,586							

Mr. Chairman, before I move on to two brief final points, I want to comment upon an alternative proposal for dealing with the problem that I have just discussed. This is some form of a "major-cities-only" revenue sharing plan in which a cut-off point of say 25,000, 50,000 or 100,000 would be established on the assumption that it is the large cities which have the greatest concentrations of low-income/high-service demanding populations, and are therefore the most worthy claimants upon limited Federal resources.

While I appreciate what I believe to be the theory behind this approach, I think it contains a number of fatal flaws.

First it rests on the mistaken stereotype that most or even a good portion of the poor reside in central cities. This is just not the case. Of the 24 million Americans below the poverty line in 1969, only 33% lived in central cities, and almost 50% lived in non-metropolitan small towns and rural areas. Yet under a "major-cities-only" revenue sharing plan these 12 million Americans and

the governmental units upon which they depend for services would be cut-off completely.

Moreover, if aid were limited to central cities of 100,000, over 66% of the population that resides in the nation's municipalities would be excluded; if the cut-off point were set at 25,000, as in the Muskie bill, nearly 33% of the municipal population would be excluded and almost 69% of the population living in townships. Yet many of these units are facing severe fiscal crises, have low-income populations that add little to revenues

but substantially increase costs, and are confronted with eroding property tax bases. Should they be arbitrarily excluded?

Mr. Chairman, I think not. Of the 1,034 towns and cities between 10,000 and 25,000 for which we could obtain complete data, over 40% had median incomes below the national average or had 20% or more families below the poverty line. What is of even greater significance is that these units are making a valiant effort to raise funds from their own meager tax bases. Our analysis indicates that the average fiscal effort index for these small towns and cities is nearly 3.4%, compared with an average of only 1.85% for the units with median incomes of more than \$8,000 in the same population group. In short, these poorer communities are taxing themselves nearly twice as heavily as their more affluent counterparts. If it is this latter group we do not want to unduly reward, then the solution is not to swing the heavy bludgeon of an arbitrary cut-off line, but use a more discriminating instrument like the fiscal effort factor that I have proposed. I would note in conclusion on this point that a "major-cities-only" approach would be particularly discriminating against non-urban states. For example, 87% of the population of Arkansas would be excluded under a big-cities plan and almost 67% would be excluded under the Muskie bill. For Kentucky, the comparative figures would be 72% and 51% respectively, and for Georgia 66% and 48% of the municipal population would be excluded from the plan. I have attached to my statement a chart (Table II) which indicates both the percent of municipal units and the percent of the municipal population that would be excluded from the program under either a big-cities plan or the Muskie bill.

I have also prepared a separate fact sheet which lists the hundreds of below-median-income municipalities between 10,000 and 100,000 in the United States. The fiscal effort index that we have computed for these cities indicates that the predominant portion of them are making a strong effort to use their limited tax bases to the fullest. I would ask that these be included in the record of the hearings, and hope that they help to demonstrate the essential truth that neither need for aid nor even worthiness to receive aid can be defined by an arbitrary population figure.

## II

Mr. Chairman, I want now to turn for a moment to a second area in which there has been some constructive criticism of the current general revenue sharing plan. Some critics have argued that since a major selling point of the revenue sharing idea is that it would relieve some of the pressure of regressive sales and property taxes on low- and moderate-income groups by plugging local treasuries into the national progressive tax base, why should not the plan contain incentives for shifting state tax structures in a similar manner. I must frankly concede that I see considerable merit in this point and hope that this committee will find some way to include such an incentive in the bill that you finally report. While we certainly want to avoid getting into the business of using massive Federal leverage or coercion against the states to drastically overhaul their tax structures—for that would contravene basic principles of our Federal system—I do not think that it is at all out of order to provide some modest incentives for state income taxes. One way to do this, as has been suggested many times, would be to double state income tax revenues in the state allocation formula.

But whatever method you adopt, I think we clearly have a growing national problem with the eroding progressivity of our tax systems that must be dealt with before it is too late. Let me elaborate just briefly.

In the years between 1950 and 1967, com-

bined state and local tax receipts increased by \$47 billion or about 280%. According to a recent study about 76% of this growth resulted from increased receipts of property, sales and other regressive taxes. This means that over this period we have had an increase in the regressive tax burden that now amounts to almost \$36 billion annually. During this same period, by contrast, there have been five Federal income tax cuts amounting, according to the estimates of one highly respected economist, to \$35 billion annually at the present time. Together these trends amount, in my view, to a substantial shift of the tax burden to lower and moderate-income groups.

To illustrate this we need only recall that almost 25% of the local and state tax burden falls on families with less than \$8,000 in annual income, whereas only 11% of the Federal income taxes are raised from these families. Put another way, almost 16% of the income of families in the \$4,000 to \$6,000 range goes into state and local taxes, while only 3.5% is taken in Federal income taxes, and when the 1969 tax reforms become fully effective, this figure will be even less. Conversely, of course, those with incomes above \$50,000 pay nearly 20% of their income in personal income taxes, but less than 2% in sales taxes and less than 1% in property taxes, the two major sources of local and state government finance. In short, Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to begin to think seriously about ways in which the tax burdens of this country can be more equitably distributed among groups and income classes. By adopting the general revenue sharing proposal, we will make one great stride in that direction; by including incentives for state income taxes we can take an additional modest but important step further.

## III

Mr. Chairman, there is just one final controversial aspect of the revenue sharing concept that I would like to address myself to. This concerns the charge made by some that we would not merely set this new \$5 billion in Federal funds on a stump and let the states and cities pick it up without exacting anything in return. Two somewhat different adverse consequences are thought to be likely to flow from such an arrangement.

One line of thought is that this gift of unrestricted funds will cause the outbreak of serious fiscal irresponsibility, especially at the local level. While I can appreciate this concern, I do not think it is something that should really deter us from moving ahead with this proposal. For one thing, revenue sharing funds will only amount to a small percentage of local revenues—from perhaps 4% to 6%. Local officials will have to continue to go to their own taxpayers for the great bulk of their revenue, and I see no reason to believe that current taxpayer wariness and resistance is likely to soften in the near future. In fact, perhaps the heat will be even greater since the public will be inclined to ask: "Why do you need more taxes when you have \$5 billion in revenue sharing funds coming in already?"

Perhaps of equal importance is the fact that we already have no-strings general aid programs in operation at the state level all across the nation. In many cases these general aid programs amount to a significant percentage of both total state aid and also of local revenues. In Arizona, for instance, no-strings state aid amounts to 9% of local revenues, and in Wisconsin it amounts to almost 20% of local revenues. Yet I am not aware of any reports that these state general revenue sharing programs have resulted in fiscal recklessness and irresponsibility at the local level. In fact, there are currently eight states in which state general revenue sharing funds would amount

to a greater percent of local revenues than would the funds slated for these units under the proposed Federal program. I have prepared a chart (Table III) which indicates the extent and scope of current state general aid programs and also compares them with the level of funds that would come under the proposed program. I think these facts ought to go a long way toward dispelling the notion that general revenue sharing is a novel and untested idea that may undermine the fiscal integrity of our Federal system.

The other line of criticism on this point is that the American governmental system at the state and local level is in substantial need of modernization and reform; to hand out massive amounts of funds on a no-strings basis, so the critics argue, will merely reinforce this outmoded structure and perhaps postpone the day when we will be literally forced to deal with the problem. The assumption seems to be that now the patient is sick in bed why not exact a pledge of self-reform and improvement before we dispense the medicine.

While modernization of local government is certainly a worthy objective, I have grave reservations as to whether we should attempt to use the lever of Federal funds to secure this kind of change. Two caveats are particularly in order. First, if we require states only to submit a general plan as is required by the Humphrey-Reuss bill without any enforcement sanctions, we are likely to get just that: paper plans. It seems to me that we already have an overabundance of idle paper shuffling in our governmental system, particularly in the form of the endless "comprehensive plans" that are required by so many of our categorical programs. We know from experience that without sanctions to back them up these "comprehensive plans" are largely empty exercises that we could well do without. Indeed, one of the major aims of the Administration's proposal for grant consolidation, or special revenue sharing, is to cut down on this kind of governmental busy work.

On the other hand if strong sanctions were provided, I almost shudder to contemplate the bureaucratic host that would have to be added to the Federal payroll to enforce them. There are almost 80,000 units of local government in the nation, and there are scores of items on the agenda of most local government reformers concerning the changes that these units would be expected to make. We have recently witnessed the tremendous conflict that can be touched off between local and Federal officials in the single area of public aid regulations; if we were to expand this to include across-the-board interference in the structure, organization and functioning of every local government in the nation, I daresay we would make of our Federal system such a brewing, boiling cauldron of conflict that only the most utopian reformer would not wish to bring it to a halt.

Yet, if we cannot engage in a massive restructuring and modernization of our governmental system through the lever of Federal revenue sharing funds, I think there is a much more modest step that we can take. That is to avoid reinforcing those extremely fragmented and miniaturized units of local government that cannot possibly deal with the range of problems confronting us in the 1970's. With new issues like population location and planning, environmental protection and enhancement, and land use control coming increasingly to the fore, it is simply unrealistic to think that the village with a population of 800 or even 1600 is a very viable unit of government.

We must move toward larger units in those areas of the nation dotted with these cross-road towns and therefore will have to in-

creasingly look to county and area-wide bodies to undertake the major tasks of government. Because of this I do not think it would be at all unreasonable to limit aid to units above say 2,500 or some other reason-

able figure that the Committee might arrive at. Since there are only a minuscule number of counties with populations under this level, such a cut-off point would clearly provide incentive and resources for the counties to

show new initiative and responsibility. In the long run, I believe such a development would add considerably to the health and vitality of local government in the non-metropolitan areas of the nation.

TABLE I.—DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE-SHARING FUNDS (CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS)

SMSA	Population (thousands)		Revenue-sharing funds (thousands)		Revenue sharing per capita		Central city as percent of suburbs	SMSA	Population (thousands)		Revenue-sharing funds (thousands)		Revenue sharing per capita		Central city as percent of suburbs
	Central city	Suburbs	Central city	Suburbs	Central city	Suburbs			Central city	Suburbs	Central city	Suburbs	Central city	Suburbs	
Los Angeles-Long Beach	3,175	2,798	\$41,913	\$19,477	\$13.20	\$6.96	189	Minneapolis-St. Paul	744	871	\$8,878	\$5,550	\$11.92	\$6.37	187
San Francisco-Oakland	1,077	1,545	29,575	13,970	27.45	9.04	303	Kansas City	675	433	10,102	2,667	14.95	6.16	242
San Diego	697	368	6,383	2,297	9.15	6.23	146	St. Louis	622	1,406	15,120	6,124	24.30	4.35	558
Denver	515	332	10,528	2,191	20.45	6.59	310	Newark	382	1,449	7,551	14,811	19.74	10.22	193
Miami	335	392	4,618	5,181	13.78	13.23	104	Buffalo	463	968	4,846	3,438	10.47	3.55	294
Tampa-St. Petersburg	494	172	8,258	2,172	16.71	12.62	132	Rochester	296	365	3,342	925	11.28	2.53	445
Atlanta	497	157	7,647	1,296	15.38	8.25	186	New York City	7,868	4,355	189,349	15,728	24.06	3.61	737
Chicago	3,367	2,275	47,601	16,886	14.13	6.31	223	Cincinnati	453	592	13,509	2,399	29.85	4.05	252
New Orleans	593	79	9,907	394	16.69	4.96	336	Columbus	540	362	5,226	969	9.68	2.67	362
Boston	641	2,728	10,701	32,349	16.69	11.85	140	Dayton	244	576	4,124	1,333	16.93	2.31	732
Detroit	1,511	2,674	24,902	19,385	16.47	7.24	227	Portland	383	157	7,938	1,475	20.72	9.62	219
								Philadelphia	1,949	2,598	39,782	11,312	20.41	4.35	469
								Pittsburgh	520	1,704	7,434	8,476	14.29	4.97	287
								Dallas	844	456	10,557	2,597	12.50	5.69	219

TABLE II.—MUNICIPALITIES AND POPULATION EXCLUDED

State	[In percent]				Big cities only		Muskie bill		State	Percent of State aid for general local government support (general revenue sharing) <sup>1</sup>	State general revenue sharing as percent of local revenue <sup>2</sup>	Federal general revenue sharing as percent of local revenue
	Big cities only		Muskie bill		Units	Population	Units	Population				
	Units	Population	Units	Population								
Alabama	99.0	63	96	40	100.0	100	99	74	Kansas	5.0	2.0	5
Alaska	100.0	100	98	59	Tennessee	98.0	42	97	Kentucky	.8	.38	7
Arizona	96.0	31	95	29	Texas	98.0	52	95	Louisiana	2.0	8.0	7
Arkansas	99.0	87	98	67	Utah	99.0	71	99	Maine	.1	.25	6
California	96.5	51	78	20	Vermont	100.0	100	99	Maryland	8.0	6.0	5
Colorado	99.0	59	97	33	Virginia	98.0	61	94	Massachusetts	22.0	9.0	5
Connecticut	88.0	46	56	12	Washington	98.0	49	97	Michigan	15.0	4.0	5
Delaware	100.0	100	98	47	West Virginia	100.0	100	97	Minnesota	21.0	2.0	5
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	Wisconsin	99.0	70	97	Mississippi	6.0	3.0	8
Florida	98.0	67	94	38	Wyoming	100.0	100	98	Missouri	2.0	.39	5
Georgia	99.0	66	98	48					Montana	0	0	6
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	TABLE III.—STATE GENERAL REVENUE SHARING				Nebraska	.9	.28	6
Idaho	100.0	100	99	74	[In percent]				Nevada	12.0	3.0	5
Illinois	99.0	55	97	34	Percent of State aid for general local government support (general revenue sharing) <sup>1</sup>				New Hampshire	24.0	2.0	6
Indiana	98.5	60	97	40	State general revenue sharing as percent of local revenue <sup>2</sup>				New Jersey	2.0	.37	5
Iowa	99.0	81	98	54	Federal general revenue sharing as percent of local revenue				New Mexico	3.0	1.0	7
Kansas	99.0	68	99	43	Alabama	3.0	1.0	7	New York	12.0	4.0	4
Kentucky	99.0	72	98	51	Alaska	11.0	3.0	5	North Carolina	5.0	2.0	7
Louisiana	99.0	49	97	35	Arizona	19.0	9.0	6	North Dakota	2.0	1.0	6
Maine	100.0	100	86	58	Arkansas	6.0	2.0	7	Ohio	10.0	3.0	5
Maryland	99.0	33	98	26	California	5.0	1.0	5	Oklahoma	1.0	.45	6
Massachusetts	97.0	57	11	3	Colorado	.1	.04	6	Oregon	2.0	6.0	6
Michigan	99.0	59	92	27	Connecticut	6.0	1.0	6	Pennsylvania	.6	.23	5
Minnesota	99.0	65	99	53	Delaware	0	0	5	Rhode Island	12.0	4.0	5
Mississippi	99.0	85	97	58	Florida	.1	.08	6	South Carolina	10.0	5.0	7
Missouri	99.0	60	99	44	Georgia	4.0	0	6	South Dakota	3.0	1.0	6
Montana	100.0	100	97	60	Hawaii	6.0	8.0	5	Tennessee	8.0	3.0	7
Nebraska	99.0	56	99	53	Idaho	10.0	2.0	7	Texas	.01	.39	6
Nevada	100.0	100	89	42	Illinois	7.0	0	4	Utah	.9	.01	6
New Hampshire	100.0	100	69	41	Indiana	10.0	1.0	5	Vermont	.03	.01	6
New Jersey	97.0	73	90	42	Iowa	12.0	5.0	6	Virginia	3.0	1.0	7
New Mexico	98.0	68	93	42				Washington	8.0	2.0	5	
New York	98.0	25	95	16				West Virginia	0	0	7	
North Carolina	99.0	78	97	49				Wisconsin	43.0	21.0	5	
North Dakota	100.0	100	99	64				Wyoming	15.0	2.0	6	
Ohio	99.0	57	96	36								
Oklahoma	99.0	66	98	51								
Oregon	99.0	62	98	51								
Pennsylvania	99.0	59	97	44								
Rhode Island	87.0	64	13	4								
South Carolina	100.0	100	98	62								

FISCAL EFFORT OF MUNICIPALITIES WITH LOW INCOME POPULATIONS (10,000 TO 100,000)

City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index
Alabama:							Decatur	29,200	\$5,261	26.9	\$50.0	\$3,818	7.63
Alexander City	13,140	\$4,643	28.9	\$19.1	\$405	2.34	Dothan	31,400	4,347	33.3	46.0	1,251	2.71
Andalusia	10,263	4,121	34.9	14.3	343	2.10	Florence	31,600	5,155	27.2	53.0	4,077	7.69
Auburn	16,261	4,269	37.5	21.6	764	3.70	Gadsden	58,100	4,705	28.3	85.0	3,611	4.24
Chickasaw	10,002	5,616	21.0	14.6	316	2.05	Phenix City	27,600	3,776	38.0	30.0	2,007	6.69
Cullman	10,883	4,125	33.7	15.2	1,772	11.18	Prichard	47,400	4,330	32.5	52.0	1,553	2.99
Enterprise	11,410	4,092	34.8	14.7	437	2.72	Selma	28,400	3,555	43.8	36.0	962	2.67
Fairfield	15,816	4,822	26.3	23.3	543	2.15	Tuscaloosa	63,400	4,620	32.0	89.0	4,824	5.42
Jasper	10,799	4,495	36.9	16.2	623	3.70	Arizona:						
Opelika	15,678	4,412	32.4	22.4	823	3.57	Douglas	11,925	4,650	27.6	16.5	505	3.23
Sheffield	13,491	5,471	23.3	22.8	997	4.39	Glendale	15,696	4,679	30.3	22.7	839	3.52
Sylacauga	12,857	4,228	36.8	16.5	1,951	12.10	Prescott	12,861	5,579	21.8	24.3	774	3.29
Talladega	17,742	3,943	37.0	20.7	562	2.90	Mesa	33,800	5,598	20.2	59.0	1,401	2.37
Troy	10,234	3,412	45.2	11.8	312	2.54	Arkansas:						
Anniston	33,600	4,122	34.6	49.0	3,734	7.62	Benton	10,399	4,831	28.0	17.3	83	.58
Bessemer	33,100	3,755	40.5	38.0	1,142	3.01	Blytheville	20,797	3,484	43.7	24.7	669	2.83

City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index
Camden	15,823	\$3,899	38.5	\$20.2	\$351	1.98	Macomb	12,135	\$5,147	17.8	\$22.0	\$540	2.27
Fayetteville	20,274	4,697	28.3	34.0	1,377	4.12	Marion	11,274	5,104	24.9	21.4	1,048	5.14
Forrest City	10,544	3,267	47.2	12.2	191	1.64	Mount Vernon	15,566	5,079	27.6	27.7	599	2.16
Helena	11,500	2,835	53.1	13.1	338	2.29	Rantoul	22,116	4,757	19.3	34.5	327	.95
Jacksonville	28,337	5,118	10.7	22.2	168	.90	East St. Louis	81,700	4,842	30.0	122.0	4,861	3.98
Jonesboro	21,418	4,657	28.2	35.1	433	1.14	Quincy	43,800	5,370	19.8	79.0	2,020	2.59
Magnolia	10,618	4,621	32.9	16.6	605	3.61	Indiana:						
Springdale	10,076	4,199	32.4	14.6	399	2.74	Bedford	13,024	5,501	20.6	22.4	681	3.13
Texarkana	19,788	3,694	38.7	25.1	390	1.59	Connersville	17,698	5,187	18.5	30.1	607	1.92
West Memphis	19,374	4,405	33.4	24.4	586	2.46	Frankfort	15,302	5,526	18.2	26.4	641	2.27
El Dorado	25,300	4,986	28.1	44.0	901	2.05	Logansport	21,106	5,572	16.6	38.7	1,181	3.10
Fort Smith	53,000	4,644	28.5	86.0	2,944	2.38	Madison	10,097	4,854	27.4	16.6	547	3.61
Hot Springs	28,300	3,635	41.0	42.0	1,330	3.17	New Castle	20,349	5,465	18.0	37.0	999	2.70
North Little Rock	58,000	4,874	27.5	88.0	1,641	1.86	Peru	14,453	5,332	20.8	25.4	669	2.76
Pine Bluff	44,000	4,604	32.6	67.0	1,237	1.85	Seymour	11,629	5,344	19.7	19.6	596	3.06
California:							Shelbyville	14,317	5,585	16.5	27.6	1,377	4.35
Banning	10,250	4,634	28.6	17.7	408	2.25	Vincennes	18,046	4,846	25.0	30.6	654	2.29
Brawley	12,703	5,384	22.8	21.6	680	3.14	Washington	10,846	4,808	23.3	18.8	362	2.13
Chico	14,757	5,554	19.1	29.1	1,365	4.66	Bloomington	31,400	5,448	20.4	58.0	1,379	2.37
Coronado	18,039	6,299	25.7	38.9	1,422	3.64	New Albany	37,800	5,439	19.4	66.0	1,463	2.22
Delano	11,913	4,917	29.6	17.9	655	3.62	Richmond	44,100	5,583	18.0	80.0	2,299	2.87
Hanford	10,133	5,242	24.6	16.5	1,080	6.52	Terre Haute	72,500	5,292	21.9	128.0	3,532	2.76
Imperial Beach	17,773	5,393	19.1	27.2	484	1.76	Iowa:						
Madera	14,430	4,873	30.7	23.5	588	2.51	Boone	12,468	5,032	22.1	22.7	581	2.64
Merced	20,068	5,638	22.7	37.9	1,715	4.49	Keokuk	16,316	5,458	19.1	30.3	1,349	4.29
Oceanside	24,971	4,928	24.8	54.7	2,035	3.66	Muskogee	20,997	5,473	17.3	39.3	1,173	3.05
Port Hueneme	11,067	5,389	19.0	19.1	183	.94	Oskaloota	11,053	4,915	23.9	19.9	379	2.01
Tulare	13,824	5,406	25.5	23.2	945	4.05	Kansas:						
Watsonville	13,293	5,710	22.1	27.0	1,154	4.44	Arkansas City	14,262	5,184	22.3	24.8	1,341	5.24
National City	32,800	5,574	20.7	55	2,101	3.82	Atchison	12,529	5,230	19.4	21.9	775	3.65
Santa Cruz	25,600	5,292	26.8	53	3,460	6.52	Chanute	10,849	4,845	22.1	17.3	208	1.16
Colorado:							Coffeyville	17,382	4,959	26.0	28.7	1,738	5.92
Longmont	11,489	5,372	19.3	21.2	574	2.83	Emporia	18,190	5,209	22.3	31.9	1,021	3.13
Trinidad	10,691	3,972	35.8	37.2	333	.81	Garden City	11,811	5,523	17.6	20.8	708	3.37
Fort Collins	25,000	5,409	21.5	44	1,099	2.49	Independence	11,222	5,270	23.3	19.1	554	3.14
Greeley	26,300	5,351	21.2	48	1,343	2.80	Junction City	18,700	4,153	29.1	28.2	1,140	3.90
Delaware: Wilmington	95,900	5,589	19.2	200	12,108	6.05	Leavenworth	22,052	5,417	20.5	37.2	1,260	3.49
Florida:							Manhattan	22,993	5,298	20.3	42.4	1,157	2.83
Bartow	12,849	4,990	22.2	21.5	641	2.98	Newton	14,877	5,447	15.8	26.7	1,037	3.75
Belle Glade	11,273	3,301	45.6	13.5	651	4.82	Ottawa	10,673	4,506	27.7	16.9	466	5.32
Boynton Beach	10,467	4,448	30.3	16.7	811	4.85	Parsons	13,929	4,522	29.4	20.8	637	2.88
Bradenton	19,380	3,709	39.2	32.0	1,640	5.13	Pittsburg	18,678	4,724	29.1	31.4	718	2.23
Cocoa	12,294	6,131	20.0	25.3	979	3.86	Winfield	11,117	5,287	18.4	10.2	1,487	7.92
De Land	10,775	4,319	31.3	19.0	822	4.33	Hutchinson	37,600	5,469	18.0	72.0	2,551	3.54
Delray Beach	12,230	5,217	27.9	29.9	1,318	4.40	Lawrence	32,900	5,427	20.1	57.0	2,743	4.83
Fort Myers	22,523	4,835	27.9	41.5	2,050	4.94	Maryland:						
Hallandale	10,483	3,600	39.2	15.9	667	4.19	Cambridge	12,239	4,073	32.5	17.6	425	2.40
Jacksonville Beach	12,049	5,077	23.5	20.8	846	4.06	Frederick	21,744	5,548	20.0	40.5	1,347	3.32
Lake Worth	20,758	4,464	32.5	39.3	2,043	5.19	Falisbury	16,302	5,335	22.6	32.2	182	.57
Leesburg	11,172	4,433	31.0	18.5	512	2.77	Cumberland	33,400	5,098	23.2	58	4,082	7.04
Ocala	13,598	4,433	32.9	23.7	1,194	9.26	Hagerstown	36,700	5,207	21.3	67	1,481	2.21
Palatka	11,028	4,236	38.5	15.4	708	4.64	Massachusetts:						
Pinellas Park	10,848	4,181	29.1	15.4	776	5.04	Adams	11,949	5,564	13.7	20.8	1,979	9.49
Plant City	15,711	3,927	37.2	20.8	909	4.37	Athol	10,161	5,400	15.1	18.3	1,577	8.60
Pompano Beach	15,992	4,838	28.6	34.9	1,845	5.29	Greenfield	14,389	5,579	16.6	27.1	2,700	9.95
Riviera Beach	13,046	4,176	30.5	19.9	1,058	5.32	Chelsea	33,700	5,298	19.0	56	5,450	9.73
St. Augustine	14,734	4,570	29.6	23.9	1,230	5.15	Fall River	99,900	4,970	20.0	165	12,805	7.76
Sanford	19,175	3,979	35.8	27.2	1,210	4.45	Gloucester	25,800	5,285	17.2	42	4,644	11.05
Winter Haven	16,277	4,888	27.3	32.6	1,390	4.26	Lawrence	70,900	5,508	18.5	120	8,919	7.43
Clearwater	34,700	4,959	26.1	74	3,645	4.92	Taunton	41,100	5,597	14.7	66	2,772	4.20
Daytona Beach	37,400	3,986	35.0	62	3,652	5.89	Michigan:						
Fort Lauderdale	83,600	5,343	23.5	207	10,129	4.89	Benton Harbor	19,136	5,600	19.6	33.3	1,805	5.42
Fort Pierce	25,300	4,170	33.0	37	1,839	4.97	Cadillac	10,112	5,401	18.3	16.9	544	3.23
Gainesville	29,700	4,702	27.9	45	2,096	4.65	Ecorse	17,328	5,479	18.8	28.9	2,400	2.68
Hollywood	35,200	4,963	25.6	81	4,487	5.53	Escanaba	15,391	5,475	17.4	25.0	673	4.22
Key West	34,000	4,736	23.3	55	1,481	2.69	Ironwood	10,265	4,356	25.6	14.9	631	2.51
Lakeland	41,400	4,902	28.4	80	3,614	4.51	Menominee	11,289	5,008	17.0	17.4	437	3.75
Miami Beach	63,100	4,411	36.4	179	12,698	7.09	Muskegon Heights	19,552	5,568	18.0	30.5	1,145	8.27
Orlando	88,100	5,037	25.5	173	7,524	4.35	River Rouge	18,147	5,324	24.2	30.0	2,487	3.35
Panama City	33,300	4,509	29.7	52	2,635	5.06	Sault St. Marie	18,722	5,190	22.9	28.9	970	5.72
Pensacola	56,800	5,204	26.0	99	3,458	3.49	Hamtramck	34,100	5,345	23.1	59.0	3,375	9.32
Sarasota	34,100	4,889	26.6	78	4,187	5.36	Highland Park	38,100	5,696	20.6	83.0	7,738	3.00
Tallahassee	48,200	5,487	25.6	80	3,583	4.47	Minnesota:						
West Palm Beach	56,200	4,855	26.9	106	6,780	6.39	Brainerd	12,898	5,497	17.9	22.5	533	4.38
Georgia:							Fergus Falls	13,733	5,303	18.3	20.9	921	3.62
Americus	13,472	3,689	43.1	17.5	529	3.02	Hibbing	17,731	5,595	16.7	32.7	2,061	6.34
Bainbridge	12,714	3,586	42.7	14.5	461	3.17	New Ulm	11,114	5,115	21.3	19.8	715	3.70
Brunswick	21,703	4,250	33.7	28.9	1,159	2.72	Red Wing	10,528	5,550	17.6	19.3	1,224	4.03
Cordale	10,609	3,005	50.0	11.0	297	3.09	Winona	24,895	5,374	18.0	41.6	1,543	3.70
Dalton	17,868	4,534	28.1	29.7	927	3.78	St. Cloud	33,800	5,592	13.0	53.0	2,140	5.02
Dublin	13,814	3,890	40.6	17.5	618	3.54	Mississippi:						
Gainesville	16,523	4,478	31.6	29.1	1,099	3.78	Clarksdale	21,105	3,427	45.9	25.1	1,256	6.92
Griffin	21,735	4,412	32.4	33.5	767	2.30	Cleveland	10,172	3,854	40.8	12.0	827	3.18
La Grange	23,632	4,256	33.5	31.9	853	2.66	Columbus	24,77					

