

He indicates the frustration that cuts in Federal aid bring both to our students and our colleges.

The House must realize the problem and encourage members of the joint conference committee to agree to the full amount of \$200 million for fiscal year 1972 allocated by the Senate. Allocating this money is the quickest and surest way of providing more financial aid to the colleges and students.

Mr. Kenneth E. Smith, president of Milton College, said last month:

Many of our students who expected Work-Study assistance during the summer will find themselves looking for a job at a time when the job market is very unfavorable. For these low income students, the prospects are bleak: (1) If they enroll in the fall in hopes of finding work, they will be disappointed and may have to drop from school; (2) If they choose not to enroll because of economic conditions, they enter a job market

next fall that is already unfavorable. In either case, both the student and the college will lose.

We are sorely disappointed in these reductions because they affect the very students we have worked so hard to recruit.

We cannot allow the work-study program to suffer. It provides a much-needed opportunity for students who might otherwise not be able to go to college, and provides society as a whole with a better educated population.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 29, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Morton J. Summer, principal, Hebrew Institute of Rockland County, Monsey, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, our King—

אבינו מלכנו

It has been said that by three things the world is preserved: by truth, by judgment, and by peace. Grant us in Thy mercy the incisive vision to perceive the truth, to see reality as it swirls and eddies about us. Bless those who strive to make our democracy a more perfect way of life. Assist them with calm deliberation, with peace of mind and with good health so that their judgment be clear and their decisions just.

Grant peace unto our generation, let those who have lived through the horror of bloodshed so many times reach the haven of love and tranquillity. Bless us with the gift of compassion and love for our fellow men and for all human beings.

Create within us a pure heart and steadfast spirit so that we glory not in our wisdom nor in our strength nor in our riches.

Let us rather glory in the justice we do, in loving mercy and in walking humbly with our G-d.

אמן וכן יהי רצון

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 joint and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 744. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and

H. Con. Res. 346. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 5257.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7960. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

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

S. 137. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land;

S. 432. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Salmon Falls division, Upper Snake River project, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

S. 488. An act to prohibit the licensing of hydroelectric projects on the Middle Snake River below Hells Canyon Dam at any time before September 30, 1978.

### THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS ELLSWORTH MARTIN, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former Member of this House, Thomas Ellsworth Martin, formerly, when a Member of Congress, from Iowa City, Iowa; lately, a citizen of Seattle, Wash. He served 16 years in this House with great distinction. Few men have enjoyed the respect of the Members of this House that Congressman Martin enjoyed. Few Members have been loved more as a public servant in his district and in his home State than was Tom Martin. He was always on the job. He was diligent in all things he did. He was completely and utterly dedicated to the great principles of our country, and served his people thoroughly, well, and effectively while he served in the Congress.

Later he decided to run for the Senate. He was successful, and served for 6 years in the other body, also with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, here he served first on the Military Affairs Committee during a very critical time in our history during World War II. He, probably more than any man in the Congress or in the country, understood the importance of materiel, and while not chairman of the committee, he served effectively on that committee to strengthen the United States and give it every possible help he

could with legislation through his great influence, insight, and knowledge.

Later, following the war, he asked to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, and the House honored him. Here again he served with great capacity and dedication.

Here was a man who served in public office many years. He had been mayor, a member of the city council, a member of various committees. He served the public and his community, and served his party well. Most of all, while a great party man, he was a great American, a man of great talent with a great sense of dedication, who served well in every opportunity he was given to serve. In war and in peace he was great.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for and received unanimous consent to speak on the life, work, and contributions of Tom Martin on July 6 and I invite all who knew him and served with him to be on hand that day to join with me in an accolade and tribute to a very deserving and honored citizen of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, for those who may want to contact his good wife, Dorris, her address is 5101 Northeast Laurel Crest Lane, Seattle, Wash. 98105.

Memorial services for Senator Martin will be held on Friday, July 2, at the University Congregational Church, 4515 16th Street NE., Seattle, with burial in the Willamette National Cemetery on Thursday, July 1. The Adams Forkner Funeral Home, 4214 University Way NE. in Seattle is making funeral arrangements.

In addition to his wife, Senator Martin is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Raymond Reiser, of Seattle, a son, Richard, of Chicago, nine grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the Republican leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the very first Members of this body whom I met when I came here in January 1949 was Tom Martin. He was friendly. He was helpful. He certainly was an outstanding legislator.

He was particularly interested in new Members. Although he came from Iowa and I from Michigan, he bent over backward to try to make helpful suggestions and to counsel and advise when matters

came on the floor of the House that were controversial and complicated.

I admired him as one of the strong members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and I respected his good approach to the problems which came to the floor of the House.

He left this body and went to the Senate, and his record of public service there, as has been explained by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) was an outstanding one.

We have lost a good friend. The country has lost a man who had an outstanding record as a public servant.

My wife and I join in extending condolences to his family.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman in the well and also those of the minority leader. I had the pleasure of serving with our late colleague on the Ways and Means Committee for several terms. He was an able and dedicated man, who served his State and Nation well. Mrs. Boggs joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suspect some of us are dating ourselves a bit here today by recalling our service with Tom Martin, but, like some others who have spoken, I did have the privilege of serving with him in the House.

He was an honorable man, a sincere man, a man who had great respect for this body in which he served so well.

I certainly want to join with my colleague from Iowa and other Members in expressing my sympathy to the family Tom Martin left behind him.

#### PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS FROM JULY 1, 1971, UNTIL JULY 6, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 351) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 351

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, July 1, 1971, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, July 6, 1971.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any

adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 6, 1971, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 118) to provide a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

##### S.J. RES. 118

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting "October 31, 1971".*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the proposed legislation will extend the Export Administration Act of 1969 for 4 months, to October 31, 1971. The Export Administration Act furnishes the basic authority for the control of exports to Communist bloc countries. It furnishes the authority for regulating the outflow of scarce materials, as well as the authority to regulate exports in furtherance of the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The temporary extension of the Export Administration Act, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1971, will enable the committee to complete its deliberations.

Continuation of this authority has not been the subject of hearings until now by reason of the extensive hearings which have been held in connection with H.R. 5700, the Bank Reform Act, because of the substantial amount of staff research which has been devoted to the question of Government loan guarantees for Lockheed, and due to the request by the Export-Import Bank that immediate priority attention be given to legislation expanding its authority to finance exports. Extensive hearings on export finance have been held, and the committee has reported H.R. 8181, the Export Expansion Finance Act of 1971, which I hope will be considered by the House as soon as possible.

It is expected that hearings on the regulation of exports will be held in conjunction with certain other international economic policy issues shortly after the August recess.

The Senate joint resolution was or-

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

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8825, LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 8825) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-317)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8825) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 31, 34, and 44, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,162,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$33,476,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate number 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,166,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$971,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$454,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$87,108,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, and 38.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,  
BOB CASEY,  
FRANK E. EVANS,  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
J. EDWARD ROUSH,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
WENDELL WYATT,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
NORRIS COTTON,  
EDWARD W. BROOKE,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*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. 8825) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SENATE

Amendments Nos. 1 through 30: Reported in technical disagreement. Inasmuch as these amendments relate solely to the Senate and in accord with the long practice, under which each body determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs therein without intervention, the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 30.

JOINT ITEMS

*Capitol Police, general expenses*

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$232,400 for general expenses of the Capitol Police as proposed by the Senate instead of \$134,000 as proposed by the House. The additional \$98,400 is for uniforms, equipment, and laundry expenses for the 164 additional police positions provided for the Senate in Amendment No. 15 (similar expenses for recently added House police positions are being temporarily paid from the contingent fund of the House).

*Capitol Guide Service*

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to provide for disbursement of this joint appropriation by the Secretary of the Senate as proposed by the Senate instead of by the Clerk of the House as provided in the House-passed bill. The motion will retain the limit of 24 personnel in both versions of the bill, and will also—as a substitute for the Senate language—provide that the personnel shall be employed and their compensation fixed in accord with the applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

*Capitol buildings*

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$2,506,700 for the Capitol buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,479,200 proposed by the House. The additional \$27,500 is for two small projects on the Senate side of the

CXVII—1419—Part 17

building—\$13,000 for improvements to the Senate restaurants recommended by the Sanitarian and \$14,500 to convert a tiled passageway to office space.

*Restoration of Old Senate Chamber and Old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol*

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

*Extension of additional Senate Office Building site*

*Senate Garage*

Amendments Nos. 36-38: Reported in technical disagreement. These amendments relate solely to Senate activities and the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS  
(Structural and Mechanical Care)

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$1,162,000 for structural and mechanical care of the Library buildings and grounds instead of \$1,202,000 proposed by the Senate and \$1,134,000 proposed by the House. The \$28,000 added to the House allowance consists of \$8,000 for fixing parking areas adjacent to the main Library building and \$20,000 for resurfacing certain areas of the main building west terrace where safety considerations are of high priority consideration.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

*Salaries and expenses*

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$33,476,000 for the main salaries and expenses appropriation of the Library instead of \$33,661,000 proposed by the Senate and \$33,408,000 proposed by the House.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$7,166,000 for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Research Service instead of \$8,155,000 proposed by the Senate and \$6,800,000 proposed by the House. The conference agreement allows for about 75 additional positions in lieu of about 52 additional under the House bill and about 137 additional under the Senate amendment.

*Books for the general collections*

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$971,000 for books for the general collections of the Library instead of \$995,000 proposed by the Senate and \$962,000 proposed by the House.

*Furniture and furnishings*

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$454,000 for library furniture and furnishings instead of \$505,000 proposed by the Senate and \$435,000 proposed by the House.

*Administrative provisions*

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed 15 positions in the Library as proposed by the Senate instead of 10 as proposed by the House may be exempt from certain provisions of appropriation acts concerning the employment of aliens during the fiscal year 1972.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$87,108,000 for salaries and expenses of the General Accounting Office instead of \$87,598,000 proposed by the Senate and \$86,618,000 proposed by the House.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1972 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1971 amount, the 1972 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1972 follows:

	Amount
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971-----	\$442,904,319
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972--	535,349,607
House bill, fiscal year 1972----	449,899,605
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972----	532,297,749
Conference agreement-----	529,309,749
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971..	+86,405,430
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972-----	-6,039,858
House bill, fiscal year 1972--	+79,410,144
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972--	-2,988,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$78,430,144 for Senate items not considered by the House. Conforming to long practice, funds exclusively for operations and activities of the Senate—including two items jurisdictionally under the Architect of the Capitol—are left for decision and insertion by that body.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,  
BOB CASEY,  
FRANK E. EVANS,  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
J. EDWARD ROUSH,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
WENDELL WYATT,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
NORRIS COTTON,  
EDWARD W. BROOKE,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8825, LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972, TOMORROW

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow, June 30, 1971, to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8825) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not object to the prior unanimous-consent request because, knowing the gentleman from Alabama and his good work habits, I presumed the work of the conferees was done and that the preparation of the report of the managers on the part of the House was in process of being prepared for filing by tonight.

May I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama as to why we again need to have unanimous consent to waive the rules of the House under the Reorganization Act of 1970 and consider this on tomorrow as requested, instead of being printed and in the hands of the Members for 3 days?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, I will just say to my friend in order to expedite an appropriation bill before June 30.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this particular appropriation, like all other noncompleted appropriations, would be cared for under the continuing resolution passed by this and the other body; is that not correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is my understanding.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. BOW. I might say on the question of the continuing resolution, it has caused and given me some concern. The other body has amended the continuing resolution and is now considering an amendment which could very probably hold it up over the next several days.

So, I think if we get this through, we will have accomplished at least in the legislative branch the enactment of an appropriation bill. However, I am concerned about the continuing resolution.

Mr. HALL. May I inquire further of either one of the gentlemen if there were any great changes other than those otherwise granted within the so-called comity with the other body, after the bill left the House?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We are bringing back one amendment in dispute. The other body provided money for the restoration of the old Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol. We bring that back in dispute. This item involves \$2,200,000, plus a few additional changes for some of the agencies. However, the bill is substantially in the same form as it was when it left the House.

Mr. HALL. I am personally in favor of the Capitol restoration, but in addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill which the gentleman seeks unanimous consent to consider tomorrow will be a controversial addition involving not only the addition to the Senate Chamber and the taking over of the hotels and the new parking spaces for that body and so forth and so on; but possibly bringing up again the question of our own legislative branch of the Government and its acquisition of property and further development? Is that a possibility?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I am sorely put, Mr. Speaker, to understand, in view of the lack of adequate action taken, as to why we should consider this at this particular time. Perhaps it would do the legislative branch the most good of all, to have an old fashioned "payless payday," as an example. I am not constrained to object however in view of the two gentlemen's statements of my faith in their committee, and, therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM AND ITS COST

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

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the question of whether the American people has any business knowing how it happened that they have been required to pay out more than a hundred thousand million dollars and more than 50,000 young lives in Southeast Asia, one might recall the words of President Kennedy:

Historians tell us that in 1914 with most of the world already plunged into war, the former German chancellor, Prince Bulow turned to the then German chancellor, Bethmann Hollweg and asked, "How did it all happen?" And Bethmann Hollweg replied, "Ah, if only one knew."

How did the United States get involved in Vietnam? Ah, if the American public only knew.

Indictment for Ellsberg; nomination for Otepeka? How did it all happen? Ah, if only one knew.

#### NEW YORK CITY, 51ST STATE— A HALLUCINATION

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues are advocating a separate State for New York City. This idea is not novel: it has appeared on the congressional horizon many times. As far back as the Civil War, Maj Fernando Wood wanted to wrench New York City from New York State, but he failed dismally. Now, with what I believe to be misguided enthusiasm, the idea is resurrected.

As a State, New York City would have to take on the total costs of such programs as welfare, medicaid, additional courts, corrections, probation, a State National Guard, to name but a few. And no tax program could meet these burdens. The tax raising potential of New York City is decidedly limited. Today, the city is being drained of businesses and citizens who are unwilling to pay the ever-increasing taxes demanded by the city, and those who remain cannot hope to bear the financial burden alone.

And what of existing State compacts which redound to the city's benefit? Indeed, in the long run, the rest of New York is a safety valve for New York City. So it is with Chicago vis-a-vis Illinois, Detroit vis-a-vis Michigan, Philadelphia vis-a-vis Pennsylvania, and so forth. The idea of an unalleviated urban State with no diversity of character and interest is not a happy one.

Rather than pursue an hallucination, we might better concentrate our efforts on exploring methods of more direct Federal aid to the cities according to need.

The campaign for the 51st State has my determined opposition.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 121, and on rollcall No. 122 I was unavoidably detained on official business in New York. Had I been present I would have voted for passage of the bills.

#### LOBBYING EQUITY FOR TAX-EXEMPT CHARITABLE AND EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

(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, current tax laws impose serious inequities on the ability of tax-exempt organizations to present their views and communicate their needs to the Congress and other legislative bodies. Under a 1962 provision, tax-exempt business associations are permitted to carry on lobby activities. But tax-exempt charitable and educational organizations, such as consumer and environmental groups and "public interest" law firms, are prohibited from presenting their views to the Congress if they wish to retain their tax-exempt status.

I believe that every group should have an opportunity to present its views to legislators and to pursue its interests and those of its members whether or not it is tax exempt. That is necessary if the legislatures are to be able to carry out their responsibilities effectively. And certainly if tax-exempt business organizations are permitted to lobby, nonbusiness organizations should have similar privileges.

Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association and other groups have recommended that this unfortunate inequity growing out of interpretations of the law be rectified and that nonbusiness tax-exempt groups be put on a par with tax-exempt business organizations. Legislation to that effect has been introduced in the House by Congressman SYMINGTON and in the Senate by Senator MUSKIE. I am today introducing similar legislation, and I am pleased to join these distinguished Members of the Congress in urging its enactment.

This legislation will not effect the rules prohibiting organizations from participating in political campaigns. It will simply enable them to present their views on legislation, of direct interest to them, to legislators and to advise their members about such pending legislation. That, I think, is only equitable and is in the best interests of all of the American public and of our political system.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT GIVES ANOTHER BLACK EYE TO THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has given another black eye to the U.S. Armed Forces. The decision overturning the draft evasion conviction of Cassius Clay is a stinging rebuke to the 240,000 Americans still serving in Vietnam and the 50,000 who have lost their lives there.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the members of the Supreme Court would assist me when I try to explain to a father why his son must serve in Vietnam or when I attempt to console a widow or the parents

of a young man who has died in a war that Cassius Clay was exempted from.

In spite of this decision, the world will go on. The Supreme Court members will take their 4-month vacation. Cassius Clay will continue to make hundreds of thousands of dollars in the ring and the grief of 50,000 families whose loved ones did not go before the Supreme Court will go on; for them, there is no relief.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is bad news for the unemployed workman of America today. In the President's veto message just sent up on the measure in which we had authorized an accelerated public works program for this country the President has stated that this bill would not provide help rapidly enough to meet the problem of unemployment in the country.

However, the President has offered no constructive alternative with any earlier hope of meeting the needs of the unemployed in this country.

This bill, as passed by the House, and by the Senate, represented the overwhelming judgment of this Congress on this question.

I regret very much that because of the President's action hundreds of thousands of unemployed in this country will be further delayed in their opportunity to secure work. I also regret very much that hundreds of thousands of families in this country will be delayed the income they so sorely need.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this ill-advised veto will be over-ridden by the Congress.

#### PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW DECISIONS OF SUPREME COURT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly more apparent that someone needs to review the decisions of the Supreme Court and determine whether or not the Court is functioning in a proper role as envisioned by the founders of this country and, indeed, within the Constitution.

I had a constituent write me a letter and make the statement that at present there is no one to call the Court to task if they, indeed, exceed their authority. The administration will not do it—the executive branch will not do it—and there is great reluctance on the part of the Congress to exercise the authority granted in the Constitution to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. Speaker, I am today along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) sending a letter to all Members suggesting the establishment of a select committee to look into the jurisdiction of the

Supreme Court and report back prior to the end of this Congress on whether or not the Supreme Court has been exceeding and whether legislation redefining the proper role of the Court should be offered.

#### VETO OF THE PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION BILL

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the Public Works Acceleration bill is a brutal blow to the unemployed of the Nation. I would say to my good friend from Ohio that this is not a partisan matter. The Governor of the State of West Virginia, a Republican and former colleague of ours, came up here to Washington to try to persuade the President to sign that bill. The veto is a terrible, shattering blow also to the many communities throughout the Nation, starved for funds necessary to build vital water and waste treatment systems and other needed public works. Revenue sharing is not the answer for these communities needing these facilities. You can't feed unemployed citizens with talk about inflation.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California, who has been a leader in the fight to enact the public works acceleration bill, and with whom I have been proud to join in his noble efforts.

Mr. McFALL. I share the gentleman's disappointment in the President's veto of the public works acceleration bill. I was interested in what the gentleman from Ohio commented. He said that the bill would not have had any effect for 18 months, and therefore it was unnecessary. I wish I could be as sure as the gentleman from Ohio is that we will not have unemployment 18 months from now. From all present indications, it appears as if 18 months from now we are going to have even more unemployment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Even if it is estimated that it will take 18 months to produce an effect, I say let us begin.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the statement. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 23, 1971.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, this bill,

H.R. 4724, to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972, passed the House on April 20, 1971. The Senate amended the bill in two respects.

By amendment No. 1, the Senate added \$320,000 to the amount contained in the House bill—\$2,200,000—for financial assistance to State marine schools. This additional amount was divided into two parts—\$150,000 would be used for subsistence payments to students at these schools; and second, \$170,000 would be used to repair, recondition and equip as necessary and maintain in good repair the vessel *Allegheny* for use as a training vessel by the Great Lakes Maritime Academy.

With respect to the first portion, the Maritime Administration had notified the administrators of each of these State schools in January 1971 that the Federal Government would confine its subsistence payments for the year 1972 to the level of students enrolled at the schools in 1965. Notwithstanding this admonition, several of the schools accepted for admission a number of students which exceeded the 1965 level.

None of the State schools appeared before the House committee in an effort to justify these additional sums. And according to the testimony of the Maritime Administrator, the prospect in the maritime industry for jobs for these State school graduates does not justify enrollments beyond the 1965 level. Under these circumstances, the \$150,000 portion of this additional amount was dropped from the bill.

The second portion of the \$320,000—namely, \$170,000—will be used for reconditioning work on the vessel *Allegheny*, which is owned by the State of Michigan, and turned over to the school for use as a training vessel. The work is needed to recondition the vessel and permit it to meet U.S. Coast Guard safety requirements and State pollution laws.

In the case of all the other State maritime schools, the Federal Government does actually supply a vessel and also pays for its maintenance and repair. Thus, it was the feeling of the conferees that this amount should be retained in the bill.

Amendment No. 2 is somewhat technical in nature and is necessary only by reason of the inclusion in the bill of the \$170,000 for work on a State-owned vessel. It would amend section 3 of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 by inserting a new subsection (c) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, where prior to enactment he has not furnished a suitable vessel to a State, to repair, recondition and equip, as necessary, and maintain in good repair a vessel which is owned by a State or by a State entity legally designated to receive assistance under the Maritime Academy Act of 1958.

This concludes my explanation of the action of the conferees and I respectfully ask that the conference report be adopted.

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

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

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 170]

Abourezk	Foley	O'Neill
Baring	Ford	Pepper
Blatnik	William D.	Pike
Brasco	Fraser	Purcell
Bray	Goldwater	Rallsback
Chappell	Hagan	Rees
Clark	Hillis	Rooney, Pa.
Clay	Jones, Tenn.	Rousselot
Conyers	Karth	Runnels
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Scheuer
Dent	Leggett	Sisk
Devine	Long, La.	Taylor
Diggs	McCulloch	Thompson,
Donohue	Macdonald,	N.J.
Eckhardt	Mass.	Veysey
Edwards, La.	Moorhead	Wampler
Fascell	Morse	Watts

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. 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. 9417), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 9417, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today, I bring you the appropriations bill on the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

Before I present the details of this bill, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee who have so faithfully participated in our committee activities. We have several new members on the committee and it has been a pleasure to work with them.

I also take this occasion to compliment our new ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Congressman JOSEPH McDADE, of Pennsylvania. I have had the privilege of serving with Congressman McDADE for several sessions on this subcommittee. His dedication and effort to understand, know and solve the problems of the entire United States is outstanding. I deeply appreciate his courtesy and I salute his work on behalf of our Nation.

All too seldom do those of us who work with the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, remember to thank him for his continuing courtesy, his understanding of our problems and his complete cooperation. Today I would like to do exactly that. He is one of the great gentlemen I have known in public life and it has been a privilege to work with him in the Congress of the United States.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the hardworking and excellent staff of our Appropriations Sub-

committee, George Evans and Byron Nielson, and Mr. Paul Wilson of the full committee.

I would also like to express my appreciation to each Member of the House who has taken the time and effort to appear at hearings before the subcommittee, who has talked with me and other members of the committee relative to funding of items in this bill and the impact of what that funding means to our total national economy, environment, and progress.

May I also recommend to each and every Member of the House that he or she read our six volumes of hearings. In these you will find a detailed analysis and innumerable facts relative to the operation of the 23 departments and agencies which are funded today as well as a stimulating summary of the management of and for our American land and its people.

You will also find copies of detailed contracts relative to the management of pertinent activities in some of the extremely controversial areas of jurisdiction.

As I present this bill each year I try to give you a short summary of where we have been, where we are, and what we are trying to achieve through the funded activities—indeed to give you a compacted glance of that part of America owned by the people for the benefit of the people.

#### SUMMARY OF BILL

The bill is never dollarwise as large as other appropriation bills but perhaps its significance is greater because in it lie management funds for the preservation and orderly development of our natural resources, the enjoyment of recreation on the far-flung areas of our domain, pollution abatement, the welfare and education of approximately 600,000 American Indians and 230,000 inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. A summary of the bill is as follows:

Item	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1972	Recommended in bill	Comparison
<b>Title I, Department of the Interior:</b>			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	\$1,540,809,000	\$1,515,084,000	-\$25,725,000
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	48,200,000	48,200,000	
<b>Title II, related agencies:</b>			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	623,760,035	644,424,035	+20,664,000
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	142,437,000	142,437,000	
<b>Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....</b>	<b>2,355,206,035</b>	<b>2,350,145,035</b>	<b>-5,061,000</b>

#### SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Because time is extremely limited in the presentation of all appropriation bills, I am listing now briefly a summary by activities of major increases and decreases in funding for 1972 fiscal year, compared to fiscal year 1971.

Following is a summary by activity of the major increases and decreases in new obligational authority for the 1972 fiscal year compared to fiscal year 1971:

#### Major increases:

Education and welfare services and other assistance to American Indians.....	+ \$66,219,800
--	----------------

#### Major increases—Continued

Conservation and development of natural resources.....	+ \$66,625,335
Arts and humanities.....	+30,150,000
Management, protection, and maintenance of national parks.....	+29,213,000
Land and water conservation fund.....	+22,600,000
Conservation and development of mineral resources, including health and safety.....	+20,386,000
Geologic surveys, investigations, and research.....	+15,397,000
Smithsonian Institution and related activities.....	+11,781,000

Major increases—Continued	
Conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources	+ \$6,115,000
Administration of territories	+4,239,000
Preservation of historic properties	+1,447,000
Offices of the Secretary and Solicitor, Interior	+1,177,000
Water resources research	+1,048,000
<b>Subtotal, major increases</b>	<b>+ \$266,398,135</b>
Major decreases:	
Forest fire control	—82,000,000
Helium fund	—29,277,000
<b>Subtotal, major decreases</b>	<b>—111,277,000</b>

Other increases and decreases (net)	—\$1,261,000
<b>Net total increase over fiscal year 1971</b>	<b>+153,860,135</b>

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

Unlike many appropriation bills, revenue is generated by agencies funded herein, and the committee has carefully measured each expenditure dollar requested in this budget, bearing in mind the revenue generated. The following tabulation indicates total appropriations to date for fiscal year 1970 and 1971, and the amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1972. It compares receipts generated by activities in this bill on an actual basis for fiscal year 1970 and on an estimated basis for fiscal year 1971 and 1972.

Item	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Appropriations	\$1,716,556,300	\$2,239,052,900	\$2,350,145,035
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	580,003,323	1,501,243,445	1,643,548,395
Forest Service	299,703,206	229,820,000	371,895,000
<b>Total receipts</b>	<b>879,706,529</b>	<b>1,741,063,445</b>	<b>1,015,443,395</b>

<sup>1</sup> Does not include any estimate for OCS leasing. (\$932,815 estimated from this source for fiscal year 1971.)  
<sup>2</sup> Reduced rate of timber harvesting and lower stumpage prices.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN BILL

What is this bill all about? Why is it important to you? Again I list for you selected items indicative of its extent.

There follows a listing of selected items which indicate the extent of activities funded in this bill:

Management of public lands (acres):	
Bureau of Land Management	451,137,473
U.S. Forest Service	186,899,958
Bureau of Indian Affairs	55,407,902
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	30,410,357
National Park Service	28,543,111
<b>Total acres</b>	<b>752,398,801</b>

	Current inventory	1972 construction
Road construction (miles):		
Bureau of Land Management	47,000	382
Bureau of Indian Affairs	21,664	615
National Park Service	10,020	24
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	6,015	7
U.S. Forest Service	196,565	7,900
<b>Total miles</b>	<b>281,264</b>	<b>8,928</b>
Recreation visitations (millions):		
National Park Service	167	184
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	20	21
Bureau of Land Management	77	99
U.S. Forest Service	173	189
<b>Total visitations (millions)</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>493</b>

TIMBER PRODUCTION

Forest Service: An estimated harvest of 13.8 billion board feet is anticipated for 1972, with receipts from sales of approximately \$352 million. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber and 40 percent of the softwood timber cut for industrial purposes annually,

and is equivalent to the construction of about 1.5 million average-sized homes.

Bureau of Land Management: Administers the sale of over 1.3 billion board feet of timber annually. Timber receipts are estimated to be \$84.5 million in 1972.

SOIL AND WATERSHED CONSERVATION

Forest Service: The national forests of the West—about 20 percent of the area—produce about 50 percent of the water, conservatively estimated at a value of over \$1 billion annually.

Bureau of Land Management: Administers an active program of soil stabilization practices on 160 million acres of public lands covering about 1,300 watersheds. Practices are designed to conserve and develop public land soil and water resources and include construction of small water control structures, contouring and cultivation, revegetation, protective fencing, and water developments.

GRAZING

Bureau of Land Management: Administers grazing of approximately 11.6 million head of livestock and 2.7 million big game animals. Grazing receipts are estimated to be over \$9.8 million in 1972.

Forest Service: Administers the grazing of 7.3 million head of livestock. This provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by 18,200 family type ranch units. In addition, an estimated 4.3 million big game animals graze on national forest lands.

INDIAN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools, 60,000.

Indian children in public schools, 87,000.

Indians provided with welfare guidance service, 90,000.

Operation and maintenance of 300 Indian irrigation systems.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Bureau of Land Management: Administers mining and mineral leasing on approximately 760 million acres of land in the continental United States and more than 515 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf. Mineral receipts are estimated to be almost \$340 million in 1972.

Geological Survey: Provides the basic scientific and engineering data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of production on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is \$3.5 billion, with royalties accruing to the Government of \$492 million. Bonuses from lease sales this fiscal year will approximate \$950 million.

FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Produces in excess of 5 million pounds of fish a year. The cumulative effect is estimated to support approximately 44 million fisherman-days annually. In addition, this Bureau's refuges accommodate about 1.5 billion waterfowl-use-days, not including Alaska. These refuges also support almost 3 million hunter-use-days.

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The Department of the Interior is responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—over 2,000 islands covering about 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific Ocean—American Samoa, and Guam. This involves the management of about 985 square miles of land with a total native population of approximately 230,000.

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON PROJECTED BUDGET EXPENDITURES (OUTLAYS) IN FISCAL YEAR 1972

The accompanying bill recommends a net reduction of \$5,061,000 in new budget—obligational—authority below the budget requests.

Although there is a decrease in new budget—obligational—authority, outlays—expenditures—projected for fiscal year 1972 will increase by approximately \$14,000,000 as a result of committee action on the budget estimate.

PERMANENT OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—FEDERAL FUNDS AND TRUST FUNDS

Permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain Government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process. Details of these activities are reflected in appropriate tables appearing at the end of this report. In fiscal year 1971, these activities are estimated to total \$720,403,032. The estimate for fiscal year 1972 is \$725,808,450, or a net increase of \$5,405,418.

The principal item in this category involves \$260,000,000 of contract authority for the construction of roads.

LIMITATION ON UNIT COST OF EMPLOYEE HOUSING

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing—regardless of the source of financing—in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the territories shall be \$29,000. This limitation includes engineering and design costs, but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall be submitted to the committee for its advance review and approval. Employee houses shall not exceed the standards outlined by the committee in House Conference Report No. 2049, 87th Congress, second session.

ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT

Public lands administered by agencies funded in this bill constitute about one-third of the total acreage in the Nation. Consequently, many of these agencies have a direct responsibility in the total effort to control pollution and improve the environment.

Of the total funds provided in this bill for the Department of the Interior, \$29.7 million is for air pollution abatement; \$42.9 million is for water pollution abatement; and \$8.8 million is for solid waste disposal and recycling. These figures total \$81,363,949.

Appropriations for the Forest Service include \$18.6 million for water pollution control.

Funds for the Smithsonian Institution include \$7.8 million for environmental sciences activities.

MULTIPLE USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

The national forests are a resource of diverse benefits—timber, watersheds, forage, wildlife habitat, and recreation. Each is important in its own way to our national well-being. The Forest Service is urged, in these times of conflicting demands, to stress imaginative planning and administration which will provide maximum multiple use of the national forests for the production of needed lumber to meet the increasing social program needs of housing; accommodation of the ever-increasing use of those seeking recreation; and the preservation and development of valuable watersheds.

The committee urges the Forest Service to continue the acceleration of reforestation and timber-stand improvement programs and to conduct ever-widening research in those fields which will decrease insect and fire devastation as well as provide the most esthetic values in forest protection.

STRIP MINING

The deleterious after-effects of strip mining continue to be a source of concern to the committee.

It is therefore urged that all contracts negotiated by public agencies funded in this bill, including leases or permits, for strip mining on public lands, contain meaningful and effective provisions requiring total reclamation within a reasonable period of all public lands disturbed by any strip mining process.

The committee is pleased to note that bills concerning adequate control of strip mining are before the proper authorizing committees at this time.

POLLUTION CONTROL ON INDIAN LANDS

The committee commends the Department on its recent proposal to revise the Federal regulations in order to tighten environmental protection stipulation in leases for the surface use of Indian-owned lands under Federal trusteeship. In addition, the Department should monitor existing operations under such leases, to the extent feasible, in an effort to attain the greatest possible degree of pollution control.

LITTER-VANDALISM-FIRE

Without exception, the bureaus appearing before the committee who are responsible for the maintenance and protection of our national recreational areas and forests testified to the mounting expenditure of funds necessary for cleanup of litter, repair of vandalized facilities, and the damage caused by manmade forest fires. Unnecessary expense and loss in this connection are now of serious import.

Funds expended for this purpose are nonproductive. They contribute nothing to the provision of additional recreation facilities so urgently needed to accommodate the ever-increasing influx of visitors to our national recreation areas.

Additional supervision alone will not correct this situation. The committee urges all agencies to increase their efforts to educate and motivate the general public to appreciate our natural resources and to treat them with reasonable care.

As we approach the discussions of lands, the United States finds itself face to face with a multiplicity of problems stemming from man's overuse, lack of care, and in some instances lack of thought for the future of this tremendous resource.

As I have enumerated earlier there are 752,398,801 acres managed here. This is one-third of the land area of the United States.

As I have already noted, visitations to these lands will total almost half a billion in 1972 and reflect an ever-rising use of every facility. At the same time this third of the United States provides an enormous reservoir of this Nation's wealth. In it are locked resource treasures for the Nation's future.

Dr. Pecora, now the Under Secretary for the Department of Interior and formerly director of the Geological Survey, when questioned about the resources of coal on Federal and Indian lands, replied that although the production of coal from public lands made up less than 2 percent of the total coal now produced in this country, the reserves of coal on public lands represented more nearly 50 percent of our total reserves.

Dr. Pecora also, when questioned about the size of the offshore area for the continental United States, replied that the area of the Outer Continental Shelf can vary by different definitions. By one definition, which is normally in the public mind, the Continental Shelf extends to a depth of 200 meters, or a bit more than 400 fathoms, or 600 feet. This area off the coast of the United States measures about 804,000 square miles or approximately 514 million acres, more than the total of the land areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Dr. Pecora went on to point out that one-half of the total jurisdictional area of the United States available for mineral development is in the public domain. One-quarter is offshore, one-quarter is on land, and the other half is in State or private lands. For those who are interested, there is a chart of page 522 of volume 3 of our hearing records.

It is in this Outer Continental Shelf where oil explorations have proceeded and where oil leases have been made, where we are faced with the necessity of stepping up our knowledge or causing difficulties to water, land terrain, wildlife, and people. If the United States continues to lack the knowledge prior to leasing we can expect disaster. If we do not monitor and supervise the explorations as well as the oil production, the United States would be derelict in its managerial obligations.

An integral part of a problem which confronts the United States in the oil exploratory and production field is that of wisely deciding how to protect our environment, how to measure our energy needs, and take full stock of our resources and, to be repetitious, because I think it bears repetition, to provide all possible safeguards in the use of this form of energy.

Our committee has reminded this Congress through our hearings of this problem and has provided additional funds here and in previous budgets to insure that our management is done for maximum efficiency and minimum disaster. The cost of the Santa Barbara Channel spill is still fresh in the minds of all Americans. The problems confronting the removal of oil from the Arctic terrain are ever present.

The committee held a long and full discussion with Dr. Pecora and with the Office of Oil and Gas, the Bureau of Mines, Office of Coal Research, and the Oil Import Administration on energy problems, energy potentials, and safeguards. These will be found in volume 3 of the hearings.

Dr. Pecora said to the committee, "Many people think that food is the biggest problem of humanity," and to my comment, "Our food supply depends on energy," Dr. Pecora replied:

That is exactly the point. The agricultural areas of the world are well known and can become productive for the masses if energy is available and distribution systems are worked out. I would consider that the supply of energy for humanity is the No. 1 critical problem for mankind. We in the Geological Survey, as a result of our analysis of oil, gas, coal, and geothermal energy and other unconventional means, see a fairly good supply for a century ahead of us in this country if we are permitted as a Nation to pursue these sources of supply, to develop them for the use of the people. If there are going to be constrictions and restraints, then we need to have our options opened up to use so the decision can be made on the options.

He proceeded to discuss these options with us and explored the shortage areas of the Nation and what our alternatives are. He pointed out that we could reduce forcibly or by law the amount of energy that can be expended so that we have to ration the use of energy to only the most essential requirements. But he stressed repeatedly that if mankind is to succeed on this planet on a continuing basis, he

has to have his options open to him and he has to look for all of the evidence he can find so that he may choose the right option at that time. How to continue to provide the social and physical needs of a culture, of a civilization, and provide the economic security is the challenge of the rest of this century.

Interestingly enough, other nations are spending a great deal more than we are to find these answers. On the question of one of my distinguished committee members, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, relative to the Russian exploratory groups, Dr. Pecora stated that 300,000 geologists are working through the Soviet Union while the United States has about 20,000.

I present these statements only to remind the committee how thoughtfully we must appraise the problems posed by our needs and how we must match these needs by the appropriate amount of expenditure. Warships and armies will mean little to a nation which is hungry and cold.

#### FORESTS

Also in this area of our resources, that of the national forests, the committee and the Nation recognize these forests as a continuing source of our well-being from several standpoints. They are a backlog source of timber which will produce the integral part of the commodities necessary to solve one of the great social problems of this century, that of housing. They also provide forage and range for our cattle and sheep, provide for the survival of our wildlife, the maintenance and development of our watersheds and for the joy that comes to any person who visits the outdoors through the recreation use of these millions of acres. We have water research, we have programs of water development, we have programs of water management, and some of them are almost too late, but in the forests of the United States, public and private, lie one of the sustaining contributions to water supply—our watersheds.

The committee has urged that in these times of conflicting demands, use be made of every imaginative device in planning and administration available to the Forest Service to provide these maximum multiple uses.

There are those who question certain techniques in the Forest Service such as clear cutting, terracing, and so forth. The committee urges that the Forest Service continue its ever-widening research to find the most valuable, the most esthetic way to manage forests.

We are accustomed to thinking in terms that only timber cutting is responsible for our lack of reforestation. This is not true in our national forests. The national forests, remember, were not, in the beginning, dedicated public lands of the United States. These are acquired lands, and these acquired lands were those which needed reforestation; they were the burnt-over, cut areas.