FISCAL EFFORT OF MUNICIPALITIES WITH LOW INCOME POPULATIONS (10,000 TO 100,000)—Continued

City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index
<b>Louisiana:</b>							<b>North Carolina:</b>						
Abbeville	10,414	\$3,475	44.8	\$12.5	\$292	2.33	Albemarle	12,261	\$4,554	24.7	\$18.9	\$448	2.37
Bastrop	15,193	4,189	37.0	22.0	664	3.29	Concord	17,799	5,028	24.6	30.8	677	2.20
Bogalusa	21,423	4,574	35.0	28.3	1,015	3.58	Elizabeth City	14,062	3,959	37.3	19.5	393	2.01
Crowley	15,617	3,680	38.9	19.3	515	2.66	Greensville	22,860	3,915	38.5	29.2	655	2.24
Eunice	11,326	3,649	40.9	13.0	359	2.76	Henderson	12,740	3,792	40.3	16.3	515	3.15
Goosport	16,778	3,832	34.7	17.2	(1)	(1)	Hickory	19,328	5,197	21.3	36.6	1,362	3.72
Gretna	21,967	5,215	22.2	33.0	773	2.34	Jacksonville	13,491	5,091	17.3	22.4	542	2.42
Hammond	10,563	4,142	36.0	14.4	219	1.52	Kinston	24,819	4,003	38.8	34.7	726	2.09
Houma	22,561	5,445	21.9	37.8	676	1.79	Lenoir	10,257	4,345	28.8	16.8	533	3.17
Jennings	11,887	4,523	31.3	17.2	428	2.49	Lexington	16,093	4,604	26.6	19.2	589	2.34
Minden	12,785	3,836	40.9	17.1	278	1.62	Lumberton	15,305	3,858	38.1	25.0	269	1.41
Morgan City	13,540	5,305	24.4	22.0	545	2.41	Monroe	10,882	4,514	30.5	15.3	293	1.91
Natchitoches	13,924	3,417	45.7	16.2	279	1.72	New Bern	15,717	3,838	40.7	20.1	502	2.49
Opelousas	17,417	3,529	43.7	21.6	680	3.15	Reidsville	14,267	4,940	25.0	23.4	823	3.51
Ruston	13,991	4,128	36.8	20.0	353	1.76	Roanoke Rapids	13,320	5,021	25.1	20.9	610	2.91
Thibodaux	13,403	4,769	26.0	21.2	377	1.87	Salisbury	21,297	4,699	29.3	38.7	1,274	3.29
West Monroe	15,215	5,156	24.8	24.4	456	1.87	Sanford	12,253	4,527	30.2	18.6	495	2.65
Alexandria	40,300	3,768	40.2	55.0	1,537	2.79	Shelby	17,698	4,598	28.1	27.2	621	2.28
Bossier City	32,800	5,043	22.4	51.0	1,787	2.31	Statesville	19,844	4,637	27.8	30.3	676	2.23
Lafayette	40,400	4,361	33.2	63.0	2,787	4.42	Thomasville	15,190	4,769	23.3	25.1	672	2.68
Lake Charles	63,400	5,462	21.1	112.0	2,838	2.53	Asheville	60,200	4,648	30.0	103.0	2,547	2.47
Monroe	52,200	3,958	38.2	75.0	2,402	3.20	Durham	78,300	4,673	27.9	129.0	4,944	3.83
New Iberia	29,100	4,663	29.4	41.0	1,168	2.85	Fayetteville	47,100	3,960	34.4	67.0	1,626	2.43
<b>Maine:</b>							<b>North Dakota:</b>						
Auburn	24,449	5,254	16.4	43.6	2,444	5.50	Jamesstown	15,163	5,450	17.3	24.3	1,012	4.17
Augusta	21,680	5,536	15.4	36.7	2,457	6.81	Mandan	10,525	5,582	15.9	15.4	661	4.29
Bath	10,717	5,558	17.1	19.3	1,366	7.25	<b>Ohio:</b>						
Biddeford	19,255	4,706	21.9	28.4	1,360	4.93	Athens	16,470	5,267	22.2	25.5	633	2.47
Presque Isle	12,886	4,949	21.4	20.3	1,478	7.39	Bellaire	11,502	4,733	26.0	17.1	258	1.52
Saco	10,515	4,962	23.3	16.0	1,059	6.88	Bellefontaine	11,424	5,533	18.0	21.1	1,364	6.63
Sanford	10,936	5,408	17.5	18.6	1,521	8.06	Cambridge	14,562	5,057	22.7	25.0	564	2.26
Waterville	18,695	5,516	16.1	33.7	1,903	5.64	Circleville	11,059	5,499	19.9	18.4	1,267	6.87
Westbrook	13,820	5,906	11.4	23.9	1,871	7.95	Conneaut	10,557	5,534	15.7	19.5	489	2.51
Bangor	38,900	5,353	16.9	66.0	4,607	6.98	Coshocton	13,106	5,551	19.6	25.1	554	2.17
Lawton	40,800	5,238	16.7	65.0	3,325	5.12	Delaware	13,282	5,523	15.3	22.0	647	2.94
Portland	72,600	5,363	17.7	132.0	10,973	8.31	East Liverpool	22,306	5,117	17.5	38.5	1,014	2.64
Tupelo	17,221	4,600	30.2	28.6	1,332	4.64	Greenville	10,585	5,592	16.4	20.2	478	2.37
Yazoo City	11,236	2,858	52.0	13.6	392	2.86	Ironton	15,745	5,388	20.0	27.0	655	2.42
Biloxi	44,100	4,146	28.9	63.0	1,344	2.13	Marietta	16,847	5,151	22.8	28.3	560	1.98
Greenville	41,500	3,812	40.3	54.0	2,400	4.44	Martins Ferry	11,919	5,036	19.4	19.5	399	2.05
Gulfport	30,200	4,540	27.7	44.0	3,125	7.10	Urbana	10,461	5,588	17.9	19.1	503	2.63
Hattiesburg	35,000	4,232	34.5	48.0	1,915	3.99	Van Wert	11,323	5,600	17.5	21.3	434	2.03
Laurel	27,900	4,338	34.6	40.0	1,342	3.35	Washington	12,388	5,067	19.4	21.6	373	1.73
Meridian	49,400	3,991	37.3	66.0	3,058	4.63	Portsmouth	33,600	5,123	26.2	58.0	2,662	4.50
Vicksburg	29,100	3,845	41.3	39.0	1,396	3.57	Zanesville	39,100	5,218	21.8	65.0	2,032	3.13
<b>Missouri:</b>							<b>North Dakota:</b>						
Cape Girardeau	24,947	5,183	22.8	44.0	869	1.97	Jamesstown	15,163	5,450	17.3	24.3	1,012	4.17
Carthage	11,264	4,647	29.1	19.2	817	4.26	Mandan	10,525	5,582	15.9	15.4	661	4.29
Fulton	11,131	4,990	23.1	14.8	302	2.04	<b>Ohio:</b>						
Hannibal	20,028	4,711	25.5	32.2	583	1.81	Athens	16,470	5,267	22.2	25.5	633	2.47
Kirksville	13,323	4,242	33.4	19.7	400	2.02	Bellaire	11,502	4,733	26.0	17.1	258	1.52
Mexico	12,889	5,453	19.6	23.1	543	2.35	Bellefontaine	11,424	5,533	18.0	21.1	1,364	6.63
Moberly	13,170	4,619	39.0	22.1	584	2.64	Cambridge	14,562	5,057	22.7	25.0	564	2.26
Poplar Bluff	15,926	3,795	32.1	23.6	720	3.05	Circleville	11,059	5,499	19.9	18.4	1,267	6.87
Rolla	11,132	5,176	22.7	17.9	358	1.99	Conneaut	10,557	5,534	15.7	19.5	489	2.51
Sedalia	23,874	4,550	28.8	38.6	2,105	5.45	Coshocton	13,106	5,551	19.6	25.1	554	2.17
Joplin	39,000	4,915	26.9	68.0	1,937	2.85	Delaware	13,282	5,523	15.3	22.0	647	2.94
St. Joseph	79,700	5,522	19.3	148.0	3,662	2.47	East Liverpool	22,306	5,117	17.5	38.5	1,014	2.64
Springfield	95,900	4,955	24.0	168.0	5,092	3.03	Greenville	10,585	5,592	16.4	20.2	478	2.37
<b>Montana:</b>							<b>North Dakota:</b>						
Anaconda	12,054	5,208	13.9	19.1	383	1.99	Ironton	15,745	5,388	20.0	27.0	655	2.42
Butte	27,900	5,156	20.2	47.0	1,415	3.01	Marietta	16,847	5,151	22.8	28.3	560	1.98
<b>Nebraska:</b>							<b>Ohio:</b>						
Beatrice	12,132	4,686	22.2	20.4	612	3.00	Martins Ferry	11,919	5,036	19.4	19.5	399	2.05
Columbus	12,476	5,555	15.0	21.6	9,907	4.20	Urbana	10,461	5,588	17.9	19.1	503	2.63
Hastings	21,412	5,086	19.4	37.7	1,254	3.32	Van Wert	11,323	5,600	17.5	21.3	434	2.03
Kearney	14,210	4,970	22.6	22.9	1,057	4.61	Washington	12,388	5,067	19.4	21.6	373	1.73
Norfolk	13,111	5,193	18.8	22.0	849	3.87	Portsmouth	33,600	5,123	26.2	58.0	2,662	4.50
North Platte	17,184	5,607	17.4	30.5	699	2.29	Zanesville	39,100	5,218	21.8	65.0	2,032	3.13
Scotts Bluff	13,377	5,571	17.6	24.9	741	2.98	<b>Oklahoma:</b>						
Grand Island	25,700	5,109	19.6	44.0	1,174	2.67	Ada	14,347	4,442	32.9	23.4	497	2.13
<b>New Hampshire:</b>							<b>Ohio:</b>						
Berlin	17,821	5,386	12.9	30.5	2,005	6.58	Altus	21,225	4,671	24.8	33.3	350	1.05
Claremont	13,563	5,292	18.2	22.6	885	3.91	Ardmore	20,184	4,542	32.6	34.6	771	2.23
<b>New Jersey:</b>							<b>Ohio:</b>						
Asbury Park	17,366	5,016	24.0	31.1	4,482	14.5	Bethany	12,342	5,522	15.4	20.4	460	2.25
Lakewood	13,004	5,148	24.3	23.1	1,282	5.62	Chickasha	14,866	4,315	35.0	22.2	613	2.76
Phillipsburg	18,532	5,276	16.5	31.4	1,842	5.73	Duncan	20,009	5,591	20.1	39.0	735	1.88
Pleasantville	15,172	5,419	19.5	24.9	1,133	4.41	Durant	10,467	3,543	44.6	13.6	253	1.86
Atlantic City	59,500	4,108	33.5	95.0	16,111	16.95	El Reno	11,015	4,861	26.2	18.9	710	3.75
Hoboken	48,400	5,435	17.3	87.0	9,634	11.07	McAlester	17,419	4,050	36.7	25.2	406	1.61
<b>New Mexico:</b>							<b>Ohio:</b>						
Artasia	12,000	5,551	20.1	21.5	710	3.30	Miami	12,869	5,452	24.1	23.0	213	0.92
Clovis	23,713	5,070	23.5	38.8	1,837	4.74	Okmulgee	15,951	4,439	35.2	26.2	738	2.82
Rosewell	39,600	5,543	24.5	72.0	2,140	2.97	Sapulpa	14,282	4,748	30.2	22.8	481	2.11
Santa Fe	33,400	5,502	23.4	57.0	1,751	3.07	Seminole	11,464	4,717	28.5	18.3	456	2.49
<b>New York:</b>							<b>Ohio:</b>						
Cohoes	20,129	5,573	15.2	35.4									

City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index	City	Population	Median family income	Percent families below \$3,000	Aggregate personal income (millions)	Local revenue (thousands)	Fiscal effort index
Oil City	17,692	\$5,263	19.8	\$30.3	\$848	2.81	Huntsville	11,999	\$3,574	43.6	\$14.6	281	1.91
Pittston	12,407	4,556	26.0	16.5	324	1.94	Killeen	23,377	3,878	29.8	31.2	878	2.82
Plymouth	10,401	4,374	28.6	14.4	134	.91	Lamesa	12,438	4,972	25.3	23.1	425	1.86
Pottsville	21,659	4,958	21.0	37.8	589	1.56	Levelland	10,153	5,243	22.7	15.3	380	2.48
Shamokin	13,674	4,406	28.8	21.6	244	1.11	Lufkin	17,641	4,858	29.9	29.8	681	2.28
Shenandoah	11,673	3,705	38.0	14.2	164	1.12	McKinney	13,763	4,333	32.0	20.5	465	2.29
Stellton	11,266	5,354	16.1	17.9	445	2.01	Marshall	23,846	4,286	35.6	33.6	1,984	5.95
Stowe	11,730	5,575	14.4	17.9	364	1.81	Mercedes	10,943	2,395	60.0	8.1	321	3.94
Sunbury	13,687	5,089	21.1	24.6	314	1.26	Mineral Wells	11,053	4,032	33.3	16.3	383	2.33
Tamaqua	10,173	4,706	25.0	15.5	73	.45	Mission	14,081	2,950	51.0	13.3	678	5.11
Uniontown	17,942	4,723	25.4	29.3	796	2.73	Nacogdoches	12,674	3,656	40.3	17.9	1,272	7.26
Washington	23,545	5,333	20.8	42.0	894	2.12	New Braunfel	15,631	4,604	24.7	22.3	505	2.24
Waynesboro	10,427	5,071	17.4	19.4	241	1.24	Palestine	13,974	4,569	32.6	20.3	561	2.76
Aliquippa	26,400	5,312	12.0	43.0	1,491	3.46	Paris	20,977	3,604	41.9	28.9	722	2.49
Altoona	69,400	5,138	21.8	112.0	2,692	2.40	Pecos	12,728	4,924	25.7	18.4	487	2.66
Chester	63,700	5,343	22.1	103.0	2,460	2.39	Pharr	14,106	2,694	56.3	14.7	302	2.04
Easton	32,000	5,126	20.0	57.0	1,911	3.35	Plainview	18,735	5,039	24.3	32.8	796	2.44
Harrisburg	79,700	5,403	19.7	154.0	5,026	3.26	Robstown	10,266	3,753	40.1	10.7	434	4.01
Hazleton	32,100	4,983	21.6	53.0	1,007	1.90	San Benito	16,422	2,945	50.9	13.7	399	2.92
Johnstown	53,900	4,674	24.4	78.0	2,354	3.02	San Marcos	12,713	3,472	42.6	14.1	427	3.05
Lebanon	30,000	5,377	15.4	56.0	1,201	2.14	Seguin	14,299	3,660	40.2	16.7	234	1.38
McKeesport	45,500	5,309	19.6	78.0	3,046	3.91	Sherman	24,988	4,754	20.1	41.9	1,322	3.10
New Castle	44,800	5,450	18.1	78.0	1,713	2.20	Sweetwater	13,914	4,855	23.4	22.5	1,393	6.22
Reading	98,200	5,453	18.0	187.0	4,719	2.52	Terrell	13,803	3,722	40.9	15.8	363	2.28
Wilkes-Barre	63,500	4,829	25.0	101.0	2,234	2.21	Uvalde	10,293	3,622	43.1	13.1	308	2.57
Williamsport	42,000	5,228	19.6	78.0	1,534	1.97	Vernon	12,141	4,458	29.8	20.2	556	2.77
York	54,500	5,441	19.4	97.0	2,940	3.03	Waxahachie	12,749	4,478	31.2			
Rhode Island:							Abilene	90,400	5,460	19.2	162.0	4,816	2.97
Bristol	14,570	5,711	14.5	25.4	1,195	4.33	Brownsville	48,000	3,021	49.7	45.0	1,390	3.09
Central Falls	19,858	4,874	20.2	30.6	1,393	4.57	Bryan	27,500	4,258	34.4	38.0	1,594	4.19
West Warwick	21,414	5,549	15.3	37.2	1,785	4.83	Denton	26,800	4,994	24.2	42.0	1,880	4.47
Newport	47,000	4,754	28.0	80.0	4,176	5.22	Galveston	67,200	4,698	27.8	114.0	9,119	8.00
Pawtucket	81,000	5,525	16.2	146.0	7,970	5.45	Harlingen	41,200	4,167	35.2	54.0	1,799	3.33
Woonsocket	47,100	5,186	19.7	77.0	4,544	5.91	Kingsville	25,300	4,366	33.3	33.0	755	2.29
South Carolina:							Laredo	60,700	2,935	51.0	55.0	2,099	3.81
Aiken	11,243	4,977	33.4	19.4	490	2.52	Longview	40,100	5,355	25.0	72.0	1,586	2.80
Florence	24,722	4,397	33.8	37.3	1,049	2.82	McAllen	32,700	3,790	40.5	42.0	2,841	6.70
Gaffney	10,435	4,183	34.3	14.0	431	3.07	Orange	25,600	5,510	22.9	45.0	1,432	3.18
Georgetown	12,261	4,079	38.3	14.8	254	1.71	San Angelo	58,800	4,650	28.1	99.0	2,724	2.75
Greenwood	16,644	3,974	36.3	22.8	667	2.92	Temple	30,400	4,509	27.8	48.0	2,187	4.55
Orangeburg	13,852	4,617	31.8	19.6	408	2.08	Texarkana	30,200	4,353	33.1	46.0	1,009	2.19
Sumter	23,062	3,916	36.7	36.7	910	2.48	Tyler	51,200	5,478	22.6	101.0	2,664	2.64
Union	10,191	4,384	31.5	14.8	266	1.80	Victoria	33,000	5,279	26.2	53.0	1,624	3.06
Anderson	41,300	4,463	29.4	61.0	1,214	1.99	Waco	97,800	4,859	28.2	165.0	5,618	3.40
Charleston	65,900	3,708	40.9	93.0	3,493	3.75	Utah:						
Columbia	97,400	4,574	31.9	150.0	3,758	2.51	Logan	18,731	5,234	21.3	29.5	357	1.21
Greenville	66,200	4,754	29.7	117.0	3,332	2.85	Provo	36,000	5,310	21.7	54.0	1,570	2.91
Rock Hill	29,400	5,010	25.6	42.0	848	2.01	Vermont:						
Spartanburg	44,300	4,483	33.0	70.0	2,220	3.17	Barre	10,387	5,509	14.8	19.1	1,501	7.84
South Dakota:							Rutland	18,325	5,327	19.6	32.0	2,388	7.47
Aberdeen	23,073	5,301	17.1	38.7	1,304	3.36	Burlington	18,325	5,327	19.6	32.0	2,388	7.47
Brookings	10,558	4,929	20.5	16.8	1,382	8.21	Burlington	35,500	5,487	16.9	61.0	4,492	7.36
Huron	14,180	5,357	19.4	24.9	839	3.38	Virginia:						
Mitchell	12,555	5,271	21.0	21.5	705	3.28	Bristol	17,144	4,456	31.3	25.0	2,099	8.39
Watertown	14,077	5,358	18.4	22.5	822	3.65	Covington	11,062	5,546	16.5	19.4	893	4.59
Tennessee:							Fredericksburg	13,639	5,305	21.8	22.7	1,459	6.43
Athens	12,103	3,936	37.2	16.6	545	3.29	Harrisonburg	11,916	5,276	23.6	21.2	1,463	6.88
Bristol	17,582	4,885	26.4	28.9	1,161	4.01	Martinsville	18,798	5,219	22.7	35.5	2,212	6.22
Clarksville	22,021	3,997	34.0	31.6	879	2.78	Pulaski	10,469	4,525	28.1	15.1	420	2.79
Cleveland	16,196	4,191	34.0	24.3	558	2.29	Salem	16,058	5,331	18.3	25.4	536	2.11
Columbia	17,624	4,562	32.0	25.4	774	3.05	South Norfolk	22,035	4,914	25.4	30.4	2,250	7.40
Dyersburg	12,499	3,666	40.9	17.9	773	4.32	Staunton	22,232	5,395	20.4	38.0	2,061	5.42
Elizabeth	10,896	4,716	25.2	17.5	518	2.96	Suffolk	12,609	4,981	24.5	21.5	1,477	6.85
Greeneville	11,759	4,187	32.7	17.0	749	4.39	Winchester	15,110	4,944	23.7	27.2	1,324	4.85
Lebanon	10,512	4,278	32.7	14.4	238	1.64	Charlottesville	29,400	5,192	22.5	59.0	3,265	5.33
Maryville	10,348	5,415	25.3	18.8	555	2.95	Chesapeake	73,600	5,391	21.7	109.0	( )	( )
Morristown	21,267	4,310	31.6	31.1	1,043	3.35	Danville	46,600	4,883	25.6	76.0	5,238	6.89
Murfreesboro	18,991	4,199	32.3	27.3	703	2.57	Lynchburg	54,800	5,472	21.3	101.0	6,829	6.76
Shelbyville	10,466	4,300	31.6	16.3	445	2.72	Petersburg	36,700	4,406	31.4	54.0	3,719	6.88
Whitehaven	13,894	7,347	6.9				Roanoke	97,100	5,103	23.8	173.0	13,672	7.90
Jackson	34,400	4,017	38.1	50.0	4,123	8.24	Virginia Beach	85,200	5,504	22.2	146.0	( )	( )
Johnson City	31,200	4,476	31.7	47.0	1,712	3.64	West Virginia:						
Texas:							Beckley	18,642	5,021	27.1	32.3	565	1.75
Alice	20,861	4,140	35.5	26.1	694	2.64	Bluefield	19,256	4,846	27.5	35.7	1,094	3.06
Bay City	11,656	4,484	32.3	17.8	387	2.19	Martinsburg	15,179	5,039	24.0	25.0	389	1.56
Beeville	13,811	3,830	38.7	17.5	454	2.57	Morgantown	22,487	5,003	23.8	39.7	1,355	3.41
Brownfield	10,286	5,169	22.8	20.8	292	1.39	Moundsville	15,163	5,244	19.9	22.1	381	1.72
Brownwood	16,974	4,083	36.5	26.9	1,177	4.46	Clarksburg	28,100	5,499	20.6	55.0	1,443	2.62
Cleburne	15,381	5,072	23.3	26.3	574	2.16	Huntington	83,600	5,426	23.8	159.0	6,648	4.18
College Station	11,396	4,733	29.1	15.9	151	.94	Wheeling	54,400	5,392	21.6	107.0	4,212	3.93
Corsicana	20,344	4,044	36.8	29.6	666	2.26	Wisconsin:						
Del Rio	18,612	3,469	43.0	22.2	520	2.34	Ashland	10,132	5,165	20.6	15.2	1,126	7.41
Denison	22,748	4,515	30.0	34.7	880	2.54	Beaver Dam	13,118	5,543	14.7	24.6	659	2.67
Eagle Pass	12,094	2,436</											

the time of our debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act. By way of the bill which we are introducing today, we ask the more reasonable members of the majority to reconsider the ill conceived and hasty action taken in January.

The minority party has been severely hampered in past years, particularly with the increase in the workload and the complexity of our problems, because of inadequate staff on the committees. As a group of distinguished political scientists has said:

To deny the Minority in Congress access to adequate representation on Committee staff eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration.

The minority party has been forced to act with a lack of adequate data and evaluation in several subject areas, and has, as a result, often been unable to offer complete and complex alternatives to legislation.

As the chairman of a Republican conference subcommittee which studied the problem of minority staffing, I have become quite well acquainted with the subject, and I and several of my colleagues, particularly my fellow Republican, Mr. CLEVELAND, have discovered some cracks in the wall, and we are working to fill them with this bill.

Though it is true that there are no minority staffing problems on many committees, there are some which have proven unacceptable. Specifically, the problem is that the staff hired by the minority is subject to the veto of the entire committee, which gives the majority party the power to deny competent personnel to the minority. This flaw is unacceptable, as I am sure, the majority party would agree if the minority were to have a veto over its staff. I would hasten to add that the present majority party may not always enjoy such status.

Our bill provides for the separate hiring by either party of the allotted number of staff personnel. Neither party will have a say in whom the other shall appoint to its professional or clerical positions. This provision would be extremely helpful in the minority's attempt at fulfilling the role of a loyal opposition, thereby contributing to the upgrading of the legislation which would result from an improved and more dynamic adversary system.

This change is relatively minor, particularly in view of the enormous benefits which would accrue. The current situation, in which the majority has a veto power, distresses me, and I ask your support to permit the minority sole hiring and firing power over the minority staff.

#### BAN THE BOOM

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to prohibit flights by civil aircraft at supersonic speeds within the navigable airspace of the United States.

We all know what a sonic boom is and what it does. We also agree that it is bad

and that we do not want it. The real question is how decisively we are willing to assert ourselves.

Too much of the legislation introduced to date on this subject, in my opinion, leaves unacceptable loopholes for squeezing through an ear-shattering supersonic flight. The Senate-passed bill, S. 1117, and its companion measures in the House, H.R. 3228, H.R. 5949, H.R. 6043, H.R. 6235, H.R. 9010, are virtual carbon copies of a rule proposed by the Federal Aviation Administration more than 14 months ago.

That proposal—notice of proposed rulemaking No. 70-16—was issued April 10, 1970. More than a year has passed and the FAA still has not acted. The agency has informed my office it is working on its final determination.

It was made at a time when the FAA and the Nixon administration were working vigorously to sell the American people and the Congress on the need to spend more than a billion of our tax dollars on developing a U.S. supersonic transport. But the people and the Congress did not buy it.

Although the United States is no longer building an SST, the British, French, and Russians are, and those nations will want to sell their SST's to U.S. airlines and fly them to and from this country. Thirty-eight of the 74 options to buy Concorde are held by American carriers. Moreover, this Nation's aircraft industry could very well build an SST of its own at some future date. For these reasons, it is no less urgent today for us to act on prohibiting supersonic flight over the United States than it was a year or so ago.

These bills, like the FAA proposed rule, would permit supersonic flights by civil aircraft over any part of the United States if the sonic boom does not reach the ground. Exceptions are made for research and development flights.

These exceptions give the FAA full authority to go ahead and approve sonic boom-producing flights for such vague reasons as "assisting aircraft development" or "studying sonic boom effects."

The FAA proposal represents a significant erosion of the Government's original promise to prohibit civilian supersonic flights over the United States.

Just how much further erosion might there be? One clue can be seen in the Administration's position on these bills which duplicate its own proposed regulation. The administration is opposed. Lest that sound like a contradiction, let us look at the reason why.

The FAA informed me it feels sonic boom prohibition should be done by FAA regulation rather by act of Congress.

Why? Regulations are more flexible than laws; they are easier to change.

The United States may be out of the SST business for the time being, but the aviation industry, the current administration, and especially the FAA, hope we will be back in before too long. Meanwhile, U.S. airlines may very well be buying and flying foreign-made SST's and certainly the airlines of several friendly nations will.

The Anglo-French SST, Concorde, was designed and built to fly between New York and Europe, especially Lon-

don and Paris. Both sponsor governments have invested billions of dollars in the project along with their national pride and possibly their political and economic futures. They do not want to see their airplane fail. You can bet they will be willing to put greater pressure on the U.S. Government, both directly and through their friends in the aviation industry, to relax threatening barriers to Concorde.

The sonic boom would not be a serious threat to inhabitants of the United States for flights between London and New York, where most of the distance is over water. However, even that has been criticized by persons who contend prolonged sonic booms of transoceanic flights could have an adverse effect on persons at sea, as well as on marine life.

But what happens when the U.S. airlines, which invested heavily in SST's to meet foreign competition on their international routes, want to put their supersonic planes to work on the lucrative domestic routes, say New York to Los Angeles?

Some conservationists say an SST on such a flight would trail a thunderous boom along a path 50 miles wide, and disturb the peace of 20 million Americans. One noise expert contends it could cause heart attacks and hearing impairments for many of those 20 million.

Tests in West Germany, France, and England, as well as this country, show sonic booms cause structural damage to buildings. Incidentally, there is a very real worry in those European countries that the boom might destroy the centuries-old churches, castles, and other relics their SST's would be bringing tourists to visit.

What happens when the airlines want to use their SST's on U.S. domestic routes? Will the FAA, in the interest of promoting aviation, grant them permission under its proposed regulation, in the guise of assisting aircraft development, or studying sonic boom effects? Or will the regulation be changed? Will the Government and industry launch a public relations campaign to tell the American people that the boom is a nice thing to have around—"a 20th century sound," as Boeing calls it—a symbol of prosperity and progress for the Nation?

Or maybe it will be explained in terms of preserving and protecting the free enterprise system and the U.S. balance of payments. Or perhaps the ban on the boom will be lifted to meet a stirred-up public demand for domestic SST service, implying the boom must be good because people want the flights—although the SST's speed advantage and extra ticket cost will appeal to only a relatively privileged small number of air travelers.

Or maybe, if the Congress acts, the prohibition of supersonic flights over populated areas will be permanent.

This Congress has decided the SST poses a threat to the environment, among other things. Approval of this legislation leaving a loophole for intense noise pollution would contradict the already expressed will of the Congress and of the America people.

We must enact legislation that decisively prohibits all sonic booms produced

by civilian aircraft. This is too important to leave to the discretion of others.

This legislation would permit the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to approve sonic boom-producing flights if he feels they assist in aircraft development or aid in studying sonic boom effects. The job of the FAA, by law, is to promote aviation, not protect the environment or fight pollution. It is for just that reason that it would be a severe error to enact legislation giving such discretionary power to the FAA Administrator.

Secretary of Transportation Volpe has said supersonic transports would "not be allowed to fly over populated areas unless and until the noise factor comes within acceptable limits."

"Acceptable" was never defined.

Who would determine "acceptable limits"? The FAA, which makes the rules and is charged with promoting aviation?

Years of research still have not produced any method of eliminating the sonic boom or even significantly muzzling it. Secretary Volpe is confident:

If we can't lick the sonic boom problem in 10 years, I don't know the United States of America.

Many persons are wary of the FAA's promise to protect them from the sonic boom. They fear that some day there will be boom-producing supersonic flights over populated areas even without Secretary Volpe's hoped-for breakthrough. They fear it will begin by allowing the boom "only within acceptable limits" and then subtly redefining what is "acceptable."

The sonic boom is clearly unacceptable.

And it is destructive. Just ask the U.S. Air Force and the 12,000 persons who filed damage claims as a result of sonic boom testing. The Government has paid about a half-million dollars in settlements so far on sonic boom damage claims.

Noise and health authorities have said sonic booms could cause hearing impairments and possibly worse damage for persons in SST flight paths.

Because the sonic boom is unacceptable, the Congress should not give the FAA such broad authority to regulate and possibly permit this threat to the public health and welfare. The Congress should—must—leave no doubt about the abhorrence for the sonic boom.

There must be an absolute ban on sonic booms by civilian aircraft over the United States.

Therefore, I am introducing today my own legislation to prohibit such flights over the United States, its territories, possessions, and territorial waters. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to include a copy of my bill in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit sonic booms by civil aircraft within the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful to operate a civil aircraft within the navigable airspace of the United States*

at speeds which would produce a sonic boom, thereby creating a measurable or audible overpressure on the surface. For the purposes of this act, the term "navigable airspace" shall have the same meaning given such term by Sec. 101(24) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 USC 1301(24)).

#### THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES— ACT IV

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Department of Justice granted immunity to Frank Sharp, who has been accused of stock frauds and manipulations, and who it is said attempted to influence key officials of the Texas State government by arranging attractive stock deals for them. At the same time, the Department of Justice is proceeding full speed to obtain indictments against those officials.

The deal for Sharp's immunity was arranged by none other than the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Kleindeinst, who was acting in behalf of the Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson. Wilson says he had disqualified himself from the case because he once knew Sharp.

But Will Wilson had a much closer knowledge of the case than just a nodding acquaintance with the chief defendant, Frank Sharp.

As a matter of fact, Will Wilson helped Sharp arrange the biggest deals he ever made.

Will Wilson, as a member of the Texas State Banking Commission voted with great enthusiasm to create the Sharpstown State Bank. That same bank was later the subject of intense and complex machinations, which in at least one instance, caused the capitalization of the bank to quadruple overnight.

Will Wilson helped Frank Sharp create the Sharpstown State Bank. He probably knew that it was blown into a mighty bubble by Mr. Sharp's wheeling and dealing.

Will Wilson later became a lawyer for Frank Sharp.

Will Wilson helped Frank Sharp buy 518,000 shares—the majority of stock—in the National Bankers Life Insurance Co.

Will Wilson himself acquired a substantial number of shares in that same company.

Within a matter of weeks after Wilson arranged Sharp's purchase, Sharp was manipulating the stock of National Bankers Life Co., to the extent that its value increased more than threefold almost overnight.

I believe that it is clear that Wilson knew a great deal about Frank Sharp. It is likely that he knew his client was operating very close to the outer limits of law, or even outside the law. It is also likely that Wilson profited mightily from his relationship with Sharp.

Now Wilson tells us that he lost money on the Sharp stock that he owned. So what? The Speaker of the Texas House

lost money on that same stock, and Wilson wants to see him indicted and jailed. What makes Wilson so different from him?

Wilson does not want to speak about his relationship with Frank Sharp. He now issues statements through spokesmen. He answers only the parts of newsmen's questions that he wants to answer. He replies with evasions, and with political attacks.

But the essential truth will not be obscured or covered up.

The truth is that the Assistant Attorney General and his bosses want as little known about his deals with and for Sharp as possible, because Assistant Attorney General Wilson was right in the middle of some of Sharp's biggest deals. They want to hide this fact. And the way to hide it best is simply not to prosecute Sharp.

So they made a deal with Sharp—"help us prosecute all these Texas politicians, and we will let you go, they said."

In this way Wilson can hide his own dealings with the defendant Sharp and at the same time appear to be prosecuting the case to the fullest extent, even though the chief defendant is let go.

Sharp has what he wants, which is immunity. But Wilson's hand has been revealed.

It may turn out that Sharp might never testify at all in the forthcoming prosecutions. If that should happen, Wilson will have made yet another bad deal, even worse than the one he already has on his hands.

As it stands now, we know this:

Will Wilson helped Frank Sharp make the deal that created the Sharpstown State Bank.

Will Wilson acted as a lawyer for Sharp in an unknown number of subsequent deals.

Will Wilson played a key role in the deal that brought Sharp into control of National Bankers Life Insurance Co.

Will Wilson bought—or had given to him—Frank Sharp's stocks.

Has Will Wilson made one last deal for Frank Sharp—to spring him from criminal liability for the crimes he has been charged with?

How many deals intertwine these two men? If it were not for those deals, would Sharp be immune from prosecution today? Is the prosecutor guilty of the same crimes he is hoping to convict his old political rivals of committing? Wilson has the whole mighty apparatus of the Department of Justice to conceal his hand. But no matter how dark the curtains may be drawn about this case, the smell is plain to all who have come near.

Malfiance and misfeasance has a common odor and it is rotten. This whole deal is shameful. Wilson has much explaining to do.

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY APPEALS TO PRESIDENT TO SIGN PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. McFALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon now has before him for signature S. 575, providing for the extension of the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works Economic Development Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, last week appealed to the President to sign this legislation at the earliest date possible in order that these additional tools may be used to combat the rising rate of unemployment.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to have Mr. Meany's letter of June 17 to the President recorded:

AFL-CIO,

Washington, D.C., June 17, 1971.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.,

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The AFL-CIO strongly urges you to sign into law S. 575, providing for the extension of the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

The national unemployment rate for all workers is now 6.2%—for construction workers the rate is 11.2%. A prompt application of the benefits of this bill would help to alleviate this situation.

Opponents of Title I of the bill allege that the pace of the proposed program is too slow to have the immediate impact that is needed to relieve unemployment. We do not agree with that evaluation.

The 1962 Accelerated Public Works Act was signed September 14, 1962, and by June 30, 1964, some \$860 million had been invested in more than 7,700 public works projects, which were located in about 1,000 counties in the fifty states and three territories. By the end of the first year, 6,811 projects had been started or completed.

At present there are several billion dollars of planned and blueprinted public works projects which would be eligible for accelerated public works grants. At the end of 1970 there were about 3,000 applicants for federal approval for waste treatment plants, 800 applications for water and sewer projects, 1,900 applications for hospital and public centers, in addition to hundreds of other state and local projects that have been planned and blueprinted.

We estimate that the proposed program would create about 170,000 jobs in on-site construction and in the production and distribution of construction materials. As the additional employee income and business profits are spent there would be a multiplying boost to production and employment, with an additional job increase of about 250,000. The overall impact of the measure, therefore, could increase employment by as much as 420,000 jobs.

The proposed program offers a great opportunity to invest in America's future by building needed projects and at the same time furnish badly needed employment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,  
President.

#### ANTIGUN LAWS DID NOT STOP CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF CO- LUMBIA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, again voices are being heard in the land against handguns. Experience with antigun legislation should teach us that this new activity will be a forerunner of efforts to end ownership by law-abiding citizens of weapons of all types, or at least to require registration and licensing for all weapons. These voices against handguns say that the handgun is the tool of the murderer, the robber, and the assaulter. They say that the handgun has only one purpose—the killing of another person. The voices say, "Do away with the handgun and you do away with most of the crime with firearms." They are, in many instances, the same voices that call for a softening of the penalties for crime, and which insist on a zealous regard for the rights of those who flout the rules of the community and society.

The American public is being told from various platforms that the removal of handguns from the social scene is an absolute necessity if crime is to be meaningfully controlled. Antihandgun proponents declare that anticrime measures without handgun prohibition will only be half as effective.

Now let us be factual. Progressively tighter firearms laws in the United States have not effected a reduction of gun crimes or overall serious crime. The principal purpose of the new Federal firearms statutes enacted in 1968 was to combat crime and violence. In addition, the Congress has passed many anticrime bills and we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for new programs against crime. What have been the results? A look at some basic criminal statistics indicates clearly and forcefully that crime is still on the increase and markedly so—this despite the 1968 gun control law and additional anticrime bills.

During the debate on the Gun Control Act of 1968, the point was loudly made time and again that unless there were a flat prohibition on the movement of all firearms between nonlicensees in interstate commerce, the anticrime purpose of the proposed law would be seriously jeopardized. Accordingly, the general prohibition was adopted—not without misgivings by many in the Congress. Now we are witnessing the astonishing spectacle, repeated many times over the last decade, of public and private chanting that the existing laws are inadequate, not sufficiently responsive to new conditions and circumstances. This less than 3 years after a major congressional overhaul of the principal Federal gun control statutes, and the adoption of far-reaching anticrime laws.

Solutions offered by national commissions and lawmakers on the problem of the use of firearms in crime are simplistic and prohibitory. Requirements of total firearms registration and the outlawing of handguns rest on the proposition that the more severe the controls, and the fewer firearms in circulation, the fewer crimes and the less harm to society. Unfortunately, experience has not borne this out. The fact is that criminals will not surrender or register their firearms.

This is so obvious and clear as to be axiomatic. The fact is that registration or prohibition will be futile as a crime-fighting measure but will be a substantial and unjustified burden on the reputable citizen. Thus, what do we see? We view the incredible result of controls operating adversely for the law-abiding citizen with no or miniscule effect on the criminal. He continues to go his lawless way.

The futility of handgun registration or prohibition is shown in bold relief in New York City and the District of Columbia, which perhaps have the strongest firearms laws or ordinances in the Nation—including registration, licensing, prohibition of possession by certain persons, and other controls. Recently, police officers were fatally shot in those jurisdictions, despite the existence of the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968, plus the highly stringent gun controls of the District and New York City. We may properly ask why the comprehensive Federal and local controls could not have prevented these tragedies. There can only be one answer—legislative controls over weapons cannot achieve that purpose. Antigun laws have failed to deter crime in the District of Columbia.

Until we are ready to attack the real roots of crime—poverty, illiteracy, housing, lack of economic opportunity, discrimination, outdated judicial machinery, inadequate enforcement of existing laws, disregard of authority and order—we shall not find the answer to crime. Firearms laws, no matter how restrictive or comprehensive, are not the answer to this social malady. There is no panacea to criminal behavior. The solution lies in an awareness of our national origin and purpose and in a willingness to criticize, evaluate, and direct our national effort along the road to cures, not controls.

#### TIME TO CHANGE THE FISCAL YEAR

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the proposal to change the fiscal year in Government to parallel the calendar year and I urge action on this proposal without further delay. The logic behind such a change is clear and I think persuasive. It has been many years since the work of Congress on authorizations and appropriations has been completed at the beginning of the fiscal year which is now established as July 1. Some bills affecting both authorization and appropriation for the fiscal year do not receive final approval until just before the adjournment of Congress. An adjournment seldom is accomplished until late December.

The result is uncertainty and confusion in the various departments of Government. Most of them now operate after July 1 on the basis of continuing resolutions but with little in the way of clear guidelines to determine their spend-

ing levels. Meaningful planning and spending is virtually impossible under these conditions.

As long as it is the end of the year before Congress is able to complete its budget work, the departments will be required to work for half the fiscal year on the confusion which accompanies continuing resolutions. If the fiscal year is changed to begin on January 1, the Congress will have a full year of work ahead in which to complete its budget considerations. This would remove the intolerable situation in which both Congress and the departments now are placed.

There is another aspect. Under the present law, Congress is expected to complete the appropriations processes by June 30. When we take into account that we are appropriating the taxpayers money in amounts in excess of \$200 billion each year, a scant 6 months is nearly sufficient for the task.

Departments, on the other hand, also should be able to plan for their needs and the needs of those they serve. In such important areas as housing and defense as well as health care and other vitally important aspects of Federal spending, 6 months in limbo followed by 6 months in fiscal clover is hardly acceptable.

Therefore, I respectfully urge the responsible committees and the Congress to give favorable consideration to the proposal to change the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year.

Such a change will serve the best interests of the taxpayers of the United States, the various Government Departments and those they are charged to serve, and the Congress whose job it is to make certain only needed expenditures are funded.

This proposed change will give us time to do our jobs, a circumstance which does not now exist.

#### A BILL TO PROMOTE TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

(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, today I am introducing legislation which is new to this Congress, I believe. It is a bill that would coordinate the present Federal efforts at technology transfer, technology utilization, the process by which new ideas, methods, and inventions, brought about through the expenditure of Federal funds for purposes of defense, atomic energy, or space research, are applied in other areas or to different purposes than the original one projected and in both the public and private sectors. My main concern is that this application of new ideas to other areas include a whole range of interests of the American public; business and education, health and consumer needs. This is no more than a just return on the taxpayers' investment.

For some years, I have been interested in the spin-offs from space, the earth benefits to be derived from research and development funds spent by the Federal

Government on a variety of kinds of equipment, machinery, and technology necessary to take men to the moon. My interest has been generated by the fact that for 10 years, I was a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee and it was during those 10 years that the initial steps resulting in the final steps on the moon were taken.

When the wheel was invented, whether by accident or on purpose, it was immediately applied to a specific intended use. Little did the original inventor realize the multiple purposes that would eventually emerge and the significance this new technology would have in the history of transportation. This is one of the earliest examples of technology transfer.

The Federal Government, while not an inventor, pays out public tax dollars, billions of dollars to scientists for invention, for research and development—amounting to over \$100 billion in the past decade. The funds spent are aimed at specific needs or goals as was the case with the idea that resulted in the wheel. Research and development is mission-oriented when funded by the Federal Government, serving either the broad needs of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

As a nation, we have enjoyed many valuable side-effects, spin-offs or "fall-outs" from this research. Many of the examples of the miracles of modern science, of technology transfer, the path from "science to sales" come from the annals of NASA, largely because NASA has made a concerted effort to accomplish the transfer of their space technology to everyday usage and have publicized that effort especially well.

Most of you are aware of the everyday usage of some of the sophisticated hardware from NASA.

Rainy day auto accidents are being reduced as much as 90 percent in some States by grooving the pavement, "hydroplaning," as a result of NASA studies of aircraft skidding on wet runways.

Sensors used for medical and other purposes in space can now be made smaller than the head of a pin and inserted by means of hypodermic needles into veins or arteries to measure blood pressure or to evaluate the effectiveness of implanted artificial heart valves.

A physician can now obtain electrocardiogram data on a patient before he ever sees him. An EKG, taken in the ambulance transferring the patient to the hospital can be transmitted by radio-telemetry direct to the physician who will handle the case. Think what this could mean in rural areas, where doctors are few and hospitals distant.

A six-legged vehicle proposed for unmanned exploration of the moon was redesigned and the lunar walker became a walking chair for crippled children and other disabled persons.

A sight switch, developed to give astronauts an extra pair of arms, has been adapted for use by people suffering from paralysis. With this a patient can manipulate a motor-driven wheel chair with only the movement of his eyes.

Superinsulation materials have been developed; one of these with high mechanical strength, great resilience, and less weight has been incorporated into a line of blankets for sportsmen.

Space electronic developments have enabled our electrical and communications scientists to produce the tiny, workable parts which are miracles of modern computers.

The whole systems analysis approach originated with the space program, which requires the integration and coordination of every phase of production of space hardware and facilities. Systems analysis has caused a revolution in American business and industry.

Again, this technology was originated to serve the purposes of space exploration—and similar ones could be shown from atomic energy and Department of Defense research—but the payoff has occurred on earth in a multitude of economic benefits.

I see infinite possibilities in all of this. With improved technology we can prognosticate the weather, contribute toward the control of pollution problems, render machinery that is obsolete or detrimental usable and profitable, balance our trade inequities, move toward a systems approach in handling large-scale problems such as mass transportation, urbanization.