During these years of limited budgets, the Forest Service has found it difficult to fully confront and solve the problem of underplanted and undermanaged areas. It has been a losing struggle, and this year the committee has taken cognizance of the problem by adding moneys for reforestation and timber manage-

ment, and when I use the term "timber," it is not in the context of commercial products, but in the context of the total use of timber for its multiple-use purposes.

Not only does the problem of reforestation and management lie with the underplanted and undermanaged areas, but insect infestation, natural disasters such as blowdowns, and fires, are also destroyers. Mortality in the national forests from insects and other causes averages between 5 to 10 billion board feet annually, depending on whether major disasters are included. The allowable cut on the national forests as of January 1, 1971, was 13.7 billion board feet of sawtimber and other products. In 1970, 11.5 billion board feet was actually cut and removed.

In 1962, on Columbus Day, Hurricane Frieda severely damaged 11.6 billion board feet of timber in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. Of this loss, 3.8 billion occurred on Federal lands—primarily national forests and Bureau of Land Management.

In 1968, the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service prepared a report, "Saving Timber Values." It was a program to salvage tree mortality on six national forests in western Oregon and Washington. It projected mortality due to insects and other causes for fiscal years 1969 through 1972. That mortality expected totaled 2.5 billion board feet. These trees would have a stumpage value of about \$132 million. In 1970, catastrophic fires swept the Wenatchee National Forest in eastern Washington; 200 million board feet were killed necessitating removal if at all possible in the ensuing 2 years or the volume would be greatly reduced by deterioration. That 200 million board feet mortality has a stumpage value of about \$1.6 million.

In testimony before the committee, California fires last year cost \$2,836,000 and did not include the loss of timber. Yet, contrary to our expressed interest in environmental concerns, we find that there are ever escalating man-caused fires resulting from recreation, land occupancy, and incendiarism.

For example, in the year 1965, there were 4,123 man-caused fires, and in the year 1970 in the U.S. forests there were 7,174. In the Bureau of Land Management, the figure escalated in 1966 from 674 to 795 man-caused fires. In the BIA, man-caused fires on Indian lands were 54 percent of the total fires and in 1969 they were 67 percent. This increase is substantially attributable to non-Indian people with additional access to Indian forests.

You will note in a few moments that the committee has taken cognizance of these ever-increasing problems of insect infestation and fires by recommending additional funds for research to find some of the necessary answers in order to respond to our challenge in forest management.

I would remind this Congress that we can no longer wait in the field of reforestation. Trees for the year 2000 and later must be in the ground this year and next. And please remember also that as Chief Cliff said at our hearings:

It is impossible to turn on and turn off reforestation like a water faucet. There are certain ingredients necessary, seed, nursery stock particularly, so that acreages to be done must be carefully analyzed and funds provided.

The Forest Service alone has 5 million acres needing reforestation and according to their own testimony if the rate of replanting until this year were in effect, it would take 38 years to reforest and 50 years to catch up on timber stand improvement.

It might be well to note here that in the country as a whole, the combined total of the U.S. commercial forest land on public, private, Federal, other public agencies, the forest industries, and private ownerships amounts to 510,212,500 acres.

It is also time that we analyzed our total use. For example, in the calendar year 1970, 2.8 billion board feet of logs, 1.3 billion board feet of lumber, 172 million square feet of plywood, and 11.2 million cords of pulpwood—including the roundwood equivalent of pulp and paper—was exported from the United States. The export of logs to Japan is about 18 percent higher this year than last. At the same time, there were 1,463,000 units of housing starts in the United States in calendar year 1970. In Japan there was an average of approximately 1,340,000 units of housing starts annually in the 1966-70 period.

The population of Japan is in the vicinity of 120 million; the population of the United States is 205 million. Their starts were aiming at 1.3 million and U.S. starts at 1.5 million.

Second, what do we do about the use of our forest products and of the recycling or reuse? Let me give you some figures from our hearing record, volume 4, page 242. In 1970, 9.7 million tons of newsprint were produced. Of this amount, only about 23 percent was reused. For a million tons of newsprint, it requires 137,220 acres of timber on a clear-cut basis or 1,231,000 acres if the cutting is on an incremental growth basis. A small example of newsprint consumption is the figure which the Washington Post so generously gave us. They use 180,000 tons of newsprint per year to produce their paper.

Third, we are wasting \$17,580,000 on cleanup costs for litter, vandalism, and so forth, as a result of forest users including recreation visitors.

The committee has also been deeply concerned with the way we harvest, if I may use that term, other natural resources. The committee is concerned with the environment as we proceed to develop oil shale lands. It is deeply concerned with strip mining and we are recommending that all contracts including leases or permits negotiated by public agencies funded in this bill for strip mining on public lands contain meaningful and effective provisions requiring total reclamation within a reasonable period of all public lands disturbed by any strip-mining process. The authorizing committees of this Congress have before them bills dealing with this area.

The committee is also disturbed by contracts which have been made in the past and have not been monitored as well

as they should have been. Therefore the committee urges that in the administration of our Indian tribal lands the Department closely monitor all contracts between tribes and industry to assure this Nation that adequate provision for pollution abatement is included as a basic requirement of the contract and that contracts now in effect with existing operations be carefully monitored and that the greatest degree possible of pollution control be exerted for the well-being of land, air, and water. We urge unceasing supervision of these problems on all public lands funded in this bill.

The committee also wants to call attention of the Members of this Congress and of the American people to a situation which is directly under their control. Almost without exception, bureaus appearing before the committee who are responsible for the maintenance and protection of our national recreation areas and forests testified to the mounting expenditures of funds necessary for clean-up of litter, repair of facilities, and damage caused by manmade forest fires. Unnecessary expense and loss in this connection are now of serious import. Funds expended for this purpose are nonproductive; they contribute nothing to the provision of additional recreation facilities so urgently needed to accommodate the ever-increasing influx of visitors to our national recreation areas. They are destructive of our wildlife habitat and can indeed cause the destruction of mankind itself because, as you are well aware, rodents such as rats carry disease and these rodents are present wherever litter is present. The cost escalation in litter clean-up in the agencies covered here has gone from \$21,000,000 in 1971 to \$24,100,000 in 1972.

Additional supervision of our Federal facilities alone will not correct this situation. The committee urges that all departments increase their efforts to educate and motivate the American people to appreciate our natural resources and treat them with reasonable care. In fact, I might add, not only with care but with affection.

As I itemize these departments, it is again well to remember what they mean in terms of land, people, resources.

Prior to the consideration of various budget items, I think I should explain to you that increased pay costs for the budget year are shown in a lump sum in the agency report tables and have not been allocated to the subactivities. Therefore, what apparently appear to be reductions below fiscal year 1971 for some subactivities would actually be reflected as small increases if the increased pay costs were distributed throughout the budget structure.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1971	\$84,060,000
Estimate, 1972	76,080,000
Recommended, 1972	76,080,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	-7,980,000
Estimate, 1972	

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 ap-

propriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Realty and mineral leasing services:			
Title, lease, and records service	\$6,416,000	-\$794,000	
Records improvement	874,000	-31,000	
Resource management, conservation and protection:			
Land classification and mineral examination	17,260,000	+1,021,000	
Range management	6,098,000	-242,000	
Forestry	7,985,000	+109,000	
Soil and watershed conservation	13,519,000	-279,000	
Fire protection	5,874,000	+437,000	
Recreation and wildlife	3,919,000	+440,000	
Alaska pipeline inspection	2,012,000	-34,000	
Cadastral surveys:			
Alaska	2,223,000	-58,000	
Other States	4,638,000	+794,000	
Firefighting and rehabilitation	10,000,000	-12,000,000	
General administration	2,501,000	-103,000	
Increased pay costs	2,760,000	+2,760,000	
Total, management of lands and resources	76,080,000	-7,980,000	

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$550,000 for development of land-use plan for northern Alaska.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the conservation, management, and development of about 452 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 278 million acres in Alaska.

In addition, the Bureau administers mining and mineral leasing on other federally owned lands, on former Federal lands where minerals have been reserved in public ownership, and on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1971	\$3,310,000
Estimate, 1972	4,430,000
Recommended, 1972	4,627,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+1,317,000
Estimate, 1972	+197,000

The increase of \$197,000 over the budget estimate is for recreation facilities on the Indian Creek Reservoir in Alpine County, Calif.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS  
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1971	\$3,500,000
Estimate, 1972	3,200,000
Recommended, 1972	3,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	-300,000
Estimate, 1972	

This appropriation is required to liquidate the obligations incurred under contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act for development of roads and trails on public lands.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

The bill continues the indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products, representing one-third of the 75 percent of revenues due the Oregon and California counties.

It is estimated that a total of \$19,000,000 will be available during fiscal year

1972 for construction, acquisition, and operation and maintenance of access roads and improvements, and for forest protection and development on the revested lands and on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Appropriation, 1971	\$1,795,000
Estimate, 1972	2,514,000
Recommended, 1972	2,514,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+719,000
Estimate, 1972	

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of \$2,514,000 to be derived from public lands and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements.

Last year I reviewed for this committee the problems encountered in Alaska. We are providing \$3,782,000 for those preliminary studies necessary for the protection of our environment should our Government decide to proceed with Arctic Slope oil distribution. We also provide for pipeline inspection. This is contingent on Interior's approval of such.

In another field, I would hope that as time goes by and our recreational uses increase on our desert lands and areas used so extensively by water enthusiasts that we can increase money for their management. It is mandatory.

We will also, of necessity, have to increase money for protection of people in various safety programs and always there will be an escalating amount expended in each of our facilities for pollution funding.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1971	\$244,275,000
Estimate, 1972	271,721,000
Recommended, 1972	273,487,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+29,212,000
Estimate, 1972	+1,766,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Educational assistance, facilities, and services	\$163,990,000	+\$17,748,000	+\$150,000
Welfare and guidance services	58,324,000	+5,664,000	+2,000,000
Employment assistance	39,058,000	-380,000	-150,000
Maintaining law and order	7,115,000	+1,180,000	
Increased pay costs	5,000,000	+5,000,000	-234,000
Total, education and welfare services	273,487,000	+29,212,000	+1,766,000

The increase of \$1,766,000 over the budget estimate includes the following additions and reductions:

Provision of higher educational services for the Navajos, +\$50,000  
Additional scholarships for legal, medical, and nursing students, +\$100,000  
Renovation of Indian houses in California, +\$894,600

Renovation of Indian houses elsewhere on a priority of need basis, +\$1,105,400. Adult vocational training, —\$150,000. Pay increase costs, —\$234,000.

The committee is concerned about various reports it has received regarding the alleged misuse of Johnson-O'Malley funds in some States. The committee directs that the Bureau of Indian Affairs makes certain that these funds are utilized for the purpose for which they are appropriated—to fund activities in public schools for the benefit of Indian pupils.

The committee believes that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should reassess its relationship to off-reservation Indians who now constitute 40 percent of the country's Indian population. While the Bureau's primary responsibility is to assist Indians living on reservations, the Bureau can and should do more to assist

Indians to adjust to city living. Where practicable, referral and employment assistance services of the Bureau's areas and field offices should be made available to any urban Indian requesting such services.

Bureau personnel should assist urban Indian organizations in the development of new programs to meet the needs of urban Indians.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$70,847,000
Estimate, 1972.....	78,891,000
Recommended, 1972.....	71,866,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+1,019,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-4,825,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Forest and range lands.....	+\$7,283,000	-\$170,000	
Fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation.....	1,340,000	-400,000	
Agricultural and industrial assistance.....	13,306,000	+386,000	
Soil and moisture conservation.....	6,576,000	-158,000	
Maintenance of roads.....	6,166,000	+463,000	
Development of Indian arts and crafts.....	638,000	-13,000	
Management of Indian trust property.....	9,394,000	-12,000	
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.....	23,613,000	+2,194,000	+\$75,000
Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.....	1,418,000	-3,000	
Indian business development fund.....		-3,400,000	-4,900,000
Increased pay costs.....	2,132,000	+2,132,000	
<b>Total, resources management.....</b>	<b>71,866,000</b>	<b>+1,019,000</b>	<b>-4,825,000</b>

The net reduction of \$4,825,000 below the budget estimate includes a decrease of \$4,900,000 for the Indian business development fund and an increase of \$75,000 for the youth work-learn program.

Although the Department originally contended that it had legislative authority for the administration of the Indian business development fund, it subsequently agreed to submit a recommendation for specific legislation in this connection. Because of the delay on the part of the Department in submitting its recommendation, the specific legislation has not yet been enacted. Consequently, the committee has deleted this item from the bill.

Within available funds, the committee directs that an additional \$50,000 shall be made available for soil and moisture

conservation work in the Anadarko Area, Okla.

The committee urges that greater consideration be given in the budgetary process to provision of more adequate funds for reforestation and rehabilitation of Indian lands.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$19,885,000
Estimate, 1972.....	36,385,000
Recommendation, 1972.....	37,206,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+17,321,000
Estimate, 1972.....	+821,000

The increase of \$821,000 over the budget estimate includes a reduction of \$200,000 for major alterations and improvements and the following increases:

Rehabilitation of drought-stricken area on the Papago Reservation, Ariz., \$387,000.

Water exploration, \$200,000.

Sanitation facilities for in-lieu fishing sites along the Columbia River, \$234,000.

Planning funds for a high school at Rough Rock, Ariz., \$200,000.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$20,200,000
Estimate, 1972.....	25,000,000
Recommended, 1972.....	25,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+4,800,000
Estimate, 1972.....	

This appropriation is required to liquidate obligations incurred for Indian road construction under contract authorization provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$6,148,000
Estimate, 1972.....	6,257,000
Recommended, 1972.....	6,057,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-91,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-200,000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$200,000 below the budget estimate for general administrative expenses. The committee directs that none of the reduction recommended under this appropriation account be compensated for by the additional allocation of administrative expenses to program operations.

TRIBAL FUNDS

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$16,204,000
Estimate, 1972.....	16,173,000
Recommended, 1972.....	16,173,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-31,000
Estimate, 1972.....	

Funds held in trust for Indian tribes under the provisions of various acts are used for expenses of tribal governments, administration of Indian tribal affairs, employment of tribal attorneys, establishment and operation of tribal enterprises, investments, and the welfare of Indians.

To each Congress, the committee tries to report the progress or lack of progress we are making in the field of our Indian programs. This year, as I have already noted, we have increased the Indian budget by \$66,219,800. I place here a list of funds from the U.S. Government available to our Indian people through a wide variety of programs.

FEDERAL FUNDING OF INDIAN RESERVATION PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEARS 1970-72 (ESTIMATED)

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency program area	1970	1971	1972	Agency program area	1970	1971	1972
<b>Agriculture, Department of.....</b>	<b>17,364</b>	<b>17,624</b>	<b>24,893</b>	Legal services.....	1,200	1,400	1,800
Farmers Cooperative Service.....	35	38	33	Work incentive program (Labor).....	1,400	1,400	1,509
Research Service (farm, etc.).....	967	963	965	VISTA.....	2,100	2,200	2,010
Stabilization and Conservation Service.....	3,180	3,165	3,165	Headstart.....	9,600	9,700	3,000
Rural Electrification Administration.....	4,436	4,533	4,580	Neighborhood Youth Corps (administered by Labor).....	9,000	9,200	9,298
Soil Conservation Service.....	550	550	550	Community Action.....	17,900	18,200	23,000
Food and Nutrition Service.....	8,196	8,375	15,600	Job Corps.....	700	2,200	2,412
<b>Commerce, Department of.....</b>	<b>21,793</b>	<b>27,400</b>	<b>29,797</b>	Operation Mainstream (administered by Labor).....	3,700	3,700	3,812
Business loans.....	7,000	6,400	5,600	New Careers (administered by Labor).....	500	700	701
Planning, technical assistance and research.....	1,075	2,000	1,200	Concentrated employment program.....	5,800	5,900	5,800
Regional development programs.....	218		1,000	Job opportunity in business sectors.....	4,500	4,600	4,697
Economic development administration (public works).....	13,500	19,000	19,000	<b>Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of.....</b>	<b>153,492</b>	<b>182,222</b>	<b>202,390</b>
Pribilof Islands fund.....			2,997	Office of Education.....	24,343	34,165	46,025
<b>Defense, Department of—Army Corps of Engineers.....</b>	<b>2,200</b>	<b>9,300</b>	<b>11,000</b>	Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	129,149	148,057	156,365
<b>Economic Opportunity, Office of.....</b>	<b>55,500</b>	<b>59,200</b>	<b>58,039</b>	<b>Housing and Urban Development, Department of.....</b>	<b>22,558</b>	<b>25,139</b>	<b>34,800</b>

FEDERAL FUNDING OF INDIAN RESERVATION PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEARS 1970-72 (ESTIMATED)—Continued  
 (In thousands of dollars)

Agency program area	1970	1971	1972	Agency program area	1970	1971	1972
Housing and Urban Development, Department of—Con.				Resources management—oil, gas, and other.....	824	916	980
Metropolitan development comprehensive-planning grants.....	650	550	900	River clearance—Phreatophyte growth.....	204	204	204
Model cities and governmental relations.....	74	916	900	Basic data collection—Ground water-resources.....	85	85	170
Alaska housing.....	1,000		1,500	Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	322,642	382,298	457,635
Low-rent public housing.....	20,834	23,673	31,500	Labor, Department of—Manpower Development and Training			
Interior, Department of the.....	327,929	387,878	461,689	Activities.....	5,000	5,700	6,202
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (Pribilof Island).....	2,774	2,875		Small Business Administration.....	6,300	12,600	19,826
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (hatcheries).....	600	1,300	2,700	Veterans' Administration—Veteran Benefits.....	500	600	1,400
Bureau of Reclamation (MRBI).....	800	200		National Foundation Arts and Humanities.....	325	551	800
Geological Survey:				Total Federal funding.....	612,961	728,214	850,836

We hear a great deal from time to time about how we are failing, how we are not doing enough. Of course we are not, because we had to do so much in so few years. Remember, just 5 years ago there were no kindergartens in the entire Indian world. No attempt had been made to break through the language and cultural barrier at this age level to accomplish the kind of educational program enabling Indian youngsters to participate equally with all other American citizens.

In this budget we provide next to the final step for the completion of kindergartens in all of our Indian schools. We completed 59 kindergarten units in 1970, 18 in 1971, and this bill provides for 22. There remain only 31 to be constructed; 1,940 students attend these kindergartens.

In 1963, we had 963 young people attending college assisted by the BIA. In 1971, we are assisting 6,100 and in the fiscal year 1972, we will assist almost 9,000 young students. There will be 293 BIA scholarship-assisted graduate students attending college in 1972.

You will note that we have added \$100,000 for scholarships in the fields of medicine, law, and nursing. These three professions have not now as many students in them as there are proportionately in other areas and yet these are three of the most necessary and vital professions for the Indian people.

The committee is also providing \$50,000 in scholarships for students attending the Navajo Community College. This college, struggling so hard to succeed, comes from the vision, ideals, and desires of the Indian people to provide an institution of their own to retain their culture and leave it as a priceless heritage for all of us as well as to educate their young people for the kind of world they are living in today.

A few years ago we had no Indian members of school boards. Today there are 500. We carry on training programs so that more and more Indians may manage their schools and activities.

The committee through the years has made sure that wherever public schools exist we assist and support the Indians' attendance and integration at these public schools. It is well to bear in mind, though, that because of the immensity of size of Indian lands, the difficulty of travel and, in some areas, the very existence of water itself, it is not always easy to have students attend public schools on certain reservations.

As I noted last year, Navajo students

are scattered from hogan to hogan. There are relatively few communities. Youngsters would have to travel great distances, perhaps get off school buses and walk into blizzards. Some have lost their lives as a result of this kind of experience. Therefore, we have been compelled to provide the boarding school-type education. I will say, and the average American does not realize this, that in the Navajo area alone our boarding schools are making sure that more than 20,000 of these young people are provided with good food which they might not have if they were automatically removed from a boarding facility. In fact, their very attendance at an institution of learning might not be possible. Not all parents enjoy getting up and getting their children off to school, particularly if they live in a remote rural area.

In Alaska the committee has constantly urged the integration of public schools with our Indian young people and we are providing dormitories so that they may attend public schools. I do want to urge people, though, in all these areas adjacent to our reservations and in the Indian world that Americans are not going to solve the problem of the Indian child in a public school by just talking about it and providing money. A great deal of loving kindness and a great deal of integration from the heart is necessary. There are existing situations where a town is desirous of a boarding school but they "do not want the Indian youngsters" in their public schools. This is an unconscionable attitude, and very few dare mention it. I do because facts must come to light as we appraise the public and boarding schools.

There is a continuing discussion now to update the Johnson-O'Malley law to provide more support, to provide and increase our support to supplement impacted-area aid for cities and urban areas. I urge that the authorizing committees hold deep and meaningful hearings on this program. The committee is deeply concerned with the Indian people who go into our urban areas and we hope that the BIA can be of assistance wherever possible in counseling, advising, and working with the Indians' difficulties in adjusting to urban situations.

The intriguing and interesting thing to this Congress should be that the BIA, which has been denounced by every politician running for anything is appealed to now as a source by the Indians "for protection and assistance not only in reservation areas but in urban areas."

This I think, is an interesting commentary based perhaps upon success achieved on the long road we have traveled in the last few years with our Indian programs.

It is with some pride that this committee is providing in our construction budget this year a new type of recreation funding for the new Cherokee school—the first swimming pool for Indian students will be constructed in that school. I hope to see the day when every one of these schools has the same kind of facility.

The BIA, at my request last year, has provided for us a summary of the status of their Indian schools as to construction needs and geographical location, et cetera. I think it is most important that the committee have this in order to urge the BIA that wherever possible they develop joint arrangements with our public schools, and then those schools necessarily remaining because of geography may be made showcases of what an education can be.

There is \$200,000 on this budget added by the committee to provide for the planning of the Rough Rock School which is one of the truly imaginative schools in the Navajo area. The committee is going to be more than interested in the kind of planning they do for the retention and maintenance of the family kind of culture in connection with their school. You know, our schools, be they Indian or anything else, should be a symbol of the best that is in any community and particularly is this true in the Indian world. I feel that through them is provision made for a community impetus second to none.

The committee is hopeful that the Office of Management and Budget and the BIA will approve increasing funding for the Navajo irrigation project. The key to Indian economy lies to a large extent on the land itself; reforestation of their lands where there exists today a deficit in reforestation of approximately 251,000 acres. Indian forest land totals 13 million acres. Timber stand improvement, reforestation, and cleanup activities are part of an economic resource of which the Indians have great need, remembering that they and the land have always coexisted.

The committee has also added funds here to provide for the renovation of Indian houses in California. The item of \$894,600 will provide 426 renovated houses which will close the gap in this category of self-help housing in California. Since HUD is largely responsible for the construction of new homes, the com-

mittee sincerely hopes that they move ahead in this area.

There is also \$1,105,400 for the renovation of Indian houses elsewhere in this Nation on a priority-of-need basis and a little later in the bill in the Indian health category there will be an item for the sanitary facilities.

**BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriation, 1971..... \$4,170,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 3,999,000

Recommended, 1972..... \$3,999,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... —171,000  
Estimate, 1972.....

The amount recommended in the bill is the same as that provided in the budget estimate. However, the committee directs that the amount available for nationwide planning be reduced by \$300,000 and the amount available for resource area studies be increased by \$300,000.

**LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND**  
Appropriation, 1971..... <sup>1</sup>\$327,400,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 380,000,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 350,000,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +22,600,000  
Estimate, 1972..... —30,000,000

<sup>1</sup>In addition, \$30,000,000 for liquidation of contract authority.

The following table reflects the action recommended by the committee on the budget request:

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1972	Change	Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1972	Change
1. Assistance to States.....	\$280,000,000	\$255,000,000	—\$25,000,000	Wiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity NRA, Calif.....	\$1,558,000	\$1,558,000	
2. Federal land acquisition program:				Wilderness areas.....	857,200	857,200	
National Park Service:				<b>Total, Forest Service.....</b>	<b>19,652,000</b>	<b>19,652,000</b>	
Andersonville NHS, Ga.....	353,000	353,000		<b>Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:</b>			
Apostle Islands NL, Wis.....	4,210,000	4,210,000		Endangered species:			
Bighorn Canyon NRA, Mont.-Wyo.....	100,000	100,000		Attwater's greater prairie chicken, Texas.....	1,000,000		
Biscayne NM, Fla.....	2,945,000	2,945,000		Black-footed ferret, South Dakota.....	550,000		
Cape Cod NS, Mass.....	8,309,000	8,309,000		Blackwater-NWR, Md.....	350,000		
C & O Canal NHP, Md.-W. Va.....	9,915,000	9,915,000		Columbian white-tailed deer, Washington-Oregon.....	1,100,000		
Delaware Water Gap NRA, Pa.-N.J.....	606,656	606,656		Hawaiian water birds.....	1,000,000		
Gulf Islands NS, Fla.-Miss.....	1,807,735	1,807,735		St. Johns NWR, Fla.....	988,000		
Minute Man NHP, Mass.....	2,000,000	2,000,000		<b>Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....</b>	<b>4,988,000</b>	<b>1,988,000</b>	<b>—\$3,000,000</b>
National Wild & Scenic Rivers System.....	2,660,716	2,660,716		<b>Bureau of Land Management:</b>			
Piscataway Park, Md.....	1,238,893	1,238,893		Rogue River, Oreg., Wild and Scenic Rivers System.....	479,000	479,000	
Point Reyes NRA, Calif.....	2,259,000	2,259,000		Pacific Crest Trail.....	20,000	20,000	
Sleeping Bear Dunes NL, Mich.....	7,925,000	7,925,000		<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management.....</b>	<b>499,000</b>	<b>499,000</b>	
Voyagers NP, Minn.....	500,000	500,000		<b>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Administration.....</b>	<b>5,031,000</b>	<b>4,831,000</b>	<b>—200,000</b>
Inholdings (other than Everglades).....	12,500,000	10,700,000	—1,800,000	<b>Total, Federal program.....</b>	<b>100,000,000</b>	<b>95,000,000</b>	<b>—5,000,000</b>
Everglades NP, Fla.....	10,000,000	10,000,000		<b>Grand total, 1972.....</b>	<b>380,000,000</b>	<b>350,000,000</b>	<b>—30,000,000</b>
Deficiencies.....	1,500,000	1,500,000					
Endangered species.....	1,000,000	1,000,000					
<b>Total, National Park Service.....</b>	<b>69,830,000</b>	<b>68,030,000</b>	<b>—1,800,000</b>				
<b>Forest Service:</b>							
Flaming Gorge NRA, Utah-Wyo.....	600,000	600,000					
Lake Tahoe Lands, Nev.....	219,900	219,900					
Mount Rogers NRA, Va.....	1,600,000	1,600,000					
National forest recreation lands.....	12,546,700	12,546,700					
National wild and scenic rivers.....	935,900	935,900					
Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks, NRA, W. Va.....	581,000	581,000					
Unidentified inholdings (within new areas).....	753,300	753,300					

<sup>1</sup> To be distributed by Department on basis of priority needs.

As indicated in the above table, the amount recommended in the bill is \$30,000,000 below the budget estimate. The total reduction consists of \$25,000,000 for assistance to States; \$1,800,000 National Park Service inholdings; \$3,000,000 for endangered species; and \$200,000 for administration.

The committee concurs with opinions heretofore expressed that acquisition of land under both the State and Federal programs should be accomplished with the least possible delay. To the extent this objective is not achieved, serious escalation in the cost of land to be acquired is experienced.

However, at the beginning of fiscal year 1971, there existed a cash balance of \$225,101,970. This amount combined with the 1971 appropriation of \$357,400,000 provided a total of \$582,501,970 available for expenditure. While it is recognized that all available funds are not expended in any one year, the committee was informed that the Office of Management and Budget had imposed an expenditure limitation of \$225,000,000 for the 1971 fiscal year. From a cash available standpoint, this would indicate a carryover into fiscal year 1972 of approximately \$357.5 million.

In view of this apparent excessive un-

expended balance which will be carried into the 1972 fiscal year, the committee is of the opinion that the funds provided in this bill will be more than adequate to provide for both the State and Federal programs.

The \$3,000,000 reduction recommended by the committee for acquisition of land for endangered species has not been designated for any particular activity. The committee expects the Department to allocate this reduction on the basis of priority needs.

The budget program for land acquisition by the Forest Service limited acquisitions, with a few minor exceptions to land associated with scenic rivers, wilderness, and national recreation areas. The committee feels this policy is too restrictive and directs that Forest Service land acquisitions in fiscal year 1972 be on the same general basis that has prevailed heretofore.

The land and water conservation fund is enabling this Nation to acquire a much-needed reservoir of acreage. However, I would remind those working on budgets in future years that the acquisition of this land is going to pose the problem of providing management funds. It is no longer possible to acquire land and let it wait. Problems of safety, overuse, public use, pollution all enter into

the escalating costs of public land ownership.

The mobility of our population today has extended the scope of travel by visitors interested in the recreation areas of this country. Consequently, the influx of out-of-State visitors to certain States with popular outdoor recreation sites has greatly increased. In some instances, this has resulted in overcrowding of State facilities to the extent that the areas are not always readily available to inhabitants of the State. In these circumstances, there are some States considering the adoption of a policy whereby out-of-State visitors would be excluded from the State parks. This would be a very unfortunate solution. It should be remembered that the development of many of these State parks was funded through the land and water conservation fund which provides 50 percent of the development cost from Federal funds contributed by all people of this Nation.

If such a restrictive policy were to be adopted by any State, the committee of necessity, would be obliged to give consideration to the reduction of land and water conservation funds to those States which exclude out-of-State visitors from participating in the pleasure of these facilities.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES  
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$17,414,000
Estimate, 1972.....	21,930,000
Recommended, 1972.....	21,537,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+4,123,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-393,000

The reduction of \$393,000 recommended by the committee includes decreases of \$19,000 for operating costs of the Office of the Governor of American Samoa, and \$374,000 for administrative costs of the Washington Headquarters Office.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$59,864,000
Estimate, 1972.....	59,980,000
Recommended, 1972.....	59,980,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+116,000
Estimate, 1972.....	

Funds provided under this appropriation account are for the continuation of the accelerated development program in the fields of education, health, public works, and resource management of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The committee is seriously concerned that ineptitude of management in the trust territories has created a dismal reservoir of uncompleted projects. One example of this is in education in the eastern district. It is necessary to provide dormitories in this eastern district in order that students may attend schools; yet the construction programs show us that we have a distance to go. For example, of 700 children graduating this summer from the eighth grade in the Marshalls, only 77 will be able to attend high school.

In the Ponape district, 600 children graduating from the eighth grade will be eligible for high school; more than 400 will not be able to attend secondary school.

The problem of these dormitories is critical and I urge the administration of the territories to step this up, for there is in the territories the matter of the student population already being relatively older than that in our American schools.

To those who are unfamiliar with the situation of the trust territories and question the need for dormitories, it is occasioned by the tremendous number of miles of ocean separating young people from school facilities.

The committee has also repeatedly urged the territorial government there to provide construction for the simple things of improvement such as wells for water supply and outpatient dispensaries. There has been an improvement in the scheduled completion for water and sewer lines, but island after island is still deficient.

I would like to express my personal appreciation to the members of the Micronesian Congress who come so far each year to meet with the Appropriations Committee to share in budget and problem discussions.

I would also like to thank the Legislatures of Samoa and Guam for their participation. Together, we can all achieve our goals.

MINERAL RESOURCES  
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$114,603,000
Estimate, 1972.....	126,182,000
Recommendation, 1972.....	130,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+15,397,000
Estimate, 1972.....	+3,818,000

The total amount recommended by the committee as compared with the appropriation for 1971 and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Special resource and environmental projects.....	\$1,750,000	+\$993,000	.....
Alaska pipeline related investigations.....	1,320,000	-16,000	.....
Topographic surveys and mapping.....	32,858,000	+1,819,000	-\$11,000
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping.....	32,100,000	+793,000	+939,000
Minerals discovery loan program.....	263,000	-5,000	.....
Water resources investigations.....	35,864,000	+1,138,000	-11,000
Conservation of lands and minerals.....	13,076,000	+3,406,000	+3,047,000
Earth resources observation systems.....	5,176,000	+3,255,000	-3,000
General administration.....	2,761,000	-68,000	.....
Special purpose facility.....	4,832,000	+4,832,000	-143,000
Increased pay costs.....			
<b>Total, Geological Survey.....</b>	<b>130,000,000</b>	<b>+15,397,000</b>	<b>+3,818,000</b>

The net increase of \$3,818,000 over the budget estimate recommended by the committee includes reductions of \$39,000 for savings in paperwork management and public relations; and \$143,000 for absorption of pay increase costs.

Testimony developed during the hearing indicated an urgent requirement for accelerated activity to achieve effective management of oil resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. The bill includes \$4,000,000 above the budget estimate for evaluation and monitoring of offshore oil production. The following tabulation reflects the distribution of the additional funds:

(In thousands of dollars)

Activity	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972 budget	Committee bill, 1972	Increase over 1972 budget
Off-shore geological surveys.....	1,315	1,510	2,460	+950
Resource evaluation.....	1,113	1,212	2,712	+1,500
Regulatory functions.....	3,041	3,313	4,063	+750
Production control (MER).....			800	+800

I have spoken earlier of the relationship of Geological Survey to mineral resources. I do want to point that the additional \$3,818,000 which we are providing will establish at more effective levels an

integrated program of geologic and geophysical investigation to, first, assess resource potential of all the Outer Continental Shelf; second, identify areas worthy of industry exploration; third, progressively provide data for lease selection, evaluation, and management; and fourth, provide for equipment acquisition including computer analysis capability intended to establish capability equal or better than industry's to assess the value of areas to be leased.

This money provides for the acquisition of geophysical and geologic data for tract selection, environmental impact review and tract appraisal. It provides supervision for additional exploration, permits, leases, and for 7-day per week inspections, routine accident investigation procedure, management information system of lease and well data, and a modest research program to stimulate larger industry efforts to improve safety and reliability of drilling, producing, and gathering systems.

The committee found in the hearings that the Geological Survey did not have as much information as industry on the very tracts over which the Bureau of Land Management handled the leasing and the Geological Survey monitored. It is unconscionable for our Government to be so handicapped.

BUREAU OF MINES  
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$49,260,000
Estimate, 1972.....	48,029,000
Recommended, 1972.....	49,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-260,000
Estimate, 1972.....	+971,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
<b>Research:</b>			
Coal.....	\$8,770,000	-\$181,000	.....
Petroleum.....	3,000,000	+225,000	.....
Oil shale.....	2,500,000	-51,000	.....
Metallurgy.....	13,550,000	+316,000	.....
Mining.....	4,900,000	-3,155,000	.....
Marine mineral mining.....		-925,000	.....
Explosives.....	693,000	-14,000	.....
<b>Resource development:</b>			
Statistics.....	2,207,000	-56,000	.....
Economic analysis.....	546,000	-14,000	.....
Bituminous coal.....	975,000	-23,000	.....
Anthracite.....	2,788,000	+984,000	+\$1,000,000
Petroleum.....	880,000	-22,000	.....
Minerals.....	5,593,000	+768,000	.....
International activities.....	692,000	-18,000	.....
<b>Reduction in public relations and paperwork management.....</b>	<b>-29,000</b>	<b>-29,000</b>	<b>-29,000</b>
<b>Increased pay costs.....</b>	<b>1,935,000</b>	<b>+1,935,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>Total, conservation and development of mineral resources.....</b>	<b>49,000,000</b>	<b>-260,000</b>	<b>+971,000</b>

The net increase of \$971,000 above the budget estimate includes a reduction of

\$29,000 for savings in public relations and paperwork management, and the following increases:

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT—ANTHRACITE

Research and demonstration of techniques for surface mine reclamation, \$600,000.

Research on abatement of acid mine drainage problems, \$100,000.

Research on using mine waste bank materials for abating mine subsidence hazards, \$300,000.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Appropriation, 1971	\$58,029,000
Estimate, 1972	73,643,000
Recommended, 1972	73,630,000
Appropriation, 1971	+15,601,000
Estimate, 1972	-13,000

The reduction of \$13,000 below the budget estimate relates to additional savings to be achieved by greater economy in public relations and paperwork management activities.

The committee is seriously concerned with various shortcomings in the health and safety program which have been reported from various sources. By enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 and the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act, Congress has indicated the importance it gives to making the Nation's mines a safe place for miners to work. It has also provided necessary funds and personnel to accomplish this objective as indicated in the following tabulation:

	Budget Estimate	Appropriation	Positions
FY 1969	\$12,546,000	\$12,334,000	825
FY 1970	15,902,000	27,452,000	1,380
FY 1971	58,029,000	58,029,000	2,242
FY 1972	73,643,000	73,630,000	2,532

1 Approved by House.

In fairness to those responsible for administration of the program, it should be remembered that many unavoidable problems were encountered in the rapid acceleration of this activity subsequent to the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. Not only was the program greatly expanded, but there was also the problem of securing skilled personnel and adequate equipment necessary for the operation of the program on an accelerated basis. These problems were discussed at some length in hearings before the committee both in connection with the 1971 and 1972 budget estimates.

Notwithstanding, the committee will expect a greatly improved quality of performance in this program during fiscal year 1972. It would seem that sufficient time has now elapsed to solve many of the problems that have prevailed, and with the concerted attention that should be given to this very important work, there would seem to be no reason why an effective program cannot be achieved within the next fiscal year.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971	\$1,942,000
Estimate, 1972	1,970,000
Recommended, 1972	1,970,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1971	+ \$28,000
Estimate, 1972	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,970,000, the budget estimate, for general administrative expenses.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1971	\$17,160,000
Estimate, 1972	21,030,000
Recommended, 1972	21,880,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1971	+4,720,000
Estimate, 1972	+850,000

The budget estimate provided that for three of the pilot plant projects to be operative in fiscal year 1972, total funding of the operation would be on the basis of two-thirds Federal funding and one-third private funding. This proposal was discussed at length during the hearings. On the basis of information provided, the committee has serious reservations as to the wisdom of venturing on a combined funding basis at this stage of the research projects. Many ramifications are involved, and it is not improbable that such action could be detrimental to the best interests of the Federal Government.

Accordingly, the committee has provided additional funding of \$1,050,000 for the Pittsburgh and Midway project at Tacoma, Wash.; and \$1,100,000 for the bituminous coal research project at Homer City, Pa. The additional amounts represent the one-third contribution that would have been required from private industry.

The committee also recommends an additional \$300,000 for a coal gasification study to be performed in cooperation with the State of Oklahoma.

The bill provides \$400,000, a reduction of \$1,600,000 below the budget estimate, for the Cresap Pilot Plant at Cresap, W. Va.