However, at present, various Government agencies do their own thing regarding technology utilization, and there is no overall, organized approach to the matter of supplying the American consumer with the knowledge and the know-how to make use of what our laboratories and universities have discovered, using public funds. Let me mention a few of these operations.

I have been very much impressed with NASA's program and plan for technology utilization. NASA operates their program through a number of approaches. There are the cooperating regional dissemination centers, a nationwide grid or network of university-based and geographically dispersed computerized information storage and retrieval centers. NASA uses applications teams to search out ways in which new technology might be useful, hunting problems to fit ready-made or almost ready-made solutions; and vice versa. They also publish NASA Tech Briefs and other monographs outlining new inventions and methodologies.

The Atomic Energy Commission operates through conferences and symposia, as well as technical progress reviews. AEC contracts with privately operated laboratories, universities and other non-profit institutions as well as commercial enterprises. Like NASA contractors, AEC contractors are required to report periodically on the results of their work. Although like NASA, AEC had planned a kind of regional dissemination with Offices of Industrial Cooperation at each of the national laboratories, this effort has been discontinued and TU operations seem at AEC to be suffering from budget cuts.

For the Department of Defense, the Defense Documentation Center receives reports on R. & D. from contractors with

the Department. The originating agency retains control over whether the information is classified or not. If it is classified, the information remains with the DDC to be used by Government agencies and organizations engaged in Government-sponsored research. If it is unclassified, then this information is sent directly to the National Technical Information Service—which I will describe more fully later—for simultaneous announcement to the scientific community and the defense complex.

The Small Business Administration in its mandate to assist small business also operates a technology utilization program with direct access to businesses. SBA works through seminars with educational and other nonprofit organizations and offers workshops relating to the application of specific technological advances. SBA also relies on direct counseling to small businessmen. Technology utilization efforts there seemed in decline when, for about a year, this office was combined with the procurement office in the SBA and therefore the efforts were somewhat diluted by additional responsibilities. Thereafter, the TU office was once again separated.

Similar, yet different, was the Office of State Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. I say was, because this is now defunct, largely by will of the Congress which failed to appropriate funds for its continuance. This office held much promise when it was created in 1965 for the purpose of assisting States to promote wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology. In this program, the emphasis is on the States. STS was modeled on the Agriculture Extension Service method of bringing new ideas, inventions, and matching need to potentiality. An Arthur D. Little Co. study found this program performing "a useful and economic service," resulting in substantial economic and social benefits. Nevertheless, unless the Massachusetts congressional delegation and other interested parties prevail, this program, now phasing out, will not be revived.

In September of 1970, a new kind of arrangement was worked out in the Department of Commerce whereby the newly created National Technical Information Service became the overseer for the final phasing out of this program. Moreover, the National Technical Information Service acquired a twofold role: First, to coordinate commerce, business and technology information activities, and second, to serve as the primary focal point within the Federal Government for the collection, announcement, and dissemination of technical reports and data. In this capacity, it operates the Clearing House of Federal Scientific and Technical Information—formerly of the National Bureau of Standards—announcing publications, R. & D. reports of interest to the public resulting from federally funded research.

All of these agencies and departments are performing a valuable service, either collecting information, collecting and dispersing information, collecting, dis-

persing, and trying to find user needs. But, their real problem lies in the fact that: First, at times there is an overlap; and second, at times actual contact is never made between those who have access to the new information or technology within the Government and those on the outside who do not even know it is available, or have not identified their own problem enough to make use of new methodologies.

The Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate after lengthy hearings and consideration dating back to May 1966, issued a report of the Subcommittee on Science and Technology called *The Prospects for Technology Transfer*, May 1968. They noted:

Despite many years of wide publicity on the wonders of science, and despite considerable directed effort in technology transfer, relatively few firms, in a handful of industries, are actually consumers of technology.

They also noted that—

Testimony on the hearings supported the contention that present Federal programs are confusing to the business community. There is no single point of contact where all Government information is accessible.

In 1970, that same Senate subcommittee deplored a "sharp regression in existing programs," the cutback at AEC, the decline of STS, and the abolition in part of the TU program at SBA—temporarily.

It is for all these reasons then that I am today introducing legislation to create a Federal office of technology transfer which I hope will accomplish a unification of these technology utilization efforts and provide a "single point of contact" not only where all Government information is accessible but easily so; with information assistance provided out in the field. Data collection is essential, but not enough since of primary importance is field service, contacts out in the field.

The Office for Federal Technology Transfer would be an independent agency headed by a director and provided with the power to conduct research—by grant or contract—with respect to technology transfer. This office would take over the present technology utilization activities now performed by various Government agencies, including those I have mentioned. Indeed, there are other TU areas in the Government besides those offices, departments, and agencies I mentioned. For example, in the National Archives, in the Smithsonian Institution's Science Information Exchange, and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, I believe the ones I have mentioned are the major ones. Moreover, the proposed legislation would allow the President to add additional technology utilization programs to this newly created office for a period of 3 years.

The clearinghouse offers valuable information; the State Technical Services did offer valuable personal assistance, but somehow we must combine the work of these and other agencies, departments, offices now concerned with technology

utilization whether through collecting and dispersing information, or through actually seeking out and supplying user needs "a personal counseling function for individual companies which lack the skill to ask the right questions," as that Senate Select Committee put it. I believe that section 4(a)(2) of my proposal would supply this need for "trained transfer agents," that "link between application engineering and the storage bank," for it provides for the establishment of "regional science and technology centers to obtain information as to the needs of potential users of federally developed technology and to more effectively disseminate such technology."

Actually what we need is all three: A storage bank, agents to transfer the information therein to industries, businesses, communities, education and other institutions. It is my intention that my proposal encompass all three.

Moreover, I do not conceive of this as just an assist to business. I believe that we have many problems in our society which might find solutions or assistance through the application of new methods and information from the field of research and development.

In 1969, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics inaugurated discussion with the National Academy of Public Administration which resulted in a study of technology assessment programs in the executive branch—"a technology assessment system for the executive branch." The description that report offers aptly describes the present situation and the need for change. The report states:

What exists today is a conglomeration of ad hoc efforts to assess the effects of technology on special interests, programs, and goals. What is lacking is attention to a broader national purpose, clearly enunciated and systematically pursued.

What I would hope to offer is a beginning consideration of programs and goals and a Federal unification of efforts to be systematically pursued. System is the word I would emphasize. Currently we have a number of valuable programs but we need a centralization of purpose and program. That is what I hope to offer in the bill I introduce today.

#### WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days when demonstrators make most of the news; where old fashioned patriotism seems to be out of style and when young people seem more interested in ridiculing our flag than in showing their respect for it, it is refreshing to learn that a few youngsters still appreciate our American heritage and have some understanding of the fact that life in America has more to offer than anywhere else in the world.

Such a youngster is Donnie L. John-

son, of Angier, N.C., winner of an essay contest on "What It Means To Be an American."

I want to share Donnie's essay with my colleagues:

**WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN**

America! What wonderful feelings tingle down my spine as I think of this word—feelings of security and patriotic responsibility. Images painted by the bright colors of exploding fireworks and distant battle sounds swarm inside my head. Is it true? Can there really be such a spectacular place to live, a place where man can respond to the clanging bells of various denominations without fear? Yes, this place is called the United States of America and it was built by strong hands of public-spirited citizens like George Washington, Andrew Jackson and Dwight Eisenhower. These brave souls spent much of their dedicated lives on blood-stained battlefields making this a better place to live. They are as much a part of this crowned republic as the red, white, and blue banner that symbolizes our heritage.

We should all be proud of this unique country in which we have the privilege to make known our many ideas and thoughts. Too many times we take for granted pleasures like reading an ink-smudged newspaper or watching the latest news events on an unappreciated television set.

Being an American is more than just observing what a great land this is. A true American is not content until he finds something to do to improve his country. Americanism defined in fewer words could be stated as "being involved."

Look around. Concerned people are taking action and trying to improve the condition of our nation. Unnoticed, gleaming planes in a background of blue infinity strengthen our powerful defense along with the giant aircraft carriers on the uneasy seas. America, in a sense, is nothing more than the interested people that love her.

America means a great deal to me. It's my way of life. I don't want to be a Communist or a Socialist. I enjoy the public radio stations and monthly magazines too much to cash in my title of being an American.

We must all feel this way for this sacred land to survive. This is God's land and He wants it to grow and prosper. Don't be a parasitic creature sucking all the wealth and fortune from this great country. Instead, humbly look toward God and ask Him what can be done to improve this miracle called America.

**FOR LOCKHEED AND OTHERS, A GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP IS VITAL**

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a continuing controversy currently surrounds the proposed \$250 million loan guarantee to the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. The contention of many observers is that such Government assistance to this firm—the Nation's largest defense contractor—is unprecedented and violates our traditionally free enterprise system. I believe it can be demonstrated that these arguments are false.

The U.S. Government has been an active partner in many business ventures for years. During the 1930's, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was begun

to aid hundreds of financially troubled firms. This Corporation's efforts are generally thought to have been a success. During the 25 years of its existence, the RFC disbursed over \$40 billion in direct loans, while also guaranteeing billions of dollars in underwritten loans and private investments. When it was liquidated in 1953, the RFC was succeeded at least partially by the Small Business Administration, which still flourishes today.

The SBA in fiscal 1970 made 8,374 business loans totaling \$444,723,028. All sorts of businesses which have experienced all sorts of problems and have had all sorts of needs come to the SBA for help and they get it—to the tune of nearly half a billion dollars in fiscal 1970 and no less than \$757,027,124 through May 31 of the current fiscal year. Yet critics of the proposed Lockheed loan guarantee persist in maintaining that such assistance is unheard of.

I believe that to allow Lockheed to go under would be a disaster. If the Small Business Administration could lend \$965,460 in disaster loans during fiscal 1970 and another \$545,500 through May 31, 1971, it seems to me that the Government could guarantee a needed loan to Lockheed. It must be emphasized that there is no request in this case for Federal funds—merely a guarantee to private lending institutions that the loans would be repaid. It is also important to note that any Government guaranteed loans will be the first debt Lockheed would repay; in other words, a "last in, first out" principle would apply, with payback probably beginning in mid 1973. The company predicts that the guaranteed portion of their loans would be fully paid back by the end of 1974. A lien on Lockheed assets would also be granted in order to minimize the Government's risk. In short, the Government would be protected and unlikely to lose money even if Lockheed does not survive.

In pointing out earlier that the Government is deeply involved in supporting businesses via such agencies as the Small Business Administration, I was not intending to limit myself to one example. The aforementioned RFC helped the Glenn L. Martin Co. in 1947 to secure \$26.6 million for the purpose of alleviating financial difficulty arising from its series of commercial airliners. The U.S. Export-Import Bank often guarantees loans for the purchase of U.S. equipment by foreign buyers. Purchase of 71 Boeing 747's by 13 foreign countries was facilitated by nearly \$600 million in export-import loans. Six foreign airliners also purchased 29 McDonnell-Douglas DC-10's with the aid of \$190 million in loans. The Export-Import Bank has even committed \$3.5 million worth of assistance for foreign purchases of Lockheed's own L-1011 airbus.

There are also V-loan precedents. These loans are designed to help companies with defense business, such as Lockheed. In 1967, however, Douglas Aircraft received \$75 million to alleviate losses generated by its DC-8 and DC-9 commercial aircraft.

Not long ago, U.S. News & World Re-

port printed an analysis which shows that Government-guaranteed and insured loans outstanding total \$137 billion. Direct Government loans—which Lockheed is not requesting—total an additional \$54 billion. The article further states—

The idea of government guaranteed loans as a financing tool, however, has flourished massively . . . the total of such loan guarantees, plus direct Federal loans, has about doubled in the past 10 years.

In 1970, for example, 6,547 guarantees were made by the Government which provided loans to small businesses totaling \$340.2 million. Again, I underline the point that relief for Lockheed is neither shocking nor unprecedented.

There are many who would blame faulty corporate management for all of Lockheed's difficulties. There is no doubt that this is at least partially true. Yet loose and inefficient Pentagon contracting procedures in years past must also be cited if one is seeking reasons for Lockheed Aircraft's current plight. I was recently dismayed to hear Assistant Secretary of Defense Packard suggest that guaranteeing the \$250 million loan to Lockheed is an idea for which he has very little enthusiasm and about which he has much doubt. This seems to me a bit like the proverbial "pot calling the kettle black." If Government and industry have inadvertently conspired to create a major problem, as I think has happened in this case, then I believe they should be willing to work together to solve the problem. There is far more at stake here than merely the good name of Lockheed.

It should also be noted that the delays the L-1011 has suffered due to the collapse of Rolls-Royce in Britain cannot be blamed on Lockheed. It is significant that the British Government has moved to save Rolls-Royce in order that they may honor a contract to produce the engines for the L-1011 TriStar.

The cancellation of the Lockheed L-1011 aircraft would have severe repercussions. More than 30,000 jobs are at stake, with all of the accompanying problems which so much new unemployment would create. Further, \$1.4 billion in U.S. investments is also at stake, with little to be salvaged if the L-1011 is canceled. Tax income would be significantly reduced as many U.S. businesses began writing off their major losses. It is a fact that scores of subcontractors would be wiped out if Lockheed is allowed to collapse. Overall losses resulting from the demise of the L-1011 TriStar at such a late stage in its development would be even larger than whatever cost the Government would incur even if Lockheed had to default on the loan.

This I think is the heart of the matter: Will we deal on the basis of strict dogma and orthodoxy by refusing to guarantee the loan, because it is an unusual case with limited precedent? Will we turn our backs on the staggering losses? Or will we deal on the basis of what is the greatest good for the greatest number and cut losses to a minimum? I favor the latter approach and feel that it should apply to an even broader question—the question

of whether the U.S. Government is going to go to bat for and back up our own industries when they need help. I do not refer only to companies which are in trouble, but to all U.S. business and industry.

World competition in the economic sphere is becoming tougher and more intense every day. Nations which have newer, thriving, and more modern industrial facilities are challenging us as never before. West Germany and Japan are booming, thanks to new industries which U.S. post-World War II aid virtually built. Additionally, they enjoy the security of our defense umbrella while paying only tiny percentages of their national wealth for defense. Meanwhile, the United States continues to bear the back-breaking cost of national and free world security. Is it any wonder that it is next to impossible for us to rebuild and modernize our industries at a rate adequate to keep us even with or ahead of the competition's technological levels?

The present-day debate over higher tariffs for certain commodities clearly underscores the concern which now exists over our position in world markets. Higher tariffs and possible trade wars are not the answer. I believe the future viability of our competing in world economics depends on using America's ingenuity and resources to build modern and efficient industries capable of producing competitive products. Government should be an active partner in this effort. To this end, I would certainly support some of the proposals which have come forth as possible methods of aiding American business. Perhaps vehicles such as a permanent Emergency Loan Guarantee Corporation or a National Development Bank are what is needed. It is my hope that the appropriate committees of this House will examine these and other ideas thoroughly.

I am persuaded that we can and should protect U.S. jobs and investments for the good of our Nation. Government assistance to business has been a part of our system for many years. Precedents exist which clearly cast doubt on the arguments of those who insist that a Government guaranteed loan of the Lockheed nature is somehow reprehensible. On the contrary, I believe it is in our best interests to prevent the collapse of valuable U.S. corporations when there is a good chance that they can continue to contribute to our Nation's economic well-being. I believe the benefits we can reap are immeasurable and certainly preferable to a series of staggering losses.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has

reported that in the United States for a 5-year period—1963-68—only two-tenths of 1 percent of our population was involved in any type of campus protest, antiwar demonstrations, racial riots, et cetera.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 21, I was unable to attend the session of the House because I was visiting the city of St. Louis, Mo., under the auspices of the Committee for Peace and New Priorities, to appeal for support of the citizens of that city for efforts to end our military involvement in Indochina by December 31, 1971. Had I been present at Monday's session, I would have voted with the majority in support of additional funds for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (S. 1538), revision of the Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property (H.R. 5237), and the enforcement of State and local laws in the national forest system (H.R. 3146), all of which passed on record votes by wide margins. Also, had I been present, I would have voted against the previous question on the rule to consider H.R. 1, Social Security and Family Assistance Act amendments of 1971.

#### ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT FOR ILO DUES

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the fiscal year 1972 appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies (H.R. 9272) comes to the floor tomorrow, the Members of the House will be asked to continue to place the United States in violation of a legally binding international commitment by again denying funds for the U.S. contribution to the International Labor Organization. The Committee on Appropriations has omitted the \$7.8 million requested by the administration for the ILO for fiscal year 1972, putting the United States \$11.5 million in arrears on our obligations to that organization.

The committee, in its report on this legislation—House Report 92-297—implies, Mr. Speaker, that its rejection of funds for the U.S. contribution to the ILO, is supported by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. The committee also suggests that recent improvements in the U.S. position in the ILO are a result of the cut-off of U.S. funds for that organization in the latter half of fiscal year 1971, and that these improvements justify and even suggest further withholding of U.S. contributions.

It is my view that the position of the United States in the International Labor Organization is dependent largely on

the degree of effort and planning we devote to strengthening our position, and that it is most unlikely that the 1971 cut-off of our contribution had anything to do with improvements in our position over the past 6 months. I am pleased to note that the administration has expressed a similar view in a background memorandum on "The United States and the International Labor Organization" in which it states:

The price involved for the U.S. (in the ILO) is basically not one of money. Rather it concerns the amount of effort and resources we are prepared to devote to achieve a balance of forces within the ILO, the degree to which we are prepared to be forthcoming toward new programs, and the extent to which we are prepared to seek a necessary accommodation with both the East Bloc and the dente-minded West Europeans—an accommodation consistent with the Constitution of the ILO.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has recommended that we terminate our current violations of international commitments to the ILO and pay our dues, and I am hopeful that the Members of the House will have an opportunity to vote on an amendment to H.R. 9272 that would restore the \$7.8 million requested for fiscal year 1972.

I wish to submit several documents for the RECORD which Members may find helpful and informative in this regard. The first is the administration's memorandum referred to above. There follow two items from recent issues of the AFL-CIO News which indicate a much more positive outlook on the ILO than that presented in the committee report.

Finally I have included a joint statement by Rev. Msgr. Marvin Bordelon and Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, of the U.S. Catholic Conference, supporting payment of U.S. dues to the ILO, and an excerpt from President Nixon's June 1 news conference in which he indicated his position on this matter.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—AN ADMINISTRATION BACKGROUND

A leading advocate of prompt payment of assessed UN contributions by all members, the United States is now in arrears in the payment of its obligations to an international body—the International Labor Organization.

The reasons that led the Congress in 1970 to withhold the last half of that year's assessment to the ILO (\$3.7 million), and to raise doubts about its intention to fund this year's assessment (\$7.8 million) are exceedingly complex. After a careful study of the matter President Nixon on May 27, 1971, stated his belief that the U.S. should not withdraw from the ILO at this time, but that considerable change must take place in the ILO if the U.S. is to remain a member. The President also thinks that in order for the U.S. to remain a member in good standing, and to be able to help effect the changes desired, it will be necessary for the Congress to vote the appropriation for this country's arrearage from last year and its assessment for this year.

Following is a summary of the factors considered by the Administration in reaching the above decision.

Increasing dissatisfaction with trends in the International Labor Organization (ILO) over the past years culminated in a decision

by the Congress in 1970 to withhold payment of the last half of the assessed U.S. contribution to the organization for that year, and to cast doubt upon the willingness of Congress to fund the money for this year's assessment.

The incident that triggered this action by Congress was the appointment of a Soviet citizen to become one of the five Assistant Directors-General of the ILO—the highest appointive position yet attained by a Russian in the Organization. This decision, taken without opportunity for the U.S. to express its views beforehand, touched off a hearing before a House appropriations subcommittee in which a number of complaints about the ILO were aired by employer, worker and government members of the U.S. Delegation to the Organization.

The complaints dealt primarily with the continuous encroachment by the communist bloc of nations upon the ILO's structure, philosophy and goals, and with the belief that the International Labor Office was doing little to counter this trend. As a result, it was thought that the Organization was drifting away from its original purposes—setting international labor standards and providing technical assistance and research in the field of manpower and human resources.

These criticisms and the fact that the United States pays one quarter of the ILO's regular budget raised the issue of whether this country should remain in the Organization. An intensive study of this situation led to the conclusion that there are four major reasons why the U.S. should not withdraw from the ILO at this time:

1. Withdrawal by the U.S. would leave the Soviet Union as the dominant power in the Organization, affording it significant opportunity to exploit the ILO as a means of enlarging its own influence—at the sacrifice of the ILO's badly needed technical work around the world. The U.S. should not hand the USSR this advantage but rather should stay in the organization and fight to make it adhere to its constitutional objectives.

2. U.S. withdrawal would work against President Nixon's objective of shifting more of U.S. aid and technical assistance to the international agencies. Within the critically important field of manpower development, ILO is the foremost multilateral agency in the world, with lengthy experience, much expertise, and a going worldwide organization.

3. If the U.S. withdraws from the ILO, we are very unlikely to gain either friendship or understanding abroad. Instead the U.S. would be condemned for attacking an organization of service to working people everywhere, for resorting to cold war politics, for returning to a naive isolationism, or for acting from pure spite. If the object of foreign policy is to maintain or even increase a nation's influence abroad in directions that it desires, it makes little sense to take an action that clearly would decrease that influence.

4. U. S. withdrawal from the ILO could well threaten our eventual participation in the whole UN system. The U. S. has various complaints against other organizations. If it withdraws from one, then the way will become open to attack the rest and to press for quitting them as well. Is it to the interest of the U. S., and particularly its foreign policy, to initiate a course of action toward ILO that carries so large an additional risk?

What is called "the ILO problem" is a multi-sided and exceedingly complex affair. It is partly a product of the internal politics of the organization itself, in particular its desire to hold itself together against the unremitting and divisive pressures of its bloc of communist member states.

In addition, among some thoughtful Western critics, the ILO has not helped its cause

by its excessive preoccupation with ceremonial activities, by its frequent employment of extravagant rhetoric on behalf of its promises and its programs, and by its tendency at times to rely more upon its sentimental appeal than upon a rational exposition of its real accomplishments.

But "the ILO problem" is not entirely of the Organization's own making. Within the United States itself there are signs that it may become good politics to beat ILO over the head, to exaggerate its sins, to demand of it the impossible, and to ignore resolutely any shifts in its policies in our favor.

In the heat of indignation about U. S. grievances, it has been easy to disregard some very real faults of our own, deficiencies that must account in part for the problem itself: the lack of enough funds to support adequate and well-balanced U. S. delegations; lack of a consistent and firm strategy on behalf of U. S. interests in ILO over the years; and a failure of the participating government agencies and private organizations to accord consistently high priority to the U. S. involvement in the Organization.

The ILO was created in 1919 by Western nations which were characterized by parliamentary democracy, modern industrialism, and mixed economic systems. In this pluralistic social-economic model, both the trade unions and the employers are independent of domination by the central government. Accordingly, this was the conceptual origin of the unique tripartite system of governance that differentiates ILO from other international bodies. The United States, of course, also could—and does—fit comfortably into this structure.

But the Soviet Union and its communist allies could not, and cannot. They have neither independent unions nor independent employers. All of their ILO representatives are designated by their central governments.

To the East Bloc, the ILO is just another intergovernmental organization, operating on the purely political plane, and presenting, by reason of its labor base, a significant political opportunity to the communist nations. Thus it is perfectly natural for the Soviet Union to press forward within ILO in all useful directions in the pursuit of its own interests.

In this context, then, the basic question for the U.S. is whether it wishes to pay the price necessary for achieving an acceptable internal equilibrium within the International Labor Organization. The price involved for the U.S. is basically not one of money. Rather it concerns the amount of effort and resources we are prepared to devote to achieve a balance of forces within ILO, the degree to which we are prepared to be forthcoming toward new programs, and the extent to which we are prepared to seek a necessary accommodation with both the East Bloc and the detente-minded West Europeans—an accommodation consistent with the Constitution of the ILO.

This last point is crucial. The U.S. cannot have an ILO composed only of purely tripartite societies—desirable as this undoubtedly is in principle. Nor can the U.S. have its own way on everything occurring in this organization. The U.S. delegation must work within the framework confronting it. It must have some flexibility in negotiating over these complex political issues. Otherwise it will fall victim to counsels of perfection, powerless to achieve that very balance of internal forces that is in the interests of the U.S. to achieve—and, of course, the interests of ILO as well.

On the other hand, if the U.S. can attain this dynamic equilibrium, it can have in ILO the kind of multilateral body which can promote the tripartite approach to questions involving the welfare of workers, labor stand-

ards and the development of the underdeveloped countries. More than this, it can preserve the organization as a unique international forum in which the issues of worker's welfare and human freedom can continue to be examined and vigorously pressed from the special vantage points of governments, workers and employers.

[From the AFL-CIO News, Washington, D.C., June 12, 1971]

#### ILO AFFIRMS TRIPARTITE PRINCIPLE IN ELECTING EMPLOYER PRESIDENT

GENEVA.—The 56th conference of the International Labor Organization elected as its president Pierre Waline, a French employer, with the warm endorsement of the worker delegates.

Brushing aside the "strong protest" registered by Ivan V. Goroshkin, a Soviet deputy labor minister, the conference proclaimed Waline president without a formal vote at the opening of the three-week session.

Goroshkin had rushed to the rostrum in Geneva's Palace of Nations to object in the name of eight Communist countries to the selection of a non-government delegate to fill the presidency. The Soviet representative made clear that in objecting to Waline's election he was registering Moscow's disapproval of the autonomy enjoyed by the worker and employer delegates. This autonomy had resulted in "discrimination" against the Communist representatives, he complained.

Commenting later on the election, U.S. Worker Delegate Rudolph Faupl said he warmly endorsed the conference's choice of the French employer because "it rightly honors a man who has devoted nearly 50 years of service to the fundamental principles and ideals of the ILO."

"But I also welcome it," the leader of the AFL-CIO delegation continued, "because in electing a non-governmental delegate over the vehement Communist objections, the conference reinforced the ILO's tripartism by confirming that the presidency is not the monopoly of any one group."

The Communist delegations received a blunt warning at the conference's start to refrain from wasting its time by indulging in vain propaganda speeches.

"The ILO is not a political assembly," S. O. Koku, Nigerian labor ministry official, recalled when opening the session as chairman of the ILO Governing Body.

Calling for the shunning of all "sterile political debates and controversy," the Nigerian official said that the ILO objectives of "better conditions of work and life for the toiling masses of the world" could not be advanced by such tactics.

Earlier, the Governing Body had approved a plan to expand its own membership without altering the basic structure that insures independent representation to trade unions and employers as well as governments.

The executive body's 35 to 8 vote, with 5 abstentions or absentees, in favor of submitting the plan to the conference was a defeat for the Soviet Union.

Moscow was spearheading a drive to change the ILO rules that reserves 10 of the 28 government seats on the Governing Body for the most industrialized of the agency's member nations. The Soviet Union hoped to win support for its so-far unsuccessful campaign to reshape the ILO to its liking by getting more of its allies elected by the conference to the Governing Body.

Joseph Morris of the Canadian Labor Congress, leader of the worker members of the executive forum, angrily denounced the Soviet campaign.

Throughout the Communist speeches calling for changes in the ILO structure

"runs the threat of reductions in the right of the groups to make decisions within the framework of their responsibilities to meet the needs and aspirations of working people," Morris charged.

Under the plan being forwarded to the 1973 conference, the Governing Body's membership would be increased to 56 by adding four government seats and giving two additional seats to both workers and employers, thereby increasing the totals of these two groups to 14 each.

At the request of the workers' group, the Governing Body placed on the agenda of the conference the questions of the prevention of occupational cancer and of paid educational leaves for workers.

Faupl, Machinists' international representative, headed a seven-man AFL-CIO team to the conference. Serving as advisers to the U.S. worker delegate are S. Frank Raftery, president of the Painters; Thomas E. Murphy, president of the Bricklayers; Charles West, vice president of the Machinists; Miles Stanley, president of the West Virginia AFL-CIO; Edward Hickey, labor attorney; and Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO Dept. of Social Security.

[From the AFL-CIO News, Washington, D.C., June 19, 1971]

#### FREE WORKERS WIN AGENDA BATTLE AT START OF ILO WORLD CONFERENCE

GENEVA.—Non-Communist workers scored a major success at the outset of the International Labor Organization's annual conference here by obtaining an immediate hearing for their call for a reinforcement of the United Nations agency's democratic structure.

The conference's resolutions committee made the proposal, seconded by employers from non-Communist countries, the number one item on its agenda.

At the start of its deliberations the committee voted to decide which five of the score of resolutions submitted to the conference would be given priority.

The highest number of votes went to the free workers' call for a strengthening throughout the ILO's activities of the "tripartism" principle on which Samuel Gompers and other farsighted trade unionists helped found the organization.

This principle provides for the participation with complete autonomy of trade unions and employer organizations alongside representatives of member governments in the work of the 21-nation ILO.

When urging priority for the tri-partism resolution, Director Bert Seidman of the AFL-CIO Dept. of Social Security stressed that respect of the cornerstone principle in all circumstances is "vital to ILO survival."

The committee's decision was a setback for the Communist countries and their supporters who had complained bitterly that the autonomy of the worker and employer groups in the ILO results in the "exclusion" of their so-called trade unionists and employers.

The setback was particularly galling because all five resolutions to which the committee gave priority were presented by free workers.

The Communist and Arab delegates fought desperately to assure a hearing for a propaganda resolution attacking Israel for alleged violations of human and trade union rights, but the committee relegated it to the also-rans.

Other members of the AFL-CIO team headed by U.S. Worker Delegate Rudolph Faupl were also taking up their committee assignments at the three-week session of more than 1,200 labor, employer and government representatives.

Elected by the worker delegates to serve

on their executive board and to represent them on the conference's key steering committee, Faupl was sitting also on the committee reviewing the ILO structure.

This is the body in which workers and employers have been successfully repulsing demands of the Communist countries for a reshaping of the ILO to suit their purposes.

Pres. S. Frank Raftery of the Painters and Pres. Thomas F. Murphy of the Bricklayers, are working on the committee that is drafting new international standards to protect against the health dangers of benzene.

Proposed standards to protect elected union representatives against discrimination by management are being prepared by a committee on which Vice Pres. Charles F. West of the Machinists is serving.

Pres. Miles Stanley of the West Virginia AFL-CIO is expounding American labor's views on a committee laying down guidelines for an ILO program to promote employment.

Edward J. Hickey, Jr., counsel for a number of AFL-CIO unions, is again working with the committee that has the difficult assignment of preparing a report for the conference on how governments abide by their ILO commitments.

The conference's general debate was also getting started with its employer president, Pierre Waline of France, not hesitating to gavel down Communist and Arab speakers when they sought to engage in propaganda tirades against the U.S. or Israel.

Charles D. Stewart, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, rose to protest against the attempts to use the ILO as a political forum. Nevertheless, he praised the conference president for having "handled this matter very well."

JOINT STATEMENT OF REV. MSGR. MARVIN BORDELON, DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION FOR URBAN LIFE U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE 1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.

PAYMENT OF U.S. DUES TO THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION AND CONTINUED U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE I.L.O.

On Monday, June 21, the House Appropriations Committee approved a bill specifically withholding United States dues to the International Labor Organization, the oldest and one of the most effective of the U.N. specialized agencies. Presumably it is too late for the Committee to reconsider its vote on this matter. Accordingly we strongly urge the leaders of the American labor movement and the American business community and concerned citizens in every other walk of life to use every means at their disposal to persuade the House of Representatives to reverse the Committee's action by enacting an appropriate amendment to the bill when it comes up for discussion on the floor.

The U.S. Government owes \$3.7 million for last year and \$7.4 million for this year in dues to the I.L.O. Failure on the part of the Congress to appropriate these funds would, in our judgment, be a serious blot on the reputation of the United States in the field of international relations and a devastating blow to an agency which, in spite of its limitations, has made and continues to make a substantial, not to say indispensable contribution to the cause of social justice and human betterment throughout the world. In the opinion of some experts, there is reason to think that failure on the part of the United States to meet its financial obligations to the I.L.O. would also be a violation of international law.

It would appear that some of those who are opposed to the payment of U.S. dues to the I.L.O. also wish to see the U.S. withdraw from the Organization. Other critics of the

Organization insist that they are not advocating withdrawal but are simply using the dues issue as a bargaining tactic in an effort to correct what they, rightly or wrongly, consider to be abuses in the administration of the Organization. The fact is, however, that the U.S. will automatically lose its membership in the I.L.O. if it falls two years in arrears in the payment of its dues. In either case, U.S. withdrawal from the Organization—whether by conscious choice or by default—would in our opinion, be a disastrous mistake.

We realize, of course, that there is room for honest disagreement among honorable men about certain I.L.O. policies and procedures. We know, for example, that a number of thoughtful observers, in and out of the Congress, are of the opinion that the Soviet Union is currently exercising disproportionate influence in the Organization and is using it as a political sounding board. More specifically, we know that some observers object in particular to the fact that a Soviet citizen was recently appointed to serve as one of the Assistant Directors General of the I.L.O.

We readily grant that those who share these concerns have every right to express them and to take such measures as they deem appropriate in an effort to correct whatever imbalances they may, rightly or wrongly, detect in the administration of the I.L.O. On the other hand, we would argue that withdrawal of the U.S. from the I.L.O. or the non-payment of U.S. dues to the Organization is not the proper way for a major power such as the United States to settle matters of this kind. We are also convinced that such a course of action on the part of the United States would almost certainly be counter-productive. We note, in this connection, that if the United States were to withdraw from the I.L.O., either by conscious choice or by default, it would be acting completely contrary to what we consider to be an encouraging trend on the part of many nations throughout the world to place more rather than less emphasis on the need for international cooperation not only in the political realm but also in the field of social and economic reform.

In summary, we strongly support what would appear to be the official position of our own Government with regard to the dues problem and also with regard to continued U.S. membership in the I.L.O. It is our understanding that the Administration is convinced that the United States should meet its financial obligations to the I.L.O. and should not withdraw from the Organization, and this for the following reasons:

Withdrawal would inevitably leave the Soviet Union as the dominant power in the Organization, allowing that country to use the I.L.O. to enlarge its own influence.

Withdrawal would seriously interfere with our Government's efforts to shift more U.S. aid and technical assistance to international agencies.

The United States would be condemned abroad, and rightly so, for undermining an organization that provides substantial assistance of various kinds to working people throughout the world.

U.S. withdrawal could seriously threaten U.S. participation in the whole U.N. system of international agencies.

We find these reasons to be persuasive, and we trust that the House of Representatives will give them serious consideration in its deliberations on this crucial matter. More specifically, we again urge the House of Representatives to reverse the decision made by the House Appropriations Committee on June 21 and thereby make it possible for the United States to meet its immediate financial obligations to the I.L.O. and to continue to

exercise effective leadership in the Organization.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S JUNE 1 NEWS CONFERENCE—INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Q. Mr. President, may I ask a question on the ILO? As you know, there is a considerable uncertainty about the position of the American Government with respect to membership in the International Labor Organization, the ILO. To remove this uncertainty, could you tell us, does the United States seriously intend to continue its membership in the ILO; and secondly, if it does, will the Administration leadership apply its energies on Capitol Hill to get the appropriations necessary to pay our dues with the ILO?

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Meany talked to me about the ILO. As you know, he has very strong feelings and reservations about our membership in the ILO. However, we have decided to continue our membership. We will attempt to get the dues in arrears paid by the Congress. We will have to have considerable support in order to accomplish that.

But also, we are going to see to it that American labor, and free labor throughout the world, gets a better voice in the ILO than it has had previously.

The reason that Mr. Meany a top free world trade union leader, opposes the ILO is because free trade unions have received a very bad deal in ILO meetings, and we are going to have to have better treatment in that way or American support for the ILO is going to go right down the drain.

The PRESS. Thank you, Mr. President.

CHAPTER II—CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROGRAMS

(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, this is the second in a series of articles on children and youth and maternal and infant care programs. Support of H.R. 7657 as amended is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth comprehensive health projects and maternal and infant care projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 64 cosponsors. There are at present 59 regional children and youth programs with additional satellites and 56 maternal and infant care programs in existence delivering comprehensive health care to almost half a million children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I have received from the directors of these programs descriptions of the programs in their community and what it would mean if their particular program were terminated. To give our colleagues an insight into these programs, I shall be placing in the RECORD each day descriptions of three maternal and infant care and three children and youth programs.

The material follows:

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

The New Mexico Maternity and Infant Care Project was funded in July, 1968 and

the first patients were seen under its auspices in March of 1969. In keeping with the general Federal guidelines this Project has attempted to provide comprehensive care to pregnant patients and their newborn infants. This has been done with an emphasis on preventative measures for the prenatal patient and specialized care for the newborn infant with problems.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

Primary Project goals have consisted of finding and providing services to vulnerable patients who would or could not receive necessary health care because they were from low income families or for other reasons beyond their control. In this Project these goals were pursued by following the general guidelines listed below:

1. The establishment of neighborhood maternity clinics.
2. The establishment of neighborhood pediatric clinics for follow up of the high risk infants.
3. The development of a program of comprehensive patient care to include Public Health Nursing, medical social work, nutritional counseling, and special services such as homemakers, patient transportation, care for the pregnant teen-ager, and special drugs.
4. Provision of a broad spectrum of diagnostic and consultation services.
5. Identification of high-risk patients.
6. Providing hospitalization for the high-risk patient either (a) during pregnancy (b) during labor and delivery (c) immediately post-partum or (d) during the first 12 months of life of a high-risk infant.

PROJECT DESIGN

The Project area has been defined as Bernalillo County and the lower portion of Sandoval County. Anyone living in the Project area is eligible for out patient services. However, in order for the Project to assume the cost of in-patient hospital services, two additional criteria must be satisfied. First, the patient must be considered high risk i.e. have a complication of pregnancy or of the newborn, and second, the family must be medically indigent.

1. Maternity services

There are 32 neighborhood maternity clinics per month in the Project area. These include the general maternity clinics as well as 12 pre-registration clinics. In addition there are 20 maternity clinics per month held in the Out-Patient Department of the Bernalillo County Medical Center. (BCMC) Approximately 1/2 of the Project maternity patients receive their pre-natal care in neighborhood clinics; the other 1/2 receive their care at BCMC (hospital clinic).

BCMC is the only hospital authorized to provide care for Project patients. Hospitalization is available there during pregnancy, for labor and delivery, and in the immediate post-partum.

2. Infant services

There are 6 high risk infant clinics meeting in the neighborhood each month. In addition there are 4 clinics per month in which Project infants are seen at the hospital out-patient department.

In-patient hospitalization at BCMC is available for high-risk Project infant e.g. prematures, or infants with other newborn problems such as birth defects or infections. A neonatologist (specialists in newborn care) is available along with modern incubators and specialized equipment.

3. Family planning services

Because of the large number of pre-natal patients being seen, family planning services have been limited and the patients are referred to the Bernalillo County Planned Parenthood Association after post-partum con-

traceptives have been prescribed. However, the patient is provided family planning consultation during pre-natal care, and each patient is approached concerning family planning recommendations while still in the hospital following the delivery of her baby.

RESULTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

1. Since BCMC is a county hospital already responsible for the medical care for indigent patients, the majority of Project funds have been funneled towards personnel rather than payments for care. This has resulted in the Project being able to provide persons with special training who otherwise would not be available. These include obstetricians, pediatricians, medical social-workers, nutritionists and nurse mid-wives. These have been coordinated into a smoothly functioning team with the assistance of back up administrative and clerical personnel.

2. The Project was funded to provide services to approximately 1200 prenatal patients per year. During 1970, however, over 1800 persons were registered as Project patients. The total number of new and return maternity patients seen at the BCMC and neighborhood maternity clinics was over 13,500. This compares to approximately 9,000 patients who were seen in 1969.

3. Several years ago 35% of the patients delivered at BCMC had received no pre-natal care. During 1970 there were only 10% delivered without prenatal care.

4. In early 1969, approximately 45% of new registrants in the Project were in their third trimester. This was reduced to 30% by late 1970. Conversely in early 1969 only 18% of new patients were in the first trimester. This was increased to approximately 32% by late 1970.

5. During 1970 there were 161 high risk infants identified and cared for by Project personnel. This compares to 81 high risk infants seen in 1969.

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, GREENVILLE, S.C.

The Maternity and Infant Care Project for Greenville, South Carolina was started October 1, 1966 through the combined efforts of the South Carolina State Board of Health and the Greenville County Hospital System.

In 1970 there were 5,054 live births in Greenville County. On the Maternity and Infant Care Project there were 1,284 obstetric admissions, 1,157 deliveries; 1,163 live born infants. In other words, 23% of all live births in the County were M&I babies. 35% of all infants born at Greenville General Hospital in 1970 were infants whose mothers were given prenatal care by the M&I Project. Just before the onset of the Project, hospital figures showed approximately 25% of all admissions in labor admitted through the emergency room had had no prenatal care. Last year these figures had been reduced to 5%.

Because of the concentrated efforts of dedicated M&I workers, more mothers are coming in at an earlier stage of pregnancy, they are thereby followed more carefully, have fewer complications of pregnancy, fewer prematures and healthier babies. In 1967 only 12% were coming in during the first trimester of pregnancy, in 1970 these admissions increased to 25%. During 1967 49% came in the second trimester; 1970 55% were coming in during the second three month period of pregnancy. In 1966 (3 month period) 22% of the Project born infants were prematures, this figure was reduced to 9% in 1970. Fewer prematures means lower infant mortality and morbidity figures—also fewer spastics and mentally retarded children. In a study made of infant death certificates for the county it was shown in 1969 45% of infant deaths occurred within 24 hours of birth,

these figures were reduced to 35% in 1970. Neonatal death were reduced from 67% in 1969 to 65% in 1970 and deaths due to prematurity were reduced from 42% to 40.6%. There were no maternal deaths on the Project in 1970; admissions of M&I patients to the hospital for preeclampsia were reduced from 6.3% in 1969 to 5.1% in 1970.

Clinics have increased from three per week to seven per week, three are held at the Greenville General Hospital and four at the Greenville County Department of Health. As of May 26, 1971, from date Project was begun, there were 5,635 obstetric admissions, 4,890 deliveries and 390 high risk infant admissions. Admissions to family planning are increasing steadily from 52% in 1967 to 68% in 1970. Every effort is put forth to make family planning information available to all.

The staff has grown from 14 full time and 3 part-time employees to 24 full time and 8 part-time employees.

Special emphasis is put on comprehensive care for the pregnant teenager. For the last six months of 1970, 47% of all admissions were 19 years and younger. At the beginning of the Project these were 1/4 of the admissions, then 1/2 and now almost 1/2. 15% of the teenage pregnancies are 15 years and younger. (37% of all admissions to the Project are illegitimate).

Teenage clinics are held at the Greenville County Department of Health where special classes geared to the teenage level are given pertaining to prenatal care, diet, baby care, family planning, etc. We hope never again to find young girls at 23 and 24 years of age having their tenth baby—some had their first baby at 11 to 13 years of age. Adequate educational resources for these girls are now becoming a reality. Through the combined efforts of the Greenville County Department of Education, The Greenville County Department of Health and other interested agencies a school will open this fall just for the pregnant teenage girl. Efforts are made to so direct her academic studies that she will be able to keep up and graduate with her class and during the same period efforts will be made to teach her better prenatal care, infant care, nutrition, and family planning—the end result to help her become a good citizen and to be motivated for the better things of life.

#### MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, 1965-70, PORTLAND, OREG.

The MICP, #511, under the auspices of the MCH section of the Oregon State Board of Health has its operational base at Emanuel Hospital, Portland, Oregon. The Project opened its doors for patient admission December, 1964. The staff at that time consisted of the medical director, a pediatric consultant and several dentists on part time, fee for services basis. The State Employee members of the staff included the Public Health Nurse Coordinator, a nutritionist, a secretary, a dental assistant and a part time social worker. Within the next two years the staff was increased by an assistant medical director, a full time dentist and an additional member for each of the team disciplines.

Since December, 1964, through March, 1971, a total of 2290 maternity patients' have been admitted to the Project. Three hundred and ninety-five have returned for care during a second, third, and even fourth subsequent pregnancies. Between 250-300 have received no further care after admission because they become ineligible, moved away, or transferred to other care facilities.

Shortly after admission, each maternal patient is referred to the local health department for public health nurse follow-up during her antepartum and postpartum periods.

The medical director, Dr. Richard Franklin, has developed a very extensive antepartum work up program on each maternal patient, including besides the routine blood and urinalysis, a Tine, IVGGT, protein electrophoresis, paps smear, vaginal and rectal smear, and culture for Neisseria, PKU, rubella titre, and Sickle cell prep. Each test is followed up with appropriate treatment as necessary. Patients with a negative rubella are given the rubella vaccine immediately post partum, and patients having the negative PH component are given Pho gam following delivery.

Family Planning services are provided for each maternal patient. Until about a month ago these services were provided by Planned Parenthood Association. Now, the opening of the ACOG Family Planning Clinic at Emanuel has facilitated referral and follow-up for the patients. Eighteen percent of the patients have had TLs upon request.

The material patients receive full dental care while on the Project. By a working agreement with the University of Oregon Dental School, such procedures as oral surgery and cosmetic corrections are possible. For many of the patients, it is their first opportunity to receive even the simplest dental care. The average monthly patient load is between 250-275. Over 1,750 visits were made by the patients last year.

The first Project baby was delivered Jan. 1965. Since then 1,813 have been born at the two Project hospitals. These babies are provided with well baby clinic services during their first 2-3 months, and high-risk babies are carried for their first year by the Project.

Cooperation with the University of Oregon and Emanuel Hospital residency programs in obstetrics and pediatrics has resulted in both maternal and newborn patients receive very comprehensive care.

The pediatric consultant, Dr. Robert Thornfeldt, has instituted some very innovative procedures for the intensive care of the newborn in distress, with excellent results as shown by the low infant morbidity and mortality rate of the Project babies.

Computerized data from one of the Project hospitals show that the 1808 babies born there had only 52 perinatal deaths, or 3.2%. Prematurity and previability accounted for 33 of the deaths. Thirty-one babies had congenital anomalies which resulted in 8 deaths. Fifty-four had other conditions as Rh incompatibility, respiratory difficulty, etc.

The combined efforts of the medical director and the pediatric consultant is no small factor in the infant survival rate and the fact that the percent of premature babies born to Project mothers has steadily decreased from 17.12% in 1965 to 8.21% in 1970.

The results of nutritional counseling are showing up in the steady decrease of poor diets with low nutrient content among the patients. In 1965 28% had diets of only 1/2 the required daily amounts of nutrients; in 1970 only 11% could be so classed.

Many of the practices and procedures which have been used so successfully in the care of the maternal and newborn patients have been put into practice in other institutions, statewide. Therefore, the services are not limited to the population of the Project area, but are reflected in improved care for patients across the state. The type of care which is the right of every pregnant woman and her baby.

#### CHILDREN & YOUTH PROJECT #622, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

If Children and Youth Projects are not continued under the present administrative plan, indigent children of Birmingham, Alabama would cease to obtain health care. This project is the primary source of health care for children in an entire county with 35,000

children in this one project. Local funds supplement medical care but are extremely limited.

Our project is also necessary for the training of physicians. In a time when there is a demand for more doctors, we are expanding our medical school, and pediatric training is necessarily dependent upon the C & Y Project. It is also well-known that medical schools all over the nation are having financial difficulties; therefore, if the C & Y Project were not continued there is no possibility for growth in the training programs for physicians or for replacing the child care now provided.

Medicaid programs in Alabama have funded only 12% of the patients cared for at our institution whereas the C & Y unit pays for health care for 65% of the indigent children receiving services. If, then, the keystone of care for children were removed the entire health system for children in our county would collapse.

Alteration of the present organized approach to child health care, as exhibited by our project, would lead to a return to the piecemeal or fragmented provision of care. Dedicated workers, many of them highly trained would seek positions elsewhere and the quality of care would decrease. In a time when our country's motives and goals are being seriously questioned by many groups, the alteration of these programs would be a loss of faith by people who have changed careers, who have gambled their future on the government's word that these C & Y projects were long-term investments in our children. We urge that present legislation be extended.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 601, CHICAGO, ILL.

Near North Children's Center (C & Y Project 601 of Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago) has been in existence since the summer of 1966. There are now over 8,000 pediatric patients registered.

We have 60 to 80 patient visits daily for general pediatric care including well child care and follow-up, acute care, consultation from schools both public and parochial, once weekly eye clinic and twice monthly surgery clinic.

Since our center is located in an economically, socially and educationally deprived area of the Near North side of Chicago our services are sorely needed. We have community health nurses, community health counselors (patient advocates) and social service workers. In addition we offer vision and hearing screening, clinical laboratory and x-ray diagnoses. We have clinic nursing assistants, clinic nurses, medical records staff, and administrator, secretaries and clerks. We employ neighborhood people in so far as possible and of our present staff of 30 approximately 75% are Black or other minority groups. Nearly half of our employees are from the neighborhood.

Near North Children's Center has had a Community Advisory Board since early 1967. This board is very active and has been consulted and listened to carefully in the growth and development of the center. Children's Memorial Hospital also participates with the board in making decisions which are aimed at improvement of health care for the area served. The board screens every prospective new employee including part-time physicians for their attitudes toward the minority groups served.

The center serves approximately 85%-90% Black people, 10%-15% Spanish speaking (largely Puerto-Ricans) and 5% whites.

The impact of loss of the center would be great since the parents of the children we serve depend on us for on-going day to day care and advice. For the first time many

people have available to them comprehensive, consistent and pleasant care for children. They have someone interested in them and their children. They have a responsible and informed source of advice. The center is "theirs" and is not a strange, distant institution. They see friends and neighbors here and are served by a non-judgmental and friendly staff.