It would seem to me in commenting on coal research programs which are so vital to utilization of this source of energy that a national policy on energy must be established. If coal is to provide no further part of that energy source due to accidents to human beings or damage to the land, then research money is ill-spent, and it appears basic to me that the executive branch of this Government in concert with the Congress determine where we are going.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

Appropriation, 1971	\$1,273,000
Estimate, 1972	1,570,000
Recommended, 1972	1,570,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1971	+297,000
Estimate, 1972	

The bill provides \$1,570,000, the budget estimate, to fund activities of the Office of Oil and Gas.

FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1971	\$59,804,000
Estimate, 1972	64,724,000
Recommended, 1972	64,794,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1971	+4,990,000
Estimate, 1972	+70,000

The amount recommended by the committee with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Fish hatcheries	\$11,114,000	-\$93,100	-\$4,000
Wildlife refuges	19,308,000	+206,300	-12,000
Soil and moisture conservation	767,000	-8,800	
Management and enforcement	5,167,000	+290,000	-2,000
Fishery research	5,297,000	+90,600	-2,000
Wildlife research	9,944,000	+510,300	+46,000
Fishery service	2,996,000	+498,750	+48,000
Wildlife services	4,117,000	+168,850	-4,000
River basin studies	3,789,000	+1,602,100	
Pesticides review		-568,000	
Increased pay costs	2,295,000	+2,295,000	
Total, management and investigations of resources	64,794,000	+4,990,000	+70,000

The net increase of \$70,000 includes a reduction of \$29,000 for savings in public relations and paperwork management; and additions of \$50,000 for a cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; and \$49,000 for a cooperative fishery unit at the Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tenn.

The committee directs that the Department, in its recently announced overview of the problems of dealing with wildlife depredation, give specific consideration to, (1) insuring that all programs to control predators be carried out in such a way as to give maximum protection to the birds, animals and wildlife in an area; (2) placing more emphasis on the supervision of control actions which will insure that Department guidelines are strictly carried out; and, (3) further efforts which can be made to develop control actions which are limited to the damage causing animals.

Within available funds, the Bureau shall provide technical assistance for development of a fishery program on the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.

The committee recommends that concerted attention be given to the adverse effects supersaturation of nitrogen is having on fish which inhabit areas where large dams are located.

The committee directs that within available funds, a special study be performed to determine the nature and cost of remedial action that should be taken to enhance recreation facilities and fish and wildlife habitat in the vicinity of the Salton Sea, Calif.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1971	\$5,144,000
Estimate, 1972	4,440,000
Recommended, 1972	6,225,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1971	+1,081,000
Estimate, 1972	+1,785,000

This appropriation finances the construction of fish hatcheries and wildlife refuge facilities, and fishery and wildlife research facilities.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,225,000, an increase of \$1,785,000 over the budget estimate. Additional funding is provided for the following projects:

San Marcos National Fish Hatchery, Tex., \$346,000.

Warm Springs National Fish Hatchery, Oreg., \$297,000.

Meridian National Fish Hatchery, Miss., \$190,000.

Relocation of Fish Control Laboratory, La Crosse, Wis., \$480,000.

Relocation of Allegheny National Fish Hatchery, Pa., \$277,000.

Complete master plan and begin construction on Muscatatuck Wildlife Refuge, Ind., \$195,000.

The 1972 budget estimate contained a listing of selected economies and reforms for 1972. It was stated that the listing of activities for termination "incorporates the results of a diligent search to uncover inefficient, obsolete, or lower priority programs." Included in this category was construction of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium. The committee is not sympathetic to the proposed action in this connection. For one reason or another construction of the aquarium has been delayed for several years. Funds for the construction of the aquarium were appropriated in fiscal year 1966.

While the committee has received no formal information from the administration as to the reason for the delay, it is aware of the extensive dissension regarding the location of the aquarium.

The committee recommends that \$25,000 of unobligated construction funds be used to perform a study of an alternate site for the aquarium, which would not necessarily have to be in Washington, D.C.

#### MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$7,500,000
Estimate, 1972.....	7,500,000
Recommended, 1972.....	7,500,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971.....  
 Estimate, 1972.....

The recommended amount, together with an estimated \$6,000,000 to be available in receipts from Federal hunting stamps, will provide a total in the migratory bird conservation account of \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 1972 to continue the expanded wetlands acquisition program.

Under the provisions of the wetlands legislation, the appropriation advances to the fund for acquisition of refugees are to be repaid from receipts beginning in fiscal year 1977.

#### ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$2,326,000
Estimate, 1972.....	2,332,000
Recommended, 1972.....	2,332,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +6,000  
 Estimate, 1972.....

Funds provided under this appropriation are to carry out the provisions of Public Law 91-249, approved May 14, 1970. The purpose of this program is to preserve, develop, and enhance anadromous fishery resources within the several States and the Great Lakes.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$2,117,000
Estimate, 1972.....	2,205,000
Recommended, 1972.....	2,155,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +38,000  
 Estimate, 1972..... -50,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,155,000, a reduction of \$50,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction of \$50,000 relates to absorption of pay increase costs.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$65,921,000
Estimate, 1972.....	70,882,000
Recommended, 1972.....	71,077,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +\$5,156,000  
 Estimate, 1972..... +195,000

The amount recommended by the committee, compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Management of park and other areas.....	\$59,527,800	+\$2,876,100	+\$197,000
Forestry and fire control.....	3,314,200	-163,200	.....
Park and recreation programs.....	4,957,000	-834,900	-2,000
Increased pay costs.....	3,278,000	+3,278,000	.....
Total, management and protection.....	71,077,000	+5,156,000	+195,000

The net increase of \$195,000 above the budget estimate includes a reduction of \$32,000 for savings in public relations and paperwork management; and an increase of \$227,000 to provide necessary funds for the management and protection of the Gulf Islands National Seashore authorized by Public Law 91-660, approved January 8, 1971.

Officials of the National Park Service responsible for the administration of the program are currently faced with ever increasing problems in the operation of our national parks. There are several reasons for this, including the greatly increased visitations which tax available park facilities; and a changing personality and backgrounds of visitors utilizing national park facilities. Many of these new visitors are totally unfamiliar with hazards that may be encountered in a natural environment. Consequently, unless adequate preventive action is taken, a serious rise in the accident rate associated with park visitations cannot be avoided.

The committee directs that the National Park Service assign top priority to its safety program and within available funds, allocate an additional \$125,000 for administration of an expanded safety program.

#### MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$50,547,000
Estimate, 1972.....	56,226,000
Recommended, 1972.....	56,230,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +5,683,000  
 Estimate, 1972..... +4,000

The net increase of \$4,000 above the budget estimate includes an addition of \$30,000 for maintenance of physical facilities at Gulf Islands National Seashore authorized by Public Law 91-660, approved January 8, 1971; and a reduction of \$26,000 for savings in paperwork management.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$19,557,000
Estimate, 1972.....	37,859,000
Recommended, 1972.....	37,849,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +18,292,000  
 Estimate, 1972..... -10,000

The reduction of \$10,000 below the budget estimate consists of the following decreases and increases:

Road and bridge construction in non-critical areas, —\$1,176,000.

Water rights, —\$20,000.

Fort Scott Historic Area, Kans., +\$65,000.

Planning funds, Indiana Dunes, Ind., +\$455,000.

Two locomotive replica, Golden Spike National Historic Site, Utah, +\$355,000.

Access road construction and maintenance funds, Canyonlands National Park, Utah, +\$50,000.

Planning funds, Greers Ferry National Water Garden Park, Ark., +\$50,000.

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Mich., +\$211,000.

#### PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$17,650,000
Estimate, 1972.....	18,500,000
Recommended, 1972.....	18,500,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +850,000  
 Estimate, 1972.....

This appropriation provides for liquidation of obligations incurred for construction of parkways and roads and trails by the National Park Service under contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The committee recommends that to the extent funds become available because of slippage in the construction program, planning be accelerated for the Big Horn Canyon Highway and the Natchez Trace Parkway.

#### PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$6,878,000
Estimate, 1972.....	8,205,000
Recommended, 1972.....	8,325,000

Comparison:  
 Appropriation, 1971..... +1,447,000  
 Estimate, 1972..... +120,000

Funds provided in this appropriation are required to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89-665, approved October 15, 1966. This legislation was enacted to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation. The total amount provided includes:

Grants-in-aid, \$5,980,000.

Maintenance of the National Register and administration of grants-in-aid programs, \$234,300.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, \$126,400.

Historic sites survey, \$220,500.

Historic American buildings survey, \$225,500.

Historic American engineering record, \$120,300.

Archeological investigations and salvage, \$1,309,000.

Pay increase costs, \$109,000.

The increase of \$120,000 over the budget estimate is for the Ozette-Makah archeological project, Washington.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$3,874,000
Estimate, 1972.....	4,006,000

Recommended, 1972.....	\$3,956,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+82,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-50,000

The decrease of \$50,000 below the budget estimate is for absorption of pay increase costs.

You will note that the National Park Service has received increasing appropriations through the years; however, problems in the national parks are increasing. Park use for demonstrations, festivals, and so forth demands increased cleanup and policing as does the ever-escalating and tragic use of park facilities for crime and drug consumption as well as drug pushing.

I may say that the committee is also deeply concerned with providing maximum safety for all visitors. However, some of the very physical properties of these parks do not lend themselves easily to the kind of safety precautions present in other facilities. Roads on steep mountains and exciting and unusual physical phenomena in a park should stimulate the most careful use by the public, particularly those with young people in the parks. In fact, if I were addressing myself to the park user, I would say, "Prior to your use of the park acquaint yourself with what you will see, what the problems may be, and educate your children in all the extraordinary safety precautions which must be utilized."

There are those who do not want any roads within a park. However, if we do not repair and keep our park roads up, safety problems are only escalated. Rolling rock, poor shoulders, all create hazards.

Another problem that large national parks face is overuse through an extraordinary number of vehicles. The Park Service is searching for solutions and has already come up with some answers. As time goes by there will of necessity have to be more of these answers. It would also seem to me that the transportation industry of the United States ought to begin to think about access to our national parks and recreation centers through use of public transportation so that we do not have the ever-broadening incidence of increasing vehicular traffic within park boundaries.

I am sure also that on our lakes and streams gasoline pollution from pleasure boats is going to be an increasing subject of discussion among those responsible for carrying out the mandates of a better environment.

EMISSIONS IN THOUSAND POUNDS PER DAY FOR 1967

	Carbon monoxide	Unburned fuel	Nitrogen oxides	Particulates
<b>National Airport:</b>				
Turbine aircraft.....	6.1	1.7	1.2	0.6
All aircraft.....	71.0	10.3	1.3	.7
<b>Entire metropolitan area, District of Columbia:</b>				
Turbine aircraft.....	36.9	7.4	3.1	1.0
All aircraft.....	162.0	24.0	3.3	1.2
<b>Kennedy Airport: All aircraft<sup>1</sup>.....</b>	8.75	11.1	4.3	2.9
<b>Los Angeles International: <sup>2</sup>All aircraft<sup>3</sup>.....</b>	72.6	27.9	4.8	1.5

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy is mostly turbine aircraft.  
<sup>2</sup> Data were not available for O'Hare so Los Angeles was substituted.  
<sup>3</sup> Los Angeles has a high volume of piston aircraft.

I bring to your attention some figures in which I think you will be interested. In fiscal year 1966, the National Park Service managed 26,549,000 acres at a cost per acre of \$4.80.

In fiscal year 1971 the Park Service managed 28,553,000 acres at \$5.48 an acre.

The total average cost in the United States in areas other than the District of Columbia was \$5.48 per acre in the year 1971. In the National Capital Parks metropolitan area of Washington the cost per acre for management and development was \$1,041.44 per acre.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Fiscal year—	Total acreage managed (in thousands)	Total amount available for management and development	Cost per acre
1966.....	26,549	\$127,446,000	\$4.80
1967.....	26,551	122,726,700	4.62
1968.....	27,215	124,302,800	4.57
1969.....	28,385	103,469,000	3.64
1970.....	28,524	126,897,500	4.45
1971 (estimated).....	28,553	156,449,000	5.48

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

[Total acreage managed, in thousands]

Fiscal year 1966.....	26,549
Acreage added in 1967.....	2
Acreage added in 1968.....	664
Acreage added in 1969.....	1,170
Acreage added in 1970.....	139
Acreage added in 1971 (estimated).....	29
<b>Total acreage, 1971 (estimated).....</b>	<b>28,553</b>

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA ONLY

Fiscal year 1971 (estimated):	
Total acreage managed.....	22,858
Total amount available for management and development.....	\$23,805,200
Cost per acre.....	\$1,041.44

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$3,102,000 for development.

It is with a great deal of pride that the committee takes some measure of credit for the nationwide program which has done a great deal in our cities during the past 3 years, "Summer in the Parks." For those who have no opportunity to visit areas at any distance from a city, these programs give urban residents a chance to use with pleasure and purpose our national parks.

Last year more than half a million participated in the city of Washington alone. There is participation also in New York, the West, and in Philadelphia. One Saturday, my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), and I visited Independence Hall and the surrounding area in Philadelphia. It was our pleasure that day to see the kind of park visitation that young people had. A room was especially created to demonstrate the living of that particular time in our history. The teacher explained that schoolchildren came through daily to visit, see, and better understand our country as it began.

The committee provided the first money for "Summer in the Parks," and in fact there would have been no program at all if the committee had not

suggested that parks could be used "by people for people."

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER  
SALINE WATER CONVERSION

A budget estimate of \$27,025,000 was presented for consideration of the committee. Hearings were held on the request, but the necessary authorizing legislation had not been enacted when the committee concluded its final consideration of the bill. Therefore, this budget request has been passed over without prejudice.

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$13,242,000
Estimate, 1972.....	14,490,000
Recommended, 1972.....	14,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+1,048,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-200,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,290,000, a decrease of \$200,000 below the budget estimate for administration of the Water Resources Act of 1964—Public Law 88-379—as amended.

The amount included in the bill will provide:

Assistance to States for institutes, \$5,100,000.

Matching grants to institutes, \$3,000,000.

Water resources research to be performed by any qualified entity or individual as provided under title II of the Act, \$4,300,000.

Administrative expenses, \$923,000.

Scientific Information Center, \$912,000.

Pay increase costs, \$55,000.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$7,626,000
Estimate, 1972.....	6,881,000
Recommended, 1972.....	6,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-826,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-81,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,800,000, a reduction of \$81,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction includes \$2,000 for savings in paperwork management; and \$79,000 for absorption of pay increase costs.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$12,472,000
Estimate, 1972.....	14,475,000
Recommended, 1972.....	13,975,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+1,503,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-500,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,975,000, a reduction of \$500,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction includes the following decreases:

Savings in paperwork management, \$2,000.

Increased salary and related costs, \$200,000.

Staff to assist industry in production and distribution of minerals and solid fuels in short supply, \$40,000.

Adjudication services, \$100,000.

Absorption of pay increase costs, \$158,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1971.....	
Estimate, 1972.....	\$500,000

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES—Continued**  
(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)—Con.  
Recommended, 1972..... \$500,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +500,000  
Estimate, 1972.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000, the budget estimate, for various research programs utilizing excess foreign currencies.

**FOREIGN CURRENCY**

Criticisms are leveled sometimes against the expenditures of our special foreign currency program. These programs are usually used for translation

of documents to which we would have no access were it not for the use of foreign currency. However, the budget this year provides interesting research activities which will contribute to total world knowledge in a wide variety of fields from desalination to oil and water separation which is intrinsic to our knowledge of oil pollutants in water.

**TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES****DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOREST SERVICE  
FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION**

The bill includes under this heading a total appropriation of \$320,667,000, a decrease of \$33,889,000 below the 1971 ap-

propriation, and an increase of \$13,050,000 above the budget estimate.

The following is a summary of action taken on the programs included under this appropriation.

**FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT**

Appropriation, 1971..... \$281,502,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 233,508,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 238,718,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... -42,784,000  
Estimate, 1972..... +5,210,000

The amount recommended by the committee in comparison with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
<b>FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT</b>			
National Forest protection and management:			
Timber resource management:			
Sales administration and management.....	\$61,164,000	+\$5,440,000	
Reforestation and stand improvement.....	31,599,000	+11,340,000	+\$4,524,000
Recreation-public use.....	38,837,000	+1,405,000	+140,000
Wildlife habitat management.....	6,089,000	+1,155,000	+146,000
Range resource management:			
Management.....	6,940,000	-165,000	
Revegetation.....	3,339,000	-45,000	
Improvements.....	4,511,000	-72,000	
Soil and water management.....	8,896,000	+2,175,000	+100,000
Mineral claims, leases, and special uses.....	5,184,000	+35,000	+300,000
Land classification, adjustments, and surveys.....	7,089,000	-142,000	
Forest fire protection.....	30,305,000	-725,000	
Maintenance of improvements for fire and general purposes (including communications).....	7,230,000	-159,000	

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Payments to Employees' Compensation Fund.....	\$1,622,000	+\$163,000	
Subtotal.....	212,805,000	+20,405,000	+\$5,210,000
Amount advanced from Cooperative Range Improvements.....	-700,000		
Subtotal, National Forest protection and management.....	212,105,000	+20,405,000	+5,210,000
Water resource development related activities.....	3,698,000	-77,000	
Fighting forest fires.....	4,275,000	-70,000,000	
Insect and disease control.....	10,250,000	-1,502,000	
Increased pay costs.....	8,390,000	+8,390,000	
Total, forest land management.....	238,718,000	-42,784,000	+5,210,000

The increase of \$5,210,000 above the budget estimate includes the following:

Reforestation and timber stand improvement, \$4,382,000.

Wildlife habitat management and stand improvement, Clark National Forest, Mo., \$210,000.

Mineral evaluation study, Monongahela National Forest, W. Va., \$300,000.

Student work program, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minn., \$140,000.

Watershed management, Beaver Creek project, Arizona, \$178,000.

For several years the Forest Service has been considering modifying its pay-

ment and scaling practices for national forest timber. The issues have been discussed with this committee on numerous occasions. The Forest Service plans to revise its regulations in this connection effective July 1, 1971. Various involved arguments still exist. It could well be that legislation should be enacted.

In view of the foregoing, the committee directs that there be no change in current Forest Service payment guarantee and deferred scaling practices until September 1, 1971. This moratorium will provide an opportunity for the responsible legislative committees in the Congress to hold hearings on this subject. In the

meantime the committee urges the Forest Service to conduct meaningful negotiations with those of opposite views to resolve the controversy.

**FOREST RESEARCH**

Appropriation, 1971..... \$48,891,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 49,868,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 54,208,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +5,317,000  
Estimated, 1972..... +4,340,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
<b>Forest research:</b>			
Forest and range management research:			
Timber management research.....	\$11,243,000	+\$5,000	+\$300,000
Watershed management research.....	5,474,000	+642,000	+850,000
Range management research.....	1,497,000	-37,000	
Wildlife habitat research.....	1,716,000	+285,000	+315,000
Forest recreation research.....	1,019,000	-19,000	
Subtotal, Forest and range management research.....	20,949,000	+876,000	+1,465,000
Forest protection research:			
Fire and atmospheric sciences research.....	5,988,000	+1,919,000	+2,000,000
Forest insect research.....	5,473,000	+359,000	+475,000
Forest disease research.....	3,154,000	+131,000	+200,000
Subtotal, Forest protection research.....	14,615,000	+2,409,000	+2,675,000

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
<b>Forest products and engineering research:</b>			
Forest products utilization research.....	\$8,770,000	+\$4,000	+\$200,000
Forest engineering research.....	1,130,000	-24,000	
Subtotal, Forest products and engineering research.....	9,900,000	-20,000	+200,000
<b>Forest resource economics research:</b>			
Forest survey.....	3,266,000	-78,000	
Forest products marketing research.....	1,943,000	-38,000	
Forest economics research.....	1,335,000	-32,000	
Subtotal, Forest resource economics research.....	6,544,000	-148,000	
Increased pay costs.....	2,200,000	+2,200,000	
Total, Forest research.....	54,208,000	+5,317,000	+4,340,000

The increase of \$4,340,000 over the budget estimate includes the following:

Aerial fire suppression techniques, \$2,000,000.

Gypsy moth, \$275,000.

Urban forestry, \$350,000.

Hardwood research, Warren, Pa., \$150,000.

Shrub research, \$200,000.

Watershed management, Beaver Creek project, Arizona, \$400,000.

Disposition of logging residuals, \$200,000.

Forest sciences research, Corvallis, Ore., \$650,000.

Maple research, \$75,000.

La Grande Range and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory, Oregon, \$40,000.

**STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION**

Appropriation, 1971..... \$24,163,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 24,241,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 27,741,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +3,578,000  
Estimate, 1972..... +3,500,000

This program, carried on in coopera-

tion with the States, encourages private timber management.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$27,741,000, an increase of \$3,500,000 above the budget estimate. Public Law 392—81st Congress—which amended the Clarke-McNary Act, authorizes annual appropriations of \$20,000,000 for cooperation in forest fire control. The budget estimate for this activity for fiscal year 1972 was \$16,494,000. The committee recommends \$19,994,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION	
Appropriation, 1971	\$15,933,700
Estimate, 1972	25,338,000
Recommended, 1972	31,858,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+15,924,300
Estimate, 1972	+6,520,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Forest land management construction:			
Development of recreation-public use areas:			
Water resources development construction	\$3,236,000	-\$5,700	+\$2,178,000
Construction for fire, administration, and other purposes	1,591,000	+1,032,000	+1,037,000
Research construction	2,000,000	-500,000	
Pollution abatement	3,305,000	+2,120,000	+3,305,000
Land acquisition, Weeks Act	20,000,000	+12,852,000	
Increased pay costs	1,300,000		
	426,000	+426,000	
<b>Total, construction and land acquisition</b>	<b>31,858,000</b>	<b>+15,924,300</b>	<b>+6,520,000</b>

The increase of \$6,520,000 over the budget estimate includes the following projects:

**DEVELOPMENT OF RECREATION-PUBLIC USE AREAS**

- Timberline Lodge, Oreg., \$951,000.
- Recreational facilities, Lava Lands Complex, Deschutes National Forest, Oreg., \$300,000.
- Recreational facilities, Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah and Wyo., \$200,000.
- Planning (\$75,000) and construction of facilities in national forests adjacent to Yellowstone National Park, \$275,000.
- Visitor facilities, Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ark., \$138,000.
- Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center, Okla., \$125,000.
- Roby Lake, Texas County, Mo., \$89,000.
- Recreational facilities, Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Va., \$100,000.

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

- Recreational facilities, Cave Run Reservoir, Ky., \$762,000.
- Recreational facilities, Turquoise Lake, Colo., \$125,000.
- Recreational facilities, Wynoochee Dam, Olympic National Forest, Wash., \$96,000.
- Clark National Forest, Mo., \$54,000.

**RESEARCH FACILITIES**

- Southern Forest Fire Laboratory, Macon, Ga., \$1,680,000.
- Forest Research Laboratory, Durham, N.H., \$1,300,000.
- Redwood Research Headquarters, Arcata, Calif., \$140,000.
- Forest Sciences Laboratory, Auburn, Ala.—planning—\$110,000.
- Land acquisition, Institute of Forest Genetics, Rhinelander, Wis., \$75,000.

**FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS**

**(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)**

Appropriation, 1971	\$120,220,000
Estimate, 1972	138,740,000
Recommended, 1972	138,740,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+18,520,000
Estimate, 1972	

These funds are required to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

Within available funds, \$50,000 shall be allocated for preliminary planning of the George Rogers Clark Recreation Way.

**ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS.**

**SPECIAL ACTS**

Appropriation, 1971	\$80,000
Estimate, 1972	80,000
Recommended, 1972	80,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	
Estimate, 1972	

Congress has enacted several special laws which authorize appropriations from the receipts of specified National Forests for the purchase of lands to minimize erosion and flood damage.

**ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES**

Appropriation, 1971	
Estimate, 1972	\$26,035
Recommended, 1972	26,035
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+26,035
Estimate, 1972	

The act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a) stipulates that deposits made by public school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for National Forest system purposes in the same State as the National Forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

**COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS**

Appropriation, 1971	\$700,000
Estimate, 1972	700,000
Recommended, 1972	700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	
Estimate, 1972	

Part of the grazing fees from the National Forests, when appropriated, are used for revegetation of depleted range lands, construction and maintenance of range improvements, rodent control, and eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds.

**ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING**

Appropriation, 1971	\$1,020,000
Estimate, 1972	1,028,000
Recommended, 1972	1,028,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+8,000
Estimate, 1972	

These funds are used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contribution under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest lands. Grants are matched by the States, and work is conducted in accordance with plans submitted by the States, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Earlier in my presentation I noted some of our national forest problems. As a result, this year the committee took cognizance of these and have placed in the categories of forest land management an additional \$5,210,000 to provide stepped-up reforestation and timber stand improvement, wildlife habitat management, mineral evaluation study, a study work program, and watershed management.

In the field of forest research, as I noted, provision is made for substantial contributions in a wide range of subjects of immediate interest to America. In every urban area of this country we are seeking answers to problems of pollution. A study of what our urban forest may accomplish and what existing problems are with these trees will be of utmost importance.

The \$650,000 for the Forest Sciences Laboratory in Corvallis will provide equipment to those scientists seeking to find some research answers to insect infestations which destroy so many billion board feet of timber each year and denude watersheds.

The committee has increased the construction budget by a total of \$6,520,000. This is divided among three kinds of categories—recreation and public use areas, water resources development, and basic research facilities to cope with the problem of forest fires, forest genetics, redwood research.

The committee has provided, as you will note, full funding for the Clarke-McNary Act, recognizing the ever-escalating fire problem and the costs related thereto between the State and Federal Government.

It has been a source of increasing interest to the committee that the U.S. Forest Service receives the largest number of recreation visits of any of our national lands, and the committee has discovered through its lengthy hearings that those forests lacking recreation facilities become a far better target for fires than those which provide camping sites.

I have earlier noted the cost of our fires. We are providing \$2 million specifically to enable the Forest Service to do research in any field they so wish, including aerospace, for better answers to firefighting methods.

**COMMISSION ON FINE ARTS**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriation, 1971	\$115,000
Estimate, 1972	121,000
Recommended, 1972	121,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971	+6,000
Estimate, 1972	

The Commission of Fine Arts is a permanent advisory agency created to give advice concerning aesthetic standards and matters of civic design involved in the orderly development of the city of

Washington; and to furnish expert opinion on questions of art to the President, to the Congress and its committees, and to the heads of various departments and agencies of the Federal and District Governments.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION  
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Appropriation, 1971..... \$125,974,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 141,903,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 147,404,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +21,430,000  
Estimate, 1972..... +5,501,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee Bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Patient care.....	\$100,801,000	+\$9,838,000	+\$3,726,000
Field health services.....	39,960,000	+7,273,000	+1,775,000
Administration.....	2,316,000	-8,000	
Increased pay costs.....	4,327,000	+4,327,000	
<b>Total, Indian health services.....</b>	<b>147,404,000</b>	<b>+21,430,000</b>	<b>+5,501,000</b>

The increase of \$5,501,000 over the budget estimate includes the following:

To provide an additional 200 positions for patient care, \$2,226,000.

To provide additional medical supplies to establish inventories at an adequate level, \$1,500,000.

To provide an additional 150 positions for field health activities, \$1,600,000.

Pilot urban health project in Minneapolis, Minn., \$150,000.

Dental service for the tribes of western Washington, \$25,000.

Within available funds, the Department shall give consideration of equal priority with other tribes to the medical needs of the Ute Mountain Tribe, Colorado.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1971..... \$18,715,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 18,789,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 20,289,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +1,574,000  
Estimate, 1972..... +1,500,000

The recommended increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget estimate will provide sanitation facilities for approximately 575 Indian homes. This work is in conjunction with the accelerated housing program provided for by additional funds included in an earlier section of the bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The committee is concerned with the delay of construction and rehabilitation of hospitals during the past few years. Information provided during the hearings revealed that there is a serious shortage of facilities in this connection, and unless the hospital construction program is reactivated, maintenance and repair costs on existing hospitals will be

prohibitive and much more expensive in the long run than if an orderly construction program is undertaken immediately. There are many instances where current hospital facilities are grossly inadequate.

In view of the foregoing, it is the recommendation of the committee that, beginning in fiscal year 1973, an orderly and efficient hospital construction program be inaugurated with the objective of bringing these facilities up to at least minimal standards in the next several years.

I would say to the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, please use public works program money to provide a minimum of at least \$30 million per year for construction of Indian hospital facilities. It is well to remember that unemployment and poverty are desperately present in Indian areas and that construction of facilities will serve a dual purpose—provide necessary health care and jobs.

The committee found in its extensive hearings, which I urge each of you to read, that we have a backlog of maintenance and repair of \$16,690,000 which could be eliminated with adequate funding in 3 years. Beyond that, 22 of the present 51 hospitals need replacement. Replacement costs would be \$171 million. The longer reconstruction and repair are delayed the greater will be the cost. If repairs are not undertaken at the time of their need, then a hospital rapidly passes into the "total reconstruction phase" and cost index figures go up.

The committee has been deeply concerned with the lack of personnel available to carry out Indian health programs. The hours in outpatient clinics and hospitals have been long and personnel is desperately overworked. In the budget quoted above, we have provided \$2,226,000 to provide an additional 200 positions for patient care. We have provided \$1,600,000 for an additional 150 positions for field health activities. You may say, why did we not add more? The Department told us that this was what they could use in their facilities and could recruit.

We have also added \$1,500,000 to provide additional medical supplies to establish inventories in our hospitals and clinics at an adequate level.

I think at this point it might be well to see how we have met the problems of our health programs for Indians. In 1961, the United States spent \$8,895,500 for patient care. You will note that this year's figure is \$100,801,000. In 1961, field health services were \$8,878,000. This year they are \$39,960,000. You will see in the charts provided in volume 4 of our hearings that infant death rates for Indian and Alaska Natives have gone down sharply compared with all races. This is down sharper than for other totals.

Our charts also indicate an ever-escalating number of outpatient visits to the IHS hospitals and field clinics. Preventive medicine and care are beginning to pay off, for the number of native admissions to hospitals show a drop. The percentage of live births born in hospitals has increased dramatically. The tuberculosis death rate is down. Incidence is

down. There is increased family planning and there has been increased dental care for our young people. There has not been as much money expended on dental care for the ages above 19, but the final chart in our record shows the medical care cost has escalated tremendously. This remains one of our great problems.

Bear in mind also that the cost of our Indian hospitals is not as easy to measure against others as we would wish because our hospitals of necessity are scattered through a low population terrain and bed numbers provided in facilities are usually far below other hospitals, therefore, the management costs are larger.

We have had many requests to provide hospital service for our urban Indians. We are providing a pilot project this year for Minneapolis to provide answers as to what needs to be done in putting all available health services together and to find what health services are available, and how to secure them.

The problem of the urban Indian is rather complicated. Those Indians who move from a reservation with BIA urging or assistance through BIA training and BIA-sponsored employment, are part and parcel of the BIA's responsibility and Congress provides for their care. The reservation Indian, who on his own, takes off for the city under current practices becomes another U.S. citizen eligible for all services to which any other American is entitled. However, some of those States which one would think, because of the voices raised, would be intensely liberal in their treatment of Indians are among those who do little for the Indian population. Indians are shunted from agency to agency, are not informed of programs, and receive little assistance. So it now becomes obvious that the BIA and the Indian Health Service must work with State and local agencies to make sure that the Indian away from a reservation indeed is treated as an equal American with others and shares programs intended for all Americans.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971..... \$1,000,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 1,025,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 1,025,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +25,000  
Estimate, 1972.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,025,000, the budget estimate, for the Indian Claims Commission. The additional funding for the 1972 fiscal year is to provide for pay increase costs.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971..... \$968,000  
Estimate, 1972..... 1,351,000  
Recommended, 1972..... 1,300,000  
Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1971..... +332,000  
Estimate, 1972..... -51,000

The bill provides \$1,300,000, a reduction of \$51,000 below the budget estimate, for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission.

The reduction consists of decreases of

\$34,000 for new positions and related personnel benefits; \$3,000 for supplies and materials; \$10,000 for reallocation of five positions to the next higher grade; and \$4,000 for the additional cost of franking monthly news letters.

During the past few years the Commission has put continued emphasis on the reclassification of employees to higher grades. The committee recognizes that to some extent such action is necessary. However, the committee does not approve the transfer of funds which have been appropriated for other activities to finance the additional cost of position reclassification.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$26,310,000
Estimate, 1972.....	56,561,000
Recommended, 1972.....	54,460,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+28,150,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-2,101,000

The bill provides a total appropriation of \$54,460,000 for activities under this appropriation account. This is a reduction of \$2,101,000 below the budget estimate. The following tabulation reflects the distribution of funds as provided in the bill:

Activity	1971 appropriation	1972 budget estimate	Committee bill, 1972	Increase or decrease
National Endowment for the Arts:				
Grants-in-aid to groups or individuals.....	\$8,465,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	
Grants-in-aid to States.....	4,125,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities: Grants and loans to individuals and groups.....	11,060,000	26,500,000	24,500,000	-\$2,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	2,660,000	3,561,000	3,460,000	-101,000
Total.....	26,310,000	56,561,000	54,460,000	-2,101,000

MATCHING GRANTS

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$5,000,000
Estimate, 1972.....	7,000,000
Recommended, 1972.....	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+2,000,000
Estimate, 1972.....	

Funds provided under this appropriation account are available for matching in an amount equal to the total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

Of the total amount provided \$3,500,000 is for the National Endowment for the Arts, and not to exceed \$3,500,000 is for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

You will note that in essence we have provided \$30 million for the arts of which \$5,500,000 goes to the States. We have cut the humanities by \$2 million since they have not heretofore had a State grant program, and we have reduced the administration of the Foundation by \$101,000 which is in proportion to the \$2 million.

There always has been and there will always continue to be a diversity of opinion on arts and humanities. Shall our Government interest itself in the preservation of art forms typical of this Nation at any given point in time and assist the artistic development of art forms? This is controversial, of course, among some people. I would remind the House of Representatives, however, that in all civilizations it is not the armies, not the galleons, nor the conquests which have survived. Only the art, music, sculpture, dance, and literature have survived. Not one single bit of the Roman conquest survives today as part of a Roman Empire, yet the beauty that was Greece, the order that was Roman law, the majesty of Roman construction, remain for our civilization to admire.

There are few who remember the individual battles fought by Britain as she

struggled toward an imperial destiny, only to lose it, but there are few people in the world who do not know of Shakespeare. The Austrian Empire is gone; the Germany of the past is gone, yet the great music of the era of Austrian greatness remains. The world will never lose the beauty of Mozart's music, the grandeur of Wagner. Those treasures of art which have been preserved in the Louvre and in the other galleries of the world are immortal. Papers, documents and controversial plans of imperial conquest by great nations come and go. The richness of man's thought never dies, and as to whether we measure a poem or a picture as great depends upon the judgment of a given time, but the very fact that this Nation is embarked on trying to build for it a reservoir of creative development and artistic perception, love of beauty, enjoyment of those things which are not material is a tribute to the Nation's thinking process.

I have said many times on the floor of this House that millions of Americans contribute their tax dollars to our land and water conservation fund, to our programs for outdoor lovers. Millions will also never leave the pavements of our cities and it seems to me that in this bill which is about America, we would be remiss if we did not join our physical resources with the resources of our soul itself and provide the dollars for a total nation. We would be a poorer land without the beauty of our mountains, our lakes, and our seashores but we would be a land bereft without the mighty words expressed in our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and the literature of our heritage. Altogether it creates for us a land which believes that not only does man inhabit the earth but brings to that earth the wealth of his thought.

Dispute what is good poetry or bad poetry—this is an ever-changing source of debate—but never dispute the fact that man's creative poetry has not made this world a better place. So, without apology,

I present the arts program. If the council make mistakes, change the council. But let us never change the philosophy that says, "We are a nation which believes that three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the national budget can be spent upon programs which provide us with music, drama, dance, sculpture, and literature.

To those who criticize the humanities, let us remember that this is fundamentally the study of understanding ourselves. One of the interesting stories that comes down to us in history is that of how our Constitution was written. The delegate to the Federal Convention, James Madison, was an avid student, and from Paris, Thomas Jefferson sent James Madison book after book which supplies him with the history and discussion of governments on this earth. Who knows what particular part in those books which James Madison received gave us some part of our treasured Constitution today?

This past week has shown us exactly how the Government itself in the conduct of its business constantly acknowledges the value of our historical perspective. The deliberations of Government can scarcely be made without reference to our antecedents and analogues by which it must be tested.

Mr. Edgerton, in presenting his statement to us said, and said it very well:

A modern society's capacity to deal with its problems is dependent upon the knowledge resources available to it. Yet, scientific knowledge, important as it has been for achieving American goals, is increasingly recognized as incapable of responding to all of the presently emerging issues in American life . . . solutions rest squarely upon a vastly increased national capacity to understand men as human beings needing values and aspirations. . . . Languages and literature define our capacity to communicate meaningfully in a world increasingly threatened by incomprehension between competing and coexisting cultures. Philosophy's ultimate aim is to clarify, to make available and to extend shared meanings—values—in the service of a richer, more productive, more rational life. . . . The authority of our Government, the power of decision depends upon a fine textured fabric of intellectual and moral authority to which the people give assent. The stability of a society, its power to grow—its very continuance—depends upon the existence of that shared heritage and the authority which is implicit in it.

In concluding this portion of my discussion I would like to pay tribute to Miss Nancy Hanks, the very able and capable Director of the Arts and to Mr. Wallace B. Edgerton the Acting Director of the Humanities. They are both people of whom our Nation can be proud.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$36,895,000
Estimate, 1972.....	46,259,000
Recommended, 1972.....	45,259,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+8,364,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-1,000,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 appropriation and the 1972 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1972	Bill compared with—	
		1971 Appropriation	Estimate, 1972
Science.....	\$15,684,000	+\$3,155,000	-\$413,000
History and art....	5,565,000	+694,000	-481,000
U S National Museum.....	3,303,000	+135,000	-----
Public service.....	919,000	+99,000	-6,000
Special programs.....	3,264,000	+1,711,000	-211,000
Administrative and central support.....	4,993,000	+450,000	-87,000
Buildings management department.....	10,366,000	+955,000	+288,000
Increased pay costs.....	1,165,000	+1,165,000	-90,000
Total, salaries and expenses.....	45,259,000	+8,364,000	-1,000,000

For the past few years, evening visitations at the various facilities of the Smithsonian Institution during the summer months have declined. There are probably several reasons for this reduction in evening visitors, but the committee is of the opinion that some of the circumstances which may have been responsible for the minimal visitations have improved to the extent that with adequate funding and publicity of the availability of the facilities, the Smithsonian Institution can once again become a focal point of visitation during the summer evening hours for school children and other visitors from various parts of the Nation.