I feel the extension of C & Y projects for 5 years is not only logical but absolutely necessary in order to give a segment of American Society their justifiable right to adequate medical care.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 646,  
HONOLULU, HAWAII

This project serves children from birth to their sixteenth birthday in a rural poverty pocket on the island of Oahu. There are about 3,500 children this age living there, almost all of them poor and nearly all of them deprived of the chance to develop their health potentials. Many are Hawaiians and part Hawaiians, living in very crowded homes on Hawaiian state homestead lands. Their families have never been motivated to go to the effort of getting adequate health care. Running ears for example are accepted with complacency, and medical visits or continuation of medication except at the peak of symptoms are a wardo with many families. Most of the rest of the population are families displaced from urban redevelopment plus other seekers after the cheapest roof. There is no physician in the area and until the project came, no dentist. Since the project has no dental clinic, there are now one full-time and five part-time dentists practicing in Waimanalo, depending on project income but also serving others in this poverty community. The project provides minibuses transportation, without which many families are stranded.

This rural project has been in operation for three years but until recently was seriously understaffed due to recruitment difficulties. There are over 500 physician visits a month and this is increasing. Definite change has occurred in the community in obtaining medical care for children and in following through, and routine screening and preventive services are beginning to be accepted. The bulk of the effort lies ahead.

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

(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, I am presently issuing my second report of the 92d Congress. My June newsletter is addressed to approximately 165,000 persons in my congressional district. It includes a report on my trip to the Soviet Union; my findings in a survey I made among subway riders during our April recess; my efforts that culminated in extending educational programs at the city's prison on Rikers Island and concurrently my work with local groups in New York that contributed to the closing of the Women's House of Detention in Greenwich Village; a new bi-lingual education program that will be conducted in my congressional district with the help of a \$400,000 Federal grant; legislation I have introduced to tighten the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act; and my bill, H.R. 7657, that would extend for another 5 years fund-

ing for the children and youth projects giving comprehensive medical care to over one-half million children in impoverished areas.

I have included in my newsletter a special section devoted to some of the problems of our senior citizens and the work we are doing here in Congress to help. I have found that considerable priority is given by the elderly to a bill introduced by our distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. PEPPER); this is H.R. 5019 which would extend and expand low-cost meal programs for the elderly. I am a cosponsor of this bill.

Finally, I have also discussed the impact on the Congress and the country of the April 24 rally of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War and the House's action on the recent Vietnam war authorization bill and the Nedzi-Whalen amendment.

At this time I insert in the RECORD the full text of my newsletter:

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH REPORTS FROM  
WASHINGTON

Dear Constituent and Fellow New Yorker: In late March at the urging of concerned constituents I made a special trip to the Soviet Union. My primary purpose in visiting that country was to speak with the families of Soviet Jews whose husbands and fathers were being held in Leningrad prisons awaiting trial.

I went to the home of Lassal Kaminsky and met with his wife, their daughter, and the wife of Lev Yagman. The families told me that their men had been in prison for more than nine months. (After my return, the Leningrad trial was held and nine Jews were convicted, with Kaminsky and Yagman being given five year sentences.)

What were their crimes? Their families told me that they had translated Russian textbooks into Yiddish and Hebrew for the purposes of teaching their children and had sent a petition to the United Nations asking assistance in emigrating from the Soviet Union to Israel. These are considered anti-Soviet acts and punishable under their law.

The women told me that they knew they were in great danger by talking with me, but they thought the only way to save their husbands was to let the world know what was going on in the Soviet Union so that private and public pressures might be brought to bear on the Soviet government.

We talked in whispers fearing the apartment was bugged. They said so eloquently with their eyes and with their words, "Help us." I asked a young woman present if her husband was in jail. She laughed with tears in her eyes, and said, "Not today," pointing to a young man sitting with us, "but who knows of tomorrow." When I left we all embraced. I told them that people in the United States, of all faiths and beliefs, are concerned for their plight and want to help.

Later Western newsmen in Moscow told me that because of increasing religious and cultural discrimination, 80,000 Soviet Jewish families have applied for emigration despite the enormous personal risks involved.

The Soviet Union is an oppressive society. Dissent is extremely hazardous and the presence of the KGB (secret police) is always felt—particularly if one is a foreigner. I was followed everywhere I went. My suspicions were not imaginary—they were confirmed by American Embassy personnel who are experienced in these matters.

The monitoring of conversations is so well known that the favorite national pastime

when anyone wants to speak confidentially is to take a long walk in the park.

A conversation I had with my Soviet guide, a young woman named Mila Cherenobrovkina, summed it all up for me. Mila said, "You Americans think you have more freedom than we do. You are wrong." I replied, "Almost every week I stand up in the Congress and criticize President Nixon and his policies. I am in no physical danger for doing so. Do you believe that a member of the Soviet Congress could stand up and denounce Mr. Brezhnev and remain healthy?" She replied quite heatedly, "Mr. Brezhnev is elected by the majority and the minority must go along." I replied, "But Mila, in America even the minority has rights."

Upon returning, I reported on the trip to my colleagues in the House and testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe. Since that time a number of other public officials have traveled to the Soviet Union to see first-hand the plight of these people.

Presently 117 Congressmen and 29 Senators are cosponsoring the Soviet Jews Relief Act of 1971 which I first introduced in early March. The bill (H.R. 5606 as amended and S. 1872) authorizes 30,000 refugee visas for Soviet Jews who wish to come to this country when and if they are permitted to do so by the Soviet government.

America has always been and shall remain a haven for the persecuted minorities of other countries. Just since World War II, special legislation permitted more than 30,000 Hungarian refugees to settle here after the suppression by the Soviet Union of their 1956 revolution. Similarly, since 1968 over 10,000 Czechoslovakian refugees were assisted in coming to the United States. And it should be remembered that more than 565,000 Cubans have made the United States their new home through special immigration legislation.

Enactment of the bill would be more than just an American gesture—hopefully, it would persuade other nations—Great Britain, France, Australia, and for reasons of history, West Germany—to enact similar legislation. Of course many Soviet Jews will choose to go to Israel but the important thing is that a multi-nation offer of sanctuary may hasten the day when they are free to leave the Soviet Union.

I will continue to urge both the legislative and executive branches of our government to take a strong public position to effect this change in Soviet policy.

SUBWAYS

During the Congressional recess in April, I handed out a mass transit questionnaire at the subway entrances in our district. The response has been excellent. I have received close to 2000 replies, most of which contained very enlightening, while often testy, comments about our subways—as well as answers to the questions posed.

Seventy-five percent of those responding are using subways and buses more often since the astronomical taxi fare increase went into effect. The most common reason people use cabs is for going out in the evening. And a majority of these people take cabs in the evening because they fear for their safety in the subways. The most prevalent comment was about the continuing increase in transit fares and the continuing decline in service, comfort, and dependability of both subways and buses.

In response to the question of what bothers you the "most" about the subways, most people could not restrain themselves to one complaint and instead checked and double checked every alternative—high fares, dirty cars and stations, overcrowding, breakdowns and delays, noise, unsafe conditions, and in-

adequate passenger information. The consensus was perhaps best summarized by one subway rider who wrote:

"The entire subway station is deplorable in comparison to when it was only 5 cents."

The results of the questionnaire once more confirm the desperate need for more federal funds for mass transit. I am sponsoring legislation in my Committee that would provide federal subsidies for subway and bus systems which are unable to maintain adequate service because of operating deficits. I also have introduced H.R. 4571, providing for the establishment of a National Transportation Trust Fund. The bill would put under one trust fund the highway, airport and mass transit programs. It would unify the administration of all our transportation programs, placing mass transit in a competitive position with highways, and most important, H.R. 4571 would provide more funds for mass transit construction.

#### PRISONS

Recently I learned that many adolescent prisoners at Rikers Island were not receiving any schooling and that there was no program of higher learning for adult prisoners. I brought together prison and education officials to get some action on the matter.

Everyone agreed that a college course program should be funded by the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Department of Corrections then surveyed the prisoners and found their course preferences were English, psychology and criminal law. We have been assured of a federal grant so that courses can begin this September.

In response to my insistence that classroom space had to be found at Rikers to provide schooling for adolescents, the Board of Education has informed me that all adolescent prisoners and found their course preferences to be in school, are now receiving an education.

In another matter involving prisons, the Greenwich Village community has long taken the position that the Women's House of Detention was not fit for women or men and better detention facilities had to be built. After long negotiations, we persuaded the Mayor to close the place. The entire structure will be demolished in the fall. A new Women's House of Detention has been built on Rikers Island.

#### BI-LINGUAL EDUCATION

Working with Local School Board No. 2 and the Puerto Rican community, we succeeded this month in getting a federal commitment of \$400,000 in educational grants to establish a comprehensive bilingual school program in the 17th C.D. The program will be conducted at PS 151, located at 91st Street and First Avenue.

The funds will be used to train Spanish speaking adults for certification as teachers within the City school system and to formulate a model bilingual school curriculum within PS 151. It is a major new program that will serve as a model to be duplicated by other cities having large concentrations of in-migrant people.

By having a Spanish speaking teacher working in the same class with an English speaking teacher, as this program will, the barrier of language will be effectively removed. All children will be able to learn English and Spanish from native speaking teachers. The bilingual school program represents an innovative approach to the needs of a large, diverse community.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

The battle goes on to save our environment—to save ourselves from the perils of pollution. The Federal Government is waking up to its responsibilities but it has a long way to go. I have introduced a number

of amendments designed to update and strengthen existing federal laws.

My bill H.R. 3686 ("The Clean Air Amendments of 1971") requires pollution control "certification" for new stationary sources of pollution; requires public disclosure by polluters on the substances and quantity of their pollution; and exempts any state from the federal standards on auto emissions, fuels, fuel additives, and aircraft emissions which wants to establish standards that are more restrictive than the federal standards.

My bill H.R. 8984 ("The National Environmental Policy Amendments of 1971") requires the Agency for International Development to issue "environmental impact statements" relating to its assistance programs abroad; requires federal agencies to make public their "environmental impact statements" before seeking Congressional approval for projects (with such a law the Federal Government might not have wasted \$961 million on the SST before we successfully cut off funds); and authorizes the Council on Environmental Quality to reject inadequate "environmental impact statements" submitted by federal agencies (last year the Department of Transportation filed a statement in support of extending the Highway Trust Fund without even mentioning the danger of increased automobile pollution).

We must close the loopholes in our existing environment laws. My amendments are intended to do just that.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

I know there are a large number of senior citizens in our district. Recently, Mrs. Sue Van Clute, a volunteer in my New York office and a senior citizen herself, wrote me a short memo which I decided should be put in my newsletter.

Ed, I am so glad that you are a co-sponsor of Rep. Pepper's bill (H.R. 5019) which would extend and expand low-cost meal programs for the elderly. So many older people do not eat adequately because they cannot afford it, while others do not eat well because they fail to buy nourishing foods and prepare well-balanced meals.

I know how slow Congress is about approving new programs so I thought maybe I could put down some practical suggestions about food buying, meals at community centers and the like which you might want to use in a newsletter.

So here it is for what's worth:

1. Food prices are high in the City but you can buy inexpensive nourishing food if you know what to look for. These are some of the basics that I like to buy—beef liver, poultry, natural or processed cheese, eggs, canned fish; evaporated milk or non-fat dry skim milk; canned vegetables and fruits; and enriched or whole grain breads and cereals.

2. I always make a shopping list of foods before I leave home—otherwise I end up buying more than I need and the food goes stale or spoils sitting on the shelf.

3. I like to get exercise every day even if it's only a 3 or 4 block walk—Of course, I love it when I am doing volunteer work in your office—there is so much going on all the time.

4. I think my appetite is better when I have friends over or go out with them for a meal. It becomes more of an occasion. And sometimes I enjoy going to the Greenwich House, a community center, for lunch.

Here's a list of major community centers in or near your district which provide a variety of programs for older people. The hours are generally 9 AM to 4 PM. Most of these centers have indicated they will have summer lunch programs served at a reasonable cost. Project FIND centers serve a free

lunch. Some centers only serve lunch on certain days and I have noted them.

#### East Side

Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association—331 East 70th Street—744-5022 (Monday and Thursday).

Sirovich Senior Center—203 Second Ave. (13th St.) 982-2732.

Stanley M. Isaacs Neighborhood Center—415 East 93rd Street—427-1160.

Leonard Covello Senior Center For East Harlem—East 109th Street—369-8136.

#### West Side

Goddard Riverside—647 Columbus Ave. (94th St.) 874-4880.

Hartley House—413 West 46th Street 246-9885 (no lunch served).

Hudson Guild-Fulton Center—441 West 26th St.—524-6700.

Project FIND Centers (call 874-0300 for information):

St. Luke's Lutheran Church—308 West 46th St. (Tuesday);

Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church—457 West 51st Street (Thursday);

Lincoln Square Neighborhood Center—218 West 64th Street (Tuesday and Thursday);

St. Stephen's Episcopal Church—120 West 69th Street (Monday, Wednesday and Friday).

Greenwich House—27 Barrow Street—675-3435.

Keep up the pressure for passing the Pepper bill.

Sue.

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., 20515.

If you need assistance, call my New York City office at 264-1066 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

Mr. Speaker, there are four pictures in my newsletter whose captions read as follows:

These Children are participants in the I SPY (Infant, School, Preschool and Youth) Health program at Beth Israel Hospital. I SPY is one of 59 Children and Youth projects providing comprehensive health care for more than 1/2 million children in some of this country's most impoverished communities. Federal funding for these projects is scheduled to stop in 1972. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7657 to continue the funding of these programs for another five years; my bill is being sponsored in the Senate by Senators Kennedy and Nelson.

In the Jewish Cemetery at Leningrad with synagogue officials and my Intourist guide.

The peaceful actions of Vietnam Veterans Against the War, culminating in the April 24 rally on the steps of the Capitol had a positive impact on the country and the Congress, as did the hundreds of thousands of people who came on that day to peacefully petition the Congress to end the war.

Since being elected to Congress I have voted against every military bill appropriating funds for the further prosecution of the Vietnam War. In 1969 I was one of 21 Congressmen recorded in opposition to the Vietnam War authorization bill of the Armed Services Committee. On June 17th 57 of my colleagues and I voted against the most recent Vietnam War authorization bill. I voted for the Nedzi-Whalen amendment which would have had the effect of setting December 31, 1971 as the cut-off date for funding our continued participation in that war. The amendment failed 158-255.

On May 12th, I invited my colleagues to view the contemporary paintings that have been loaned to my office during the 92nd Congress by the major museums of the 17th C.D., including the Whitney, the Guggenheim, and the Museum of Modern Art. At the "opening" we were privileged to have with us three of the artists whose work is being exhibited: Richard Anuszkiewicz, Edward Corbett, and Paul Jenkins. If you visit Washington, I hope you will come by to see me, my staff and my paintings.

#### THE BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1971

(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, Sunday, May 16, was national bicycle day. In a speech that day Secretary of Transportation John Volpe said that his Department is "excited about bicycles" and he expressed the intention to make Washington a model city for bicycles. The Secretary said that his staff is in the process of working with the Department of Interior on establishing bicycle commuter routes in the District of Columbia particularly for bicycle traffic.

Today, I am introducing a bill, The Bicycle Transportation Act of 1971, that would allow States and communities to use Highway Trust Fund moneys for the development of bicycle lanes or paths. The bill also provides that such funds can be used for the construction of bicycle shelters and parking facilities, and for bicycle traffic control devices. The concept of this bill is essentially the same as that underlying the development of preferential bus lanes in our highway system. Federally aided bicycle lanes would be constructed so as to be part of an interstate system, an ABC road, or a designated urban system.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that bicycles be considered an important component of our transportation system. Bicycles are an important transportation resource and can make a definite contribution to municipal transportation—they should not simply be regarded as only recreation vehicles. Many commuters, when given the option of safe bicycle travel, will choose to pedal to work rather than ride by car or bus.

One of the nice things about bicycling is that it has benefits in addition to the transportation it provides; these include its contribution to mental and physical health and the lessening of air pollution and crowding.

It is remarkable that we have a vehicle that emits no pollution, makes no noise, takes up little room and acts as a body conditioner for its rider. And when provided, with their own bicycle lanes, bicycles have a very low accident rate.

There is a danger, however, for cyclists who are forced to use roads heavily congested with automobiles. And thus, if bicycle transportation is to be encouraged, we need to develop bicycle lanes and paths.

Perhaps the most famous bicycle city in this country is Davis, Calif. Today, this city of 24,000 persons has 18,000 bicycles. During the past 5 years when a concentrated effort has been made to develop

bicycle transportation, bicycling has become an important part of the city's transportation system. Bicycles now represent 40 percent of all traffic and during rush hour, 90 percent of all riders are adults. A study of Davis City's bicycling experience was recently conducted and it was found that the development of bicycle paths was welcomed by both cyclists and automobile drivers. The survey found that the bikeways are almost unanimously regarded as a desirable safety feature. In fact, to date no car-bicycle collisions have taken place in the bicycle lanes. And automobile drivers joined with bicycle riders in favoring the development of separate bicycle lanes for purposes of both safety and traffic reduction.

Last month bicycle riders won an important victory in Oregon. Approval was given to Oregon House bill 1700 which is expected to divert some \$1,300,000 into bicycle trails from the State's highway trust fund. The bill provides that 1 percent of State highway funds spent by State, city, and counties will go for bicycle trails and footpaths.

In addition, Gov. Tom McCall, of Oregon, was informed on May 23 by Under Secretary of Transportation James M. Beggs that:

There is no prohibition against planning and construction of bicycle paths including legal Federal aid reimbursement therefore, as part of an otherwise eligible Federal aid highway project.

This means that a Governor of a State can include in plans for the construction of a federally aided road, provisions for a contiguous bicycle lane. My bill, the Bicycle Transportation Act of 1971, would broaden this authorization so that bicycle lanes could be constructed separately with Federal assistance so long as they are eventually incorporated in an urban road, ABC, or interstate system.

In 1965 William F. Buckley, Jr. ran for mayor of the city of New York. One of his proposals was that of a bicycle lane running down Second Avenue. Time has caught up with his idea. New York City should implement it by immediately setting aside a lane on Second Avenue going downtown and extend it by an uptown lane on Eighth Avenue. I am particularly distressed that New York City has not been in the forefront in terms of implementing the proposals that have been put forward. City officials have engaged in a great deal of discussion but unfortunately, except for opening the parks which in itself must be commended, little if anything has been done to open the city to bicycles.

One of the great sites in Amsterdam which I saw in 1961 was of thousands of bicycles in the heart of the city operated by men and women, young and old, going to and from work. This country is behind Europe in this area for understandable reasons. In our infatuation with the automobile we have lost sight of the pleasures and benefits of other forms of transportation, such as bicycling.

Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case, that which is new, shiny, and big is not always the best—and in this case, that is especially true.

At this point, I should like to insert for printing in the RECORD Secretary

Volpe's remarks on Bicycle Day, May 16, 1971. They follow:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE FOR BICYCLE DAY, SUNDAY, MAY 16, 1971, WASHINGTON, D.C.

As some of you may know, today is the first day of Transportation Week. Now while it may seem odd to some that I am starting off this week on a seemingly old fashioned mode, nothing could be further from the truth.

The philosophy of my Department is that each transportation job must be done in the most sophisticated and efficient fashion—and sophistication doesn't mean complexity. Bikes are healthful, bikes are non-polluting, bikes are non-congesting, and bikes are fun. There's not much more you can ask from a mode.

Let me tell you that my Department is excited about bicycles, and particularly excited about the possibility of bicycles in the district. We intend to make Washington a "model city" for bicycles. But let's be specific.

My personal staff and the Federal Highway Administration will explore with the District the possibility of establishing bicycle commuter routes with exclusive lanes—or even streets—set aside for bicycles during rush hour. I, Rog Morton, and the District are also exploring the possibility of bike routes through Rock Creek Park and other similar areas.

As you all know, the main problem with bike riding is the danger involved. We hope exclusive rights of way will solve that problem.

My staff is also investigating the possibility of having bicycles and bicycle storage facilities at transportation terminals such as Union Station and fringe parking areas. There is no reason why a commuter shouldn't be able to bike from his home to a fringe parking area or from Union Station to his job in Washington. In this regard, you will also be hearing some encouraging words from Metro a little later in the program.

Another point:

Washington is a superb city to tour by bicycle and we hope, in cooperation with the District and the Park Service, to have bicycle facilities for visitors established before the Bi-centennial Celebration.

And a third point:

A number of you are government workers. You will be pleased to know that I intend to use my utmost influence to have bicycle racks and other facilities in every Federal building in this City.

At my own Headquarters in Southwest Washington, we have indoor bicycle parking for our staff's bikes just as we do for their automobiles.

The Department's Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts will be investigating the development of new hardware to make bicycle racks and other storage facilities secure from vandalism.

This is what we intend to do. I don't consider bicycles a gimmick or a fad. As far as I am concerned, and as far as the District of Columbia Code is concerned, bicycles have equal rights with automobiles on our city streets.

In conclusion, we have one of the best slogans on two wheels: "Ride On!"

#### TOM WICKER ON THE "SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIAL"

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report from the

Treasury Department which proved that gun laws work. But I also pointed out that they must be refined by closing loopholes which develop as unscrupulous gunrunners figure ways to get around these laws. I feel the 1968 Gun Control Act needs no further vindication than the Treasury Department report I inserted on June 15. However, it does have a serious flaw, that is the unhindered domestic production of cheap handguns referred to by law enforcement officers as "Saturday Night Specials." Recent statistics released by the New York City Police Department show that of the 1,117 criminal homicides committed in New York City in 1970, the weapon most often used was a handgun; the day of the week when most murders were committed was on Saturday night between 9 and 11 p.m.; and, according to Police Commissioner Patrick Murphy we can attribute a large percentage of these gunshot murders to "Saturday Night Specials."

That is why the Commissioner and I want these weapons eliminated not only from New York City, but from every city in America.

And while 1,117 homicides are far too many, the figures in my judgment prove the value of New York City's gun law, just as Federal law enforcement agencies have proven the value of the Gun Control Act. Of the 10 major cities in the United States, New York ranked 9th as far as killer crimes go. While cities such as Cleveland had murder and manslaughter rates as high as 36 per 100,000, New York City's rate was 14 per 100,000. I am such that our gun law plays a major role in this comparably better crime situation.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue my efforts to plug the loophole in the 1968 Federal law which is adding to the crime problem nationally and allowing criminals to circumvent good local laws such as New York City's. For example, cheap guns are smuggled into New York from out-of-state and end up in the hands of would-be murderers. And I want to thank those who have supported my effort to do this.

I salute today, the New York Times for the support it has given over the years to those of us who have worked for stronger Federal firearms laws. In both its reporting and in its editorial pages the Times has been a strong advocate of good gun laws.

The current thwarting of the Federal gun law was pointed out by editorial writer Tom Wicker in November 1970. More recently, on May 27, 1971, he again wrote a thoughtful article on the efficacy of good gun laws and the need to close the leak in the 1968 law before it becomes a veritable flood. I commend Tom Wicker's article, entitled "Saturday Night Specials," to my colleagues and ask that they read it for a lucid and concise presentation on where we stand today on Federal firearms legislation.

I include the New York Times article "Saturday Night Special," dated May 27, 1971, at this point in the RECORD.

**SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIAL**

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—It was pointed out in this space on Nov. 11, 1970—and as early

as April 30, 1969, by Neil Sheehan in The New York Times—that the 1968 Gun Control Act was being to some extent thwarted because domestic firms were importing and reassembling the individual parts of cheap handguns, which were themselves barred by the act from importation.

This turns out to be only partially true. The parts are being imported and reassembled, all right, and with devastatingly dangerous effect. Before the act, for instance, the importation of cheap revolvers—weapons of such low quality that few sportsmen or law officers would want one—had risen from 41,350 in 1951 to 747,012 in 1968. That was enough to move Congress to ban shipments of handguns that could not qualify under a factoring system as a sporting weapon.

Since the act, which did not bar the importation of the individual parts of cheap handguns, five former importers have been authorized to import enough parts to assemble in this country about 1.5 million such guns. In addition, domestic manufacturers now are producing annually nearly a million cheap handguns made entirely in the United States. All these "Saturday night specials" retail for about \$15 to \$30, and often for much less on resale in the streets and alleys of every major city.

These are figures supplied by Representative John Murphy of New York, a principal sponsor of the 1968 act. He and another Murphy—Commissioner Patrick V. Murphy of the New York City police, who is a firm supporter of gun-control legislation—appeared the other day in a news conference to ask support for Representative Murphy's new legislation to bar the sale of cheap handguns domestically manufactured or assembled.

The Congressman also has written Representative Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, that domestic manufacturers now are producing 41 different versions of the "Saturday night special" that would not be importable under the 1968 law.

Representative Murphy urged Mr. Celler to hold immediate hearings on the bill to apply the importation standards to domestically produced handguns. This is a measure obviously needed to plug a gaping loophole in the 1968 law, and the political prospects are reasonably good that this modest additional gun-control step can be taken; it is one that the most vociferous sportsman or gun fan will find hard to oppose on any rational grounds.

Further figures supplied by Representative Murphy—who got them from the Treasury's Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division—do not, however, bear out the notion that the domestic production of "Saturday night specials" has thwarted the 1968 law. In fact, as Representative Murphy said at his news conference, the record shows that "gun legislation does reduce crime and contribute to its prevention."

From January, 1969, to March, 1971, 967 arrests were made under Title I of the 1968 act, which prescribes certain standards as to who may and may not legally buy and sell guns (convicted felons, for instance, may not). In a comparable period before the passage of the act, only 258 arrests had been made on somewhat similar charges.

Altogether, under various provisions of the 1968 law, 4,477 arrests had been made through March, 1971—including, Representative Murphy said, "significant arrests of every type of criminal known." Arrests are not convictions, but since this record represents an increase of about 410 per cent over gun-law arrests in the 27-month period before the 1968 law was passed, convictions and imprisonments for various firearms violations are bound to have increased, too.

The importance of these statistics is that they tend to disprove those who have been convinced that gun-control laws would have the effect of disarming law-abiding citizens,

while leaving criminals free to dodge the law and commit as many crimes as ever. The effect, instead, has been to make it much easier to charge a violation of the new law to a gun-bearing criminal, or potential criminal, before the gun has been used in a crime.

A small further step, beyond closing the senseless loophole that permits the domestic manufacture of "Saturday night specials," has been proposed by a New York State Bar Association committee. It recommended a voluntary Federal license that would offer legitimate gun owners certain advantages, and at the same time make a beginning at determining on the Federal level who should and who should not be permitted to own a gun. That would be a small step indeed, but big ones are not likely in this politically volatile field.

**INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PREVENT THE IMPORTATION OF HEROIN INTO THE UNITED STATES (TO BE INTRODUCED JUNE 24, 1971)**

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and to restrict immigration from and travel to any such country.

I think this is a timely bill in view of the disclosure yesterday by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird that Turkey has refused a \$5 million offer by President Nixon to destroy that country's opium poppy crop.

Even though the crop is estimated to be worth \$3 million to Turkish farmers which would mean a \$2 million profit, the Turkish Premier, it is reported, did not want to appear to be "an American lackey."

This has been our experience for decades. The American heroin market is being exploited by our "friends" who can think of every conceivable excuse not to eliminate their drug production. Because of the pride of the Turkish Premier, a great chunk of the world's supply of raw opium, half of which is produced in Turkey, will end up in the criminal traffic and ultimately its distilled essence, heroin, will find its way into the bloodstreams of a quarter of a million young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out last week, the problem of the elimination of opium production in many countries of the world is complicated by social and economic factors which influence the ability and the incentive of many countries to suppress the production of opium.

This has been going on for years. But I refuse to believe that those governments in the countries involved do not have the ability to eliminate either the production or the distribution and processing of opium and opium derivatives which are destined for the United States. I cannot believe that it is impossible to

interdict either the production or the sources of supply by law enforcement—or the Army if need be—in France, Turkey, Mexico, Greece, Lebanon, and a host of other countries.

That is why I am introducing this bill which will provide the incentive to those countries that have been dragging their feet in knocking out the clandestine production of opium and the criminal network of refinement and distribution that has been allowed to go on for 50 years. I feel it is time we quit playing games with these nations and let them know in no uncertain terms that the United States of America will no longer tolerate this unhindered criminal traffic or be placated by the annual burning of a few poppy fields—which usually have already been harvested—and arresting a few secondary traffickers.

My legislation would take a hard line by punishing those countries which allow narcotic drugs to be produced and processed and which are destined for the United States by suspending economic and military aid to such countries.

Until they take the appropriate steps to stop the dope traffic, my legislation would do three things:

First, the legislation would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully.

Second, the legislation would prohibit the issuance of visas to Americans who wish to visit those countries that have been identified as opium producers or processors. Under the provisions of my bill the Secretary of State may restrict travel to a foreign country or area by citizens and nationals of the United States if there is in effect with respect to such country or area a determination by the President that the country or area has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs—as defined by section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act—produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully.

Third, my legislation would prohibit the immigration of residents from these countries into the United States. Under this provision, no immigrant visa may be issued under the Immigration and Nationality Act to any national of any country with respect to which there is in effect a determination by the President that the government of such country has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs—as defined by section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act—produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully; and no national of any such country may be permitted to otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

I take this step reluctantly—but these countries leave us no alternative. Nothing has worked so far at the diplomatic level

and the problem has now gotten completely out of control.

I am certain my bill, if enacted into law, would provide the incentive to the governments involved.

I am certain they would—in very short order—devise ways to eradicate the poppy crops, the marihuana fields, the pill producers and those vicious criminals who refine, package, produce, and smuggle these deadly powders and tablets into the United States.

When we realize there are 250,000 heroin addicts, 12 million marihuana users, and untold millions of our youths strung out on dangerous drugs, I feel that such a drastic step is warranted. The U.S. Congress should let these drug source countries know that the American people are fed up with their indifference and that we in Congress have had enough. We should let them know we are not going to be “nice guys” anymore and that we are willing to temporarily suspend our amicable relationships in order to put a stop to this outrageous international disgrace.

I urge Members to support this legislation. We in Congress must let these countries know that their lack of respect for the lives of young Americans has caused us to lose respect for them. Nothing could make this message more clear than to forbid our citizens to visit these countries and to prevent their citizens from immigrating to the United States.

#### TRIBUTE TO JAMES CHANEY, ANDREW GOODMAN, AND MICHAEL SCHWERNER

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is 7 years since the murders in Mississippi of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner—three courageous young men who were in search of a dream. Their dream was that of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—equality of all men.

Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner were white; James Chaney was black. Each of them was concerned, determined and dedicated to the ideal of political freedom.

Coming from a different background and environment than James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner had come to Mississippi as volunteers to work for equal voting and educational rights for blacks in Mississippi under the auspices of the Council of Federated Organizations, an alliance of several civil rights groups which included the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. They met James Chaney in Mississippi where they were involved in setting up freedom schools and voter registration drives. In their civil rights work they encountered a hostile and inflexible en-

vironment in which acts of violence and murder were condoned.

Their murder on June 21, 1964, was brutal. The tragedy of their deaths helped to jolt this Nation into an awakening to an issue that was submerged and ignored by a great number of people—the denial of the basic rights of many American citizens and the necessity to affirm these rights.

The courage of these young men and many other unheralded but gallant civil rights workers was finally met with long overdue congressional action in the form of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The results of the Voting Rights Act have been of enormous importance. The total number of blacks registered in the seven Southern States which fell under the operative mechanism of the act was 1,222,000 in 1965. By the fall of 1970, the total registered black voters in these States was 2,110,000, equivalent to 67.7 percent of those eligible. As black voters exercised the right to vote, black public officials were elected. In 1970, there were more than 500 black elected officials in the Southern States falling under operation of the Voting Rights Act. In 1968 the Mississippi Freedom Democrats were seated at the Democratic National Convention; in 1969 Charles Evers was elected Mayor of Fayette, and I was privileged to attend his inauguration.

Yet, despite the strides made by blacks in the South—and the North, as well—in achieving political power, much remains to be done. The basic problem which underlies the continuing failure of this Nation to achieve civil rights for all is, I believe, the absence of moral leadership from those who occupy the highest offices in the land to eradicate discrimination wherever it exists. There is, in fact, a moral vacuum.

The reluctance of the administration to firmly stand up and demand equality for all Americans is evidenced in numerous manners. The nominations to the Supreme Court of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell demonstrated at the least a lack of sensitivity to the civil rights issue—and that is a charitable description of the motivations underlying their nominations. The President's continuing reluctance to use the full power of the Federal Government—and by full power I refer not only to moral suasion, but also to use of the Federal power which derives from dispersing of Federal moneys—was again demonstrated recently by his statement on fair housing. He clearly there disavowed what he has termed in the past “forced integration,” a catch phrase which obscures what is the real issue—the continued bars which are raised to prevent blacks and other minority group members from obtaining housing in the white suburbs which surround our decaying, and increasingly black, cities.

The consequences of this lack of clear articulation by the highest officials of the administration that racial discrimination must be rooted out find realization in the operation of Federal programs such as the section 235 homeownership assistance program.

This Federal program aims at assisting lower income families to become homeowners. Yet, because of its passive administration by FHA, the result has been, to quote from the recently released study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, entitled "Home Ownership for Lower Income Families," that:

(T)he full potential of the program is not being realized and . . . the traditional pattern of separate and unequal housing markets for majority and minority families is being repeated in the operation of Section 235, (page VIII).

Similarly, the massive report issued last fall by the Civil Rights Commission, entitled "The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort," has made clear that throughout the Federal Government, enforcement of the civil rights laws and Executive orders has been inadequate. To quote from the summary of this report:

Measured by a realistic standard of results, progress in ending inequity has been disappointing. Even in securing basic rights—by far the easier part of the problem—success has been spotty and moot. In many areas in which civil rights laws afford pervasive legal protection—education, employment, housing—discrimination persists and the goal of equal opportunity is far from achievement. The plain fact is that some of these laws are not working well. The Federal civil rights effort has been inadequate to redeem in full the promise of true "equal protection of the laws" for all Americans. As a result, many minority group members are losing faith in the Federal Government's will and capacity to protect their rights. Some also are losing faith that equality can be achieved through law. It is important that their faith be restored and that the promise of the hard fought battle for civil rights laws be redeemed.

Right now, in Mississippi, that battle for civil rights is continuing. Charles Evers, of whose national campaign committee I am a member, is waging a political struggle—through the political process—to become the first black Governor of Mississippi. At the same time, a vigorous voter registration drive is being conducted there.

One key reason why that drive is so important derives directly from the work of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, whose efforts were so instrumental in producing enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This act has resulted in there being the potential of enough black voters on the voting registers to make a difference. As the June 22 edition of the Wall Street Journal, in an article by Neil Maxwell entitled "New Efforts in South To Enroll Black Voters Threaten White Leaders," describes the situation:

The voter registration drive in Mississippi is significant because this is the first time there have been enough blacks registered in the state to seriously threaten firmly entrenched white leadership. There are an estimated 270,000 Negroes currently registered, compared with less than 25,000 prior to passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. That's still less than 30% of the total vote, but in a dozen counties, mostly in the heavily black Delta, black voters equal or outnumber the whites.

More than 200 blacks, in addition to

Mr. Evers, are running for office in Mississippi, and chances are very good that many of them will be elected.

Not unexpectedly, violence has reared its ugly head once again. Intimidation, even shootings, have occurred. I have written, on June 7, to the Attorney General, requesting that Federal observers and registrars be sent to Mississippi, in order to discourage this violence and assure that those who want to register to vote can freely do so. Thus far, I have received no response.

James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner paid with their lives for their determination to fight for civil rights. On the seventh anniversary of their deaths let us remember their sacrifice to reaffirm the determination and commitment that blacks and Puerto Ricans and Chicanos and American Indians, and all minority groups in this Nation, can and will settle for no less than their equal role in this Nation. Until equality is achieved, this Nation has failed its precepts and its most enshrined documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. So long as that failure continues, we will persevere. And we shall overcome.

At this point, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Neil Maxwell's article which appeared in the June 22 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1971]  
BLACK BALLOTS—NEW EFFORTS IN SOUTH TO ENROLL BLACK VOTERS THREATEN WHITE LEADERS

MISSISSIPPI PROJECT, IMBUE WITH RIGHTS SPIRIT OF OLD, GEARS UP FOR 'CRUCIAL' VOTE—I HAVE FAITH IN OUR NIGGERS'

(By Neil Maxwell)

JACKSON, Miss.—What a question for a college lad: Where would you rather spend your vacation—the Bahamas or the muggy Mississippi Delta? Doug Schoen, a 17-year-old Harvard student from New York, had that decision to make a few weeks ago. And he chose here.

Doug is one of several score students and others who have descended on Mississippi for a few days or a few months with the aim of unseating whites from offices as high as that of the governor and as low as those of local justices of the peace.

Their presence is important not only because their voter-registration efforts may tip the scales in some contests but also because it is the first time in five years there has been any significant black and white togetherness in working for civil rights goals in Dixie.

A "MOST CRUCIAL ELECTION"

"You have, perhaps not consciously, the makings of an attempt to regain the spirit of the old civil rights movement," says John Lewis, director of the Mississippi Voter education project and a longtime civil rights leader. "Maybe it will serve as a spark to get people in the rest of the South, or even the whole country, to start working together again."

The voter-registration drive in Mississippi is significant because this is the first time there have been enough blacks registered in the state to seriously threaten firmly entrenched white leadership. There are an estimated 270,000 Negroes currently registered, compared with less than 25,000 prior to passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. That's still less than 30% of the total vote, but in a

dozen counties, mostly in the heavily black Delta, black voters equal or outnumber the whites.

"This is the most crucial election in the history of the state," says Mr. Lewis. "Nearly every office is up for re-election, and, for the first time, blacks have the strength to do some good."

"I HAVE FAITH IN OUR NIGGERS"

The greatly enhanced chances of winning have brought more than 200 Negroes into election races. Charles Evers, black mayor of Fayette, is a longshot candidate for governor and the first of his race ever to run. There are 48 black candidates for the state legislature, and Aaron Henry, state president of the NAACP and a candidate for the Mississippi House, figures half have a chance. "Realistically, about a dozen will probably get elected," Mr. Henry says at his Clarksdale drugstore. Currently there is one black legislator.

"We can reasonably expect about 100 blacks to be elected over the state," Mr. Henry predicts. That's double the number in office now. Whites see that as a gross exaggeration.

In Charleston, seat of Tallahatchie County and scene of a concerted registration drive to increase the black vote, W. W. May, publisher of the Mississippi Sun for 20 years, says there's little concern over chances of a black takeover in November, even though registered black voters slightly outnumber the whites and even though Negroes plan to challenge nearly every white officeholder in the county.

Mr. May doesn't think many blacks will vote for blacks. "I have more faith in our niggers than that," he says. "They are going to vote for the best qualified candidate."

THE WELCOME MAT ISN'T OUT

Whites may not be worried, but you couldn't tell that from the reception voter-registration workers are getting.

Tallahatchie County has a long reputation for being a tough spot for blacks. It was here that Emmett Till was lynched in 1955 for whistling at a white woman, and just three weeks ago a white night watchman allegedly gunned down a black man in what was apparently a minor dispute at a filling station in the county. (The sheriff had announced that the death was due to "natural causes," though the undertaker had said there were three bullets in the body. A grand jury will consider the evidence.)

It's still a tough place, as the visitors are quick to find out when they venture onto plantations to seek to register voters.

Sister Barbara Voltz, a Milwaukee nun who was down three weeks ago as adviser to a group of 15 students, says, "You could feel something electric in the air. I admit that after a day or two we picked up a degree of paranoia."

Her reaction is perhaps understandable, since (a) on Wednesday afternoon she was run off of two plantations in a row (b) on Thursday morning she was working down the road from a group that claims someone fired two rifle shots at them and (c) on Thursday night she was at a lake with a racially mixed group that was allegedly harassed and threatened with arrest by lawmen with drawn guns.

"AN AMAZING LEARNING EXPERIENCE"

For the students, Sister Barbara says, "it was an amazing learning experience. It taught them a lot about the value of human rights."

Even without opposition from whites, trying to persuade rural Negroes to journey to the courthouse—a place that has never meant anything but trouble—to register can be fraught with frustration. Sheila O'Flaherty, a 25-year-old visitor from Montana, is an authority on that.

One recent afternoon Miss O'Flaherty and Herman Batteast, a 14-year-old Negro youth

with whom she works as a team, attempted a couple of "pick-ups," which means picking up and taking to the courthouse folks who had previously been talked into registering. After a 20-mile drive to the first stop, a plantation near Tutwiler, the two go through a fruitless pitch to a 63-year-old tenant farmer and his wife.

"You mean you got to go all the way to the courthouse to register?" the overall-clad Negro asks. "I'm hooked up where I can't go this evening. I'm expecting the boss man any minute for me."

This is cotton chopping time in the Delta, when weeds are hoed from the fields, and the man explains that he had to be on hand waiting for whenever the plantation owner decided the fields were dry enough.

Asked how he feels about voting, he says, "I wouldn't mind it. But I don't know anything about it. I do know some people on these plantations who vote, but they vote like the boss man tells them to. If that's the way a privilege works, I'm not sure I want it."

Giving up, the pair visits a plantation a few miles away, stopping at a ramshackle home with 10 autos outside—eight hulks and two in need of repair.

First, the man of the house says he can't go because he has to fix his car. Second, he says he can't go because his vote wouldn't be counted anyway. Third, as a thunderstorm sweeps sheets of rain across the yard, he says he can't go because it is raining too hard.

By the time the rain eases, it is too late to make it to the courthouse anyway. The afternoon has produced no voters.

"There's nothing at all unusual about that," Miss O'Flaherty says. The record for the pair was one day when they took 10 voters to register, eight in one group. "I don't think we've gotten more than five any other day," she says.

#### A PLEA FOR U.S. HELP

Once blacks get to the old white courthouse in Charleston, they are signed up fairly, because the county clerk is under federal court orders to do just that.

In many other places, however, it isn't so easy, and the federal government is being urged to send registrars in to end abuses. A few days ago three prominent lawyers—former White House aide Theodore Sorensen, former NAACP general counsel Robert L. Carter and civil rights expert Joseph L. Mitchell "to dispatch immediately to Mississippi sufficient numbers of federal registrars and observers to ensure that every eligible Negro who so desires may be permitted to register to vote in the forthcoming election."

The lawyers cited an alleged incident earlier this month at Liberty, Miss., where they said white registration workers and several Negroes who wanted to register were forceably ejected from the Amite County courthouse by the sheriff. "The local mayor and the sheriff threatened these workers with physical harm if they returned to continue registering black voters," their request for help says. "Only after considerable pressure from Washington were they permitted to return . . . to witness the actual voter enrollment of 14 local blacks." (Mayor Jack Causey denies the allegations. "It's a damn lie," he says. "I don't recall anything like that. We don't want them in here, but I have never been confronted with anything like that. It just didn't happen.")

Registration workers also complain of clerks closing their offices for unduly long lunch hours or closing to make frequent trips for medical attention during normal business hours.

At Evers headquarters in Jackson, Ed Cole, a campaign leader, says "in several

places they won't permit registration workers in the office with blacks. It stands to reason that if you can have help in the voting booth you should be able to get it in the clerk's office."

Mr. Cole also complains that many clerks query registrants about where they work and he says that has an intimidating effect on a registrant. "The first thing he thinks of is his job. And if he signs up and gets fired a week later—for whatever reason—there is no way to convince him that registering to vote didn't cost him his job," he says.

#### "I'M GOING TO BLOW YOUR BRAINS OUT"

Plantation owners can be bigger obstacles than registration clerks, some outsiders working here say. Bryan Shane, 19, a student from Oconomowoc, Wis., recalls, "We were talking to these tenants when this white guy pulled up in his car and said we were on his road. He said for us to get our white Yankee — out, but I told him it was a county road. He pulled out a pistol and said, 'I'll show you how much of a county road it is,' so we didn't argue and left. He said he would blow our brains out. My heart was going 'boom, boom.'"

"'I'm going to blow your brains out' is a very common expression around here," Miss O'Flaherty says.

The registration workers have run into other problems, too. A couple of weeks ago, they left a van unattended while they went into the courthouse at Charleston for a few minutes. When they returned, it had three flats. Rev. Leon Walker, in charge of the registration campaign in Tallahatchie County, claims someone fired two shots at him from a high-powered rifle.

He also got fired from his job as pastor of St. James AME Church when his conservative black flock found out he was working on voter registration. He was fired by blacks, but he blames whites. "The white man realized that my working on voting threatened his position, so he got to my parishioners and put pressure on them," he says, sipping a late morning beer at a house where several visiting students are staying.

White residents are quick to agree that they don't countenance outsiders coming in to bring about radical change, but they insist that the tales of harassment are exaggerated.

"They've been harassed, but not shot at," says State Sen. Donald Strider, chatting in the shade of a tree on his vast plantation bordering the Tallahatchie River. "They've had guns pulled on them, because sometimes that's the only way you can get them off the place."

He recalls one instance when registration workers came right into the field where hands were chopping weeds, halting work. So the plantation owner got his gun and ran them off, the senator says.

He is convinced that the outsiders want violence, because it would gain sympathy for their cause, but he also feels it won't happen, because the whites are too smart to fall into the trap.

Sen. Strider says the Negroes living on his own place in the long row of tenant houses—each with one huge letter of the name "Strider" painted on the roof—are already registered to vote. But he says his farm manager has run off some registration workers.

"I'm definitely against them coming onto my place, because they send them out in mixed couples," the senator says. "My farm manager ran them off after he noted this black boy and this white girl standing under this very tree necking."

"Now, if it was you and a black man, or you and a white woman. I'd let you on the place—but not if it was you and a black woman. I'm against this mixing of couples. If God had intended us to become a mon-

grelized race, he would have just made one race in the first place."

#### "GO BACK TO NEW YORK"

In more cosmopolitan sections such as Jackson, the registration workers have fewer difficulties, but they still have them.

Doug Schoen, the one who could have gone to the Bahamas but chose here instead, says he has found it helpful to lie about why he's here when he visits official offices to get research materials for Charles Evers' gubernatorial campaign. "I just tell them I'm a graduate student," says the Harvard sophomore, whose father is a New York lawyer and mother a teacher at City University of New York.

"I knew people would be reticent, but I didn't know how reticent," he says. "They tell me things like I should go back to New York and work on the problems that are there."

Like many male visitors, Doug got a haircut before coming South, thinking he would be more readily accepted. It didn't help much. While he deems his hair "very conservative, by Harvard standards," it's still long for Mississippi, where crew cuts are still in vogue.

The conservatism of the South has also been a problem for Chris Evans, a 22-year-old Tulane graduate whose home is here and who is working to help elect Mr. Evers. His parents object strongly to what he's doing, and Chris moved out of the house recently after a controversy over the discovery of some New Republic magazines in his room. "My father thought that proved I was under Communist influence," Chris says.

#### CHARGES OF TRICKINESS

Seldom has a political scene been as fraught with charges of trickiness as in this year's in Mississippi. The legislature passed a law doing away with party primaries and having instead one "open" primary. The reasoning was that Negroes would have a tough time getting into the runoff, and if they did get in they would have a far tougher time winning it against solid white opposition. Federal courts overturned that.

In another move, 23 counties wiped the voting rolls clean and required everyone to re-register. Black leaders say county officials knew that it would be far easier to get whites to re-register than it would blacks and that the move would undo nearly a decade of voter-registration work.

That's one reason behind the current massive campaign to get blacks on the books. The deadline is July 2.

Whites charge that Mr. Evers is being sneaky by refusing to run in the August Democratic primary. He is running as an independent and urging other blacks to do the same. This means they don't run the risk of coming out of the primary a loser.

But the big advantage is that the general election will be "sudden death," with no runoff. So if there are several candidates, the chances of blacks having enough voting muscle to elect blacks rises rapidly.

Sen. Strider says that Mr. Evers could become governor with far less than a majority vote. "If we get a Republican candidate and a Democrat, and there may be a Conservative, plus Evers, 26% of the vote could elect a man," the senator worries.

#### AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE MIKVA TO H.R. 9272

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer the following amendments to H.R. 9272 to restore the cut to the Bureau of Prisons.

Amendments offered by Mr. MIKVA to H.R. 9272: Page 20, line 11, after 168a), strike out "\$13,000,000." and insert "\$14,250,000."

Page 19, line 15, after the word "Code" strike out "\$103,500,000" and insert "\$105,225,000".

Page 20, line 1, after "account," strike out "\$57,842,000" and insert "\$74,153,000".

#### TRAGEDY AT QUEBEC TERRACE

(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, the tragic shootout at Quebec Terrace has raised extremely serious questions about the conduct of a firearms raid by agents of the Treasury Department. The Treasury agents were assisted by members of the Montgomery County Police Force, two of whom were dressed in casual-hippy style clothing. There are serious questions about the use of these officers in such a raid.

County officials have reported to me on this matter, but there are unanswered questions of wider scope which must be answered to the satisfaction of the public and Government.

Although county police officers played a supporting role, the primary responsibility for this raid rested with agents from the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Fire Arms Division of the Treasury Department. I have joined my colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in urging Secretary Connally to conduct a complete investigation of the raid. My letter directed his attention to seven questions of special importance, and I am inserting it in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, last year I spoke out against the no-knock provision of the District of Columbia crime bill because I believed that broader powers of the unannounced entry by the police would jeopardize the safety of citizens and policemen alike. I am deeply disturbed that the tragic consequences I feared from the no-knock entries could occur even in a case where law enforcement officers were supposedly following the regular procedure of announcing themselves in the execution of a warrant. The right of Americans to be free from arbitrary police intrusion into their homes ranks as high as any right in a civilized society. We must find out what went wrong at Quebec Terrace and take all necessary steps to see that this tragedy is not repeated.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1971.

HON. JOHN CONNALLY,  
Department of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply disturbed by the tragic consequences of the fire arms raid at Quebec Terrace in Silver Spring, Maryland. Discrepancies in press accounts of the incident and many unanswered questions about the conduct of the raid have led to increased public concern. I urge that you make a complete investigation of the matter, so that these questions can be cleared up and a repetition of this tragedy prevented.