Accordingly, the committee has provided an additional \$300,000 for this purpose. With the \$160,000 provided in the budget base, a total of \$460,000 will be available for this purpose. These funds are especially for evening visitor hours and the committee does not expect them to be dissipated by their allocation to other activities to offset various cost increases.

These evening hours were first provided by the very beloved former chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Kirwan, who was my predecessor. I shall never forget his statement in that first year of funding:

I want to create an opportunity for every boy and girl in the District of Columbia to see something other than the streets.

#### MUSEUM PROGRAMS AND RELATED RESEARCH (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$2,500,000
Estimate, 1972.....	5,500,000
Recommended, 1972.....	3,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+1,000,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-2,000,000

This appropriation item is to provide for the special foreign currency program of awarding grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning, interested in conducting research in foreign countries. The reduction of \$2,000,000 below the budget estimate includes decreases of \$450,000 for archaeology and related disciplines; \$1,500,000 for systematic and environmental biology; and \$50,000 for astrophysics.

#### SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Appropriation, 1971.....	-----
Estimate, 1972.....	\$1,400,000
Recommended, 1972.....	1,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+1,300,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-100,000

The Science Information Exchange receives, organizes, and disseminates information about research in progress in the life, physical, and social sciences. Its mission is to assist the planning and management of research activities supported by Government and non-Government agencies and institutions by promoting the exchange of information that concerns subject matter, distribution, level of effort, and other data pertaining to current research in the prepublication stage.

This organization was previously funded by the National Science Foundation, but effective July 1, 1971, funding responsibility for this activity will be assigned to the Smithsonian Institution.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$200,000
Estimate, 1972.....	200,000
Recommended, 1972.....	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-----
Estimate, 1972.....	-----

The amount recommended under this appropriation item is for the capital improvement program at the National Zoological Park. The amount provided is for minor repair and renovation of various facilities at the National Zoological Park.

#### RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$1,725,000
Estimate, 1972.....	1,050,000
Recommended, 1972.....	550,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-1,175,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-500,000

The appropriation of \$550,000 recommended by the committee includes \$400,000 for the Renwick Gallery; \$125,000 for sewer system improvement—South Buildings; and \$25,000 for space modification at the Lamont Street Library.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$5,200,000
Estimate, 1972.....	5,597,000
Recommended, 1972.....	5,597,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+397,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-----

Of the total amount provided, \$1,900,000 is for planning and redesign of the National Air and Space Museum; and \$3,697,000 is for liquidation of contract authority for construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

During the past several months, there has been extensive discussion regarding the location of the sculpture garden that is to be constructed in conjunction with the Hirshhorn Museum. It was originally planned that the sculpture garden would bisect the Mall on a north-south axis. This proposal has now been revised whereby the sculpture garden will be on an east-west axis off the greensward of the Mall. The change in plans for the sculpture garden is opportune since the

committee is of the opinion and so directs, that none of the funds provided in this bill shall be used for construction of a sculpture garden on a north-south axis across the Mall.

The committee further understands that final approval for the revised plans of the sculpture garden has not yet been granted by the National Capital Planning Commission. Until such approval is granted, the committee directs that none of the funds provided in this bill for the Hirshhorn Museum shall be available for expenditure.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$4,136,000
Estimate, 1972.....	4,713,000
Recommended, 1972.....	4,713,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+577,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-----

The bill provides \$4,713,000, the budget estimate, for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery of Art continues to expand its services to the people of this Nation as is indicated by the following tabulation:

Fiscal year	Visitations to gallery	Persons (estimated) served by extension service	Total persons reached by gallery
1965.....	1,577,108	1,170,434	2,747,542
1967.....	1,510,967	1,780,361	3,291,328
1968.....	1,267,028	2,182,000	3,449,028
1969.....	1,283,398	2,757,000	4,040,398
1970.....	1,935,533	3,161,000	5,096,533

#### WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1971.....	\$750,000
Estimate, 1972.....	695,000
Recommended, 1972.....	565,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	-185,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-130,000

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was authorized by Public Law 90-637, approved October 24, 1968, as the Nation's official living memorial to the 28th President. It sponsors a continuous advanced scholar, international fellowship program on various social and scientific subjects of special interest in the world of today.

The bill provides \$565,000, a reduction of \$130,000 in the Fellowship program below the budget estimate. This \$130,000 reduction will be offset as of July 1, 1971, when an identical amount now held in reserve will be released for expenditure, according to information received by the committee.

#### FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1971.....	-----
Estimate, 1972.....	\$37,000
Recommended, 1972.....	37,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971.....	+37,000
Estimate, 1972.....	-----

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$37,000, the budget estimate, for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Memorial Commission as authorized by Public Law 91-398, approved September 8, 1970. This appropriation will provide funds for the execution of preliminary plans to develop the approved site of the memorial.

**NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriation, 1971-----	\$287,500
Estimate, 1972-----	300,000
Recommended, 1972-----	275,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971-----	-12,500
Estimate, 1972-----	-25,000

The bill provides \$275,000, a reduction of \$25,000 below the budget estimate, for the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

The function of the Council is to en-

courage full use of programs to benefit the Indian population.

The committee directs the Council to utilize the expertise of the staff of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the fullest possible extent.

**FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriation, 1971-----	\$167,000
Estimate, 1972-----	167,000
Recommended, 1972-----	167,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1971-----	-----
Estimate, 1972-----	-----

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$167,000, the budget estimate, for the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review which was established by Section 10 of the Federal

Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act (30 U.S.C. 721-740).

The adjudicative duties of the Board, in docketed cases, involve the hearing and determination of applications filed by mine operators seeking annulment or revision of, and temporary relief from, orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior under sections 8 and 9 of the act.

In conclusion, I am not going to say what a chairman usually does, "This is a good bill," because it could be better. It could provide more money to do the job that 1972 imposes on us but under the circumstances it is the best that can be done. May I say that it is with distinct affection for the Nation that the committee presents this appropriation for your approval.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1971 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1972**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1971 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1972 (3)	Bill compared with—	
			New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, fiscal year 1972 (5)
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>				
<b>Public Land Management</b>				
<b>Bureau of Land Management:</b>				
Management of lands and resources-----	\$84,060,000	\$76,080,000	\$76,080,000	-\$7,980,000
Construction and maintenance-----	3,310,000	4,430,000	4,627,000	+1,317,000
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)-----	(3,500,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(-300,000)
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)-----	18,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	+1,000,000
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)-----	1,795,000	2,514,000	2,514,000	+719,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management-----</b>	<b>107,165,000</b>	<b>102,024,000</b>	<b>102,221,000</b>	<b>-4,944,000</b>
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs:</b>				
Education and welfare services-----	243,440,000	270,221,000	271,987,000	+28,547,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)-----	(835,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(-665,000)
Resources management-----	70,847,000	76,691,000	71,866,000	+1,019,000
Construction-----	19,885,000	36,385,000	37,206,000	+17,321,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)-----	(20,200,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-4,800,000)
General administrative expenses-----	6,148,000	6,257,000	6,057,000	-91,000
Payment to the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation-----	3,561,700	-----	-----	-3,561,700
Tribal funds (definite)-----	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-----
Tribal funds (indefinite)-----	13,204,000	13,173,000	13,173,000	-31,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs-----</b>	<b>360,085,700</b>	<b>405,727,000</b>	<b>403,289,000</b>	<b>+43,203,300</b>
<b>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Salaries and expenses-----</b>	<b>4,170,000</b>	<b>3,999,000</b>	<b>3,999,000</b>	<b>-171,000</b>
<b>Land and water conservation fund:</b>				
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite)-----	327,400,000	362,500,000	350,000,000	+22,600,000
General fund-----	-----	17,500,000	-----	-17,500,000
(Appropriation out of the fund to liquidate contract authority)-----	(30,000,000)	-----	-----	(-30,000,000)
<b>Total, Land and Water Conservation Fund-----</b>	<b>327,400,000</b>	<b>380,000,000</b>	<b>350,000,000</b>	<b>+22,600,000</b>
<b>Office of Territories:</b>				
Administration of territories-----	17,414,000	21,930,000	21,537,000	+4,123,000
Permanent appropriation (special fund)-----	(118,000)	(367,000)	(367,000)	(+249,000)
Transferred from other accounts (special fund)-----	(367,000)	(458,360)	(458,360)	(+91,360)
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands-----	59,864,000	59,980,000	59,980,000	+116,000
<b>Total, Office of Territories-----</b>	<b>77,278,000</b>	<b>81,910,000</b>	<b>81,517,000</b>	<b>+4,239,000</b>
<b>Total, Public Land Management-----</b>	<b>876,098,700</b>	<b>973,660,000</b>	<b>941,026,000</b>	<b>+64,927,300</b>
<b>Mineral Resources</b>				
<b>Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research-----</b>	<b>114,603,000</b>	<b>126,182,000</b>	<b>130,000,000</b>	<b>+15,397,000</b>
<b>Bureau of Mines:</b>				
Conservation and development of mineral resources-----	49,260,000	48,029,000	49,000,000	-260,000
Health and safety-----	58,029,000	73,643,000	73,630,000	+15,601,000
General administrative expenses-----	1,942,000	1,970,000	1,970,000	+28,000
Helium fund (authorization to spend from public debt receipts)-----	29,277,000	-----	-----	-29,277,000
Helium fund (portion applied to liquidate contract authority)-----	(35,800,000)	-----	-----	(-35,800,000)
<b>Total, Bureau of Mines-----</b>	<b>138,508,000</b>	<b>123,642,000</b>	<b>124,600,000</b>	<b>-13,908,000</b>
<b>Office of Coal Research: Salaries and expenses-----</b>	<b>17,160,000</b>	<b>21,030,000</b>	<b>21,880,000</b>	<b>+4,720,000</b>
<b>Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses-----</b>	<b>1,273,000</b>	<b>1,570,000</b>	<b>1,570,000</b>	<b>+297,000</b>
<b>Total, Mineral Resources-----</b>	<b>271,544,000</b>	<b>272,424,000</b>	<b>278,050,000</b>	<b>+6,506,000</b>

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1971 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1972—Continued

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1971 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1972 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, fiscal year 1972 (6)
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>					
<b>Fish and Wildlife and Parks</b>					
<b>Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:</b>					
Management and investigations of resources.....	\$59,804,000	\$64,724,000	\$64,794,000	+\$4,990,000	+\$70,000
Construction.....	5,144,000	4,440,000	6,225,000	+1,081,000	+1,785,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance).....	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	-----	-----
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation.....	2,326,000	2,332,000	2,332,000	-----	-----
General administrative expenses.....	2,117,000	2,205,000	2,155,000	+38,000	-50,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....</b>	<b>76,891,000</b>	<b>81,201,000</b>	<b>83,006,000</b>	<b>+6,115,000</b>	<b>+1,805,000</b>
<b>National Park Service:</b>					
Management and protection.....	65,921,000	70,882,000	71,077,000	+5,156,000	+195,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	50,547,000	56,226,000	56,230,000	+5,683,000	+4,000
Construction.....	19,557,000	37,859,000	37,849,000	+18,292,000	-10,000
Parkway and road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(17,650,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(-1,850,000)	-----
Preservation of historic properties.....	6,878,000	8,205,000	8,325,000	+1,447,000	+120,000
General administrative expenses.....	3,874,000	4,006,000	3,956,000	+82,000	-50,000
<b>Total, National Park Service.....</b>	<b>146,777,000</b>	<b>177,178,000</b>	<b>177,437,000</b>	<b>+30,660,000</b>	<b>+259,000</b>
<b>Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.....</b>	<b>223,668,000</b>	<b>258,379,000</b>	<b>260,443,000</b>	<b>+36,775,000</b>	<b>+2,064,000</b>
<b>Office of Water Resources Research</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	13,242,000	14,490,000	14,290,000	+1,048,000	-200,000
<b>Office of the Solicitor</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,626,000	6,881,000	6,800,000	-826,000	-81,000
<b>Office of the Secretary</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	12,472,000	14,475,000	13,975,000	+1,503,000	-500,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	-----	500,000	500,000	+500,000	-----
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary.....</b>	<b>12,472,000</b>	<b>14,975,000</b>	<b>14,475,000</b>	<b>+2,003,000</b>	<b>-500,000</b>
<b>Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....</b>	<b>1,404,650,700</b>	<b>1,540,809,000</b>	<b>1,515,084,000</b>	<b>+110,433,300</b>	<b>-25,725,000</b>
<b>Consisting of—</b>					
Appropriations.....	1,375,373,700	1,540,809,000	1,515,084,000	+139,710,300	-25,725,000
Definite appropriations.....	(1,014,974,700)	(1,143,622,000)	(1,130,397,000)	(+115,422,300)	(-13,225,000)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(360,399,000)	(397,187,000)	(384,687,000)	(+24,288,000)	(-12,500,000)
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	29,277,000	-----	-----	-29,277,000	-----
<b>Memoranda—</b>					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(107,985,000)	(48,200,000)	(48,200,000)	(-59,785,000)	-----
<b>Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....</b>	<b>(1,512,635,700)</b>	<b>(1,589,009,000)</b>	<b>(1,563,284,000)</b>	<b>(+50,648,300)</b>	<b>(-25,725,000)</b>
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>					
<b>Forest Service:</b>					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management.....	281,502,000	233,508,000	238,718,000	-42,784,000	+5,210,000
Forest research.....	48,891,000	49,868,000	54,208,000	+5,317,000	+4,340,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	24,163,000	24,241,000	27,741,000	+3,578,000	+3,500,000
<b>Total, forest protection and utilization.....</b>	<b>354,556,000</b>	<b>307,617,000</b>	<b>320,667,000</b>	<b>-33,889,000</b>	<b>+13,050,000</b>
Construction and land acquisition.....	15,933,700	25,338,000	31,858,000	+15,924,300	+6,520,000
Youth conservation corps.....	2,500,000	-----	-----	-2,500,000	-----
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(120,220,000)	(138,740,000)	(138,740,000)	(+18,520,000)	-----
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	80,000	80,000	80,000	-----	-----
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	-----	26,035	26,035	+26,035	-----
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	700,000	700,000	-----	-----
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,020,000	1,028,000	1,028,000	+8,000	-----
<b>Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service.....</b>	<b>374,789,700</b>	<b>334,789,035</b>	<b>354,359,035</b>	<b>-20,430,665</b>	<b>+19,570,000</b>
<b>Commission of Fine Arts</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	115,000	121,000	121,000	+6,000	-----
<b>Department of Health, Education, and Welfare</b>					
<b>Health Services and Mental Health Administration:</b>					
Indian health services.....	125,974,000	141,903,000	147,404,000	+21,430,000	+5,501,000
Indian health facilities.....	18,715,000	18,789,000	20,289,000	+1,574,000	+1,500,000
<b>Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....</b>	<b>144,689,000</b>	<b>160,692,000</b>	<b>167,693,000</b>	<b>+23,004,000</b>	<b>+7,001,000</b>
<b>Indian Claims Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,000,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	+25,000	-----
<b>National Capital Planning Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	968,000	1,351,000	1,300,000	+332,000	-51,000
<b>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</b>					
Salaries and expenses:					
Endowment for the arts.....	12,590,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	+13,910,000	-----
Endowment for the humanities.....	11,060,000	26,500,000	24,500,000	+13,440,000	-2,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	2,660,000	3,561,000	3,460,000	+800,000	-101,000
<b>Subtotal, salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>26,310,000</b>	<b>56,561,000</b>	<b>54,400,000</b>	<b>+28,150,000</b>	<b>-2,101,000</b>

Footnotes at end of table.

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1971 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1972 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, fiscal year 1972 (6)
<b>Matching grants:</b>					
Endowment for the arts.....	\$2,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	+\$1,000,000	
Endowment for the humanities.....	2,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	+1,000,000	
Subtotal, matching grants.....	5,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+2,000,000	
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	31,310,000	63,561,000	61,460,000	+30,150,000	-\$2,101,000
<b>Public Land Law Review Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	171,000			-171,000	
<b>Smithsonian Institution</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	36,895,000	46,259,000	45,259,000	+8,364,000	-1,000,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	2,500,000	5,500,000	3,500,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000
Science information exchange.....		1,400,000	1,300,000	+1,300,000	-100,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	200,000	200,000	200,000		
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	1,725,000	1,050,000	550,000	-1,175,000	-500,000
Construction.....		1,900,000	1,900,000	+1,900,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(5,200,000)	(3,697,000)	(3,697,000)	(-1,503,000)	
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	4,136,000	4,713,000	4,713,000	+577,000	
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	750,000	695,000	565,000	-185,000	-130,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	46,206,000	61,717,000	57,987,000	+11,781,000	-3,730,000
<b>Executive Office of the President</b>					
Salaries and expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.....	400,000			-400,000	
<b>Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	224,000			-224,000	
<b>Historical and Memorial Commissions</b>					
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....		37,000	37,000	+37,000	
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	670,000			-670,000	
<b>National Council on Indian Opportunity</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	287,500	300,000	275,000	-12,500	-25,000
<b>Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	167,000	167,000	167,000		
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies.....	600,997,200	* 623,760,035	644,424,035	+43,426,835	+20,664,000
<b>Consisting of—</b>					
Appropriations.....	600,997,200	623,760,035	644,424,035	+43,426,835	+20,664,000
Definite appropriations.....	(600,217,200)	(622,980,035)	(643,644,035)	(-43,426,835)	(+20,664,000)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)		
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(125,420,000)	(142,437,000)	(142,437,000)	(+17,017,000)	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(726,417,200)	(766,197,035)	(786,861,035)	(+60,443,835)	(+20,664,000)
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>					
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	2,005,647,900	** 2,164,569,035	2,159,508,035	+153,860,135	-5,061,000
<b>Consisting of—</b>					
(1) Appropriations.....	1,976,370,900	2,164,569,035	2,159,508,035	+183,137,135	-5,061,000
Definite appropriations.....	(1,615,191,900)	(1,766,602,035)	(1,774,041,035)	(+158,849,135)	(+7,439,000)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(361,179,000)	(397,967,000)	(385,467,000)	(+24,288,000)	(-12,500,000)
(2) Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	29,277,000			-29,277,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(233,405,000)	(190,637,000)	(190,637,000)	(-42,768,000)	
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(2,239,052,900)	(2,355,206,035)	(2,350,145,035)	(+111,092,135)	(-5,061,000)

<sup>1</sup> Excludes budget amendments of \$15,426,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 92-119.  
<sup>2</sup> In addition, \$229,000 transferred from "Land Acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System."

<sup>3</sup> Excludes budget amendment of \$1,900,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 92-119.  
<sup>4</sup> Excludes budget amendments of \$17,326,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 92-119.  
<sup>5</sup> Excludes Office of Saline Water—authorizing legislation not enacted.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It is with pleasure that I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, on which I once served as a Member while on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I note that the present bill provides \$273,487,000 for the BIA Education and Welfare Services.

That is approximately \$29 million more than was in the 1971 bill; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I note that you have \$20,289,000 in Indian health facilities. That is an increase of approximately 1.5 million; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct. Significant increases are required in the Indian health field.

Mr. HALEY. I note also there is a slight increase in the Indian Claims Commission. I presume that that small increase is due to the increase in salaries of the employees?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct, it is due to pay increases.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee about the specific status of the helium acquisition program.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That issue is still before the courts.

Mr. VANIK. That is not in the provisions of this bill?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is

no money in this bill for the helium program.

Mr. VANIK. There is no money allocated?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. None.

Mr. VANIK. I want to commend the distinguished chairlady for this action.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations yielding, and I appreciate her lengthy explanation of the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I tried to make it as short as possible.

Mr. HALL. I particularly appreciate the gentlewoman's comment about the need for maintaining the arts and humanities and the relatively small percentage of our national budget which is going to it, and although it escapes me as to why it is the Federal Government's business to assure that everyone has advantage of this, my real question is, Why is the amount double this year over last year's appropriation?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be very frank. The committee reduced the humanities budget estimate by \$2,000,000. The amount in the bill is the amount of the authorization for the arts. It is also the budget estimate President Nixon sent to Congress. The budget request was for the full authorization. I think the President was entirely right. I think he recognizes that this program can provide great benefits for all of us.

As I have said many times on this floor, there are millions of people in the United States who will never go out with fishing poles or guns, to hunt or fish. But there are millions in the cities and in communities who might avail themselves of opportunities in art, music, drama, sculpture, museums—all the things that we associate with the arts.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentlewoman's statement. May I ask further, referring to pages 30 and 31 of the committee report on the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, whether the \$54,460,000 recommended by the committee includes the matching grants, including the \$7 million recommended.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No, it does not. The gentleman will find the matching grants on page 31. The committee separated the appropriation into two accounts for clarification.

Mr. HALL. The fact remains that the \$7 million for matching grants recommended is in addition to the \$54,460,000?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, that is correct. May I point out to those of you who have a curiosity about who contributes to these activities, you will find a complete list in the hearing record this year of every amount that has been contributed to both the arts and the humanities, and it goes back for several years.

Mr. HALL. Are contributions from private sources satisfactory to the gentlewoman, may I ask?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It seems so. They seem to be perfectly respectable people.

Mr. HALL. I was speaking of the adequacy of the contributions. Originally we were told that this whole program would be on the basis of private contributions.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. They were able to secure donations at least equal to appropriations for matching funds. I would suspect that as time goes on it may be necessary to raise the appropriation for matching grants. It seems to me more and more contributors are making sizable contributions. I found one interesting item in that list. The Klickitat Labor Council in my own district contributed \$25 to the arts.

Mr. HALL. They did not contribute enough to complete the National Center for Performing Arts here without the appropriation of Federal taxpayers' money, is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CULVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I noticed on page 24 of the committee report language that directs the Forest Service to delay their plans for improving payment guarantee and deferred scaling practices for National Forest Service timber.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We set a date of September 1, 1971, in order to give the Forest Service and industry an opportunity to sit down and clear away the clutter that has surrounded this issue. I have received several interesting letters from those who are violently opposed to the payment bond and also from those who are solidly for the payment bond, due to a wide variety of reasons. The Forest Service proposed to terminate this practice on July 1, 1971. It seems entirely proper to provide additional time until September 1, 1971, for further negotiations of this matter.

Mr. CULVER. The thing which is of particular concern to me, and I believe many other Members, is the fact, as the gentlewoman is very much aware, that nearly 2 years ago the Forest Service recommended reforms in the payment of scaling practices with respect to our national forests. At that time such initiatives in terms of improving the public interest situation in this regard were blocked by the Subcommittee on Interior of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Subsequent to that time an 18-month study was ordered.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. May I complete the point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Let me emphasize that it was the Senate committee which put the language in originally.

Mr. CULVER. Exactly. I believe the important point to keep in mind is that we have had a study for 18 months, and upon completion of that study the Forest Service once again has recommended reforms based on their findings.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Forest Service proposed July 1, 1971, as the termination date. The report provides in effect, "Get your house in order before September 1, 1971, because that is it."

Mr. CULVER. Throughout this entire period of time we have had a situation where the Service was in the most direct and closest possible consultation with the forest products industry. We have seen as a result of their findings that they concluded again, at the end of nearly 2 years: "That the current practices did not adequately protect the interests of the Government nor provide equitable treatment of timber sale purchases."

In light of this sizeable delay which already has taken place in this important area of national policy, I should wonder what need there is for further prolonging the period during which the Government of the United States does not get full value for its timber.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), one of the members of the subcommittee, for further comment in this connection.

Mr. WYATT. If I may respond to the gentleman from Iowa, I believe this is a matter far more complex than we have time to delve into on the floor of the House today.

I would say to the gentleman that the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) and I have cosponsored a bill which is now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture, dealing with this exact problem. I can give the gentleman almost an absolute assurance that there is no jeopardy so far as the Government is concerned.

What we have done is to ask the Forest Service and the industry to get together and discuss in meaningful terms what can be worked out to bridge this chasm. Actually, by putting on a firm deadline of September 1, it means either something is going to be worked out by negotiation before that time or it will give the appropriate authorizing committee the opportunity to have hearings and act on the legislation.

Very frankly, since Congress will be in recess from around the 6th or 7th of August, this effectively gives about 5 more weeks.

I can assure the gentleman, I believe, there will be nothing adverse to the interests of the United States occurring in that time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I may say, when one is closing out a program which has been such an inherently basic part of an industry which is troubled by weather and conditions over which it has no control, due consideration must be given all aspects. I believe the Forest Service is right in asking for the curtailment. I believe also it is right to discuss all the facets of what needs to be done by that industry. There are many problems in the timber industry.

As the gentleman knows, I looked at the map and I could not find a single acre of commercial forest land in Iowa. It happens that the entire West is probably one of the greatest timber harvest areas of the Nation, as is the South, and Great Lakes area.

Problems peculiar to the timber industry are woven into the national economy. The committee is as deeply concerned with doing the right job by the Nation's forest as anyone.

Mr. CULVER. I respectfully appreciate remarks of the gentlewoman, but with regard to the nature of the Iowa landscape, I do suggest we have taxpayers in our State. What concerns us is the failure of the U.S. Government to get full value for its timber under these present practices.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say to the gentleman that the Forest Service pays its own way, and the receipts are paying not only for timber management but also a major portion of the cost for recreation and research. This is shown in the table of receipts in the report.

Mr. CULVER. The delay that has been determined to be appropriate is most unfortunate, because it will only serve to benefit the 3 percent of the industry that harvests nearly quarter of the public timber. As a result of that study during the 18-month period, we have seen the Inspector General under the Department of Agriculture make an estimation that the U.S. taxpayer has lost \$1.4 million in interest costs alone.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The timber receipts cover a major portion of the cost of maintaining the national forest program.

Mr. CULVER. This revenue loss is all brought about as a result of these present practices. In addition to that, it is estimated by the Inspector General that the cost to the taxpayer is \$200,000 to \$600,000 in loss of revenues because of price changes as a result of deferred scaling—timber cutters are able to cut the timber in the forest when prices are high and get scaling accomplished at a later date and paying for it at that time much to their advantage when the price is low. Furthermore, the Inspector General found that Government logs were damaged because of extra handling, and some were allegedly diverted to private use in the millyard or wasted, and others were misclassified after weathering. In all these instances, the Government lost money. In light of this loss of Government revenue and failure to obtain full value for the Nation's timber, I am mystified how we can sanction further delay under the guise of additional study. Put simply it is a several hundred thousand dollar bonanza to the large timber companies; several hundred thousand dollars that could be better used for reforestation and harvesting timber for additional homebuilding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I want to tell you about where some of the tax dollars are going.

Mortality in the national forests from insects and other sources averages between 5 to 10 billion board feet annually dependent on whether major disasters are included.

The allowable cut in national forests as of January 1, 1971, was 13.7 billion board feet of timber.

In 1970, 11.5 billion board feet was actually cut and removed.

In 1962, on Columbus Day, Hurricane Frieda destroyed 3.8 billion board feet of timber on Federal lands.

Insect damage from 1969 through 1972 totaled approximately 2.5 billion board feet with a stumpage value of about \$132 million.

In 1970, the Wenatchee National Forest loss was 200 million board feet with a stumpage value of \$1.6 million.

The California fire last year cost \$2,836,000 and this did not include the loss of timber. One of these fires was started by a recreation group that had not been given a permit and which had been told not to use the land. They burned 44,000 acres.

In the year 1965 there were 4,123 man-caused fires, and in 1970 in the U.S. forests there were 7,174. The same is true in the other agencies.

Last year we exported 2.8 billion board feet of logs, 1.3 billion board feet of lumber, 172 million square feet of plywood, and 11.2 million board feet of pulpwood.

There were 1,463,000 units of housing starts in the United States in 1970 for our population of 205 million; in Japan there were 1,340,000 units of housing starts for a population of 120 million.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to express the appreciation of the thousands of Indian people across the country for the very, very substantial addition which the gentlewoman and her committee made to the budget for Indian health services and Indian health facilities.

I think these are long needed improvements in the budget. I think the gentlewoman's recognition of that need is something that speaks eloquently of her heart and of her understanding and compassion and interest in the health needs of the Indian people.

I want to express thanks to her for that again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

On page 23 of the bill, at the top of the page, do I understand that the Interior Department is now getting into the foreign aid act?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Does the gentleman mean the White House request for the use of foreign currencies?

Mr. GROSS. I do not care whether it was at the request of the White House or at whose request it was.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Those foreign currencies are to be used in Yugoslavia and Poland. They are doing some extensive work over there on oil pollutants as they affect rivers and streams. This is a very good place to get some valuable information with our foreign currency.

Mr. GROSS. Does this mean that eventually the Interior Department will be in Kuwait and Timbuctu and other countries with foreign aid programs?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. As far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, it does not, but I can not assure the gentleman what the administration might propose in the future.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriations bill before the House is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered by the House of Representatives this year. It is the result of more than 2 months of extensive hearings, covering over 5,000 pages of testimony, consisting of six volumes of hearing records. During that period of time, we heard from nearly 100 departmental witnesses. Over 150 Members of Congress and outside witnesses gave additional testimony.

I would be very much remiss if I did not note the skill and dedication with which our distinguished colleague, the gentle lady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), conducted those hearings in a most thorough and nonpartisan manner and she is to be complimented for it; and the diligence and hard work of the other members of the subcommittee, all of whose efforts have brought this bill for your consideration.

This bill is most comprehensive in the scope of its activities. It concerns itself with enormously important programs involving history, arts and humanities, recreation, our natural resources, and our energy resources.

I shall not detail each of the sections of this bill, but there are some very significant portions which should be called to the particular attention of the Members of this House.

A first major feature of this bill reaffirms our commitment to provide education and welfare assistance to our Indian and Alaskan Natives. Our neglect of these first Americans has been a national tragedy. This bill will enable us to provide better care for the 60,000 Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools; the 87,000 children in public schools; and the 90,000 Indians currently receiving guidance in welfare services.

Recent years have been years of great progress in our Indian health programs. Infant death rates are down 51 percent from 1955; tuberculosis death rates are down 75 percent; gastroenteritis deaths down 53 percent; and death rates from pneumonia and influenza are down 36 percent over this same period. However, despite these impressive statistics, the general state of Indian and Alaskan health is still some 20 to 25 years behind that of the general population. This great progress must not deter us from recognizing the great needs that still remain.

Also included are significant increases for recreational opportunities. Since its inception in 1964, the land and water conservation fund has acquired 822,000 acres for outdoor recreation projects. In addition, 5,770 grants for development, land acquisition and recreation planning totaling \$327.2 million have been made to the States. The money being appropriated in this bill will be another major step toward meeting our ever-increasing needs.

While on the subject of lands, it has been noted in the committee report that the funds appropriated in this bill are used to manage 750 million acres of public lands throughout the United States. It is interesting to note that this acreage represents about one-third of the total land area of the United States. The management of these lands is pointed toward a concept that involves multiple usage.

I have already referred to recreation in the National Park Service. That same usage is part and parcel of the administration of our Forest Service lands and the vast holdings of the Bureau of Land Management. Having said that, we must not lose sight of the fact that these lands are also managed extensively to provide areas to graze cattle, to enable us to harvest timber, to provide wildlife habitat, to help meet the energy needs of the nation, and to provide water in the water-scarce areas of the West.

All of these lands are held in a fiduciary capacity for the 200 million people who live in the United States today and for those who will come after them.

In determining whether we are effectively managing this immense resource, some effort was made to arrive at an asset value of the 750 million acres that we manage through appropriations in this bill.

It belabors the obvious to say that in arriving at such a figure without extensive studies, it is exceedingly difficult. But I think it is of interest to note just for purposes of illustration that the Forest Service estimates that its land area of 187 million acres has a valuation of \$18.5 billion.

The Bureau of Land Management estimates that its surface area of 451 million acres is worth \$11 billion. It must be noted that this figure of \$11 billion does not reflect any valuation for minerals nor does it include the 515 million acres of Outer Continental Shelf lands which produce millions of dollars in royalties and other payments from the oil taken on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The National Park Service, administering 28 million acres of public lands uses a book value figure to try to arrive at an asset valuation of \$4.8 billion. The combined total of these assets, and I emphasize that this total can be used only for purposes of illustration and not to arrive at the real value of these lands, is \$34.3 billion.

A conservative estimate of the amount of cash flow that these assets will produce each year is in the neighborhood of \$1 billion. The self-liquidating nature of the expenses incurred in connection with managing these assets can be seen from the fact that the total cost in this budget for all purposes for these three agencies is \$633 million.

But as I indicated when I began these remarks, the efforts at placing a valuation on these lands can be extremely difficult.

During the 1969 budget hearings, our good friend and former colleague, Ben Reifel, asked the National Park Service to determine the asset value of our national parks. After much study, the Park Service found itself unable to establish a value on the worth of the land. There

was no way to measure the incomparable pueblo tops at Mesa Verde or the geyser basin at Yellowstone. Yet they did derive an acceptable economic formula for evaluating the return on assets. Using 1969 figures, the park visitations generated \$4.8 billion in personal income. This in turn produces \$952,000,000 in tax revenues to the Treasury. One would have to invest \$119 billion at 4 percent annually to yield \$4.8 billion in income. So our national parks in terms of their economic contribution to personal income are worth the equivalent of an asset of \$119 billion, earning 4 percent per year. That same year, we spent \$103 million, or one-tenth of 1 percent, to manage and operate the parks. I know of no other investment in Government that could yield such a profitable return.

It is noteworthy that an estimated 493 million visitations will be made to our public lands in 1972, an increase of 56 million over 1970. With this increased usage, the problem of maintaining high health and safety standards will grow proportionately. A legislative provision is added to this bill giving the National Park Service increased funding flexibility to meet emergency or law enforcement needs. The cost of repairing damage as a result of demonstrations in our national parks alone for the first months of 1971 is already \$827,200.

The bill recognizes the need to conserve both our natural as well as our mineral resources, and to meeting future resource needs. The committee gave its attention to both our renewable and our depletable resources. The conservation of our fish, wildlife, and the development of our water resources were increased by over \$7 million. There is a substantial increase for reforestation, yet at the rate reforestation is funded in this bill, it will take us 38 years to reforest the 5 million acres in our national forests that have been ravaged by fires.

We are asking for this additional money because of the increased strain being placed on our forests to supply timber and other wood products. Today our public lands, mostly our national forests, produce about 40 percent of our softwood needs. As a result, we are already importing wood products from other countries and aggravating our difficult balance-of-payments problems.

An even greater problem lies with our depletable resources. The statistics to support this problem are numerous and they are alarming. With 6 percent of the world's population, the United States consumes 34 percent of the world's energy, 29 percent of its steel, and 30 percent of its oil.

It is noteworthy to mention, I think, that testimony in the hearings indicated that if we could increase by 2 to 3 percent the amount of oil we recover from drilling operations in the United States today, we would have an additional oil reserve to draw upon that would be equal to the entire Alaskan oil find.

Our electrical energy requirements will nearly double every 10 years at the present rate. At the current rate of use of crude oil, natural gas, and our domestic reserves, we have an 8-year energy supply remaining.

To meet this energy crunch, coal and other fossil fuels will be in ever increasing demand. Coal is not only our most abundant fossil fuel, but it is the major source of electric energy, providing 55 percent of our electric power-needs. The bill provides increased funds for the Office of Coal Research and necessary funds to the Bureau of Mines for research, resource development and health and safety. Significant programs in recycling and control of urban wastes will receive necessary funding. Increasing funds to the Geological Survey, which has only explored 1 percent of our oil rich Outer Continental Shelf, will insure technological monitoring and evaluation of offshore oil production. Only by planning now can we be sure of meeting these future energy needs.

Despite the significant increases found in this bill, the committee did not simply accept the budget. It added some and cut some with the result that this bill, despite these significant increases, is still \$5 million below the budget estimates presented to the committee. In addition, this bill generates enough receipts to be almost self-liquidating. \$1.015 billion in receipts are generated, including revenues from timber sales, grazing fees, mineral leasing, OCS royalties and golden eagle and other land use permits.

An important provision of the Interior appropriations bill is a \$2.3 million appropriation to the Bureau of Mines for Anthracite Research Development; \$1.3 million will be used to fund a new mine flushing technique to be used in the city of Scranton, Pa. This new method of slurry crushed mine refuse into an abandoned mine will spread culm refuse under the buildings and streets of a section of Scranton completely backfilling the entire affected area. Its success will command national attention for two reasons. First, it is only about one-half as costly as previous backfilling methods. Second, by using the old technique, only 43 percent of the mine voids would be filled. This new process will fill 100 percent of these mine voids. To the people of Scranton and surrounding areas, this represents a tremendous investment in their welfare and safety.

The remaining \$1 million will be allocated to three related research projects; \$600,000 for research and demonstration of new surface mine reclamation techniques, \$100,000 for research on the abatement of acid mine drainage problems and \$300,000 for research on using mine waste bank materials for abating mine subsidence hazards.

I am deeply grateful to the members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for accepting my recommendations that these projects be funded and for recognizing their importance to the people of the Scranton area.

These projects have had the cooperation of the very capable staff of the Bureau of Mines under the direction of Dr. Elbert Osborn. I particularly want to single out Mr. Joseph Corgan, the very distinguished Chief of the Bureau's Environmental Division, for his most valuable contribution to these projects. He is one of the most intelligent, respected, and competent civil servants in our Gov-

ernment. His guidance and assistance have helped us to successfully combat mine fires in such projects as the Cedar Avenue mine fire, as well as mine fires in Throop and Carbondale, Pa.

Mr. Chairman, the anthracite area of Pennsylvania fueled America for the great industrial growth and expansion in the latter half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. The price has been a legacy of serious problems. Today we are taking a giant step forward in the repayment of this long-standing debt.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill represents a tremendous investment in natural, mineral, recreational, and human resources. Its interests cut a broad path across the lives of all Americans. It is a bill worthy of our enthusiastic support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I would like to express my deep appreciation for the dedication and devotion of our chairman and of our ranking member and other members of the committee in working on this very comprehensive bill. The testimony on the bill was compiled in six volumes. We were privileged to hear from a number of Members of Congress with respect to various aspects of this appropriation bill.

At the outset, I would like to compliment Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton, the new Secretary of the Interior, for an outstanding job accomplished in a very short time in his new job. He has assembled a very competent group of assistants. I think very obviously he now has his Department under control.

I would like to address my colleagues for a few minutes only in regard to one of our great renewable natural resources, the forestry resources of the Federal Government. You will note that we have increased the reforestation allocation in this bill by approximately \$4 million over and above what was requested in the budget. The evidence is very clear that this is a good investment. Every dollar which the Federal Government invests in reforestation and in timber stand improvement returns to the Federal Government somewhere between \$5 and \$6.

Private industry has long ago learned this and really led the way. The Federal Government has been coming along slowly but surely.

I am frankly very dismayed at the testimony of the Forest Service that it will take 38 years at the present rate of reforestation to completely reforest what now has to be reforested, and I think we would be wise in the future to invest substantially more sums in reforestation and in timber stand improvement. It is only in this way that we are going to have sufficient wood fiber to meet the housing goals of this country, sufficient trees to meet the recreational demands of this country, the wilderness demands, the watershed demands, and the demands of fish and wildlife. I think we should be moving rapidly in the next few years toward a much expanded increase in the rate of reforestation of the Federal timber stands.

As the budget was submitted to our subcommittee, there was no money whatsoever in the Forest Service budget for any construction except in the area of pollution abatement. In other words, all the new construction was limited to pollution abatement construction.

Our committee added a few modest amounts for forest research construction and for forest recreation construction. The fact of the matter is that the demands in these other areas for construction money are really snowballing. The fact that we are concentrating on pollution abatement almost to the exclusion of other construction means that the demands for construction in these other areas just multiply. I believe this is something we have to give much more attention to in the future.

The Office of Saline Water is one of the agencies in which I have been particularly interested. They have done a very good job. Of course, we have no money in the budget for them, because the authorization has not yet been approved. We hope this will be picked up in time for inclusion of the funds in the other body.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As one who is deeply concerned about the field as to which the gentleman in the well just spoke so eloquently, I should like to associate myself with his remarks and commend the members of the subcommittee, and particularly my colleague from Oregon, who in my opinion is one of the most knowledgeable, hard-working and able men in the Congress in this field. I wish to commend him and the other members of the subcommittee for what I believe is an excellent job of checking the needs in this particular area and responding with this bill before us today.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the authorizing Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, as usual I should like to thank and congratulate the gentlewoman from Washington and her subcommittee for developing the legislation which we have before the House today. In those thanks, of course, go special thanks to the ranking minority Member, who has a new responsibility in this particular operation.

In my opinion, this is a good bill and the allowances are adequate to carry on the programs which are covered, particularly those in the Department of the Interior that come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I would also like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine working relationship that has grown up over the years between her subcommittee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take note of and comment on a few items in this legislation. The commit-

tee has approved the full budget request for the programs administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service which call for an increase of about \$65 million over the 1971 appropriation. I take no exception to this but I do want to point out to the entire House as I pointed out to the subcommittee that close oversight of these programs by both the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee is needed in order to assure the wise expenditure of these funds. I know the chairman of the subcommittee agrees with me on this matter and she is working with the authorizing committee to accomplish this objective.

With respect to the saline water program, the committee has appropriately passed over without prejudice the budget request for about \$27 million because the necessary authorizing legislation has not been enacted. For the information of the House, there is pending in the Rules Committee legislation which would authorize the appropriation of the full amount requested. It is anticipated that this legislation will be enacted in the near future and that the funds for carrying on the saline water conversion program can be taken care of in conference.

It is noted that the budget request for \$380 million to be expended from the land and water conservation fund has been reduced by \$30 million. My concern with respect to this particular decrease goes to the fact that the authorizing committee has had an understanding with the administration that the full amount available in this fund would be recommended for appropriation. It is my understanding that at the beginning of fiscal year 1971 there existed an unexpended cash balance of about \$225 million in appropriated funds and that with the 1971 appropriation approximately \$580 million was available for expenditure for the Federal land acquisition program and for assistance to the States during fiscal year 1971. It is also my understanding that the Office of Management and Budget imposed an expenditure limitation of \$225 million for fiscal year 1971 indicating a carryover at the end of the present fiscal year of roughly \$355 million. Practically all of this carryover, of course, is in the part of the program providing for assisting the States, and it is my belief that OMB has purposely overloaded the State assistance part of the program, knowing full well that the expenditure could not be made for many years. I would like to ask the gentle lady chairman of the subcommittee, if she does not agree with this appraisal of the situation and if this is not in fact the reason why the budget request was reduced.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is entirely correct. This is a sum that the States could not possibly use.

Mr. ASPINALL. In my opinion, additional funds could be expended very effectively for land acquisition in Federal areas, and I would like to ask whether the

subcommittee considered shifting appropriations from State assistance, where the money cannot be spent, to Federal acquisition.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, we did consider shifting the funds and appropriating the full amount. But I would point out to the gentleman that on page 13 of our report we give a summary of the unexpended balances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The gentleman has been a strong advocate of full funding for the land and water conservation fund for several years. He and his committee have worked diligently toward this end.

As stated in the report, the committee concurs in the opinion that land acquisition should be accomplished with the least possible delay in order to avoid to the greatest possible extent the rapid escalation of land prices we are experiencing today. The committee has recommended appropriations accordingly.

The committee would like to have recommended the full budget estimate of \$380 million for fiscal year 1972. However, as pointed out on page 13 of the report, current indications are that a carryover of unexpended cash at the end of fiscal year 1971 will be approximately \$357.5 million. This carryover balance combined with the recommended appropriation of \$350 million will provide a total of approximately \$707 million. Based on past experience, even this amount is in excess of what program requirements will actually be if an efficient and economical land acquisition program is administered.

Even though the committee has recommended a reduction of \$25 million for assistance to States, the \$255 million provided is \$69.6 million more than was available in fiscal year 1971.

The committee understands the Office of Management and Budget placed an expenditure ceiling of \$225 million on this fund probably for the reason that programs were not moving as fast as had been anticipated. I sincerely hope this will not be the situation which will prevail in fiscal year 1972. I certainly share the gentleman's feeling that the land acquisition program both for the Federal and State portions should be organized so that satisfactory progress can be made in the acquisition of these lands for the purposes set forth in the act. I can assure the gentleman, the Appropriations Committee is inclined to provide all the funds required for a sound and practical program.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentlewoman for answering these questions and thank the committee for their wise and effective consideration of the matter involved in the legislation before this.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take the opportunity, first, to commend the chairwoman of the Interior Subcom-

mittee (Mrs. HANSEN) the ranking member of the committee (Mr. McDADE) and other members of the committee for their efforts in rebuilding the budget we have before us today.

In the hearings before the subcommittee, on which I have the honor of serving, I have always found the gentlewoman from Washington tremendously thorough and knowledgeable about the budgets and programs involved in the bill before this House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, too, should be complimented for his knowledge and aggressiveness as a leading member of this subcommittee.

While this bill recommends a reduction of \$5 million in new obligational authority below the 1972 budget requests, it is important to note that it makes additions in a number of important areas.

The funds available for education and welfare services and other assistance to American Indians, for example, were increased by over \$66 million. This may seem high, but the problems presented to the committee are enormous.

One-third of all Indian homes have two rooms or less, and an estimated 66,000 homes are inadequate or in need of repair. Over 20,000 Indian homes will still lack running water and will have inadequate means of waste disposal. In 50 percent of Indian households, the income is less than \$2,000. The rate of unemployment among the Navajo was 55 percent.

I think it is clear, then, just why these additional funds are needed.

This committee has added funds also for forest land management, forest research, and reforestation programs. Much of what has been said about the need for reforestation was confirmed during our hearings on this bill.

There are 5 million acres of land in our national forests which need to be reforested. At our present rate it would take 38 years to reforest that area, and 50 years to catch up on the timber stand improvement work which is needed—unless we accelerate our present rate of advancement.

This Nation loses up to 5 billion board feet of timber each year because we do not have adequate research in the area of forest insects. In light of the fact that we lost 556,000 acres of forest lands by burning last year, the largest figure since 1934, it is hard to question the fact that we can effectively utilize additional funds in this area.

The committee has added a significant increase of \$4 million to aid our efforts to effectively manage our oil resources on the Outer Continental Shelf.

We learned during hearings that a major company probably spends 10 to 20 times more money to obtain information about lands to be leased by the Government than the Government itself spends to study the character and potential of offshore oil lands. That gap must be narrowed, as it will be with the adoption of this budget, if our Government is to obtain the kinds of information necessary to not only maximize our economic gains from the development

of the Outer Continental Shelf, but to make sure as well that this development is carried out in a way which will insure the safety of our marine environment.

This committee should be complimented also for its increase in funds for research on techniques for surface mine reclamation and acid mine drainage problems. Five billion tons of coal have been taken out of the anthracite areas of Pennsylvania alone. Billions of tons more have been gouged out of land areas throughout the country. We heard that it would cost up to \$1 billion to reclaim one river polluted by acid mine water.

But reclamation has been accomplished, with fast growing grasses, with the neutralization of acid soil, and with methods which make sure that acid mine water does not escape to contaminate streams.

To match our land reclamation problems with possible solutions, it will take money for research. I am pleased this committee has recognized that.

I hope the Members note, also, the degree to which this committee has expressed a concern over the environmental effects of strip mining.

The committee has urged:

All contracts negotiated by public agencies funded in this bill, including leases and permits, for strip mining on public lands, contain meaningful and effective provisions requiring total reclamation within a reasonable period of all public lands disturbed by any strip mining process.

I would certainly hope that by this time next year the Congress will have passed legislation, introduced by Senator NELSON and Congressman HECHLER, among others, which puts tight controls on the practice of all strip mining.

I should like to emphasize too, Mr. Chairman, this committee's recognition of several specific problems now associated with the Government's predator control program.

The Department of the Interior recently announced its own review of these programs, and the committee has directed that specific consideration be given in that review to:

First, insuring that all predator control programs be carried out so as to give maximum protection to birds, animals, and wildlife in an area;

Second, placing more emphasis on the supervision of persons who carry out Department predator control activities to make sure that Department guidelines are strictly adhered to; and,

Third, further efforts which can be made to develop control activities which make sure that only target animals are the victims of poison programs.

I frankly think the time is fast approaching for us to bring under control what is in effect a Government sponsored program for poisoning the environment. I am hopeful that the Department's study, coupled with the directions of the committee, will help us accomplish that goal.

With these additions, Mr. Chairman, and from reading the committee report on this legislation, it should be obvious that this budget makes some significant

efforts to deal with serious problems in both our natural and social environment.

This bill represents a significant restructuring of priorities in environmental areas. For that we can all be pleased. There are nevertheless significant directions in public and private policy which are cause for serious concern, and I would like to mention just a few.

The Secretary of the Interior a few weeks ago, announced an accelerated schedule for oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf which would include at least two major oil and gas lease sales each calendar year through 1975. These would take place in the Gulf of Mexico, the Gulf of Alaska, and off the Atlantic coast.

All of us are aware, of course, of the need for additional sources of energy, but we should have serious questions about the continued—let alone accelerated—development of offshore oil until we have the resources and technical knowledge to adequately cope with the environmental devastation which such drilling can cause.

Even more worrisome is the potential devastation which accompanies our oil transportation system. More than 50 percent of oil pollution is caused by tankers and other ships. And the problem with pollution from tankers is getting worse.

More and more tankers are plying the seas and they are getting larger. During hearings some of these tankers were characterized as "rust buckets in the fleet." Moreover, with tankers getting larger and larger, it is not improbable that one day the infamous *Torrey Canyon* spill, which poured 700,000 barrels of oil into the water, could be dwarfed by a spill from a tanker three to 10 times the size of the *Torrey Canyon*.

I might add also that in my judgment the most serious concern surrounding the Alaska pipeline as it is presently proposed is a necessary reliance on the use of tankers to transport oil from Alaska to the continental United States. Certainly, when any final decision is made on that project, this aspect of it ought to be given careful consideration and analysis.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned before that in addition to advancements in the area of environmental protection, this committee also attempted to deal with some of the social problems over which it has some control.

Thus, this bill contains a significant increase, of about \$23 million, for both Indian health services and facilities. That money is critically needed, but even a brief glimpse of the inadequacy of the facilities now available for 420,000 American Indians indicates future budgets must contain even larger increases.

While concentrated efforts have been made for many years to upgrade the health of our Indian and Alaskan Native populations, their general standard of health is still 20 to 25 years behind that of the general public. Their infant death rate is 40 percent higher than the rate for the population as a whole, and their death rate for tuberculosis is 350 percent higher.

The Indian Health Service operates 51 hospitals, but 22 of these are badly in need of replacement.

Much remains to be done. We need to attack malnutrition and alcoholism and provide enough psychiatric care for our Indians in an attempt to bring down a suicide rate which is twice as high as that for the general public.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a kind word for the support we have given to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Some persons question the need for Government support for the program. But I think it is useful to point out that the funds provided in this bill for this program represent less than three-hundredths of 1 percent of our entire Federal budget. Surely a civilized and sensitive people can afford at least that kind of investment in this area.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am highly impressed with the outstanding work of the distinguished chairman and members of the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior. This, of course, is one of the most important bills which the House must consider. It relates to a very significant portion of the natural resources of American and the guidelines which are provided have much to do with the preservation and the sound management of those priceless assets. In this time of enlightened concern over the future of forests, and wildlife, the safeguarding of open spaces, and the ecology, and the protection of the beauties of nature for future generations, the appropriations for the Department of the Interior are of vital interest to us all.

I strongly urge that my colleagues in the House study in detail the report on the bill which is now before us. There just is not any other way to comprehend the widespread scope of the work done by this subcommittee or the importance of the subjects with which it treats among many other items. It includes the funding of new park areas, the improvement of America's impressive recreational assets, and the financial support necessary to carry forward the work of the Department itself.

In particular, do I want to express appreciation for this year's recommendations on forestry appropriations. The forests of America are one of its greatest assets, but it is not generally known that the operation and management of publicly owned forest resources constitute one of the Nation's major enterprises. These hundreds of millions of acres not only are important from the standpoint of timber, but they provide a priceless asset in fish and wildlife resources, mineral resources, and recreational assets. To a considerable extent, the Government's forest resources are self-sustaining.

However, this is only one of the important features of the forestry program. Under the direction of the Forest Service, there is forest research in which the Government must take the lead. There is State and private forestry cooperation, a program which carried on in cooperation with the States encourages private timber management. There is the

operation of the cooperative forest fire control program conducted with the States, and without which the Nation's forest resources would quickly be lost to uncontrolled fires. In all of these, the subcommittee has wisely provided sound increases which will help to insure a better tomorrow in America's outdoor assets. This bill does more for forestry, all of it needed, than any bill in years.

I am especially pleased that the first full year's funding of the Gulf Islands National Seashore is included in this bill. This wild and beautiful and historic coastal area of Florida and Mississippi is to be protected henceforth and will become an integral part of the Nation's park system.

I am very happy at the action of the House of Representatives in making available for the seashore \$2,034,735 for this purpose. This will continue the work instituted earlier this year in acquiring land and staffing the offices in Pensacola and Biloxi.

The money is principally for land acquisition, but it will also provide for an interim staff of 13. When in full operation, the seashore will require the services of 89 permanent employees and approximately 200 seasonal employees, plus contract personnel who will be required to operate concessions. This involves parts of Santa Rosa Island and of the Perdido Key beaches, the Naval Live Oaks Reservation, and the historic forts in the Pensacola area. The seashore will preserve some of the most important sites in Florida's long and important history and, in combination with the magnificent beaches and woodlands which will be included, the park is expected to be one of the principal points of interest in the Nation. The Department of the Interior predicts that millions of visitors annually will come to the park when it is in full operation and it will be well worth their time.

The members of the Interior Subcommittee, working under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) have labored long and hard to arrive at one of the best Interior appropriation bills that I have seen brought to the House. Theirs has been no easy task, but the subcommittee has done its work well.

The bill appropriating funds to the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1972 is important, not only in terms of the immediate impact on the recreational lives of Americans, but on the importance of the future of maintaining free, open, and wild spaces as well as important natural resources for mankind.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

I notice on page 2 of the committee report there is a very substantial decrease of \$82 million in forest fire control. While I understand the situation, I believe it would be helpful if the gentleman could respond to some inquiries. I believe it would be helpful to have it on the record.

I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania could explain why the decrease? Are these funds in the pipeline, or are they deleted for some other specific reason?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say to the gentleman from California that this decrease occurs because we have paid that amount of money in the last fiscal year as the actual cost of fire suppression on our public lands.

I would further state to the gentleman from California that we do not normally appropriate money for this activity until such time as a fire occurs and thereafter when bills are submitted and approved we appropriate the money to pay for these costs.

We are extremely hopeful, in fact, we have appropriated \$2 million as an increase to try to find additional ways to fight fires on our public lands, that we will not have to appropriate that amount of money in the next fiscal year, because we may have found some new methods of fire control.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Serving as I do on the Committee on Public Works, which handles disaster relief legislation, I can assure the Members that we definitely need to maintain the best of programs for forest fire control.

I appreciate the response of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and, in particular, the reference to research funds.

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time of the Committee to direct a question to the chairwoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee.

I ask the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee (Mrs. HANSEN) if there are any funds provided in the bill for planning for the school expansion at Rocky Boy?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would state to the gentleman from Montana that there are no funds spelled out for planning for the Rocky Boy School, and I will explain why.

We requested the BIA to give us the details on this particular school so that we could consider them. They told us that the land did not belong to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but to the school district. They did not provide us with the complete details. However, I may say they wrote a letter saying that they were enthusiastic about the program. They have \$685,000 for advance planning, and they also have \$2,387,000 for project design drawings, so if their enthusiasm for this project is so great I would say to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) that there should be no problem in getting the BIA to begin the planning work on the Rocky Boy School. It would be a matter of their realigning their priorities.

I recognize the problem of this kind of facility in Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington, and I would ask the gentlewoman then if the ownership of the land, as reported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been straightened out, then, so that funding could now go forward?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Apparently ownership of the land is no problem. But if the BIA and all those involved would provide complete detail at a sufficient early date, we could consider these matters more effectively. Apparently they think the Committee on Appropriations is going to continue in session on a particular bill indefinitely.

The gentleman understands, of course, that at this point with relation to the BIA schools, we are trying to make a complete evaluation of what schools should be operated by BIA and what public school facilities should be utilized.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) further.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In other words, may I say to the gentleman from Montana, in order that our best dollar value be achieved and also that we give the kind of education that the Indian child is entitled to, we very carefully weigh where the money should go—to public or Indian schools. It is hoped to get as many as possible in the public schools wherever the facilities are available and the land is available and where the arrangements are made. So I do trust the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be able to develop a meaningful and practical policy in this connection.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind assistance with reference to this matter.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK).

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the chairwoman of the committee with regard to page 29 of the report—\$1,600,000 is provided for an additional 150 positions for the field health activities.

I would like to ask the chairwoman if this money is available to be used in Community Health Representative programs on the various reservations that have requested it?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The \$1,600,000 is provided for an additional 150 positions for field health activities. The Department tells us that this is the number of people they can recruit and train and it is for the reservations where the priority need is.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Yes, and specifically I would like to establish whether or not the funds are to be used for community

health representative programs, or for some other programs.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No, this could not be used for other purposes. This is provided specifically for field health activities.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairwoman of the committee a few questions because I have planned to offer four amendments to the appropriation bill, and perhaps her answers might clear up the matter so we do not have to offer these amendments.

First, on page 5, line 19, and I am specifically addressing myself to the employment assistance funds for Indians—the bill, as reported out, provides \$380,000 less than was requested by the committee. I am having some difficulty in understanding the cutback—in view of the unemployment rate in the country generally and according to a study published by the Joint Economic Committee in 1969, the unemployment rate for reservation Indians in 1967 was 37.3 percent. 1967 was a year of overall economic boom; the national unemployment rate was 3.8 percent. Today, Indian unemployment has increased as has national unemployment.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be very glad to explain this item.

The only amounts by which the committee reduced the budget estimate was a token reduction in pay costs and \$150,000 which, as I explained a little earlier, we transferred because young people have been influenced to go into the direction of vocational grants rather than having an opportunity for college. We put an additional \$100,000 into college scholarships for legal, nursing, and medical students because so few have an opportunity to pursue those professions. We also provided \$50,000 for provision of higher educational facilities for the Navajos.

The rest of the decrease below 1971 shown below in the report table represents 1972 pay increase costs which were not prorated to the subactivities.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentlewoman.

My second question goes to the category of Indian arts and crafts development. There was a rather modest sum of \$13,000 that has apparently been cut from this item, or at least that is my interpretation of it. Can the gentlewoman inform me the reason for that cut?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The same reason I have stated applies to this item—the lump-sum 1972 pay increases at the bottom of the column shown in the report table have not been prorated to the sub-activities.

Mr. DELLUMS. My next question goes to the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities. I had planned to offer an amendment which would restore a

\$2 million cut by the committee. The amount in the bill is \$2 million less than what was requested. Can the gentleman give me the justification for the \$2 million cut?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. For fiscal year 1971, if the gentleman will recall, the humanities received about \$1½ million less than the arts. Throughout the years there has been a formal State grant program by the National Endowment for the Arts. Next year the humanities plans to start a modest State program but no one is sure at this time how successful the program will be. So to try to equalize for the differing State programs, the committee gave the humanities \$2 million less than the arts.

May I say to the gentleman that no one is more deeply concerned than the committee relative to the humanities, because most of us realize that our Constitution comes down from an understanding of the humanities.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the Chairman agrees that the Woodrow Wilson National Center for Scholars is obviously an extraordinary program. I was planning to offer an amendment which would restore the \$750,000, but I learned from you in informal conversation that this figure will be realized. Can the gentleman explain that again?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Office of Management and Budget saw fit to put \$130,000 of 1971 appropriated funds in reserve. They will free those this July 1st, and make available the total budget estimate of \$695,000; so there will be about the same operating level of funds available in 1972 that were provided for 1971. We hope that none of this appropriation is put in reserve again.

Mr. DELLUMS. My last question, Madam Chairman, is this: Obviously, being new to this body and trying to research some of the history of congressional action, I have learned, as is often the case, the Senate tends to appropriate at a higher level than the House. I was wondering if that should take place on the Senate side with respect to the Interior appropriation bill, would the committee see fit to support those increases?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We usually sit down and have a thorough discussion of the bill. I may say that the other body is as deeply concerned about these programs we are funding as we are.

The conference report we bring back for House approval may be higher than this bill because the Senate is considering several budget amendments that were received too late for House consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is today considering legislation that includes the appropriation for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, and it is my hope that the Congress will strongly support this request. My interest in this program has been reinforced by the enthusiastic support of Dr. D. B. Varner, the crackjack good chancellor of the University of Nebraska. Dr. Varner, long active in the development of the arts and humanities, feels that this program should be high on our list of priorities. I agree.

For many years the United States has lagged far behind in cultural achievement, because of the absence of a national commitment to improving our standing in the international cultural community, as well as the absence of the environment and facilities necessary to allow for the development of our talent in these fields. This is no longer the case. Since the inception of the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities in 1966, the United States has begun to take its rightful place among the leading cultural nations of the world. But there is much to be done if we are to fully realize our potential and continue to make a meaningful contribution.

The development of the arts and humanities is essential if we are to utilize the talent available and provide man with great art, literature, poetry, and theater—all necessary to a civilized society seeking understanding, knowledge, and beauty.

All of the major nations of the world recognize their responsibilities to cultural achievement, and it is imperative that the United States be willing to provide the necessary tools for the development of its own cultural achievements.

The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities is the tool. During its few short years of operation, the Foundation has brought culture to the underprivileged who might otherwise never have experienced it and has supported and encouraged our youth in realizing their talent. The Foundation has strengthened every aspect of the performing and nonperforming arts, has assisted in providing communities all across America with permanent facilities for the continued development of its cultural community, and has provided support for artists to enable them to pursue their careers in the arts. These are just a few of the contributions made by the Foundation, and their plans for the future are more exciting than ever.

There are programs to preserve our history through assistance to museums, historical societies, and educational programs; to support and preserve the cultural history of America's minority groups; to bring to communities all across the country theater, art, sculpture, and literary achievements; and, perhaps most important of all, to provide our youth with a cultural heritage that will be second to none.

Mr. Chairman, the tempo of the times demands that man have some respite

from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. The National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities can provide that respite, but it must have the support of Congress and the American people if it is to continue to grow, to contribute, and to serve.

Nancy Hanks, Mike Straight, Wally Edgerton, the distinguished Councils on the Arts and Humanities, and their most effective barrister, Larry Reger, are to be complimented on the superb administration of this program.

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend my colleague from Washington and the members of her subcommittee on the fine job they did in producing a most difficult bill. In reviewing the administration budget requests I was highly concerned about the insensitivity shown to many of the needs of our Western United States. I was distressed, for instance, at the administration's lack of concern for the difficulty the Golden Spike National Historic Site would have faced had it lost the locomotives which are so integral a part of its appeal. I was distressed because the administration cut the budget for Flamingo George Recreation Area at a time when the number of visitors there is increasing by 7 percent per year. I was concerned by the snails pace at which the access road construction was proceeding at Canyonlands National Park. I was concerned because the administration failed to ask for Clarke-McNary funding to the level of authorization and because the shrub research program did not receive the attention it deserved.

Our colleague from Washington and her subcommittee corrected these unfortunate oversights. Her awareness of and sensitivity to the area of responsibility within the purview of her subcommittee, indeed is remarkable. One difficulty in the administration budget she was unable to correct was its inadequate request for funding oil shale research. Increasing appropriations is of no avail when the administration has minimized the importance of the project and provided no initiative. The rate of depletion of our oil resources has been the subject of many speeches and articles and the development of shale oil has been discussed as a potential new source of this valuable fuel, but environmental and technological problems need to be overcome before this potential can be realized. It would be inappropriate for me to take the time of this body at this time to discuss the formidable problems in this area and some of the imaginative proposals for overcoming them, but I do want to point out that studies by the Department of the Interior and private industrial groups and hearings before a congressional committee have pointed out that any program in developing this resource will require substantial participation by the Government.

The amount requested by the administration reflects its lack of enthusiasm for the challenge of oil shale development. Our colleague from Washington and her committee have shown their interest in this enterprise by giving the administration all that it asks for. It is up to the

administration to take the initiative in the future and see to it that this resource is available before the need for it is upon us.

I shall call upon the appropriate officials regularly to obtain this action. Once again, Mr. Chairman, may I commend Mrs. HANSEN and her subcommittee for the keen awareness of the problems of this Nation.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support passage of H.R. 9417, but I also want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished lady from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, for the tremendous task she and the subcommittee have just finished. Mrs. HANSEN has and indeed deserves utmost praise and admiration for a "big job very well done."

H.R. 9417 in its entirety is a good bill and it does contain 3 line items in which I have been expressly interested. It is of paramount importance to me that funds for forestland management have been increased above the 1972 budget estimate. That \$210,000 of the appropriation is allocated to be used in Clark National Forest in Missouri for "wildlife habitat management and stand improvement" is "good news."

Wildlife habitat is an area which is now recognized as being in the "critical shortage" category. Attention must be given, therefore, to wildlife habitat as it is included among the Nation's shrinking natural resources. In the last decade conservationists have alerted both State and National Government entities to the fact that in the not too distant future, the "demand will outweigh supply." The time may be "later than we think."

The Nation's abundant and rich resources are the natural treasury with which we have been endowed by the Creator. Certainly, no one will deny that they are the basic reasons and the buttress of our greatness as a people and as a nation, and as legislators we have the obligation of preserving these natural resources for posterity. Many species of valuable wildlife in Missouri and the Nation are rapidly becoming extinct, because of diminishing habitat areas, and unless positive action is taken very soon to provide maximum funds for research in wildlife habitat, it is going to be too late too soon to insure adequate populations of wildlife. Such species as prairie chicken, migratory birds including mourning doves, to name only two important ones, may soon be "species of the past," so any further delay in providing the necessary research funds could and would, most probably, become false economy.

Personally, I believe it will be far less costly to face these matters now and sagaciously plan ahead than to later adopt crash programs and "grandiose" projects as we have in other areas of conservation.

H.R. 9417 also provides for the construction and development of Roby Lake in Texas County, Mo. Roby Lake will become a foremost recreational facility in my area of Missouri and offers camping, picnicking, swimming, hiking, and horseback riding for over 30,000 visitor days annually. The \$89,000 recommended by

the committee will cover the total cost for the actual construction of the dam and facilities. The outlet works, needed land, and plans and specifications have already been acquired. I have worked for some time in behalf of this project which is urgently needed in the surrounding rural areas. The economical and recreational benefits far outweigh the construction cost.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I support the \$3.5 million be added to the budget estimate for the 50-50 cooperation of the Federal Government with State governments for forest fire control authorized under the Clarke-McNary Act which will bring the total appropriation to \$27,741,000. In view of the fact that in the last 10 years wildfires have destroyed great areas of timber land all over the country causing billions of dollars in damage, we certainly must make every effort to strengthen fire prevention and law enforcement efforts to reduce the number of man-caused fires. Additional State facilities, ground equipment as well as new aircraft units are desperately needed for the States to effectively control forest fires, and I am very much in favor of the increased appropriations for this purpose.

H.R. 9417 has my complete support.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's recommendation that \$61,460,000 be appropriated in new budget—obligation—authority for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, as stated in title II of H.R. 9417.

Although the bill as reported by the committee provides \$2 million less than requested in the budget for salaries and expenses for the Endowment for the Humanities, and provides \$101,000 less than the budget request for administrative expenses for the Foundation and the endowments, the committee otherwise approved appropriations for the Foundation as requested in the budget. The bill provides \$28,150,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1971. In addition to these appropriations, it is estimated approximately \$7 million will be available to the Foundation in this next fiscal year through gifts and donations.

The largest proportionate increase in funding provided in the budget and in the bill will go into programs designed to increase creativity, increasing fellowships for painters, musicians, photographers, and experimental art programs. In the humanities, the largest single increase will go to programs to "bring the humanities closer to the average citizen." The Endowment for the Arts expects to add a program to help opera and choral groups, and to increase aid to museums.

The Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 has had broad bipartisan support since its first enactment, as did the extension of that act enacted in the last Congress. As President Nixon said in December, 1969, upon his urging extension of the authorization:

The attention and support we give the arts and humanities . . . represent a vital part of our commitment to enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

The Endowment for the Arts and the Endowment for the Humanities both have significant contributions to the effort to encourage art and humanistic study and research and to broaden opportunities for public consumption.

Through the activities of the State Art Councils alone, the Endowment for the Arts has made it possible for programs in the various arts disciplines—the visual arts, theater, literature, dance, architecture, music, and arts education—to reach into the lives of more than 30 million Americans. It would indeed be tragic if we did not continue and enlarge upon this stimulation and encouragement to the works of artists and scholars so that their works might become even more broadly available throughout the land to enrich the lives of all citizens.

As President Nixon has pointed out, both of the two agencies comprising the Foundation—the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities—have developed programs that reach far beyond our major cultural centers, "reaching more people than has ever before been possible."

When the legislation authorizing continuation of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was before the House last June, I brought to the attention of my colleagues on the House floor various articles and editorials from newspapers in my Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, praising the National Humanities Series team visit to Cherokee, Iowa, a community which had already demonstrated its interest in the humanities. The National Humanities Series, developed by the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation and funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, was presented by teams last year to this 30 communities throughout the Nation in a program designed to make the humanities—literature, philosophy, art, music, film—relevant to the everyday life of "rural" residents. This program was highly experimental—but it has proved very worthwhile and should be continued and expanded. As a Cherokee Daily Times editorial of March 5, 1970, declared, the Humanities Series was "Food for the Soul," which "if partaken of by us, can give us broader perspective and understanding toward those around us."

Other types of projects of the Humanities Endowment have also helped humanists "stir people to think." Among these have been films and television programs using the humanities, such as the historical documentary "The Trail of Tears." The endowment has also funded workshops and internships for training workers needed desperately by historical societies and museums. Through these efforts the endowment has supported preservation for future generations of actual objects which are part of the American heritage.

As former president of the Sioux City Symphony Orchestra, I must admit special interest in the Arts Endowment's efforts during this current fiscal year in expanding and improving public service and quality of many of the fine orchestras of the land. In many cases these

symphony orchestras could have gone under without this small but significant assistance; instead, they are thriving—but from time to time they may need a modicum of help to get them through rough times

An article in Cultural Affairs last fall stated that gross expenses in 1968 for the 88 orchestras with budgets of more than \$100,000 were \$66,794,000 against earned income of \$33,842,000.

As Mrs. Lee Bliesman of Denison Iowa, a member of the Iowa State Arts Council, stated in a recent council newsletter:

The arts in smaller communities and rural areas are somewhat different than in the cities. We do not have art museums with fine collections of art. Nor do we have nine foot concert pianos readily available.

Ah, but we do have a tangible hunger for the very same cultural enrichment our city cousins have at their fingertips.

There was a time—just a few short years ago—when a rural community could not finance programs by performing artists or were even aware of the fine arts available. What a difference the Iowa Arts Council makes! This central communication center has joined all 99 counties together with a common purpose—to give artists an opportunity to perform for appreciative audiences. With a minimum of funds and a maximum amount of enthusiasm every community, big and small, can enjoy the best that Iowa has to offer in the creative arts. The increasing number of community arts councils is a strong indication that we realize where there are no art patrons there can be no great art.

In a country described as being the most art conscious and receptive in the world it is no mystery why Iowa has a growing appetite for improving the quality of its environment.

I would add my commendation for the work of the Iowa Arts Council, and note that this activity would not be possible without the support it receives from the National Foundation.

President Nixon has shown keen awareness of the great potential of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities for stimulating and improving America's cultural life, accurately stressing the urgent need for protecting and improving our cultural environment, and realistically defining the Federal role in attaining this objective as supportive rather than primary.

The fact that the President and the House Appropriations Committee recommend the substantial increase in funds for the Foundation contained in the bill now before the House, and the fact that this House and the Senate will, I predict, approve this funding, proves that the Nixon administration and this Congress are not just working for our country's material progress but also have deep concern for things of the spirit.

Miss Nancy Hanks has more than fulfilled President Nixon's and the Congress' high expectations in her service as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts. With the full backing of the President, Miss Hanks has developed a very effective program. The funding provided in the bill before the House will enable Miss Hanks and her great team of dedicated men and women to continue to implement these programs. I urge my

colleagues to support the appropriation for the National Foundation for the Arts and for the Humanities as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, and to defeat any amendments proposing to reduce that funding.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the work done by the Subcommittee on the Interior of the House Appropriations Committee under the extremely able leadership of its chairwoman, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This subcommittee has taken two major steps to improve the Federal programs assisting the Indian population of the United States, particularly the urban Indian population.

The first step is in the form of a directive to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the report filed by the House Appropriations Committee, House Report 92-308, the committee calls for a reassessment by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of its relationship to the thousands of Indians who live off-reservation. As the report notes, these urban Indians account for 40 percent of the entire Indian population in our society. Further, the committee directs the Bureau to make available to any urban Indian the referral and employment services which are presently only provided for a small number of those Indians living in these settings. This mandate, given to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, emphasizes the congressional intent to deal with some of the major problems facing Indians in cities.

The committee took another major step on behalf of urban Indians. The committee approved funding for a pilot urban health project in Minneapolis, to be funded under the Indian Health Services Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The \$150,000 earmarked in the report filed by the Appropriations Committee for this project would permit the development of an important health project to serve the health needs of the Indians in Minneapolis. The following letter, from Dr. Jean Smelker, which I will submit for the RECORD, provides startling information as to the health needs facing urban Indians. I particularly want to commend Mrs. HANSEN and the members of her subcommittee for indicating their support for this especially important project.

The letter follows:

APRIL 23, 1971.

CONGRESSWOMAN JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations,  
Department of the Interior, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN JULIA BUTLER HANSEN: My name is Jean Smelker, and I write to you as a private citizen. Let me give you a little perspective, so that you may better understand my writing. I am a physician, the director of the Community-University Health Care Center and Assistant Professor, Department of Family Practice and Community Medicine at the University of Minnesota. For the first twelve years of my professional life I was in private practice in Topeka, Kansas, limiting my field to the care of children. For approximately 10 of those years I was also a pediatric consultant for the Indian Public Health Service at Holten, Kansas, and the "unofficial" physician to the majority of the "Urban" Indian children, living in the adjacent Shawnee county, but ineligible for serv-

ices because they lived in Topeka. For the next three years I was the clinical director of Children and Youth Project No. 641 in Topeka, Kansas. This project delivered continuing, comprehensive health care to primarily minority children in a poverty area of Topeka and during the last year in which I was associated with this project, we elected to serve the Indian children throughout Shawnee county, as well as those living in the more circumscribed area which the project served. In the summer of 1970, I moved, with my family, to Minneapolis, Minnesota and was fortunate enough to step into the recently vacated position of clinic director of a sister project, Children and Youth Project No. 603A, the University of Minnesota's sub-project of the larger Minneapolis Health Department O and Y Project.

One very unique feature of the Minneapolis sub-project is its location in an area where the American Indian population is most heavily concentrated. Geared to serve, in depth, the health needs of low income children in its catchment area and blessed with an evaluation system which is without question the most elegant ever devised for health purposes, the potentiality for studying the health needs and behaviour of the urban Native American has, unfortunately, only recently been fully recognized. The fact that, after four and one half years of operation we are just now beginning to ask "what is comprehensive care for the Indian child (of what does it consist?)" is perhaps not merely a reflection of our own stupidity. It seems to be a question that few have asked and fewer still have answered. Building upon the recent survey, done by Minnesota Systems Research, on Health Needs and Behaviour of the Indians in Hennepin County, we are in the process of restructuring our program to get some answers to health needs of urban Indian children. Fortunately, we have some figures to turn to and build upon.

We learn from the foregoing report done by Minnesota Systems Research, that there are approximately 12,000 to 15,000 Indians living in Hennepin County, with the most of them concentrated in the area which our clinic serves. Our project is geared to serve roughly 2,500 children, given our current budget and staffing. About one third of our registrants are Indians under the age of 18 years. This would suggest that our "sample" is roughly that which represents a need eight to ten times as great as we are able to serve. Considering that our outreach has not been one of the strongest elements of our program as far as the Indian population is concerned, the estimate of real and even greater need is probably much greater.