I believe that an investigation should be addressed to the following matters in dispute:

1. Was there sufficient evidence to justify requesting a warrant?
2. Was a night time raid warranted by the

information about possible violation of federal law?

3. Under what circumstances do agents of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Fire Arms Division seek the assistance of local police officers in carrying out such raids?

4. Why did the Federal agents accept the assistance of local police officers dressed in casual-hippy clothes in carrying out a raid of this type?

5. How much time was allowed for the occupants of the apartment to open the door? In a case like this where the evidence cannot be easily destroyed, how much time is generally permitted?

6. Could a key to the apartment have been obtained, rather than battering down the door?

7. Who was responsible for leaving the apartment in such disarray?

There have been ambiguous or conflicting reports on many of these issues. I believe your department has every interest in getting to the bottom of this controversy in order to provide a full explanation to the public and also to assure that any necessary changes be made in the operating procedures of Treasury agents responsible for conducting such raids.

Your prompt reply to this inquiry will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

GILBERT GUDE.

#### INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF CHANCELLOR BOYER OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY, N.Y.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent ceremonies at the State University at Albany, in my congressional district, Dr. Ernest L. Boyer was inaugurated as chancellor of the State University of New York, the largest university system in the world, I might add.

In his inaugural address, Dr. Boyer made many proposals which are pertinent not only to our own great State university, but also to education in general and to all educational systems in this country.

I am certain that Dr. Boyer's remarks will be of great interest to my colleagues here in the House, and I am therefore placing Dr. Boyer's fine address in the RECORD so that others may be able to read and profit from his recommendations:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY ERNEST L. BOYER,  
CHANCELLOR, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
TO THE DEEPER RITUALS

In formally accepting the Chancellorship of the State University of New York, I do so with a deep sense of gratitude for your confidence, and a pledge to give myself unreservedly to the task.

The State University of New York—with more than 300,000 students on seventy campuses from Suffolk on Long Island to Fredonia in the west, stands proudly as an institution unparalleled in its growth, unique in its diversity, and increasingly looked to as a model of what the public university of the future must become. The dramatic emergence of the University as one of America's truly preeminent institutions of higher learning in the nation is a tribute to a great many individuals, not the least important of whom are the citizens of New York State. But two men in particular come to mind today.

For the past twelve years, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller has played a truly significant role in the growth of the State University of New York. His vision of what a great university can mean in the life of a people and his drive to see that vision realized have unfailingly sustained this monumental effort. Thomas Jefferson's self-chosen epitaph points with satisfaction to three achievements: the Declaration of American Independence, the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, and the Founding of the University of Virginia. When the history of higher education in the Twentieth Century is chronicled, Governor Rockefeller's name will be recorded very prominently indeed. And because of his vision and support, the lives of hundreds of thousands of students for generations to come will be richly endowed.

My thoughts turn also to Chancellor Emeritus Samuel B. Gould. When Chancellor Gould invited me to join him here in 1965, I gladly accepted because of my great respect for Sam Gould as a man and my admiration for his dream of what this institution might become. The intensity of my convictions regarding his leadership has deepened during the intervening years. And it is humbling, indeed, to find myself now taking on the challenges to which he so brilliantly responded.

Today, the State University of New York confronts a world dramatically different from the one it first greeted in 1948. Nineteen forty-eight, that was the year in which Charles Evans Hughes died and Dwight D. Eisenhower became president of Columbia University. That year an annual review issued by one of our leading encyclopedia publishers described France's colonial war in Indo-China, praised a new miracle pesticide called DDT, and suggested that the quality of programming was beginning to improve on the nation's nineteen television stations. In 1948 editors did not think it necessary even to mention such topics as ecology, integration, urban affairs, narcotics, birth control, computers, automation, or pollution.

The changes of the past twenty-three years (the total life span of the State University) are almost beyond belief. Consider, for example, the litany of place-names—so poignant to us but which would have merely puzzled that entering class of '48. Cape Kennedy, Montgomery, Dallas, Watts, Kent, Jackson State, Woodstock, My Lai, and the Fort Benning trial. Our minds and the minds of our youth have been driven from exhilaration to despair, from cautious optimism to confusion and even shock. During these years we have gathered in the silence of our darkened homes—as though mesmerized by a kind of electronic ritual—to watch as our astronauts descended onto the moon and as our slain leaders were lowered into the earth.

And what does all of this have to do with the university? A great deal I would say for it is on the college campus that the future most dramatically meets the past. And here the fiercest after-shocks of change are felt. The campus turmoil of the recent past has ripped our institutional fabric. And we in the university now enter the decade of the 1970s much more sober and mature. This is not to say, of course, that adversity has passed. Suddenly, a new and more penetrating crisis has emerged. Almost without warning, questions of fiscal resources, institutional flexibility, and even the very integrity of the university itself have tumbled in upon us.

I do not for one moment misjudge the urgencies we face. They are very real, and I feel them keenly. And yet, the issue ultimately is not the gravity of the crisis but rather the quality of our response. The strength, the fiber of an institution—as in all of us—are not truly revealed in tranquil, easy times. Rather, character shines

through when pressures mount, when adversity looms large, when hard choices must be made.

This, then, is our challenge: to move forward with confidence, using our resources wisely and drawing strength from our tradition. And I believe this challenge can be met. The State University of New York is not some towering disembodied, structure. It is, quite literally, assembled in this room. Our future will be shaped, not by mysterious, invisible forces beyond ourselves, but by the convictions we agree to share and the actions we decide to take.

Therefore, I suggest that we look beyond the moment and focus on the future. Let us consider together several goals to guide our future course.

First, we must rekindle a spirit of mutual trust and confidence between the University and the community beyond.

It is no secret that the recent turbulence has left us with a yawning chasm between the campus and the town. The climate of acceptance, always fragile, seems to have given way to distrust, suspicion and even fear.

If we are to regain our equilibrium as a people, this festering antagonism must begin to heal. This requires, among other things, a recognition of the University's delicate, critical social role. It means accepting and rejoicing in the University as an island of free and open inquiry, and viewing it as a place where the established order of things can be scrutinized and probed. In so doing, we shall reaffirm the vitality of democracy itself, for if we lost faith in our universities, we lose faith in our future and in ourselves.

But if it is to be effective, trust must be a two-way street. The university has its own responsibilities to fulfill. Specifically, we must go beyond our cloistered walls to meet with honest critics, not to quarrel, but to listen and to learn, and to demonstrate our determination to serve as good stewards of the public trust. Smugness, aloofness, and arrogance are inconsistent with our mission, and ultimately destructive of the very institution we seek to serve.

The mission of the university can never be chained to the narrow purposes of a single group; neither can it long survive alone. The campus and the community are inevitably interlocked, and the time has come for us to stand together and rekindle confidence and hope.

Woodrow Wilson used to speak of "Princeton in the Nation's Service." I like to think that something analogous to that spirit will underlie our own efforts in the future—as, indeed, it has in the past.

As a second State University goal, there is the need to keep the structure of our university fully functional. We are the nation's largest university. But if our size serves only to stultify, or if in the name of centralized control we substitute bland uniformity for diversity, we shall have salvaged only the shell of the institution, while watching its spirit slip away. Every person in this university should be able to take pride in being part of a large and exciting undertaking. But each should enjoy as well, a keen sense of his own freedom within "the system" and personally help the University chart its future course. With this goal in mind, I shall continue to encourage diversity among the colleges, protect local initiative, and promote the creative new ideas which flow from students and teachers on all our campuses.

But local initiative, as essential as this may be, will not suffice. Duplication and overlap would, I am convinced, lead to fragmentation and work against the best interests of us all. More than ever before, University-wide priorities must be set, new programs examined, and hard choices made. At this critical time, we cannot afford the deceptive luxury of uncoordinated growth. Faced with an unprecedented crisis of resources, this is

the time to plan together. This is the time for the University to stand as a cohesive whole—with its separate parts, to be sure—but in spirit a great and unified educational network, whose pooled resources are available to the citizens of the State.

And yet, the State University of New York—for all its size and diversity—is only one partner in New York's total enterprise of learning. Nothing could be more petty or shortsighted than for each college and university of this State to huddle within the protective shelter of its own enclave, seeking to survive in splendid isolation. The day has come to recognize that all of us—public and private institutions alike—are intimately joined in a single goal: that of meeting the educational aspirations of the young.

In this spirit, I should like to propose that we draw together, as public and private colleges and universities throughout this great State, into a series of regional—"Cooperative Councils on Higher Education"—building upon and strengthening the excellent consortia already beginning to emerge in such areas as Rochester, the North Country, Buffalo, and Long Island.

These councils, as I visualize them, would be working organizations—not mere window dressing. Assisted by a network of regional offices and staffs, the possibilities are endless and, to me, quite exciting: shared library facilities, faculty exchanges, joint research, regional conferences and cultural events, to name just a few. Rather than eroding the independence of the individual colleges involved, collaboration would strengthen—educationally and administratively—the separate institutions and dramatize the unity of our cause.

This call for a flexible structure, both in the University and beyond, leads to another and closely related concern: the need to keep the educational process imaginative and open.

As long ago as 1869, President Charles William Eliot of Harvard declared in his non-sensical way: "The University must accommodate itself promptly to significant changes in the character of the people for whom it exists."<sup>1</sup> This remains as true today as it did in 1869.

I do not for one moment, of course, propose that we dilute the University's great traditions: critical analysis, reasoned discourse, precision of thought, and free and open inquiry. These remain—as always—the essentials. And yet, earlier maturation, vastly upgraded high school programs, and dramatic breakthroughs in communication have combined to alter radically both the context of our work and the entering college student.

In this regard, there are, I believe, good and sufficient reasons to rethink the length of time required to complete the baccalaureate degree. Specifically, I suggest that one of State University's newly emerging arts and science colleges be established as a three-year institution, not simply to substitute one rigidity for another, but rather to adapt our schedule somewhat to the changing student. As one approach, the first of these years might be thought of as a "capstone year" in liberal learning to bridge the transition from high school to upper division college work.

I propose another step: The introduction (possibly as early as September 1972) of an experimental and voluntary three-year A.B. program for perhaps ten percent or more of the freshmen students entering throughout the entire University system.

If these experiments prove successful in educational and human terms, I can foresee a day in the not too distant future when large numbers of our students will be able

to earn their degrees in a shorter and more flexible span of time.

But greater flexibility in the length of college study is not sufficient. The time has come to examine, as well, the conventional notion that "going to college" necessarily means four or three or any arbitrary number of actual years of residence on a campus—one traditionally covered with mouldering bricks and luxuriant ivy.

Coming in increasing numbers to State University's doors are many kinds of people—young mothers, war veterans, mature students—with a fierce desire to be better educated but who either cannot or do not wish to relocate on a college campus, and who have the motivation and ability largely to guide themselves.

These are the circumstances that led to our launching of the Empire State College, a new kind of college on the American scene—one with a well-conceived program, high standards, its own faculty, but without a campus. Students will study at home, in ghettos or foreign countries, in front of television sets or tape machines, or they may find themselves temporarily in campus seminars. The faculty will supervise and guide them. This is essential. The important point is that the form of Empire State College will be strikingly novel, while its process will remain flexible and its quality high.

Clearly the length and the location of higher learning must be re-examined. Yet these changes—important though they are—will be empty gestures unless, at the same time, we examine the content and quality of the educational encounter. Indeed, as we become less preoccupied with the mechanics—the form—of education, we will be freed to focus on the substance of our work: what do we mean by "the educated man?" What should be the content of our programs? What should be happening to, or, more precisely, within each student?

This brings me to a fourth issue: the need to keep as a central aim a deep concern for the individual. It is true (as Clark Kerr once observed) that the modern multiversity—with its computers, research institutes, government contracts, and sprawling parking lots—has become a vast enterprise indeed.

And yet, the human learning activities at its heart remain curiously intimate and low-keyed: the girl studying alone in a library alcove, the boy challenging his professor's ideas after class, roommates arguing their way through a "bull session" late at night. The framework of this university may seem huge and monolithic. But within the institution thousands of intimate intellectual encounters are constantly taking place. Our responsibility, it seems to me, is to encourage such exchanges a thousandfold.

One of the charges most frequently directed against the modern university is that research is stressed while teaching is ignored. In a sense, this accusation is misleading because of the cleavage it implies. The best teachers frequently are precisely those men and women most deeply immersed in their research.

But it would be foolish to deny that there is some validity to the charge. Too often have we paid lip service to teaching while reserving for research the more concrete rewards. The problem of course is not new. Charles Townsend Copeland, one of Harvard's truly gifted teachers, had to wait eighteen years for a promotion from instructor to assistant professor, because he was considered to be "only" a teacher!

Just as we now—quite properly—give recognition to those who have achieved outstanding distinction in research, honoring them as Distinguished Professors, so too must we honor those who intellectually nourish their students. As a step toward that goal, I propose that we create within the Univer-

<sup>1</sup> Charles William Eliot, "Inaugural Address", *Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses* (New York: Century, 1909), p. 35.

sity still another academic rank: that of University Teacher.

The designation of *University Teachers*, prudently and sparingly given throughout the State University, will signify to the best of our master teachers, both by title and salary, that this University regards excellence in teaching as the hallmark of success.

I fully recognize the pitfalls inherent in the measurement of teaching; I am also aware that a new rank to reward excellence is only a modest step. But the difficulties are worth confronting, and a distinguished rank for teaching is, I believe, more than simply an empty gesture. In a university whose hallmark is excellence, superior research and superior teaching must flourish side by side. To be sure, we must cultivate new realms of knowledge. But we also must cultivate the people in our midst. "The worth of a State," wrote John Stuart Mill, "is the worth of the individuals composing it." And so it is with the university as well.

My final concern, while difficult to define precisely, is perhaps the most crucial of all. As I talk with teachers and students, I often have the uncomfortable feeling that the most vital issues of life—the nature of society, the roots of social injustice, indeed the very prospects for human survival on this earth—are the ones with which the traditional structures of academia are least equipped to deal.

Our students come to us at a time of high expectancy, hoping to explore their urgent questions about society and about themselves. And yet, all too often they find themselves enmeshed in routines that are deadly and distracting. Thoreau might have put the problem this way: we are prepared for the student who wants to understand the anatomy of the frog, but are we prepared for the student who wants to understand the anatomy of his own society, or of his own soul?

I hope so, because I believe society today is desperately in need of individuals who are able to look at the old and the familiar in startling new ways, pose the "obvious" questions people seldom ask, and who seek—as William Faulkner phrased it in his Nobel Prize address of 1950—"to make out of the material of the human spirit something which was not there before."

Such a thrusting beyond the familiar may be an irritant at times. But creativity on the campus will also illuminate the mind, stimulate the arts, and speak to the common yearnings we all share. Carl Sandburg expressed it well in his simple moving poem, *The People, Yes*:

Once having marched over the margins of animal necessity, over the grim line of sheer subsistence, then man came to the deeper rituals of his bones, to the time for thinking things over, to the dance—the song—the story, or the hours given to dreaming once having so marched.

Frankly, at this moment I do not know precisely *how* the University of the future will organize itself to confront "the deeper rituals" of our bones. And yet, in a period when our priorities are being sharply probed, what a tragedy it would be if the most deeply felt issues, the most haunting questions, the most creative moments were to be pushed to the fringes of our institutional life—simply because they do not fit neatly into the organizational grooves and academic routines to which we sometimes seem excessively devoted.

"With all thy getting," declare the Scriptures, "get understanding."

#### CONCLUSION

I am keenly aware of the limited impact which men and their institutions seem to

make these days on the events of the times. But our abiding *hope* that, with determination and effort, we indeed *can* make a difference represents a life-giving beam of light.

Furthermore, if any single social invention carries with it that potential for the fulfillment of our dreams, it is the university. And long after we have all disappeared from the scene, it will have been said of this magnificent State and its people that by educationally caring for its sons and daughters, it also secured the future.

I wish to acknowledge the debt I owe to the members of the Board of Trustees for the trust they have placed in me, for their guidance and wise counsel, and for their unfailing encouragement and support.

Because of my faith in the students and teachers and administrators of this institution, and because of my sense of what the university has meant in the long sweep of human history—and what it may yet become—I am eager to move ahead.

For I can think of no greater mission than the building of a university.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, for today, on account of death of administrative assistant.

Mr. HOGAN, for June 24, 1971, and the balance of the week, on account of official committee 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. STEELE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. GRASSO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McFALL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, during consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous material and tables.

Mr. DINGELL to extend his remarks previous to those of Mr. REUSS in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HORTON to extend his remarks prior to the vote on the Widnall-Stephens amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. RYAN prior to the passage of the Conte amendment during general debate on H.R. 9270.

Mr. DORN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia during consideration of the Reuss amendment to the bill H.R. 9270.

Mr. GUDE prior to the vote on the Reuss amendment to H.R. 9270 and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SCHWENGEL during consideration of the Reuss amendment to H.R. 9270.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania after the vote on the Michel amendment to H.R. 9270.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts prior to vote on the Reuss amendment to H.R. 9270.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEELE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD in 10 instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. MARTIN in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. GRASSO) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. DRINAN in three instances.

Mr. FRASER in four instances.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MIKVA in eight instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. O'NEILL in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. MANN in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. MITCHELL in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. DENHOLM.

Mr. NIX.

<sup>2</sup> John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism, On Liberty, and Representative Government* (New York, E. P. Dutton, 1950) p. 229.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 26. An act to revise the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 27. An act to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 30. An act to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 108. An act for the relief of Kyung Jo Min and Kyung Sook Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. An act for the relief of Manuela C. Bonito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 248. An act for the relief of William D. Pender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 361. An act for the relief of Maria de Lourdes Moitoso Mota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 504. An act for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 624. An act for the relief of Fung Yut Ma, also known as Ma Yut Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 654. An act for the relief of Frederick E. Keehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 751. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond crushing bort from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 752. An act to authorize the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 753. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 754. An act to authorize the disposal of silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 755. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 756. An act to authorize the disposal of quartz crystals from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 757. An act to authorize the disposal of iridium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 758. An act to authorize the disposal of mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 759. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 760. An act to authorize the disposal of manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 761. An act to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 762. An act to authorize the disposal of chromium metal from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 763. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile

and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 765. An act to authorize the disposal of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 766. An act to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 767. An act to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 768. An act to authorize the disposal of chemical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 769. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 770. An act to authorize the disposal of columbium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 771. An act to authorize the disposal of selenium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 772. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 775. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 776. An act to authorize the disposal of abaca from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 777. An act to authorize the disposal of sisal from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 778. An act to authorize the disposal of kyanite-mullite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1489. An act for the relief of Park Jung Ok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1545. An act to amend section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to remove certain limitations on the establishment of acreage allotments for other farms owned by persons whose farms have been acquired by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1670. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1759. An act for the relief of Leonarda Buenaventura Ocariza and her daughter, Lucila B. Ocariza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating July 20, 1971, as "National Moon Walk Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 645. An act to provide relief in patent and trademark cases affected by the emergency situation in the U.S. Postal Service which began on March 18, 1970;

S. 1538. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; and

S. 1732. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2036. An act for the relief of Miss Linda Ortega; and

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution providing for the observance of "Youth Appreciation Week" during the 7-day period beginning the second Monday in November of 1971.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1161. An act to amend section 402 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in order to remove certain restrictions against domestic wine under title I of such act;

H.R. 1729. An act giving the consent of Congress to the addition of land to the State of Texas, and ceding jurisdiction to the State of Texas over a certain parcel or tract of land heretofore acquired by the United States of America from the United Mexican States;

H.R. 1890. An act for the relief of Robert F. Cheatwood, Walter R. Cottom, Kenneth Greene, Kenneth L. March, Ernest Levy, and the Estate of Charles J. Hiller;

H.R. 2011. An act for the relief of Philip C. Riley and Donald F. Lane;

H.R. 2036. An act for the relief of Miss Linda Ortega;

H.R. 2047. An act for the relief of Marion Owen;

H.R. 2132. An act for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.;

H.R. 2835. An act for the relief of William E. Carroll;

H.R. 3748. An act for the relief of Sgt. John E. Bourgeois;

H.R. 3929. An act for the relief of Gheorghe Jucu and Aurelia Jucu; and

H.R. 4327. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stevenson.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

890. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the lengthy delays in settling the costs of health services furnished under medicare, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred 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. GARMATZ: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4724. (Rept. No. 92-300). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Investigation Into Electronic Battlefield Program" (Rept. No. 92-301). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 742. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8181. A bill to require Federal Reserve banks to discount certain commercial paper used to finance the export of United States commodities, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to eliminate certain export credit controls, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 9181. A bill to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9382. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 92-305). 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 to as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9335. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make emergency relief grants to certain cities experiencing serious fiscal crisis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9336. 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

H.R. 9337. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9338. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9339. A bill to provide that the value of survivor annuities payable under chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, shall not be taken account for State inheritance tax or Federal estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS of

Illinois, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. THONE and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 9340. A bill to amend the Self-Employment Contributions Act of 1954 to provide that an election to be exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, made by a minister, a member of a religious order, or a Christian Science practitioner, may be revoked at any time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DORN, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. LENNON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 9341. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 9342. A bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to concentrate the resources of the Nation in a crusade against drug abuse to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 9343. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide for an immediate increase of 10 percent in such benefits to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself and Mr. MAILLIARD):

H.R. 9344. A bill to amend chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to authorize assistance for narcotics control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 9345. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide for the inclusion of child-care facilities in low-rent public housing projects, and to provide that the eligibility of a family to remain in such a project despite increases in its total income shall be determined solely on the income of the head of such family (or its other principal wage earner); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 9346. A bill to convey certain federally owned land to the Twenty-Nine Palms Park and Recreation District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9347. A bill to provide a temporary program for the sharing of Federal revenues with States and communities; to provide for a tax credit designed to encourage States to increase certain aspects of their revenue efforts; and to provide for the collection of State and local income taxes by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 9348. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the restriction on the use of certain private institutions under the dependents' medical care program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9349. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of special health care coverage for retarded or handicapped dependents of certain members of the Armed Forces

after the retirement of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9350. A bill to provide for a study mission to the Vietnam elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9351. A bill to prohibit sonic booms by civil aircraft within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 9352. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a register listing the names of certain persons who have had their motor vehicle operator's licenses denied or withdrawn and to allow more efficient use of that information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9353. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to provide for the development of a consumer information program concerning the damage susceptibility and crashworthiness of passenger cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9354. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 9355. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize reduced-fare transportation on a space-available basis for persons who are 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 9356. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed, or for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. ABOUREZK):

H.R. 9357. A bill to provide for the economic development of Indians, Indian tribes, and other Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9358. A bill to provide for the creation of the Indian Trust Counsel Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9359. A bill to provide a tax incentive for industrial development for the Indians on certain reservations in order to improve conditions among the Indian people on such reservations, and in other communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 9360. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans for parking projects and facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9361. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize parking projects by local authorities and agencies designed to ease traffic congestion and expedite traffic safety and flow; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. POFF):

H.R. 9362. A bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to concentrate the resources of the Nation in a crusade against drug abuse; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9363. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83

of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9364. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of non-marriage of certain annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9365. A bill to amend section 634 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide for retirement benefits for certain Foreign Service officers retired from the Service in accordance with the provisions of section 633 of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9366. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9367. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 9369. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 9370. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9371. A bill to provide for the control of surface and underground coal mining operations which adversely affect the quality of our environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois (for himself, Mr. STEELE, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. REES, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 9372. 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. PEPPER:

H.R. 9373. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of non-marriage of certain annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9374. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9375. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retire-

ment system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9377. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROE, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 9378. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 9379. A bill to establish an office for Federal Technology Transfer; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 9380. A bill to establish the Office of Drug Abuse Control within the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 9381. A bill to provide for the admissibility of certain evidence in prosecutions for drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9382. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DOW (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 9383. A bill to encourage States to increase the proportion of the expenditures in the State for public education which are derived from State rather than local revenue sources; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOW (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 9384. A bill to end combat in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 9385. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9386. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9387. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and to restrict immigration from and travel

to any such country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 9388. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9389. A bill to prohibit the use of certain devices and contests in rodeos and other public performances involving animals, and to prohibit the shipment or movement in interstate or foreign commerce of animals and devices involved therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 742. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 743. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate March 12 of each year as "National Girl Scout Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. ASPIN):

H. Con. Res. 345. Concurrent resolution relating to the 1971 South Vietnamese elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 507. Resolution dismissing the election contest in the 38th Congressional District of the State of California; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. ABOUREZK):

H. Res. 508. Resolution; no termination of Tribal Council; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

219. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to treatment of prisoners of the Vietnam war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

220. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to resolving the tidelands dispute regarding revenues from offshore mineral production; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

221. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, requesting Congress to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution relative to sharing of Federal income tax revenues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 9390. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winifred Patricia Christensen-Lonborg Malloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9391. A bill for the relief of Luigi Santaniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 9392. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Quillin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.