It is possible to break these health needs down into two main categories; those needs related to poverty in general and those which have perhaps a genetic, and certainly at least a cultural or ethnic basis. Undoubtedly there will be some overlapping, but for the sake of simplicity perhaps we can begin here. How health behaviour modifies the needs and fulfilling of these needs is of course a very complex business, but one which cannot be wholly ignored in this discussion either. As a baseline regarding some health needs associated with poverty, let me quote some figures which suggest how some of the urban Indian's health statistics may be related to socio-economic factors, when needs for better jobs, better housing, better education (some sort of stability and/or security?) in short, the need for more dollars. The median number of Indian persons living in the same dwelling is 2.85 in our area. 49.77% of households surveyed receive welfare support, of those not receiving such support 27.41 have a yearly income of \$3,000 or less, 37.15% earn between \$3,000 and \$6,000 and 24.75% earn more than \$6,000 per year. Almost half of the households have children of school age and one out of three

of these households reported school difficulties due to health problems. In 42.67% of the households surveyed no male over 21 years of age or older is present, in 45.78% of the households at least one person is employed. The median number of years of school completed for this group is 9.89 years, 65.77% of those surveyed do not have a driver's license and only 28.88% of the households have a car available during the day. Almost half, 49.78% of the households, do not have health insurance coverage. The median length of time lived in the present dwelling is 1.11 years, which means that urban Indians move almost once a year within the city. (Shorter time of residence in a dwelling is clearly linked with lower income.) The median length of residence in Minneapolis is 8.95 years and the longer the length of residence in the city, the higher the income tends to be. Just over 81% of the households had someone receiving medical care within the year, one-fifth of that care was received in private situations, one fifth in government-supported centers (including ours) and three fifths in emergency rooms or out-patient departments. Fortunately, almost all pregnancies receive medical care during delivery and most receive at least some pre-natal care. Although 8 out of 10 households judged someone to be in need of dental care, in one out of four households none has received dental care in the past two years. (Two out of three dental visits are for extraction or filling.) An overwhelming 84.88% of households stated that they had no money available for medical care and interestingly almost the same percentage of those interviewed would prefer free medical and dental care versus paying a small fee. Not surprisingly, 94.21% of the households would like to go to a health care clinic with Indian employees. At the time of the interviews, in the fall of 1970, nine-tenths of the respondents would seek future non-emergency medical care in the Twin Cities area and almost all would seek emergency care there.

Three out of five would seek their emergency care at the county hospital and two out of five would seek their non-emergency care in the clinics there (suggesting this is the only real possibility open to them in most cases). Although we are in the midst of collating our figures, one of the most obvious health problems related to poverty seen at our clinic, in the pediatric population, is the marginal nutritional adjustment which so many Indian children have. There is simply not enough money for adequate food in a good many households. Much of the chronic illness, the recurrent infections, must certainly be related to this single factor. Especially in the winter time, the respiratory infections which are almost universal and unending, can in part be related to the inadequate housing as well as to the poor nutrition. Certainly the learning disabilities so common in inner city school populations, are again related to factors that are influenced by poverty and the kind of medical care available to the poor. Most of the new cases of tuberculosis identified in Minneapolis last year lived on the near south side. Problems of alcoholism, suicide and general depression are found, as with all poverty groups. The cross-fire of cross-cultural pressures undoubtedly increases the problem. Among Indian children in our area, otitis media—middle ear infection—and its attendant short and long-term hearing handicaps stands out as a problem of major proportion (much as it does in other Indian populations).

Having to stand by and watch—or learn later of—many high risk urban children and their elders as they "fall through the cracks" of existing health services in the cities, I urge your committee to move vigorously towards some realistic plan for health care of the urban Indian. I also urge you to carefully con-

sider the kind of health care system that should be provided for. Experience, amply documented, of comprehensive health care services given over the past four and a half years to some 440,000 children in the Children and Youth Project programs has demonstrated that such care can change the disease pattern of the population it serves. Certainly a change in the morbidity and mortality statistics in the American Indian population is much to be desired. The C and Y experience has also demonstrated quite conclusively the high cost of episodic services, which in most cases is the only kind of care now available to the urban Indians I am acquainted with, both in Topeka and Minneapolis. Although episodic care may relieve the pain temporarily, it does nothing to change the overall disease pattern, in short it is only a temporary favor to those it serves and should not be seen otherwise. The time to provide for continuing comprehensive health care services to the urban Indian, in a way which is accessible to him, available in terms of cost and acceptable to him seems long over due to those of us who have had to be a party to makeshift care for so long. It seems to me that decisions made by your committee could go a long way towards helping to correct this situation.

Sincerely,  
 JEAN H. SMELKER, M.D.,  
 Director, Community-University Health  
 Care Center.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to learn in my discussion with the distinguished Member from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BULTER HANSEN, chairman of the Interior subcommittee, that no funds are appropriated in this bill for the helium fund for fiscal year 1972.

However, it is not clear whether the Government can continue to make purchases and payments out of the helium fund, in which the Government investment is estimated at \$403.4 million by June 30, 1972. Of this investment, \$288.3 million will be owed to the U.S. Treasury, leaving a net investment balance of \$115.1 million.

Apparently it will be necessary to change the basic law to prevent incursions or misuse of the helium fund. It is my intention to prepare legislation which will terminate the legislative authority for the program in order to prevent continued wasteful expenditure by the Federal Government.

The offshore oil leasing program is also of grave concern to me. In the Wall Street Journal, of May 13, 1971, it was stated that—

For every eight dollars spent for federal offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico in the last three bonus bidding sales, only one dollar has been spent in actual exploratory drilling.

On that same day, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, directing his attention to this article stating:

It seems to me that the federal gas and oil leases should provide that the lessee must exercise prompt and scheduled drilling and pumping, or suffer the termination of his lease. If the federal government is permitting lessees to option off these huge reserves and freeze them from production, it would be contrary to the public interest, would limit American produced supplies, and would increase consumer costs by keeping producing areas out of production.

Thereafter, on June 11, 1971, I was advised by Mr. W. A. Radlinski, Acting Director of the U.S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey that—

There are no specific contractual requirements in OCS leases for drilling and production within time periods occurring prior to the termination of the 5-year primary term. However, we believe that the present method of competitive bonus bidding for OCS leases encourages both early production and complete extraction. Bonus bidding insures that the operation is undertaken by a capable and financially responsible operator, assures a fair value to the government, and provides efficient lease sale evaluation and administration by the government. The successful bonus bidder is generally quite optimistic about finding oil or gas and has backed this with a substantial amount of money. The lessee will begin exploration as quickly as possible in order to recover his capital or take a tax deduction on his loss.

The term of OCS leases is five years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced in paying quantities or approved drilling or well reworking operations are conducted. This is a relatively short period of time to establish actual production in the offshore environment. The Department of the Interior strictly enforces its rules and regulations requiring diligent development and production of leases. These rules and regulations were developed pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and represent the maximum feasible standards on performance by lessees.

There are several justifiable reasons to delay development drilling or to leave wells shut in for a period of time on an OCS lease such as; distance from existing pipelines; time to develop additional reserves, construct development platforms, acquire Federal Power Commission certification, or time to negotiate a sales contract. The Department is closely investigating each non-producing lease which is in its extended term. If circumstances warrant such action, additional development and production will be required within a specified time or the lease will terminate as a result of disallowing additional suspensions of production.

It seems to me that in the granting of mineral right leases on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf there should be a legislative requirement that development and production occur within a mandatory time frame as a condition of the lease.

If official policy does not compel development and production on a realistic timetable, these new fields may not contribute to solving the alleged gas and oil shortage problem.

It would be tragic to sell off mineral rights which belong to the people of the United States to purchasers who endeavor to keep the resources off the market to suppress production in order to protect pricing policies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior, under the leadership of its able and distinguished chairman, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, has again demonstrated its longtime commitment to the preservation of our natural resources and open spaces.

The bill before us today provides the funding necessary for vital land acquisition in national park areas throughout the country. Approval of the committee recommendations will provide \$10 million for land acquisition in the Ever-

glades National Park in south Florida as well as \$2.945 million for acquisition in the Biscayne National Monument. Funds in the fiscal year 1972 budget for Biscayne National Monument will complete acquisition in that area under the current authorization.

The determination to proceed expeditiously wherever possible with land acquisition is a wise one from both an economic and efficiency standpoint as well as from a conservation standpoint. We all have seen difficulties developed with escalating land prices—often resulting in a timelag between authorization and acquisition of as much as 20 years. Not only is this inequitable to private property owners, but it inevitably costs the Federal Government additional money.

From a conservation standpoint, it is vital to the preservation of unique areas that all land within a park's boundaries be administered by the National Park Service. Allowing private "inholdings" to remain endangers the whole area.

I congratulate our colleague, Mrs. HANSEN, for her longstanding record as an advocate of conservation. We are all indebted to her and the subcommittee for their foresight. I thank them in behalf of all of south Florida and the hundreds of thousands of citizens who will visit and enjoy the scenic and recreational areas throughout the country.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I object to the current practice in the House of concealing absurd appropriations behind generalized language that is innocuous and, at first glance, appealing. It is like buying a book for the art work on the cover and finding the contents bore no relationship. Virtually all of the Members of this House depend primarily on the language of the bill being considered as the basis for their vote. Few have the time to read the accompanying committee report, and even fewer Members have the time to read the voluminous hearings conducted by the committee that is reporting the bill.

This is unfortunate, for often the Members give their approval to appropriations for items foreign to the interests of this country, or, in some cases, to those organizations actually opposed to the ideals and beliefs that form the basis of our system of government. Were all of the items contained in one of the generalized appropriations bills that have come before this House ever made public knowledge, few, if any, of the present body would dare stand for reelection.

The bill under consideration, H.R. 9417, "Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," is an example of my point.

Consider the amount designated by this bill for the "National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities." This committee has asked the Members to approve an appropriation of \$54,460,000 for the fiscal year 1972, or an increase of \$28,150,000 over the amount designated for this purpose in the fiscal year 1971. This is a tremendous increase in this appropriation, yet the committee has seen fit to summarize this sizable appropriation

in a single page of the bill—33—and actually devotes less than one-half page to this topic in the committee report—30-31—and if one only read this material as the basis for voting, he would probably support the measure.

This, however, is not the full story. The true story of the appropriation of \$54,460,000 of our taxpayers' money and how it will be thrown away can be found in volume 5 of the six-volume work that constitutes the "Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations." Even a third grader, if he had access to this information, would come to the conclusion that this Congress is bent and determined to give away the wealth of the people of the United States, regardless of the worth and/or absurdity of the intended project.

The data contained in these volumes of hearings is shocking. I would like to quote briefly from pages 452-465 of volume 5 to give this House some indication of where the taxpayers' money is going and what it is being used for. I am certain that this information will shock my colleagues as much as it did me. These answers were provided as representative examples of the types of grants awarded by the National Foundation—The scholars receive taxpayer money—

To broaden their knowledge of the literature of French Africa.

To explore the origins and development of the independent black church movement between 1790 and 1840.

To continue work on a book he is writing on civil disobedience.

To study the theme of man's alienation from the natural world in 20th-century American literature.

To examine the 16th-century experience with the argument of insanity as a legal defense in criminal cases.

To study the nature of satire in literature as well as in the visual arts.

To study the relationships between ecology and humanistic studies.

To study the black French culture of the Island of Martinique.

To write a book on film esthetics, as a natural extension of two projects: (1) A philosophical examination of the role knowledge about an art plays in criticism; (2) An examination of attempts to do systematic film criticism.

To make a critical study of the man and his work to show his contribution to black culture in particular and to literature in general.

To write a book dealing with art and the esthetic.

To make an in-depth examination of sociolinguistics for its relevance to the study of Mexican-American bilingualism.

The above examples are but a small drop compared to the buckets of money that will be wasted if this bill is approved. The list of trivia continues ad infinitum. I could not have explained to the people of my district why they should support an appropriations bill of this nature while taxes continue to rise and prices go higher and higher while money gets tighter and tighter.

Mr. Chairman, the duplicity involved in the appropriations for the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities is repeated in other portions of this bill. I could never conceive of forcing the taxpayers of this country to pay for the idle

recreation of a select few. I intend to cast my people's vote against H.R. 9417.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$76,080,00.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this bill calls for \$2,350,145,035, or an increase of \$153,860,135 over the spending for the same general purposes last year. This is beyond acceptance. At a time when this country is desperately in need of drastic savings on the part of the Federal Government, when it is facing a desperate fiscal situation at home and abroad, to bring a bill out with this kind of increase I say again is beyond acceptance.

My friend from Missouri Dr. HALL, mentioned a little while ago the increase for the arts and humanities. I do not know how anyone can possibly justify an increase of \$28,150,000, to a total of \$54,460,000 in 1 year for the arts and humanities when the taxpayers who have to cough up this increase will not have enough left after they pay their taxes to buy a ticket to the ballet or the opera they are forced to subsidize.

The hearings show it is freely admitted that not one major orchestra, opera or ballet company in this country is operating in the black. Obviously, if the public is so hungry for these things that segment of the public ought to be willing to pay for them.

Not long ago Congress defeated the subsidy program for the supersonic transport. The Government was subsidizing that airplane for the "jet set" by taxing the mass of the people. The mass of the people revolted and forced an end to that Government subsidy.

Now here you are subsidizing the arts, which the great mass of the people obviously neither want nor patronize. You had better look out for a taxpayer revolt in this area, too.

Here are some examples of the way this outfit throws away money.

An English professor is getting a grant to study the movies.

A classics professor has a fellowship to "study the impact of legal thought on the politics, religion and philosophy of the fifth century Athenian democracy."

A physics teacher is studying how scientific disputes are resolved in the scientific community.

A history teacher is making a study of "the oral folk poems of Vietnam." I am sure that will be a brilliant contribution.

A French teacher is studying "the development of social and political con-

sciousness in the main characters of leading representative novels of the 19th century." How nice.

The Foundation is spending our tax dollars for "An historical analysis of the French Army Officer Corps," of the 18th century.

Several thousand dollars is going for "The Peruvian Experience, 1529-1650." What about the recent Peruvian experience, when they learned how to hijack American fishing boats on the high seas, and seized millions of dollars worth of Americans property in Peru for which they have not made restitution.

And more thousands are going for "Mesopotamia—The Classical Phase," whatever that is. Undoubtedly that has already been studied to death.

There's \$23,000 for a history of urban renewal in the United States. How many other thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent to study urban renewal in the United States?

Then there is the study of Africans in the Roman Empire. I am sure that will lend a lot of help to the situation of the taxpayers of this country.

This bill also provides for "a study of the relations of fishing boat crew members and how they relate to conflict groups in a peasant fishing town in Yugoslavia."

Do you have any idea of what that is all about? And then there is the ecology and behavior of the wild boar in West Pakistan. How is that for a nice little study?

The ecology of gazelles in Israel and mammals in Morocco is under study and there's also a study of the biological rhythms of the catfish—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Yes, a study of the biological rhythms of the catfish in India. These catfish are apparently different than the catfish in the Mississippi River, or would one of my friends from Alabama or Mississippi agree with the statement that the catfish in India have different rhythms than those in the Mississippi River?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I know nothing about catfish in India.

Mr. GROSS. How about Alabama?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Oh, they are good.

Mr. GROSS. I know they are good, but is their rhythm different?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know anything about catfish rhythms.

Mr. GROSS. So here we are today being asked to spend \$154 million more than was spent last year for this and a lot of other claptrap. I would like to hear and see someone get up on the floor of the House today and defend this kind of business. For my part, I am not going to be a party to this raid on America's taxpayers.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, \$73,630,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: Page 15, at the end of line 17, insert: "No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay any public relations firm for any promotional campaigns among coal miners."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am prone to accept the amendment, at least on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the time of the Committee with an excessive amount of discussion of this amendment, if it is acceptable to the Committee. I will just take a little time to explain its purpose, because the legislative history is important.

I would merely like to observe that this amendment does tie in very closely with the committee's objectives, inasmuch as the committee report reveals that public relations activities have been cut by the committee in numerous instances. I do not think we can produce safety in the coal mines by a Madison Avenue propaganda barrage. You cannot sell coal miners like you sell soap.

The coal miners of West Virginia and the Nation are not going to fall for this kind of a snow job. Here is a timely editorial in this morning's Washington Post, which comes at a very opportune moment:

#### MINE SAFETY: A "CRUEL . . . STUPID" CAMPAIGN

As if the nation's coal miners don't have enough trouble—risking death and injury in the industry with the nation's highest accident rate—they will soon be the object of a campaign to convince the public that miners, not mine owners, are mostly responsible for coal mine tragedies. The Bureau of Mines is about to launch an aggressive public relations and advertising effort, aimed mostly at coal miners, that will use television, radio, print media, billboards, bumper stickers and lapel buttons; the purpose is to convey the message that if miners would shape up while in the shafts and tunnels accidents would not happen.

It will take a considerable propaganda effort to make the point. According to the amply and grimly documented report of the General Accounting Office, issued earlier this month, the major cause of mine accidents is first, the failure of the Bureau of Mines to enforce the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act and, second, the failure of many coal companies to clean up their mines. It is true that accidents in the past have been caused by lax miners, but the testimony of Elmer B. Staats of the GAO is that nine of every ten underground coal mine accidents can be traced to inadequate safety precautions on the part of the operators. Rep. Ken Hechler of West Virginia, whose hard work helped en-

act the 1969 law, says the miners of his state "are not stupid enough to swallow" a mass-media public relations campaign. "Why doesn't the Bureau of Mines," ask Rep. Hechler, "get on with the job of enforcing the health and safety law, instead of trying to give the miners a snow job?"

Good question. Last week, the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee announced it would investigate the Bureau of Mines' plan and try to find the answer. Chairman Henry Reuss (D.-Wis.) is already skeptical. "This proposal will cost the federal government and taxpayers several hundred thousand dollars. . . In view of the industry's unenviable record of safety violations and fatalities, would not this money be better spent for law enforcement than for publicity experts?"

It is known that the idea for a public relations approach to mine safety came from Harry W. Treleven Jr., an ad man who directed publicity strategy for the 1968 Nixon campaign and who became a \$121-a-day consultant to the Interior Department shortly after Rogers C. B. Morton left the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee to head Interior. Last month, his consulting finished, Treleven made an unsolicited proposal to the Bureau of Mines for a public relations campaign on safety, proposing that his new company—Allison, Treleven and Rietz, do the promotion jointly with a Nashville public relations firm. The latter—the Holder-Kennedy Co.—successfully managed the Republican television campaign against Sen. Albert Gore in 1970.

While the Bureau of Mines considers the Treleven offer, and one from other firms, we direct your attention to a comment by Rep. Hechler that the whole proposal is "cruel, heartless, arrogant and stupid, in that order." There is even a question according to Rep. Reuss, about its legality. His investigation will serve a useful purpose if it can help stop this scheme.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is designed to prevent the Interior Department and the Bureau of Mines from using funds appropriated by this bill to finance a campaign to make the miners of this Nation a "fall guy" for mine accidents that daily cause their death.

As of June 1, 1971, 87 coal miners met their death in the Nation's coal mines—three more than the number killed in the comparable period in 1970. The Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer B. Staats, recently said that 90 percent of the accidents in the coal industry are not miner caused. In a comprehensive report of May 13, 1971, the GAO stated that:

Interior Department's policies for enforcing health and safety standards have been, at times extremely lenient, confusing, uncertain, and inequitable.

Despite this, the Interior Department has decided to embark on a costly program to convince the miners that they are to blame for accidents.

The proposal was first made on May 20, 1971, to the Bureau of Mines by Harry W. Treleven, Jr., of the public relations firm Allison, Treleven & Rietz. The proposal was for a "full-scale, all media communications program" to help "motivate miners "to do what is right." And the Bureau thereafter began negotiations on an emergency basis with the Treleven firm without soliciting bids. When the press got wind of the scheme and publi-

cized it, the Bureau took the Treleven proposal, made some minor changes, and then sent it out on June 10, 1971, as an invitation for bids. The bids were due back 6 days later on June 16, 1971.

Both the Treleven and the Bureau's proposal call for the use of television, radio, newspapers, billboards, posters, buttons, bumper stickers, and pamphlets aimed at "motivating workers to adopt safer working habits and in actually changing behavior."

It is estimated that this proposal will cost the Government between a quarter and a half a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, these funds could be better used for enforcement of the mine safety law rather than publicity campaigns.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have read the language of the gentleman's amendment. I know the gentleman is sincerely interested in the problem of coal mine safety. I want to propound this question to the gentleman.

It is true, is it not, that you are in no way attempting to impede any educational program that might be carried forward in connection with improving safety in the coal mines of America?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I know shares my strong belief in better mine safety, that there must be education by the fulltime employees of the Bureau of Mines in order to produce more safety in the mines.

I feel, in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that you cannot substitute public relations or propaganda for education, even if you label such a public relations campaign as "education." What I object to is the use of an outside, nongovernmental public relations firm that has contracted with the Bureau of Mines, and has no relationship, knowledge or understanding of the coal mining industry or coal mines or miners themselves. That can scarcely be called education to improve safety.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, of course, my friend recognizes the fact that they do use consultants on many occasions for many purposes. I simply want the Record to reflect that we are not, if this amendment is agreed to, impeding in any way the Bureau of Mines in its health and safety functions as it makes an effort to improve health and safety in the United States.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I certainly think that this amendment would not in any way impede health and safety, and I am glad my friend from Pennsylvania raised that question. As a matter of fact, the gentleman will recognize that the language in my original amendment was changed to take out the words "health and safety" and at the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, it merely covers "any promotional campaigns."

Mr. McDADE. On that basis, and rec-

ognizing the gentleman's interest in trying to assist the Bureau of Mines in attacking the problem of coal mine safety, I will say that we, on this side, have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to submit data relating to matters in the pending appropriation bill which relate to strip mining, minerals in the Monongahela National Forest, and certain legal and constitutional issues which relate to these issues.

The pending bill includes a provision for a \$300,000 mineral survey of the Monongahela National Forest in eastern West Virginia. The money will be used to start a 2-year study of the minerals, including their ownership and value. The U.S. Forest Service, in a letter to me dated June 28, 1971, estimates that the total cost of the study will be \$600,000. Thus, another \$300,000 will be required next year to complete the study.

The purpose of the study is to develop the cost estimates leading to an acquisition program by the Forest Service of the minerals underlying the surface. The Forest Service estimates that in four critical areas of the forest the underlying coal deposits totals 659 million tons—Dolly Sods, 65 million tons; Otter Creek Basin, 24 million tons; Cranberry Back-Country, 220 million tons, and Shavers Fork, 260 million tons. The cost of acquiring these minerals is staggering.

I believe that we need not spend this sum if we were to act imaginatively and resolve that the National Forests and other Federal lands are treasures that must be preserved for future generations of Americans. They must be spared the terrible onslaught of the "Big Muskie"—the largest mobile land machine in the world towering 10 stories high and as wide as an eight-lane highway, with a bucket that scoops up 325 tons of earth and rock at a time—and other lesser mining equipment and methods which destroy the environment.

The answer lies in enactment of legislation to halt surface coal mining and to establish effective environmental controls for underground coal mining. H.R. 4556 would do just that.

But some skeptics, and there are many, say "Congress cannot enact such a law, it would be unconstitutional." They cite the fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution and fast conclude that we would be "taking" one's property "without just compensation." Let me briefly comment on this point. At a later time, I will delve into this matter more deeply.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . . [the so-called Commerce Clause] And to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . . [the so-called Necessary and Proper Clause]. It is for Congress alone to determine the subject matter, circumstances, and methods of regulating interstate commerce. *New York Central Railroad Company v. United States*, 267 F. Supp. 619, 625 (S.D.N.Y. 1967).

Further, if a Federal act is devoted to such matters as the promotion of safety and efficiency in interstate commerce, if it bears some reasonable and rational relationship to the subject over which it has assumed to act, the power is supreme and may not be denied, although it may include within its scope activities which are intrastate in character. *Rosenhan v. United States*, 131 F. 2d 932, 935 (10th Cir. 1942), cert. den. 318 U.S. 790 (1943). However, in enacting legislation within its constitutional authority over interstate commerce, Congress will not be deemed to have intended to strike down a State statute designed to protect the health and safety of the public unless its purpose to do so is clearly manifested, or unless the State law, in terms or in its practical administration, conflicts with the act of Congress or plainly and palpably infringes its policy. *Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761 (1945).

Even though there are some early judicial pronouncements that the production of coal in and of itself may not constitute interstate commerce, for example, in *City of Atlanta v. National Bituminous Coal Commission*, 26 F. Supp. 606, 608 (D.D.C. 1939), aff'd 308 U.S. 517 (1939), subsequent rulings of the Supreme Court appear to leave little doubt that regulation of an activity such as coal mining by Congress would be upheld under the ever-expanding scope of the commerce clause. For example, see *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942) and *Katzenbach v. McClung*, 379 U.S. 294 (1964).

Thus, the commerce power goes beyond reaching only that which moves or has moved in interstate commerce. If an activity affects interstate commerce or if a purely local activity would make ineffective or more difficult a congressional regulation of interstate commerce if the local activity were left unregulated, then it would seem that Congress has the power to so regulate it.

It might also be argued that the purpose of Congress in enacting a regulation of surface and underground coal mining operations is not to regulate commerce in any meaningful sense of what might be thought of that phrase; the purpose is not to regulate the rates or prices or terms of sale or exchange of something or even to prescribe rules for carrying on commercial and noncommercial trade. The purpose basically, it could be argued, is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of citizens, an exercise which would be a "police power" if performed by a State.

The statement that the federal government exercises no police powers, although technically correct, is erroneous to the extent that such an assumption involves the conception of a total absence of powers in the nature of police powers in the federal government, because it runs counter to the repeated exercise, by the national government of legislative powers within the sphere of general powers granted to it by the Constitution which are typical of what would, in the case of a state, be designated as "police powers." Once it is assumed that the general subject of a controversy is properly within the scope of the enumerated powers granted to the federal government, that government has as broad powers to prescribe police regulations concerning such subjects as a state government would have concerning

a subject within its reserved powers. Such powers are analogous to the police power of the states. In other words, the limitation in the Constitution (in the Tenth Amendment) of the powers of the federal government deprives that government of the right to exercise police powers only to the extent that the exercise of such powers may not be connected or associated with one of the powers expressly or by necessary implication granted to that government. It has been stated that the accurate way of putting it is not that the United States has no police power, but that the United States possesses whatever police power is appropriate to the exercise of any attribute of sovereignty specifically granted it by the Constitution. Thus, under the power of Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and under other powers such as the war power, the power over mails, and power over federal lands, regulatory federal measures have been adopted and held valid which are directly analogous to the police power exercised by state legislatures. And it has been said that a federal power corresponding to the police power of the states arises under the general welfare provision of the Federal Constitution. Moreover, since, under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Federal Constitution, Congress has the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, this power of the United States, "analogous to the police power of the state," is clearly applicable where the lands of the United States are concerned. (16 Am. Jur. 2d, Constitutional Law, § 276.)

See, Annotation: Illustrations of exercise by Congress, within the general range of Federal powers analogous to police power exercised by State legislatures—Federal cases (99 L. ed. 40, supplementing 81 L. ed. 938).

Here it is important to note that one must distinguish between a taking of property which is unquestionably subject to the Fifth Amendment prohibition and regulating the use one may make of his property.

Long ago Congress acted to limit one's use of property within the National Forests. In 1897, Congress directed—16 U.S.C. 551, 478—that persons entering the National Forests for the purpose of prospecting, locating, and developing mineral resources must comply with the rules and regulations issued to preserve them as national treasuries. In 1955, Congress added—30 U.S.C. 612—that certain mining claims are subject to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof.

More recently, Congress has enacted statutes, such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act which, if properly administered, could severely restrict the use one chooses to make of his property. In some cases, full regulation may even mean that the highest and best use of that property is no longer possible. But this is not a taking within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment.

In the case of the 1899 Refuse Act—33 U.S.C. 407—Congress has absolutely prohibited the discharge or deposit of refuse material into navigable waterways without a permit from the Corps of Engineers authorizing the discharge or deposit. Until recently, this act was not fully enforced. But on December 23, 1970, President Nixon issued an Execu-

tive order directing the corps to implement a permit program under this act. On April 7, 1971, the corps issued regulations—36 F.R. 6564—to carry out the President's mandate. In order to obtain a permit, the discharger will have to comply with the regulations. Failure to comply will mean denial of the permit and possibly the shutting down of the discharger's business by regulation. Surely, this is not a taking.

On July 16, 1970, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit issued a decision which recognized that the corps' denial of a permit was not a "taking." *Zabel v. Tabb*, No. 27555. In that case the court said:

Landholders own land riparian to Boca Ciega Bay and adjacent land underlying the Bay. It is navigable water of the United States, being an arm of Tampa Bay which opens into the Gulf of Mexico. The Zabel and Russell property is located about one mile from the Intracoastal Waterway.

Landholders desire to dredge and fill on their property in the Bay for a trailer park, with a bridge or culvert to their adjoining upland. To this purpose they first applied to the state and local authorities for permission to perform the work and obtained the consent or approval of all such agencies having jurisdiction to prohibit the work, namely Pinellas County Water and Navigation Control Authority (which originally rejected permission, but ultimately issued a permit pursuant to state Court order); Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida, Central and South Florida Flood Control District, and Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Port of St. Petersburg.

Landholders then applied to the Corps of Engineers for a federal permit to perform the dredging and filling.

Congress clearly has the power under the Commerce Clause to regulate the use of Landholders' submerged riparian property for conservation purposes and has not given up this power in the Submerged Lands Act.

Landholders' last contention is that their private submerged property was taken for public use without just compensation. They proceed this way: (i) the denial of a permit constitutes a taking since this is the only use to which the property could be put; (ii) the public use is as a breeding ground for wildlife; and (iii) for that use just compensation is due.

Our discussion of this contention begins and ends with the idea that there is no taking. The waters and underlying land are subject to the paramount servitude in the Federal government which the Submerged Lands Act expressly reserved as an incident of power incident to the Commerce Clause.

The power of the Congress of the United States to promulgate laws for the betterment of the public health, morals, safety, and welfare is beyond question. Whether or not Congress has acted within its powers depends upon whether or not there is a reasonable nexus between the subject matter of the suspect legislation and the results sought to be achieved. If the answer to this question is fairly debatable the legislation must be upheld. *Ortega v. Rasor*, 291 F. Supp. 748, 750 (S.D. Fla. 1968).

"In an operation having the magnitude of surface mining in the United States, the relationship existing between the activity and the general public and the degree of control to be exercised in the public interest are of paramount importance." Comment, Constitutional Law—Governmental Regulation of Surface

Mining Activities, 46 N.C.L. Rev. 103, 103-104 (1967).

Safety and health hazards of various types frequently result from surface mining operations. Such operations are characterized by steep slopes and, in many cases, by deep pools of standing water, which constitute an attraction and a hazard for young children. In hilly areas landslides are an everpresent danger for those who live in the valleys.

In agricultural areas farmers complain that grazing cattle often fall on the precipitous and unstable terrain of strip mining areas, that the areas harbor foxes and other predators which prey on agricultural livestock, and that mosquitoes breed on the stagnant pools.

In addition, surface mining operations involve heavy equipment transporting large quantities of materials from the mine to market, spreading dust and debris, and increasing traffic hazards on roads and highways in the area.

The process of surface mining is inherently noisy; there is no quiet way of moving tons of earth and rock. The operation of surface mining equipment can typically be heard with annoying clarity at a distance of several hundred yards from the site, and it is difficult to decrease the noise level except by increasing the distance between the listener and the source of the noise.

The blasting associated with quarrying operations may cause annoying vibrations for a substantial distance, although the extent of actual harm resulting from blasting is a matter of frequent contention.

Perhaps the most serious but least tangible effect of surface mining is in the amorphous area of aesthetics. It is generally agreed that an 80-foot high pile of gray rubble rising from the flat countryside like the tunnel of some monstrous mole, is aesthetically undesirable. Nor can an aesthetic case be made for the denuding of mountains and the destruction of scenic valleys by the gashes of contour mines. Disagreement arises, however, when an attempt is made to determine the extent to which the aesthetic disadvantages of surface mining should be weighed as an important factor in determining where its location should be permitted. The current public mood indicates, however, that aesthetics will be a strong factor in regulatory decisions, perhaps to a greater degree than would have been anticipated by unemotional cost-benefit analysis.

Surface mining also affects the economy of the nation in a more indirect fashion. To the extent that strip mining leaves land in an unusable condition, it reduces the total available supply of land for productive uses. With the booming population growth of the nation, the existing supply of land in the urbanized regions of the country is proving inadequate to handle all of the uses which society deems desirable. To the extent that surface mining is carried on in such areas, it reduces the supply of land available for other uses.

In agricultural areas, also, the amount of high quality arable land is a finite quantity; to the extent that such land is withdrawn for surface mining and not reclaimed for agricultural use it brings closer the day when such land will be in short supply.

In addition, extensive surface mining can have a catastrophic impact on the tax base of individual counties by creating derelict, nontaxpaying land that makes it difficult for the county to meet its obligations." *Bos-selman, The Control of Surface Mining: An Exercise in Creative Federalism*, 9 Nat. Res. J. 137, 142-144 (1969).

A number of local laws prohibiting strip mining within the local jurisdiction have been held to have been Constitutional. For example, in *Village of Spillertown v. Prewitt*, 171 N.E. 2d 582 (Sup.

Ct. III, 1961), a village ordinance forbidding strip mining in the village was held to be Constitutional as an exercise of police power in the preservation of the health and safety of the citizens of the community. After stating that: "The deep cuts, steep slopes and water-filled holes abutting on public streets, all necessary adjuncts to strip mining, present a real and imminent danger to the safety and health of the public" (at 584), the Court held that if the ordinance is neither unreasonable nor arbitrary, the fact that the exercise of the police power precludes what may be a more profitable use of the property does not violate a person's Constitutional rights. See, also, *East Fairheld Coal Co. v. Booth*, 143 N.E. 2d 309 (Sup. Ct. Ohio 1957), and Annotation: Prohibiting or Regulating Removal or Exploitation of Oil and Gas, Minerals, Soil, or Other Natural Products Within Municipal Limits, 10 ALR 3d 1226.

There is no legal right to exploit natural resources wherever they may be found. This principle, in conjunction with the police power to provide for the public health, welfare, safety and morals of the citizenry, furnishes the foundation for governmental units' endeavors to regulate mining activities. Comment, Constitutional-Governmental Regulation of Surface Mining Activities (46 N.C.L. Rev. 103, 105 (1967)). Of course, action in the form of regulation can so diminish the value of property as to constitute a constitutional taking. However, the mere fact that the regulation deprives the property owner of the most profitable use of his property is not necessarily enough to establish the owner's right to compensation. *United States v. Central Eureka Mining Co.* (357 U.S. 155 (1958)). The characterizing of a law as prohibiting a beneficial use to which the property has previously been devoted does not reveal whether such is unconstitutional. Every regulation necessarily speaks as a prohibition. If a law is otherwise a valid exercise of the police powers, the fact that it deprives the property of its most beneficial use does not render it unconstitutional. *Goldblatt v. Town of Hempstead* (369 U.S. 590, 592 (1962)).

Thus, surface or underground coal mining operations being within the reach of the commerce power, then Congress could be said to have the power under the interpretation of "regulate" in the Commerce Clause (Art. I, § 8, cl. 3), combined with the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, § 8, cl. 18), to make all reasonable laws prohibiting or otherwise regulating such activity.

It is time—indeed, way past time—that Congress act to protect our Nation's priceless resources. We cannot afford to allow exploiters to destroy them in the name of progress. Nor can we afford to purchase mineral rights in these areas. We must utilize fully Congress' power to regulate.

In the meantime, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior have broad powers to call a halt temporarily to much of the mining activity within lands under their jurisdiction. In separate letters dated May 17, 1971, to both Secretaries, I urged that a moratorium be declared

"on all new prospecting, exploration, and development of coal resources" on Federal and Indian lands where a Federal permit, license, lease, or other authorization is required by law, regulation, deed, or agreement from the Federal Government. I would continue this moratorium pending development and adoption of effective regulations or the enactment of legislation in the 92d Congress. At this point, I insert the text of my letters. I have not yet received a reply.

MAY 17, 1971.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

I.

DEAR SECRETARY HARDIN: The March 26, 1971, edition of the American Mining Congress Bulletin states that the "U.S. Forest Service has proposed regulations to govern the use of surface resources in connection with mining activities authorized by the mining laws." The Bulletin indicates that the proposed regulations were transmitted to the AMC and that the Service "has invited the American Mining Congress to comment on the proposed regulations, which have also been distributed to other organizations and individuals concerned with development and use of the National forests." Finally, after noting that comments must be sent to the Service by April 30, the Bulletin states:

"Following Forest Service review of comments, final regulations will be published in the *Federal Register*." (Underlining supplied.)

This Forest Service practice of giving those "concerned with development and use of the National Forests" ample opportunity to comment on regulations affecting the public's property and resources, while totally excluding the general public from commenting on them through the established rule-making procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 553) is unconscionable and should be halted.

It is contrary to the 1969 recommendation of the Administrative Conference of the United States that the exemptions of the APA concerning grants, loans, contracts, benefits, and property no longer be utilized by any Federal agency. The Department of Agriculture is a member of the Conference. The Department of the Interior and Health, Education and Welfare have recently adopted the Conference's recommendation.

I urge that the Forest Service publish the proposed regulations in the *Federal Register* and provide an opportunity for public comment thereon.

I would appreciate your supplying the following items:

1. (a) A copy of the proposed regulations in the form transmitted to the AMC by the Forest Service.

(b) A copy of each of the written comments received by the Service from any governmental agency or any organization or person on those proposed regulations.

2. (a) A copy of the Forest Service's draft environmental statement which was also transmitted to the AMC.

(b) A copy of each of the written comments received by the Service from any governmental agency or any organization or person on the statement.

3. A list of those organizations and individuals receiving copies of the proposed regulations and draft statement from the Service.

II

I am gravely concerned that the Forest Service is not responsibly, economically, and efficiently utilizing all of its existing authorities to protect fully our threatened National Forests from the detrimental effects of

mining. I believe that the Forest Service should re-examine and reinterpret its laws and regulations to give maximum support to the protection of our environment.

The Service has an obligation to consider all facets of the public interest in administering these laws and regulations. This obligation arises from the national policy and directives expressed in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and other statutes and in Executive Orders 11472 (34 F.R. 8693, May 29, 1969) and 11514 (35 F.R. 4247, March 5, 1970). In section 102 of the 1969 Act, the Congress directs that (1) "the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies" of the NEP Act, and (2) "all agencies of the Federal Government shall . . . develop methods and procedures . . . which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economics and technical considerations."

Recently, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled that the ecological aspects mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act may—indeed, must—be considered by the Corps of Engineers when it reviews applications for permits to fill parts of a waterway. The Court therefore reversed a district court order which had directed the Corps to issue a permit to a land developer seeking to dredge and fill in the navigable waters of Boca Ciega Bay near St. Petersburg, Florida, where the fill would adversely affect the ecology of the Bay, even though the fill would not impair navigation. *Zabel v. Tabb* (C.A. 5, July 16, 1970, No. 27555). The court, in discussing the impact of the 1969 Act on all Federal agencies, said:

" . . . This Act essentially states that every Federal agency shall consider ecological factors when dealing with activities which may have an impact on man's environment. (Footnote omitted)." (Italic supplied.)

Congress reiterated its environmental directives to all Federal agencies in the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of April 3, 1970, that there is a national policy for the environment which provides for the enhancement of environmental quality. This policy is evidenced by statutes heretofore enacted relating to the prevention, abatement, and control of environmental pollution, water and land resources, transportation, and economic and regional development." (Sec. 202(b).)

The Corps of Engineers, to its great credit, has recognized these "environmental directives" and reinterpreted its 1889 Refuse Act to establish a potentially effective anti-pollution program. The Corps did not wait for new specific legislative directives. Rather, the Corps is imaginatively utilizing its old laws in consonance with new ones to achieve faster pollution control.

There is pending before the Congress many bills designed to prevent the detrimental effects to our environment caused by various mining activities. Many of these, including the Administration's bill, apply to Federal lands.

I believe that adequate authority exists today to carry out much of the President's policy expressed in the Administration's bill. Indeed, the authorities just mentioned mandate that this be done. The Forest Service need not and should not wait for the passage of such legislation.

I urge that the Service follow the Corps' lead and act now to revise its present regulations to establish effective and stringent procedures and controls to protect the forests and their resources from degradation by mining interests. The regulations should include a prohibition against surface mining until the industry study called for by the Mining

and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-631) proves that effective "methods" for "reclamation of mined land" exist and will be utilized.

Such a revision of the regulations will, of course, be necessary anyway to comply with the CEQ's guidelines of April 23, 1971 (36 F.R. 7724), the permit program under the 1899 Refuse Act (33 U.S.C. 407) and Executive Order 11574 of December 23, 1970, and section 21(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Pending the development and adoption of such regulations or the enactment of legislation in the 92nd Congress, I believe that it is essential and in the public interest that a moratorium be declared on all new prospecting, exploration, and development of coal resources within the National Forests where a Federal permit, license, lease, or other authorization is required therefore by law, regulation, deed, or agreement from the Federal Government.

I urge that such a moratorium be declared.

### III.

I have recently been informed that one or more coal operators plan to begin coal mining operations in the Cranberry Buck Country of the Monongahela National Forest. The plans, I am told, include the opening of mines in the Little Fork and the Middle Fork.

I would appreciate learning from the Forest Service:

1. What information it has concerning these plans;

2. Whether or not such mining operations can be conducted in this area of the Forest. (Please include copies of each provision of any law, deed, or other instrument, if any, under which such operations could be undertaken and the names and addresses of those persons so authorized to conduct such operations);

3. What provisions of law, regulation, or agreement applicable to such operations exist that the Service can rely on as providing enforceable environmental controls in connection with such operations;

4. Whether or not the Service, using its statutory authorities to the fullest extent, can prevent such mining in this area; and

5. What steps have been taken or are planned by the Service to prevent or control such operations.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

MAY 17, 1971.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of Interior,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

### I.

DEAR SECRETARY MORTON: Under the Act of March 13, 1879, (43 U.S.C. 31), the Director of the Geological Survey "shall have the direction of the Geological Survey, and the classification of the public lands and examination of the geologic structure, mineral resources, and products of the national domain." The Survey has been classifying public lands since 1906.

In the past three years, I understand that more than 1.5 million acres have been classified as coal lands.

It has recently come to my attention that the Survey revised its coal classification standards in May, 1969, at the recommendation of its Mineral Land Classification Board. The Board is composed of Government employees, but their meetings are not public.

The January 7, 1969, minutes of the Board indicate that the objective of the changes was to classify "a greater amount of withdrawn [public] land as coal land." This objective has apparently been achieved. In Fiscal Year 1970, more than 800,000 acres were classified as coal lands. This is double the amount so classified in the previous year.

One of the principal changes made in 1969 was to increase the depth for coals of minimum thickness. The minutes explain this change as follows:

*"A large increase in the mining of coal by stripping, particularly in recent years, has taken place since the regulations of 1913 were issued. The depth to which strip mining can be carried on economically has increased as machines and techniques have improved. Although the maximum depth of 500 feet for coal of minimum thickness prescribed in 1913 (Smith and others, 1913, p. 75) is adequate for present operations, a depth of 1,000 feet may be more realistic for the future. Moreover, the change to 1,000 feet will make the classification of coal lands conform more closely to the data on coal reserves published from time to time by the U.S. Geological Survey (Averitt, 1961)." (Italic supplied.)*

I understand that the classification of lands for coal is desirable to avoid the possible loss of the resource to surface owners. I am, however, concerned that the above changes in the standards were made without public participation through the rule-making provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553), and that they have increased the possibility that more lands will be strip mined. The fact that these changes were later published in final form as a GS bulletin (No. 633) does not satisfy the public's need to participate in such matters before they are finalized.

As a matter of fact, the standards preceding these were published in Part 201 of the Code of Federal Regulations (1969 edition), but this part was revoked by the Department on July 8, 1969, (34 F.R. 11299). No explanation is given in the notice of revocation for this action.

I urge that the Interior Department publish these new standards for coal land classifications in the *Federal Register* and provide an opportunity for public comment thereon. I also urge that their use by the Geological Survey be suspended pending such publication.

### II

The leasing of coal lands within the public domain is carried out by the Interior under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 181 et. seq.) and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351-359). Several statutes authorize such leasing on Indian lands.

In 1969, the Department issued regulations concerning surface exploration, mining, and reclamation of lands under the above laws (see 43 C.F.R., Part 23 and 25 C.F.R., Part 117). These regulations provide that it "is the policy of this Department to encourage the development of the mineral resources." At the same time, the regulations provide that the "public interest requires that . . . adequate measures be taken to avoid, minimize, or correct damage to the environment." The regulations require a "technical examination" of an area for which a permit or license is applied for. Based on this examination "general requirements" are formulated "for the protection of non-mineral resources during the conduct of exploration or mining operations and for the reclamation of lands or waters affected" thereby. No mention is made in the regulation that the Department might deny the application on environmental grounds.

Similar regulations apparently have not been issued for underground coal operations, except those set forth in 30 C.F.R., Part 211. But those regulations relate largely to safety in coal mining. Moreover, those regulations are no longer valid because, most, if not all, of them are inconsistent with the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. They should be revoked.

The failure of the Department to publish effective environmental regulations for underground coal mines, and its expressed pol-

icy of placing priority on development of minerals over the protection of our environment, are not in the public interest.

The Interior Department is not responsibly, economically, and efficiently utilizing all its existing authorities to protect fully our environment from the detrimental effects of surface and underground coal mining.

I believe that the Interior Department should re-examine and reinterpret its laws and regulations to give maximum support to the protection of our environment.

The Corps of Engineers, to its great credit, recently did this in connection with its 1889 Refuse Act (33 U.S.C. 407). The result is an expanded anti-pollution program built upon a 70-year-old law that may do more to save our waterways than other more expensive programs.

The Interior Department has an obligation to consider all facets of the public interest in administering these laws and regulations. This obligation arises from the national policy and directives expressed in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and other statutes and in Executive Orders 11472 (34 F.R. 8693, May 29, 1969) and 11514 (35 F.R. 4247, March 5, 1970). In section 102 of the NEP Act, Congress mandates (1) that "the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies" of the National Environmental Policy Act and (2) that "all agencies of the Federal Government shall" develop procedures which will "insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values" be given "appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations." (Underlining supplied.)

Congress reiterated its environmental directives to all Federal agencies in the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of April 3, 1970, "that there is a national policy for the environment which provides for the enhancement of environmental quality. This policy is evidenced by statutes heretofore enacted relating to the prevention, abatement, and control of environmental pollution, water and land resources, transportation, and economic and regional development." (Sec. 202(b).)

These authorities make it clear that the Department's policy of fostering the development of mineral resources is subject to the policies and authorities just mentioned. This point was emphasized by Congressman John D. Dingell during the debate on the House version of S. 719 in the 91st Congress which later was enacted as the "Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970" (Public Law 91-631). Representative Dingell said: (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 25, p. 32757):

"When the bill passed the Senate, I was concerned about its broad scope and some of the statements in the Senate report on the bill. I was concerned because the Senate's report seemed to imply that this bill did, in fact, provide a new basis for a vast new minerals program. More importantly, I was concerned because these statements seemed to imply that this new policy would override the policies of environmental and health and safety protection established by many statutes, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969."

Mr. Dingell then told the House that he was "heartened to read that S. 719 has been completely rewritten" in the House, and that this action makes it clear that it "is subject to the policies and requirements" of no less than 19 existing environmental laws which he listed. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 25, p. 32758, supra). He noted also that recently the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled that the ecological aspects mandated by the Act

may—indeed, must—be considered by the Corps of Engineers when it reviews applications for permits to fill parts of a waterway. The Court therefore reversed a district court order which had directed the Corps to issue a permit to a land developer seeking to dredge and fill in the navigable waters of Boca Ciega Bay near St. Petersburg, Florida, where the fill would adversely affect the ecology of the Bay, even though the fill would not impair navigation. *Zabel v. Tabb* (C.A. 5, July 16, 1970, No. 27555). The court, in discussing the impact of the 1969 Act on all Federal agencies, said:

"... This Act essentially states that every Federal agency shall consider ecological factors when dealing with activities which may have an impact on man's environment. (Footnote omitted.)" (Italics supplied.)

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 directs that Interior "foster and encourage private enterprise in . . . the study and development of methods for the disposal, control, and reclamation of mineral waste products, and reclamation of mined land, so as to lessen any adverse impact of mineral extraction and processing" on our environment.

The President, in his Environmental Message of February 8, 1971, (H. Doc. 92-46), said (p. 16):

"Surface and underground mining have scarred millions of acres of land and have caused environmental damages such as air and water pollution. . . . These problems will worsen as the demand for fossil fuels and other raw materials continue to grow, unless such mining is subject to regulation requiring both preventive and restorative measures."

Many bills are pending before the 92d Congress, including the Administration's bill, which are designed to prevent the detrimental effects to our environment to which the President referred. But, as the Corps of Engineers realized, we cannot afford to wait for new laws and organizational methods and studies to resolve specific environmental problems. The press stories of how Indian lands have been ravaged clearly demonstrates the folly of waiting. We must use existing tools and procedures more effectively.

The Interior Department, buttressed with the new laws, court decisions, and executive orders just mentioned, has broad authority to deal with this problem now on Federal and Indian lands. The Department need not and should not wait for the passage of such legislation.

I urge that the Department follow the Corps' lead and act now to revise its present regulations to establish better and more stringent environmental controls on coal mining operations, including prohibition against surface mining until the industry study called for by Public Law 91-631 proves that effective "methods" for the "reclamation of mined lands" exist and will be utilized. I know of no better way to "foster and encourage" such an industry study. A revision of the regulations is, of course, required anyway in order for the Department to comply with the CEQ's guidelines of April 23, 1971 (36 F.R. 7724).

At a recent meeting of the Business Advisory Council on Federal Reports of the Office of Management and Budget, a representative of the coal industry said that 5500 coal mine operations in the United States would, in his judgment, have to file applications with the Corps for permits under the 1899 Refuse Act. These operators will also have to obtain state certificates of compliance with applicable water quality standards under section 21(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Such certificates are also required where your Department issues permits under mineral leasing laws for mining operations that may result in any discharge, such as a sluicing or pump-

ing operation, into a navigable waterway. The Department's regulations should make these requirements clear to mining interests.

Pending the development and adoption of such regulations or the enactment of legislation in the 92d Congress, I believe that it is essential and in the public interest that a moratorium be declared on all new prospecting, exploration, and development, under lease, permit, or other agreement, of coal resources on Federal and Indian lands under the Interior Department's various mineral leasing laws.

I urge that such a moratorium be declared.  
Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

Despite this, it is my purpose to pursue this moratorium. I believe it essential since existing regulations of coal mining in these areas are either non-existent or toothless.

Having submitted data concerning these additional items, I hope that the committee will support my pending amendment that "no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay any public relations firm for any promotional campaigns among coal miners."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), \$21,880,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$575,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MELCHER

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MELCHER: On page 16, line 17, strike "\$21,880,000" and insert "\$25,880,000".

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment because I have a profound and deep feeling that the pennywise and pound foolish maxim applies with a great deal of force to one item in the Interior Department appropriations bill which we are considering today.

I refer to the \$1 million being appropriated for research on magnetohydrodynamics, or MHD, a new method of generating electric power by forcing superheated, ionized gas through an electromagnetic field. It should be many times \$1 million.

In 1969, a panel of scientists advised the President that \$4 million annually should be put into research on this process, which promises a great increase in fuel efficiency, with almost no pollution of the atmosphere.

However, the administration's 1971 budget called for only \$400,000 for MDH research. Our Interior Appropriations Subcommittee raised this to \$600,000, which was finally appropriated.

This year the administration requested \$1 million, or about one-tenth of the amount that should be put into a pro-

gram to get MHD generators developed and on the line just as soon as possible.

The potential benefits which this process promises—and tests are far enough along that the benefits have indeed been demonstrated—entitle it to top priority. Other countries, notably Russia, which has already completed an MHD plant, and West Germany and Japan, are years ahead of us in this research field. We have reason to pride ourselves in basic electrical energy research from the time of Franklin to Edison. But with MHD we are negligent, almost indolent only assigning a crumb—not crumbs, but just one little crumb—from the \$20 billion feast of funds on the Federal Research and Development table.

What does MHD do?

It will capture 60 percent of the energy in coal, instead of 35 to 40 percent recaptured by the present steam turbine generating process.

It will reduce air pollution close to zero. The only exhaust into the air will be a relatively small volume of clean gases, carbon dioxide, and nitrogen.

It will reduce water pollution, and water requirement for cooling, to the vanishing point.

If there is anything this Nation needs more urgently than a nonpolluting source of massive amounts of low-cost energy, I do not know what it is.

I am not opposed to pure science research, or to research with only theoretical future value to mankind—including explorations in space—but certainly research and development on a process that can meet one of our most urgent and critical national needs—the energy shortage—and simultaneously relieve one of our greatest problems—pollution—deserves all the money that can be effectively used to speed up development.

Mr. Chairman in its November 1970 issue, *Fortune* magazine carried an article by Lawrence Lessing dealing with MHD, captioned "New Ways to More Power With Less Pollution."

In an overline, the magazine commented:

We don't have to choose between power shortages and ever dirtier air.

At the appropriate time I will request to include in the RECORD portions of that article which are both a status report and an objective appraisal of MHD for the benefit of those who may distrust my appraisal.

I confess that I have an interest in MHD because Montana, the Dakotas, and northeastern Wyoming have the world's largest deposit of coal—trillions of tons—to fuel MHD generators.

With prompt financing of in situ, or underground gasification of coal, which the Director of the Bureau of Mines tells us we are ready to undertake, and speedy development of magnetohydrodynamics, this upper Missouri Basin fossil fuel deposit can meet both energy and pollution problems for a large part of this Nation for generations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) whether the

gentleman had intended to offer the two amendments en bloc?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the remainder of the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

And on line 19, strike the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and of which \$5,000,000 shall be available for research and development of magneto-hydrodynamics."

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I very much dislike opposing research programs, particularly in the field of the development of energy, but I would say basically before we get too deep in any one of the programs we have to establish some balances.

For example, there are now before the various authorizing committees bills which could prevent strip mining entirely. About 50 percent of the coal reserves in this Nation are those which must come from the strip mines.

The total cost of the MHD program is estimated to be a minimum of \$75 million. Obviously this is not going to be a short-term project.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDADE. The Director of the Office of Research testified that it would be 4 or 5 years before he could get to the construction. I think the gentleman is making an important argument and I support her and I associate myself with her remarks.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

This bill provides \$1 million for MHD for the Office of Coal Research and also \$400,000 for Bureau of Mines Research on MHD.

The research people testified before our committee that they are having grave problems with heat in connection with this project.

I think we are going to have to concentrate and do some thinking on the preliminary work. This \$1,400,000 I think is all that can profitably be used. I sympathize deeply with the desire to find new sources of energy, but I would not embark at this time beyond the commitment of the \$1,400,000 for additional research on MHD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and thirty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including not to exceed ninety for police-type use; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; and to provide, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at a cost not exceeding \$50,000, transportation for children in nearby communities to and from any unit of the

National Park System used in connection with organized recreation and interpretive programs of the National Park Service; *Provided*, That any funds available to the National Park Service may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to maintain law and order in emergency and other unforeseen law enforcement situations in the National Park System.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question or two concerning this provision which is to be found on page 22 of the bill beginning at line 2 and running down through to the end of line 6. The language I refer to is as follows:

*Provided*, That any funds available to the National Park Service may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to maintain law and order in emergency and other unforeseen law enforcement situations in the National Park System.

Does this mean that money can be taken from any funds in the National Park Service for law enforcement purposes?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This language was carried in the second supplemental bill for fiscal year 1971. The gentleman is probably aware that at the present time these unusual demonstration costs are charged to the regular annual appropriation. It is impossible to adequately budget for these greatly varying costs.

So rather than curtail the management of functions at all our national parks across the Nation, the suggestion was made by the Park Service that if we would allow them to use the funds—that is any funds, that are within the Federal park service for that time—then they could come up with the supplemental to repay those items, after the expenditure of the funds.

I am sure the gentleman is very much aware that we have great problems of crime in our national parks.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but I was concerned as to how reimbursement was to be handled. So funds may be taken from any source within the Park Service for that purpose?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct. It is very similar to the way we have handled forest fire costs which are also quite unpredictable.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any bonding requirement on the part of the Park Service? In other words, demonstrators and others use the Park Service lands, is there any bonding requirement for their use? That was Park Service land, was it not, that was used here in the District of Columbia on the Potomac River near the Lincoln Memorial? Is that not true?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct. National Park Service land was involved in many demonstrations throughout the Nation this year. I thought the gentleman was aware of that.

Mr. GROSS. No, I am not. I have not the vaguest idea where all the Park Service lands are in the District of Columbia or outside the District of Columbia, and

I doubt that any Member of this House knows where all the Park Service lands are.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the gentleman that the Park Service has a limited bonding provision and they use it to the extent they are able.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, the Park Service in many instances, as my colleague knows, does not have the last decision in stating what will be done with certain lands under its jurisdiction. That was true in relation to our last difficulty in the District of Columbia. The National Park Service desired to take care of the situation in one way. They were overruled. They are put at a disadvantage much of the time because of this question of administrative authority.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt of that, particularly in the District of Columbia, where there is so much divided authority.

But does the gentleman think that there are adequate bonding requirements for the use of the park lands?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my opinion that there is as adequate provision for bonds as the Park Service can use.

Mr. GROSS. Are bonds being exacted commensurate with damage that has been done and we may anticipate will be done if we have more of these incidents?

Mr. ASPINALL. The Park Service is desirous of having more adequate bonds, but they are not permitted to do so in certain instances. This is the difficulty we find, not only in this area, but in certain other areas.

Mr. GROSS. We are putting the pressure on the Park Service? Who put the thumb on the Park Service? The Department of Justice, the President, or who?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say it was a combination of all of them above the Park Service administrative authority.

Mr. GROSS. So, rather than make those who may use and damage these lands, and perhaps desecrate what is on them pay for the damage, we make the taxpayers liable for the damage that they do, is that correct? And that is because certain officials of Government will not permit the Park Service to require a bond commensurate with the damage that may be done?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is a sad commentary on the Congress of the United States, that it does not enact laws that will permit those who are custodians of the public domain to properly take care of the public domain.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield once more, I would say that we can pass all the laws in the world, we can have all the statutes we desire, but if there is no desire on the part of those who have the ultimate authority to see that those laws are enforced, they will not be enforced. That is our difficulty. The gentleman from Washington and her committee have gone into this matter as thoroughly as any committee could

go into it. I am sure the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has tried to keep up with it every step of the way.

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

(By unanimous consent Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. If I did not agree with the committee in what they are doing here, I certainly would have made a point of order to this language, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado that there are people in this city, apparently in high places, who will not back up the Park Service, but I do believe that somehow or other Congress can enact a law, with teeth enough in it, to make even these people observe the law.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague from Iowa will yield once more—

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

Mr. ASPINALL. We have in the record of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a statement of the Director of the Park Service as to what he wished to do and he was not permitted to do it.

Mr. GROSS. It is a shame, I will say to the gentleman, that those in the Interior Department who are entrusted with the protection of the people's property, are not permitted to carry out that trust.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to compliment the gentlelady from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, for the excellent work her subcommittee has done on this legislation.

However, I could not help but be very interested in the colloquy by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and my colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross) concerning the damage done to our National Parks here in Washington, D.C.

On April 7, 1971, I introduced a bill that would have taken care of this problem. It is identical to the legislation which this House overwhelmingly approved in the last Congress 327 to 51. That bill never became law because the other body never considered it.

We were asked by the Park Service to submit this legislation because it was needed; there was not enough in the law by itself to help them take care of the problem. This bill was submitted a month before the May Day demonstrators came to Washington.

It is unfortunate that for the 3 weeks the demonstrators were here the cost to the taxpayers was over \$5 million.

I agree with my colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross). It is a shame, if the Department needs this type of legislation to contain these incidents here in the Capital and other places throughout the country, that we are not in a position to provide them with necessary tools. My proposal would ban any overnight camping on Federal land in the District of Columbia and would require a bond to cover the estimated amount of destruction that any daytime demonstration would bring.

This legislation is presently pending before the House Public Works Committee. Many of my colleagues have joined with me in urging that this bill be brought to the House floor for immediate consideration. I am sure that this body will once again approve this proposal by a large margin as it did in the last Congress.

As I start my third term in Congress I wish to pay tribute to the tremendous job on behalf of the environment and the public interest that the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) have been doing. These men typify the very high standard of work which is quietly being performed in this body every day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from Government and other sources; international exchanges; anthropological research; maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; and operation and maintenance of the National Zoological Park, including purchase, acquisition, and transportation of specimens; including not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; purchase, or rental of two passenger motor vehicles; purchase; rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, policemen, animal keepers, and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications, \$45,259,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

With respect to the Smithsonian Institution, it has been brought to my attention that a number of foreigners are employed there. Did the committee develop any figures as to the number of foreigners employed, the pay of these foreigners, and the manner in which they were recruited?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No. The committee did not delve into that area this year. There are some policies that we think are generally within the jurisdiction of the administrators of the Smithsonian and the Board of Regents of that Institution. We feel we are very fortunate that we have in this Congress and, in fact, in this House very distinguished Members who are Regents of the Smithsonian.

As you are well aware the Civil Service Commission is the agency primarily responsible for jurisdiction over matters of this type.

Mr. GROSS. I raise the question because of the unemployment situation in this country. Unless there is something special about these foreigners, it is my opinion that Americans ought to be hired for these permanent jobs, particularly in the upper grades, rather than foreigners. Of course, if we cannot find Americans

capable of administering the Smithsonian Institution, then I suppose the hiring of foreigners would be in order.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I can understand in certain categories of programs that distinguished scientists who might have done outstanding work in some fields might qualify. As I say, employment practices are handled by the Civil Service Commission, and certainly the guidelines are set by the Board of Regents.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESTORATION AND RENOVATIONS OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$550,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of the preparation of plans and specifications for, construction of a building for a National Air and Space Museum for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, and for the construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, to remain available until expended, \$5,597,000, of which \$3,697,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under the contract authorization granted under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1969: *Provided*, That such sums as are necessary may be transferred to the General Services Administration for execution of the work.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY  
OF ARTS

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase, or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed \$70,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$4,713,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next to the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might have some kind of a report on this Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and sculpture garden. What is the progress or the lack of progress of it and is it going to be built as planned.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. You will find a very detailed discussion in the hearings on this project. Funds provided in this bill are for the final portion of the construction. The language in the report provides that there will be no construction of a sculpture garden on the greensward of the Mall. We have also stipulated that no expenditure of these funds be made until the National Capital Planning Commission gives final approval on the plans for the sculpture garden. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), a member of our subcommittee, has spent a great deal of time in preparing some information on this. I hope the gentleman will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois at this point to answer any further questions on this subject.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an explanation?

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

Mr. YATES. This is the original design for the Hirshhorn Museum. The rendition on the right was the original design for the Hirshhorn Museum. It shows that there was to be a sculptural garden which went across the Mall and which would have broken the greensward which extends from the Capitol past the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial and then on to the river.

That has been changed now. It no longer will go across the Mall. This is the Hirshhorn building. This was the sculptural trench, you might call it, where they were going to put sculpture figures. This is going to be the sculptural garden for the National Gallery of Art. That is the change. This is the way it will be in the future. No, this is the Hirshhorn Museum. Instead of going across the mall, now it will be lateral. This will be the sculptural garden of the National Gallery of Art. When both are completed, you will have a sculptural exhibit that will make Washington one of the finest establishments throughout the entire world.

Mr. GROSS. Well—and I say this somewhat facetiously—will the name of Hirshhorn be displayed in neon over these sculptural designs?

Mr. YATES. The name, I am sure, will be displayed on the building, but I do not think it will be in neon, however.

Mr. GROSS. Well, perhaps, in living color.

Mr. YATES. I do not know whether it will be living or dead color.

Mr. GROSS. I thought it crossed the Mall. With this alteration from the original plan for what is that land to be used?

Mr. YATES. The original proposal to cut across the Mall has been changed. They will not be using it at all. The greensward will continue from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial. The Hirshhorn Museum or its gardens will not be on the Mall at all. They will have the

sculpture gardens placed in an area where it will be the center of the tree line rather than the Mall itself.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. However, there is one other question. Is this the same Hirshhorn who was in trouble with the Canadian Government?

Mr. YATES. Well, it is the same Hirshhorn that has the contract with the Federal Government, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. YATES. I hope I have answered the gentleman's question to his satisfaction.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to report briefly on the history of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. On October 17, 1966, the House of Representatives unanimously approved the acquisition of this gift and the terms attendant thereon.

Subsequently, a great many questions were raised, and during the last Congress, for the first time in 100 years, there were oversight hearings on the Smithsonian Institution. I might emphasize that the oversight hearings were the first since the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution, of which, incidentally, the members of the committee and I are very proud. The hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, of which I was chairman.

The chart on my right represents the Hirshhorn Museum, the original design of which was approved by an act of the Congress in 1966. Incidentally, I might say that I made a speech on the day the legislation was passed expressing approval of the acquisition of this collection. At that time I did not know that the sculpture gardens would extend more than 600 feet across the Mall, to be dug into the Mall some 10 feet, and to have a retaining wall on both sides, for the protection, ostensibly, of those who might fall into it. The center rectangle which you see on the chart was to be the sculpture gardens. It was to cut directly across the Mall.

I might say further that on my left of the chart, and on your right, this brown circle here surrounded by the trees, is to be the sculpture garden for the National Gallery of Art.

We did not realize initially that there would be this trespass on the Mall, having the effect of creating a new axis to the Mall.

Further to your left, not shown on this chart, is the National Archives. So that in effect, under the original plan, until last year this transverse of the Mall was to be the sculpture garden.

The Subcommittee on the Library and Memorials discussed this in considerable depth, incidental to the overall hearings on the Smithsonian Institution, which again, I say, reflect credit on that Institution.

Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. SCHWEN- GEL, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. CRANE, and myself

introduced legislation entitled H.R. 2561, at the beginning of this Congress, asking that the Smithsonian Institution and the Regents reconsider the matter and not trespass the Mall. H.R. 2561 directs that a different site for the sculpture garden be found.

As a result of this, Mr. Gordon Bunschaft, the architect, came in with a new plan which, instead of breaking up this unbroken vista from the Capitol to the Washington Monument along the Mall, eliminates this transverse of the Mall. And so the new plan—and I have not to this minute heard of its official status, although I am assured that there will not be a transverse of the Mall—calls for the Hirshhorn Sculpture Gardens be put contiguous to the museum in this direction, which is perpendicular to its former direction. In other words, the sculpture garden will not cross the Mall, but will be parallel to it.

I must confess that, although I feel that perhaps a better alternative plan could have been devised, that we have a contract, we are committed, and that this new sculpture garden plan is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey, has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This is, in my judgment, an acceptable alternative.

With respect to the collection itself, I think that the paintings and sculpture are an absolutely invaluable asset which we will acquire.

There are some questions about the maintenance and the operation of the collection and the present method of construction. But in the main, I can assure the Members that the community in arts and sculpture is better qualified by far than I am, and is enthusiastic about this acquisition.

It will still, I will say to the gentleman, be named the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. It will be in the position that this House agreed on in November 1966. But the trespass on the Mall will not take place, I am assured. If it does take place or if there is any undertaking to construct the sculpture garden across the Mall, I certainly will be among the first to object.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is a regent of the Smithsonian, as I am, and I can assure the gentleman that the regents have acted upon this. The regents are opposed to a trespass on the Mall and are in complete accord with the plans that the gentleman has here outlined.

So I can assure you that the regents have had this matter before them and have considered it very carefully and have taken action to see that there is no trespass on the Mall, and that includes the Chancellor who is the Chief Justice.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for these firm as-

surances from two distinguished congressional regents.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. In the committee report on page 33, the committee says this:

The Committee is of the opinion and so directs, that none of the funds provided in this bill shall be used for construction of a sculpture garden on a north-south axis across the Mall.

The committee also says this:

The Committee further understands that final approval for the revised plans of the sculpture garden has not yet been granted by the National Capital Planning Commission. Until such approval is granted, the Committee directs that none of the funds provided in this bill for the Hirshhorn Museum shall be available for expenditure.

So the committee is protecting against that eventuality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was granted permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say—that I am at a total loss to understand why, beginning on page 933 of the hearings of this subcommittee, Mr. Bradley of the Smithsonian Institution took pains to insert in the record numerous statements, including two articles beginning on page 934 to 938; articles which assert that I, as the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials was engaged in a vendetta with the Secretary of the Institution, Dr. Ripley. These articles are absolutely false and, even worse, outrageous, for they accuse me of being anti-Ripley, an anti-Semite and anti-Smithsonian.

I consider this, and I would like the record to show it, on the part of the Smithsonian authorities a gratuitous insult and absolutely unnecessary. I disavow them as being totally false.

I still support in principle the acceptance of the Hirshhorn gift. I would suppose Mr. Bradley, and perhaps Dr. Ripley, were upset that this body had the temerity for the first time in 100 years to oversee their activities.

Now the chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials is the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI). I am still a member of that subcommittee, but not its chairman. I hope in the future as we exercise, under the law, our oversight responsibilities, that those who are asked reasonably and rationally to come in and report to us, and through us to the American people, will not set forth accusations which are unverified, untrue, and derogatory of Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(On request of Mr. SCHWENDEL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I want to join in this colloquy, because I want to say to this House that I was a member of the subcommittee. I participated in all the hearings chaired by the gentleman from New Jersey who spoke to you and who straightened out the records. I agree that this was not a personal vendetta or a vendetta by the committee. This was merely an attempt to get at all the facts. It was done fairly and accurately and in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, before we move finally on the Hirshhorn donation, we should be more sure of reservations. It seems to many of us that the project was rushed through Congress in a hurry and before all necessary precautions and valuations were made. There are some problems in connection with receiving this collection that need to be explored. Already the plans have been amended and they need to be amended further, I believe. More valuation should be given to the naming of this art center. If the proposition is accepted as now understood, it might not work in the public interest. This calls for more study and some evaluation and then some further decisions.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I am really not so upset because of the assurances by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) as related to us from the record by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). The fact is that I sincerely feel that we made a mistake in the initial instance of this authorization, in the design of it. We corrected that mistake, and I think it is to the credit of this body that it did exercise its oversight responsibility and bring about, therefore, the change effected in the location of the sculpture garden.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: Page 38, after line 21, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for any predator control program in which any food, water, or other substance which has been treated with any biocide or toxicant is used as bait to be ingested by the predator, or for any predator control program in which that use is promoted, or in which information concerning that use is disseminated, unless that substance is approved for use by the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency. For the purposes of this section the term 'biocide or toxicant' means direct acting, cumulative, or chain-reacting poison; namely, strychnine, thallium, and compound 1080, (sodium monofluoro acetate)."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require the Secretary of Interior to gain the approval of the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency before

the Division of Wildlife Services may purchase, use, or distribute a poison, such as strychnine, thallium, and compound 1080, in its predator control program.

This Government's schizophrenic attitude toward our wildlife must be reversed. On the one hand, we are attempting to preserve animals, while on the other hand, we are spending millions of dollars to destroy them.

I recognize the need to control specific, individual predators, but the indiscriminate poisoning of any animal that happens to feast on tainted meat must be curbed.

How many animals has the Department slaughtered?

As a starting point, we can use Interior Department figures for fiscal year 1970. Last year—73,093 dead coyotes were discovered, autopsied, and credited to the Department of Interior; 8,403 bobcats were killed under Interior programs; 121 mountain lions were killed under their supervision, and 403 black bears were killed by the Department of Interior.

But, this is only the tip of the iceberg—these numbers represent only the number of animals that were discovered, autopsied, and credited to the Department of Interior. Many more animals died in the wilds and were not discovered.

In fact, the Department of Interior, with only one of their favorite poisons—compound 1080, distributes enough poisoned bait to kill 36.7 million coyotes—and that figure assumes that each coyote ate twice as much poisoned meat as is required to kill it.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Interior, in its policy of saturation and overkill, last year distributed enough 1080 bait to eliminate every coyote in an area covering 388,800 square miles or an area larger than the entire States of California, Colorado, and Idaho.

This 1080 bait, already enough to kill well over 36.7 million coyotes, is supplemented by 822,043 strychnine baits. Add this to the other poison and we can see that the intent of the Department of Interior is to completely wipe out wildlife in the Western States.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Did the gentleman read the hearings the committee held this year, where it was said exactly 24 pounds had been used throughout millions of acres in the West? I only ask this because we discovered during our hearings there was a multiplicity of partial truths. I just think the whole truth needs to be said. I am for freedom of total information.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have read the hearings and I agree with the gentlewoman that nearly 24 pounds of compound 1080 were used last year in poisoning wildlife. But, I hasten to add that this is diluted into 645,000 pounds of treated bait—an amount sufficient to kill 73.4 million coyotes, since only 1.4 ounces of treated bait is required to kill a single coyote.

Yes, I have read a great deal of the record, and I have read the report on the bill. I commend the committee for their steps in recommending that the Department of Interior give specific consideration to:

First, insuring that all programs to control predators be carried out in such a way as to give maximum protection to the birds, animals, and wildlife in an area;

Second, placing more emphasis on the supervision of control actions which will insure that Department guidelines are strictly carried out, and;

Third, further efforts which can be made to develop control actions which are limited to the damage-causing animals.

In referring to the recent death of eagles in Wyoming, William Ruckelshaus, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, testified that—

This situation graphically illustrates the inadequacy of the present law—we do not have at the present time the controls over the use of environmentally hazardous pesticides that we so clearly need.

Madam Chairman, the funds in this act should be designed to save wildlife.

We need research on methods to selectively control the individual predator that is causing the damage. Reproductive inhibitors should be investigated. Research to discover a "coyote or predator repellent" should be completed.

I would like to thank the wildlife conservation groups such as the Sierra Club, the Friends of the Earth, the Committee on Humane Legislation, the Humane Society of the United States, and the League of Conservation Voters for their support and for their guidance on this matter. In addition, I appreciate the suggestions and support given by my colleagues, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DON EDWARDS, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CLEVELAND.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from California has made some very devastating statements with respect to compound 1080. I should like to ask a question. Does compound 1080 kill endangered species?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes. These poisons are not selective. The Denver Wildlife Research Center conducted research on the cause of death of certain birds. Of 19 dead endangered birds that were examined, 13 contained lethal doses of 1080. These included one California condor, one bald eagle and 11 golden eagles. We are wiping out other animals—some of which are endangered. The black-footed ferret is about to flicker out and die as a species, victim of the poisons that are wiping out the prairie dogs on which the ferret dines.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. I should like to say, I

did not raise a point of order against the gentleman's amendment but I cannot sit silently without expressing, in as clear language as possible, that I believe this is the poorest possible legislative exercise, to attempt to legislate with no hearings and no facts, and obviously to legislate on an appropriation bill in this manner.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would say in agreement with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) and to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) that it is very difficult to legislate policy, particularly on poisons, insecticides, and their effect on species of animals, and so forth, in an appropriation bill.

You will find that our hearings have covered several thousand pages. We had divergent viewpoints expressed on all manner of things, including the matter of pesticides and poisoned bait and so on.

You have the problem of the Navajo Indians, who are pitifully dependent upon their sheep that they are trying to graze. You have certain poor people scattered all over the grazing lands of the West who are desperately in need of both food and income. I know exactly how the environmentalists feel, but I do think that the place for this kind of an amendment lies with the authorizing committee. There you have adequate opportunity to hold specialized hearings and utilize the talent and the skill of various scientists and the people qualified to recommend what is best for the Nation.

I am not going to oppose the amendment, since I know the gentleman is very sincere and very well intentioned. I think every Member of this House is well intentioned in this regard, also. I just say that if many Members would be as enthusiastic about writing speeches for the authorizing committees and going before them and bringing the talented people in the various fields of science to those authorizing committees to obtain legislation, you would have a much better Government than you will have by tacking amendments on the tail end of an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, in no way am I being derogatory to the distinguished gentleman from California, but I just warn that this is becoming an increasing practice. I have had some few deals with reform programs. Good reform comes about where we have ample time and talent to fully discuss these things, I do hope in the future that this will happen because we have a grave question here about making long-range policy decisions on an appropriation bill without adequate scientific advice.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for her statement. As a matter of fact, the thing that I am afraid of is someone may think we are accomplishing so much more here than we are. The way this amendment is written, I do not believe it will change a

thing, and I do not want anyone to think it will.

As a matter of fact, because of the enthusiasm for amendments of this kind which the gentlewoman spoke of, we preclude more scientific controls.

We had all of the fuss about killing animals from airplanes. If we have a predator like a mountain lion doing damage, the best way to get rid of him is to track him down with an airplane, find him, and then shoot him. However, we cannot do that, either, so alternative methods have to be devised.

I think the gentlewoman is right. Both she and I find poisoning abhorrent, and we believe it is not the way to do the job, but I feel that little if anything will be accomplished by this amendment as it is phrased today.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say something on behalf of the lambs. It is recognized that coyotes in a pure wilderness area or an area where sheep are not present will survive and satisfy their hunger by eating birds, rabbits, rodents, and, if available, the fawn of deer and antelopes.

But where sheep are raised, coyotes feast on lamb, they thrive on lamb and frequently kill or wound more than they are ever going to eat.

Mr. Chairman, the numbers of sheep are on the decline in the United States, and they are on the decline in the State of Montana. However, the number of coyotes is on the increase in Montana. They are definitely increasing. Somehow, for humanitarian reasons, we have concern for the suffering of these animals or predators when they are controlled by poison. I do want to see that the predators are controlled as humanely as possible, but I do want them controlled because the coyotes cause suffering too. Coyote killing or seriously wounding lambs is not humane. They take more than they can eat. They rip open the throats or the bellies of the lambs and those lambs that do not die immediately, but live or survive for hours or days, dragging their viscera through the sagebrush, receive very inhumane treatment from the coyote. It is not very often that coyotes kill ewes, but they frequently cripple them. They experience considerable pain from the teeth of the killer coyotes.

I think it is prudent that we control predators where they exist.

The control and prudent use of 1080 by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is not overdone. It is necessary. I have some concern as to its use also, because I find eagles are on the increase in Montana, and some have been poisoned. They were not poisoned by 1080 baits set by the Bureau. The eagles that were poisoned or died recently in Wyoming do not show any 1080 put out by the Bureau. While some 1080 has been found in some of the eagles, it does not contain a tracer that the Bureau uses. The Bureau can positively identify the source of the 1080, if it is theirs, and the eagles that were poisoned or died recently in Wyoming do not show any of the tracer that the Bureau uses with 1080.

Mr. Chairman, eagles do not easily succumb to 1080, but, at any rate, there is a need for the proper use of it.

Balancing the need for controlling killer coyotes against the damage and death they do to thousands of lambs—let me tell you of some recent losses near my home in Montana.

One cold evening last January I met with some 20 sheepmen at Jordan as they listed for me their losses during 1970 from coyotes. Their operations were, for the most part, family-sized ranches. They listed substantial losses of lambs from coyotes. Close to 4,000 lambs on one area were listed in one year. This represents too big a loss for them to take. They cannot afford it.

Airplane hunting, trapping, or other means of control do not get all of the killer coyotes, and the use of 1080, closely controlled, is needed on occasions in specific areas by the Bureau.

I mention this specifically because when a coyote starts killing lambs, he just lives with the flock. That is all he lives on. He hangs with the flock or flocks, in the general area, and he takes all the lambs he wants, eating few but killing or maiming many.

Mr. Chairman, it is better to have 1080 regulated and used by the Bureau as prudently as it is now done, rather than to rely on the individuals using it themselves or using some other form of poison.

Let me say that the people in my area have accepted the control of predator coyotes by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and I think the Bureau has done it carefully without excesses and as humanely as possible.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman's amendment proposes is taken care of under already existing programs which coordinate the various branches of Government on environmental questions. The Environmental Quality Act of 1970 called for a coordinating group, and this group was chartered by the President under a charter which appeared in the Federal Register of March 27, 1970.

The use of 1080 and other poisons by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife has to be approved each and every fiscal year by the Environmental Protection Agency, which reviews the need and proposed uses.

Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, calls for the very thing the gentleman's amendment would require. It is already part of the law. There is no need for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the

recommendation that the amendment 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 resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9417) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 400, nays 5, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]  
YEAS—400

Abbt	Blester	Cederberg	Dennis	Kazen	Riegle
Abernethy	Bingham	Celler	Derwinski	Keating	Roberts
Abourezk	Blackburn	Chamberlain	Dickinson	Kee	Robinson, Va.
Abzug	Blanton	Chisholm	Diggs	Keith	Robison, N.Y.
Adams	Blatnik	Clancy	Dingell	Kemp	Rodino
Addabbo	Boggs	Clark	Dorn	King	Roe
Alexander	Boland	Clausen	Dow	Kluczynski	Rogers
Anderson, Calif.	Bolling	Don H.	Dowdy	Koch	Roncallo
Anderson, Ill.	Bow	Clawson, Del.	Downing	Kuykendall	Rooney, N.Y.
Anderson, Tenn.	Brademas	Clay	Drinan	Kyl	Rooney, Pa.
Andrews, Ala.	Brinkley	Cleveland	Dulski	Kyros	Rosenthal
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brooks	Collier	Duncan	Landgrebe	Rostenkowski
Annuozio	Broomfield	Collins, Ill.	du Pont	Latta	Roush
Archer	Brozman	Collins, Tex.	Eckhardt	Leggett	Roy
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Colmer	Edmondson	Lennon	Roybal
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Conable	Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Ruppe
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Conte	Edwards, Calif.	Link	Ruth
Aspin	Broyhill, Va.	Conyers	Eilberg	Lloyd	Ryan
Aspinall	Buchanan	Corman	Erlenborn	Long, Md.	St Germain
Badillo	Burke, Fla.	Cotter	Esch	Lujan	Sandman
Baker	Burke, Mass.	Coughlin	Eshleman	McClory	Sarbanes
Baring	Burlison, Tex.	Crane	Evans, Colo.	McCloskey	Satterfield
Barrett	Burlison, Mo.	Culver	Evins, Tenn.	McClure	Saylor
Begich	Burton	Daniel, Va.	Findley	McCollister	Scherle
Belcher	Byrne, Pa.	Daniels, N.J.	Fish	McCormack	Scheuer
Bell	Byrnes, Wis.	Danielson	Fisher	McDade	Schneebell
Bergland	Byron	Davis, S.C.	Flood	McDonald,	Schwengel
Betts	Cabell	Davis, Wis.	Flowers	Mich.	Scott
Bevill	Caffery	de la Garza	Flynt	McEwen	Sebelius
Biaggi	Camp	Delaney	Foley	McFall	Seiberling
	Carney	Dellenback	Ford, Gerald R.	McKay	Shiple
	Carter	Dellums	Ford,	McKevitt	Shoup
	Casey, Tex.	Denholm	Ford,	McMillan	Shriver
			Forsythe	Madden	Sikes
			Fountain	Mahon	Sisk
			Fraser	Mailliard	Skubitz
			Frelinghuysen	Mann	Slack
			Frenzel	Martin	Smith, Calif.
			Frey	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
			Fulton, Pa.	Mathis, Ga.	Smith, N.Y.
			Fulton, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Snyder
			Fuqua	Mayne	Spence
			Gallifanakis	Mazzoli	Springer
			Gallagher	Meeds	Stafford
			Garmatz	Melcher	Staggers
			Gaydos	Metcalfe	Stanton,
			Gettys	Michel	J. William
			Gialmo	Mikva	Stanton,
			Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	James V.
			Goldwater	Miller, Ohio	Steed
			Gonzalez	Mills, Ark.	Steele
			Goodling	Mills, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
			Grasso	Minish	Steiger, Wis.
			Gray	Mink	Stephens
			Green, Oreg.	Minshall	Stokes
			Green, Pa.	Mitchell	Stubblefield
			Griffin	Mizell	Stuckey
			Griffiths	Mollohan	Sullivan
			Grover	Monagan	Symington
			Gubser	Montgomery	Talcott
			Gude	Moorhead	Teague, Calif.
			Haley	Morgan	Teague, Tex.
			Halpern	Mosher	Terry
			Hamilton	Moss	Thompson, Ga.
			Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
			schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.
			Hanley	Myers	Thone
			Hanna	Natcher	Tiernan
			Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi	Udall
			Hansen, Wash.	Nelsen	Ullman
			Harrington	Nichols	Van Deerlin
			Harsha	Nix	Vander Jagt
			Harvey	Obey	Vanik
			Hastings	O'Konski	Veysey
			Hathaway	O'Neill	Vigorito
			Hawkins	Passman	Waggonner
			Hays	Patman	Waldie
			Hébert	Patten	Ware
			Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly	Whalen
			Heckler, Mass.	Pepper	Whalley
			Helstoski	Perkins	White
			Henderson	Pettis	Whitehurst
			Hicks, Mass.	Peyser	Whitten
			Hicks, Wash.	Pickle	Widnall
			Hillis	Pike	Wiggins
			Hogan	Pirnie	Williams
			Hollifield	Poage	Wilson, Bob
			Horton	Podell	Wilson,
			Hosmer	Poff	Charles H.
			Howard	Powell	Winn
			Hull	Preyer, N.C.	Wolf
			Hungate	Price, Ill.	Wright
			Hunt	Price, Tex.	Wyatt
			Hutchinson	Pryor, Ark.	Wyder
			Ichord	Pucinski	Wyllie
			Jarman	Quie	Wyman
			Johnson, Calif.	Quillen	Yates
			Johnson, Pa.	Randall	Yatron
			Jonas	Rangel	Young, Fla.
			Jones, Ala.	Rees	Young, Tex.
			Jones, N.C.	Reid, Ill.	Zablocki
			Karh	Reid, N.Y.	Zion
			Kastenmeier	Reuss	Zwach
				Rhodes	

## NAYS—5

Bennett	Hall	Schmitz
Gross	Rarick	

## NOT VOTING—28

Brasco	Hagan	O'Hara
Bray	Jacobs	Purcell
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, Tenn.	Rallsback
Chappell	Landrum	Rousselot
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Runnels
Dent	McCulloch	Stratton
Devine	McKinney	Taylor
Donohue	Macdonald,	Wampler
Edwards, La.	Mass.	Watts
Fascell	Morse	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Morse.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Chappell.  
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Bray.  
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. McKinney.  
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Devine.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Rallsback.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Wampler.  
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Watts.  
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Jacobs.  
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 742. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

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

S. 991. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue a program of research, development, and demonstration of processes for the conversion of saline and other chemically contaminated water for beneficial use and for the treatment of saline and other chemically contaminated waste water to maintain or improve the quality of natural waters, and for other purposes.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what will be the program tomorrow, if I might ask the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's request.

We have a heavy program for tomorrow. There are two privileged resolutions having to do with the so-called Pentagon papers from the Committee on Armed Services. Also there are two conference reports involving important appropriation bills.

Also scheduled are S. 1700—Treasury borrowing from Federal Reserve and one regular appropriation bill.

We hope to dispose all of this business tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. There is one appropriation bill?

Mr. BOGGS. There is one regular appropriation bill and two appropriation conference reports.

Mr. GROSS. There are three appropriation conference reports?

Mr. BOGGS. There are two.

Mr. GROSS. What about the other two bills—I believe they are called the health bills—they are on the program for this week. Will they go over until Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. They are the two health bills. One is the Health Manpower Training Act and the other is the Nurses Training Act which were announced that they will be scheduled on Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any reason why one of those bills could not be taken up today?

Mr. BOGGS. Unfortunately, may I reply to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, many of the Members on our side of the aisle because of commitments early this evening have asked that no further business be scheduled, and we have no further business on the whip notice for today.

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

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

There was no objection.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the third Annual Report of the National Science Board, as required by Section 4(g) of the National Science Foundation Act, as amended by Public Law 90-407.

Action to meet the needs of today includes laying the foundation for tomorrow's problem solving. For this reason, I suggest that this report of the National Science Board receive your attention.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 29, 1971.

## THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-136)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I herewith transmit the third annual report on national housing goals as required by Section 1603 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

This Report, prepared by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, notes the progress toward meeting the Nation's housing needs. Increased housing opportunities have been provided for lower income families through the greatly expanded federally assisted housing programs. Lower interest rates and the increased availability of mortgage capital will permit greatly expanded housing production during the current year.

The Report also makes it quite obvious that we must not be complacent about the progress we have made in the past two years. Several types of problems are emerging. Housing costs continue to rise, pricing many families out of the market for adequate homes. This Administration has taken firm steps to control the inflation in construction costs, but we cannot consider the problem solved.

Other problems highlighted in this Report are equally or more difficult to solve:

—The need to deal with inequities which arise when some families receive subsidies and others do not, the inevitable result of having to allocate scarce resources.

—The need to assure that the effort to meet housing production objectives goes forward in consonance with our deep concern for assuring a desirable overall living environment.

These problems are complex; simplistic solutions will not do the job. This Report raises the problems in a straightforward way so that they can be aired and each of the possible solutions explored openly. Only in this way can realistic answers be found. This Administration is committed to the search for those answers, working in full cooperation with the Congress, private industry, labor and the American people.

I commend this Report to the Congress and to the public as a major step forward in our efforts to meet the housing needs of the American people.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 29, 1971.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall Nos. 147 and 148, and on recorded teller votes Nos. 159 and 160. I

would have voted "no" on recorded teller votes Nos. 161 and 163. I would have voted "yea" on recorded teller vote No. 164 and on rollcall vote No. 165.

#### DRUG ADDICTION IN OUR ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the subject of drug addiction in our Armed Forces has become a matter of national concern. It is estimated that there may be as many as 40,000 American troops in Vietnam alone, who are dependent on hard drugs. We know that many former members of the Armed Forces became drug dependent while in the service; some, in fact, have been discharged because of their addiction.

Aware of the need for a direct legislative approach to meet this situation, for the protection of both the servicemen and society, my colleagues from Philadelphia, Congressmen ROBERT N. C. NIX, JAMES A. BYRNE, JOSHUA EILBERG, and WILLIAM J. GREEN, have joined with me to introduce a bill to provide for the detection and treatment of present and former members of the Armed Forces who are narcotic addicts.

This proposal provides for a simple, direct, straight forward approach to meet the situation. It refuses entrance into the Armed Forces to those who are found to be drug dependent. It provides for detection and treatment for members of the Armed Forces, strongly encouraging and providing incentives for voluntary submission to treatment and rehabilitation.

Voluntary submission by the serviceman is encouraged by granting him immunity from disciplinary action. In addition, confidentiality between doctor and patient, which is nonexistent in the military, is established. Even those charged with or convicted of drug-related offenses are to be afforded every opportunity for treatment and rehabilitation while in the service.

At the same time, those adjudged to be addicted to a narcotic drug may not be separated from the service to become a burden on and threat to society. Another feature of the bill is the provision that the addict is required to go through the period of treatment and rehabilitation on his own time. In other words, the addict cannot be discharged from the service until cured and the time it takes to cure the GI would not be included as part of his service time.

The bill overcomes the legal question of extending military service beyond the obligated period and the requirement to defer discharge will serve as an effective deterrent to the taking of drugs. Also, it will stop many GI's who take the drug route as a means of being discharged from the service before their time is up. This course of action, as well as the military practice of discharging the addict, has resulted in countless addicts being turned loose with uncontrollable habits, posing terrifying threats to themselves and to all society.

The bill also provides for treatment of veterans who became drug dependent while on active duty. We know that many former servicemen were introduced to habit-forming drugs while in the Armed Forces, and are drug dependent today. While the VA has undertaken a program to assist drug-dependent veterans it is limited by law to those veterans receiving an honorable discharge. Unfortunately, many veterans were discharged because of drug addiction and received less than an honorable discharge and are therefore not eligible for VA treatment. Provisions in the bill would alter the situation so that these veterans could receive a full range of assistance for drug dependency from the Veterans' Administration or the Public Health Service.

#### TEXTILE IMPORTS

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the news from the Far East with regard to the administration's efforts to negotiate textile import agreements is anything but encouraging.

While little has been stated publicly, wire service dispatches from Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong indicate that those countries are taking a very hard line with regard to proposed restraints.

One report even stated that Korea, one of the largest exporters of textiles and apparel, has suggested a 45 percent annual increase in its exports. This is difficult to understand in view of the very bad economic and employment conditions throughout our domestic textile industry.

Ambassador David M. Kennedy, and a team of U.S. Government negotiators, have been meeting for the past several weeks with Government leaders in Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong. After lengthy sessions in each country, Ambassador Kennedy reports that some progress has been made only with Taiwan, where there apparently was general understanding on some of the major elements of an agreement.

This apparently was not the case where Korea is concerned. A leading official of Korea's Ministry of Commerce and Industry was quoted last week as saying that the talks had failed.

The details of what is being discussed have not been released in this country, but it is my understanding that Ambassador Kennedy has, in each country, made a forceful presentation of the textile import problem in this country. He placed particular emphasis on the unemployment which is resulting from the ever increasing level of imports.

We have heard a great deal about Japan's burgeoning imports and her refusal to agree to meaningful controls. Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong are playing an equally significant role in the vast buildup of imports which has contributed to the loss of 100,000 textile and apparel jobs in the United States. In my State, alone, where textiles are the largest industrial employer, we have seen 30 plants close. Thirteen have closed in

South Carolina and seven in Georgia and Alabama.

Last year, textile and apparel imports reached a record level of 4.5 billion square yards. More than half of these products came from Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong.

Yet, these countries refuse to admit their imports have reached a level and a rate of growth where some reasonable restraints would be in order.

In the case of Korea, her textile exports have more than tripled since 1967, growing from 97 million square yards to 300 million square yards in 1970. Imports from Korea during the first quarter of this year indicate that this figure will rise to 444 million square yards by the end of the year.

The United States has a bilateral agreement with Korea governing imports of cotton textiles, and the growth has been steady, but reasonable. The unregulated area of manmade fiber textiles is another story. Manmade fiber textile imports from Korea have grown from 64 million square yards in 1967 to 254 million square yards in 1970.

The growth of textile imports from Taiwan has been even more dramatic. In 1967, we imported about 197 million square yards, but today imports from Taiwan are entering this country at an annual rate of 625 million square yards.

These dramatic increases have been taking place during a period when the textile market was growing only about 3 percent per year.

It is my impression that Taiwan has evidenced some understanding of the magnitude of the textile import problem in the United States and has shown some desire to cooperate. This may or may not result in a satisfactory agreement.

Korea, on the other hand, apparently has shown no willingness to cooperate. They have pleaded that they need special consideration. It seems to me that we have given Korea a great deal of that special consideration already. We have spent more than \$5 billion on economic assistance to Korea since the end of the war. We have given military assistance to the tune of \$3.2 billion.

Our Government is not asking that Korea stop her shipments of textiles and apparel to the United States. We all appreciate the value of this trade to both countries. But our trade with Korea and Taiwan and Hong Kong and Japan has reached the point where it is too much of a good thing. Our friends in the Far East are killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

It is in the long-term best interest of all of them to come to terms now, so there can be orderly development of textile trade. The United States can no longer tolerate the unregulated trade which is leading us down the road to longer and longer unemployment lines.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I

sponsored a major air pollution conference for legislators throughout the Los Angeles-Riverside air basin. This conference and other official business made it impossible for me to be present during the legislative week of June 10-18. I want the record to show how I would have voted had I been present.

On June 10, I would have voted "yea," roll No. 129, on House Resolution 471, the rule under which the Sugar Act was considered. On the Sugar Act, H.R. 8866, roll No. 130, I was paired for and would have voted "yea."

On June 15, I would have voted "yea," roll No. 134, on the conference report on S. 575 Appalachian regional development, which includes public works acceleration.

On June 16, when the House considered military procurement authorization for the fiscal year 1972, I would have voted "nay," roll No. 137, on the amendment that sought to limit ABM funding. On the amendment that sought to strike out \$370.2 million for development of the B-I manned bomber, roll No. 138, I would have voted "nay." On the amendment to the previous amendment that would reduce B-I development funds to \$200 million, I would have voted "nay." I would have also voted "nay," on the amendment that sought to reduce research, development, and evaluation funds to fiscal year 1971 levels, a cut of \$900 million. I would have voted "nay," roll No. 139, on the amendment which was identical to the previous amendment except that it provided a 5 percent increase over last year's levels for inflation. On the amendment that sought to limit authorization to the fiscal year 1971 appropriation level, I would have voted "nay," roll No. 140.

On June 17, roll No. 142, I would have voted "yea" to table the Hathaway motion to agree to Senate amendments to education appropriation bill. On the amendment that provided for a straight cutoff of support after January 1, 1972, with no other provisions, I would have voted "nay," roll No. 143. On the Nedzi-Whalen amendment which was designed, subject to certain provisions, to prohibit the expenditure of new funds after January 1, 1972, to support U.S. military deployment or military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, I would have voted "nay," roll No. 144. On the amendment to the previous amendment that extended the deadline by 4 months, and contained provisions regarding POW's, or any cease-fire entered into; I would have voted "nay." On the amendment that called for a cutoff of funds to support the deployment or maintenance of any U.S. Armed Forces in or the conduct of U.S. military operations in or over Indochina, after June 1, 1972; subject to certain provisions regarding POW's, I would have voted "nay," roll No. 145. On H.R. 8687, the military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1972, I would have voted "yea," roll No. 146. On the amendment that forbids funds to institutions of higher education that deny armed services recruiting personnel access thereto, I would have voted "yea."

On June 18, I would have voted "yea," roll No. 147, on House Resolution 434, to

authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor. On H.R. 7736, to extend for 1 year the student loan and scholarship provision of titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act, I would have voted "yea," roll No. 148.

#### STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS NOW SERVING IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, many things have been said by Members of this august body, and by others, regarding revenue sharing. Much has been constructive, but a good deal has been ill-thoughtout. One of the major criticisms of this concept has been leveled at those public officials who would administer these shared funds on the State and local levels.

I am concerned about the attitude of some of my colleagues regarding the fitness of local and State officials to administer the funds shared under the revenue sharing concept.

Having served recently as the mayor of a growing city of 50,000, I have taken these criticisms somewhat personally, and I am sure that many of my colleagues had been offended by such thoughtless cynicism. So, I have done some research on the question and I have discovered that over 400 members of the 92d Congress have held responsible positions in State and local government before becoming Members of Congress. Seventeen Members of this Congress have been Governors of States, 11 have served as Lieutenant Governors, 337 have served in the legislatures of our States. Thirty-six have been city or county executives, and 51 have been members of city or county councils.

Under these circumstances an indictment of local and State officials becomes an indictment of this Congress to a substantial degree.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert into the RECORD a list of the Members of this Congress and the positions of responsibility they have held in State and local government before coming here. The major source of information in compiling these listings was the "Official Congressional Directory; 92d Congress; First Session." Therefore, in some cases where the biographical summaries in the Directory are incomplete, the following lists may be likewise incomplete. However, several checks of other sources of information have indicated that these listings are substantially complete:

#### LIST BY CATEGORY GOVERNORS

Senator Paul J. Fannin, Arizona.  
Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, Connecticut.  
Senator James Caleb Boggs, Delaware.  
Senator Herman E. Talmadge, Georgia.  
Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho.  
Senator Harold E. Hughes, Iowa.  
Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Maine.  
Senator Henry L. Bellmon, Oklahoma.  
Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon.  
Senator John O. Pastore, Rhode Island.  
Senator Strom Thurmond, South Carolina.

Senator Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina.  
Senator George D. Aiken, Vermont.  
Representative Robert T. Stafford, Vermont.  
Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin.  
Representative Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin.  
Senator Clifford P. Hansen, Wyoming.  
Total: 17.

#### LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS

Senator James B. Allen, Alabama.  
Representative Glenn M. Anderson, California.  
Senator Gordon L. Allott, Colorado.  
Senator Philip A. Hart, Michigan.  
Representative Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota.  
Senator Thomas F. Eagleton, Missouri.  
Senator Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico.  
Senator John O. Pastore, Rhode Island.  
Senator Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina.  
Senator George D. Aiken, Vermont.  
Representative Robert T. Stafford, Vermont.  
Total: 11.

#### MEMBERS OF STATE LEGISLATURE

Senator James B. Allen, Alabama.  
Representative William Nichols, Alabama.  
Representative Tom Beville, Alabama.  
Senator Ted Stevens, Alaska.  
Senator Mike Gravel, Alaska.  
Representative Nicholas J. Begich, Alaska.  
Representative Sam Steiger, Arizona.  
Representative David Pryor, Arkansas.  
Representative John E. Moss, California.  
Representative Robert L. Leggett, California.  
Representative Phillip Burton, California.  
Representative George P. Miller, California.  
Representative Charles Gubser, California.  
Representative Jerome R. Waldie, California.  
Representative John J. McFall, California.  
Representative Glenn M. Anderson, California.  
Representative H. Allen Smith, California.  
Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, California.  
Representative Thomas M. Rees, California.  
Representative George E. Danielson, California.  
Representative Charles H. Wilson, California.  
Representative Richard T. Hanna, California.  
Representative John G. Schmitz, California.  
Representative Victor V. Veysey, California.  
Senator Peter H. Dominick, Colorado.  
Representative Donald G. Brotzman, Colorado.  
Representative Frank E. Evans, Colorado.  
Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado.  
Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, Connecticut.  
Senator Lowell P. Weicker, Connecticut.  
Representative Stewart B. McKinney, Connecticut.  
Representative Ella T. Grasso, Connecticut.  
Representative Pierre S. DuPont IV, Delaware.  
Senator Lawton Chiles, Florida.  
Representative Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida.  
Representative Don Fuqua, Florida.  
Representative Charles E. Bennett, Florida.  
Representative William V. Chappell, Jr., Florida.  
Representative Sam M. Gibbons, Florida.  
Representative James A. Haley, Florida.  
Representative C. W. Bill Young, Florida.  
Representative Claude D. Pepper, Florida.  
Representative Dante B. Fascell, Florida.  
Representative G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia.  
Representative Jack T. Brinkley, Georgia.  
Representative Fletcher Thompson, Georgia.  
Representative John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia.  
Representative Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Georgia.

- Senator Hiram L. Fong, Hawaii.  
 Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii.  
 Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii.  
 Representative Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii.  
 Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho.  
 Representative James A. McClure, Idaho.  
 Representative Orval Hansen, Idaho.  
 Senator Adlai E. Stevenson, III, Illinois.  
 Representative Abner J. Mikva, Illinois.  
 Representative Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois.  
 Representative John C. Kluczynski, Illinois.  
 Representative Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois.  
 Representative Robert McClory, Illinois.  
 Representative John N. Erlenborn, Illinois.  
 Representative Thomas F. Rallsback, Illinois.  
 Senator Birch Bayh, Indiana.  
 Representative Earl F. Landgrebe, Indiana.  
 Representative J. Edward Roush, Indiana.  
 Representative Elwood H. Hillis, Indiana.  
 Representative David W. Dennis, Indiana.  
 Representative Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Indiana.  
 Senator Jack R. Miller, Iowa.  
 Representative Fred Schwengel, Iowa.  
 Representative William J. Scherle, Iowa.  
 Senator James B. Pearson, Kansas.  
 Senator Robert J. Dole, Kansas.  
 Representative Keith G. Sebellius, Kansas.  
 Representative Garner E. Shriver, Kansas.  
 Senator John Sherman Cooper, Kentucky.  
 Senator Marlow W. Cook, Kentucky.  
 Representative Ramano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky.  
 Representative John C. Watts, Kentucky.  
 Representative Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky.  
 Senator Allen J. Ellender, Louisiana.  
 Representative Patrick T. Caffrey, Louisiana.  
 Representative Edwin W. Edwards, Louisiana.  
 Representative Speedy O. Long, Louisiana.  
 Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Maine.  
 Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland.  
 Senator J. Glenn Beall, Jr., Maryland.  
 Representative Paul S. Sarbanes, Maryland.  
 Representative Goodloe E. Byron, Maryland.  
 Representative Gilbert Gude, Maryland.  
 Representative Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Michael J. Harrington, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Thomas P. O'Neill, Massachusetts.  
 Representative James A. Burke, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Hastings Keith, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Marvin L. Esch, Michigan.  
 Representative Garry Brown, Michigan.  
 Representative Edward Hutchinson, Michigan.  
 Representative Guy A. Vander Jagt, Michigan.  
 Representative Charles C. Diggs, Michigan.  
 Representative William D. Ford, Michigan.  
 Representative Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan.  
 Representative William S. Broomfield, Michigan.  
 Representative Albert H. Quie, Minnesota.  
 Representative Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota.  
 Representative Bill Frenzel, Minnesota.  
 Representative Joseph E. Karth, Minnesota.  
 Representative Donald MacKay Fraser, Minnesota.  
 Representative John M. Zwach, Minnesota.  
 Representative John A. Blatnik, Minnesota.  
 Senator James O. Eastland, Mississippi.  
 Senator John C. Stennis, Mississippi.  
 Representative Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi.  
 Representative Gillespie V. Montgomery, Mississippi.  
 Representative Richard H. Ichord, Missouri.  
 Representative John Melcher, Montana.  
 Representative Walter S. Baring, Nevada.  
 Senator Norris Cotton, New Hampshire.  
 Representative James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire.  
 Senator Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.  
 Representative John E. Hunt, New Jersey.  
 Representative Charles W. Sandman, New Jersey.  
 Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey.  
 Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey.  
 Representative William B. Widnall, New Jersey.  
 Representative Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey.  
 Senator Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico.  
 Representative Harold L. Runnels, New Mexico.  
 Representative James R. Grover, Jr., New York.  
 Representative Norman F. Lent, New York.  
 Representative Seymour Halpern, New York.  
 Representative Shirley A. Chisholm, New York.  
 Representative Bertram L. Podell, New York.  
 Representative Robert C. McEwen, New York.  
 Representative John H. Terry, New York.  
 Representative Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York.  
 Representative James F. Hastings, New York.  
 Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina.  
 Representative Walter B. Jones, North Carolina.  
 Representative L. H. Fountain, North Carolina.  
 Representative Nick Galifianakis, North Carolina.  
 Representative Alton A. Lennon, North Carolina.  
 Representative Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina.  
 Senator Milton R. Young, North Dakota.  
 Representative Arthur A. Link, North Dakota.  
 Senator William B. Saxbe, Ohio.  
 Senator Robert Taft, Jr., Ohio.  
 Representative Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Ohio.  
 Representative William M. McCulloch, Ohio.  
 Representative Delbert L. Latta, Ohio.  
 Representative Jackson E. Betts, Ohio.  
 Representative Samuel L. Devine, Ohio.  
 Representative Charles A. Mosher, Ohio.  
 Representative Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio.  
 Representative John M. Ashbrook, Ohio.  
 Representative Wayne L. Hays, Ohio.  
 Representative Charles J. Carney, Ohio.  
 Representative Charles A. Vanik, Ohio.  
 Representative William E. Minshall, Ohio.  
 Representative Walter E. Powell, Ohio.  
 Senator Fred R. Harris, Oklahoma.  
 Senator Henry L. Bellmon, Oklahoma.  
 Representative John Jarman, Oklahoma.  
 Representative John N. Happy Camp, Oklahoma.  
 Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon.  
 Senator Bob Packwood, Oregon.  
 Representative John Dellenback, Oregon.  
 Representative James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative John H. Ware, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Edwin D. Eshleman, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative John H. Dent, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania.  
 Senator John O. Pastore, Rhode Island.  
 Representative Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island.  
 Senator Strom Thurmond, South Carolina.  
 Senator Ernest Hollings, South Carolina.  
 Representative Floyd D. Spence, South Carolina.  
 Representative William J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina.  
 Representative James R. Mann, South Carolina.  
 Representative James H. Quillen, Tennessee.  
 Representative La Mar Baker, Tennessee.  
 Representative Richard R. Fulton, Tennessee.  
 Representative Leonard R. Blanton, Tennessee.  
 Representative Wright Patman, Texas.  
 Representative Ray Roberts, Texas.  
 Representative Bill Archer, Texas.  
 Representative Bob Eckhardt, Texas.  
 Representative Jack Brooks, Texas.  
 Representative William R. (Bob) Poage, Texas.  
 Representative James C. Wright, Jr., Texas.  
 Representative Eligio de la Garza, Texas.  
 Representative Richard C. White, Texas.  
 Representative Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas.  
 Representative O. Clark Fisher, Texas.  
 Representative Robert R. Casey, Texas.  
 Representative Abraham Kazen, Jr., Texas.  
 Representative K. Gunn McKay, Utah.  
 Representative Sherman P. Lloyd, Utah.  
 Senator George D. Aiken, Vermont.  
 Senator Winston L. Prouty, Vermont.  
 Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Virginia.  
 Senator William B. Spong, Jr., Virginia.  
 Representative David E. Satterfield, III, Virginia.  
 Representative W. C. (Dan) Daniel, Virginia.  
 Representative J. Kenneth Robinson, Virginia.  
 Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington.  
 Representative Julia Butler Hansen, Washington.  
 Representative Mike McCormack, Washington.  
 Senator Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia.  
 Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin.  
 Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin.  
 Representative Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin.  
 Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin.  
 Representative William A. Steiger, Wisconsin.  
 Representative David R. Obey, Wisconsin.  
 Representative John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin.  
 Representative Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin.  
 Total: 337.
- CITY OR COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 Representative Harold T. Johnson, Roseville, California.  
 Representative Burt L. Talcott, Monterey County, California.  
 Representative John J. McFall, Manteca, California.  
 Representative Glenn M. Anderson, Hawthorne, California.  
 Representative Del M. Clawson, Compton, California.  
 Representative Charles E. Wiggins, El Monte, California.

Representative John S. Monagan, Waterbury, Connecticut.  
 Senator Edward J. Gurney, Winter Park, Florida.  
 Senator Vance Hartke, Evansville, Indiana.  
 Representative Keith G. Sebelius, Norton, Kansas.  
 Senator Marlow W. Cook, Jefferson County, Kentucky.  
 Representative James Harvey, Saginaw, Michigan.  
 Representative Elford A. Cederberg, Bay City, Michigan.  
 Representative Jack H. McDonald, Redford Township, Michigan.  
 Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Minneapolis, Minnesota.  
 Representative Thomas G. Abernethy, Eupora, Mississippi.  
 Representative William R. Hull, Jr., Weston, Missouri.  
 Representative Richard G. Shoup, Missoula, Montana.  
 Representative John Melcher, Forsyth, Montana.  
 Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, Laconia, New Hampshire.  
 Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, Moores-town, New Jersey.  
 Representative Robert A. Roe, Wayne Township, New Jersey.  
 Representative Henry Helstoski, East Rutherford, New Jersey.  
 Representative Edward J. Patten, Perth Amboy, New Jersey.  
 Representative Peter A. Peyser, Irvington, New York.  
 Representative Samuel S. Stratton, Schenectady, New York.  
 Representative Henry P. Smith, III, North Tonawanda, New York.  
 Representative Walter B. Jones, Farmville, North Carolina.  
 Representative Donald D. Clancy, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Representative Clarence E. Miller, Lancaster, Ohio.  
 Representative Wayne L. Hays, Flushing, Ohio.  
 Representative John J. Duncan, Knoxville, Tennessee.  
 Representative Earle Cabell, Dallas, Texas.  
 Representative James C. Wright, Jr., Weatherford, Texas.  
 Senator Winston L. Prouty, Newport, Vermont.  
 Representative Vernon W. Thomson, Richland Center, Wisconsin.  
 Total: 36.

MEMBER OF CITY OR COUNTY COUNCIL

Senator Barry M. Goldwater, Phoenix, Arizona.  
 Representative John Paul Hammerschmidt, Harrison, Arkansas.  
 Representative Don H. Clausen, Del Norte County, California.  
 Representative Harold T. Johnson, Roseville, California.  
 Representative Ronald V. Dellums, Berkeley, California.  
 Representative Del M. Clawson, Compton, California.  
 Representative Charles E. Wiggins, El Monte, California.  
 Representative Edward R. Roybal, Los Angeles, California.  
 Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Palisade, Colorado.  
 Senator Lowell P. Weicker, Greenwich, Connecticut.  
 Representative Robert N. Glamo, New Haven, Connecticut.  
 Senator Edward J. Gurney, Winter Park, Florida.  
 Representative J. Herbert Burke, Broward County, Florida.  
 Representative Ralph H. Metcalfe, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Representative Harold R. Collier, Berwyn, Illinois.

Representative Charles M. Price, St. Clair County, Illinois.  
 Representative Keith G. Sebelius, Norton, Kansas.  
 Representative F. Bradford Morse, Lowell, Massachusetts.  
 Representative Louise Day Hicks, Boston, Massachusetts.  
 Representative James Harvey, Saginaw, Michigan.  
 Representative Jack H. McDonald, Wayne County, Michigan.  
 Representative William L. Clay, St. Louis, Missouri.  
 Representative Richard G. Shoup, Missoula, Montana.  
 Representative John Melcher, Forsyth, Montana.  
 Representative Walter S. Baring, Reno, Nevada.  
 Senator Clifford P. Case, Rahway, New Jersey.  
 Representative Edwin B. Forsythe, Moores-town, New Jersey.  
 Representative Robert A. Roe, Wayne Township, New Jersey.  
 Representative Henry Helstoski, East Rutherford, New Jersey.  
 Representative Edward I. Koch, New York, New York.  
 Representative Samuel S. Stratton, Schenectady, New York.  
 Representative John H. Terry, Onondaga County, New York.  
 Representative Frank Horton, Rochester, New York.  
 Representative Thaddeus J. Dulski, Buffalo, New York.  
 Representative Wilmer D. Mizell, Davidson County, North Carolina.  
 Representative Earl B. Ruth, Salisbury, North Carolina.  
 Representative William J. Keating, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Representative Donald D. Clancy, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Representative Clarence E. Miller, Lancaster, Ohio.  
 Representative John William Stanton, Lake County, Ohio.  
 Representative Charles A. Vanik, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Representative Walter E. Powell, Fairfield, Ohio.  
 Representative Lawrence G. Williams, Springfield, Pennsylvania.  
 Representative Bill Archer, Hunters Creek Village, Texas.  
 Representative Henry B. Gonzalez, San Antonio, Texas.  
 Representative David E. Satterfield III, Richmond, Virginia.  
 Senator Clifford P. Hansen, Teton County, Wyoming.  
 Delegate Walter E. Fauntroy, Washington, District of Columbia.  
 Total: 51.

#### A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON WORLD TRADE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the news this weekend is not all that good on the foreign trade front. In fact, no less an authority than the Secretary of Commerce predicted a trade surplus of \$1 billion or less this year. The United States, according to the Secretary, has been losing and is continuing to lose its competitiveness in world market. As bad as a \$1 billion surplus figure would be, the key words in the Sec-

retary's prediction, as far as I am concerned, are the words "or less." For the Secretary went on to confess that we may end up this year, though I am not predicting it, with a trade deficit for the first time in 75 years. The most marked decline has been in the area of technologically intensive manufactured goods. We seem to be losing our competitive edge in this field as foreign countries, with the assistance of investment by our multinational firms in their economy, seem to be catching up with us. Anyone who fails to see the connection between the declining investment of this Nation's GNP in private research and development and the rising unemployment figures among this Nation's technicians and scientific workers simply is not capable of putting two and two together. Furthermore, anyone who does not see the connection between our staggering unemployment figures in this sector and the impact of foreign imports on these figures is not considering all the factors in this elementary equation. While we are on the subject of equations, one only has to look at the healthy balance-of-payments surplus announced for Japan recently and compare it to the \$1.4 billion trade deficit that this country had with Japan in 1970 and realize that it is no accident that these figures coincide. I am glad to see that both the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury are lately in agreement and are at least publicly urging that the United States take a hard-core stand on reciprocity and it is my hope that these public utterances will be reflected in our trade negotiations. It would certainly be a novel approach to judge from past performance.

Against this background, I think it is clear for all to see that the old theory of comparative advantage in world trade isn't working—we've all seen that in the reversal of our balance of payments and in the move of many companies to overseas production sites. Technology has been refined and spread to the point that low-wage labor in any country can build the most advanced electronic equipment—obviously at a lower cost than it could be produced in the United States. And the multinational corporations have taken advantage of this. Their operations now make up more than half our total trade, and they are rapidly becoming one of the most powerful forces in world economics.

The American Federationist recently carried an article by Howard D. Samuel, a vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, discussing these changes in world trade. He emphasizes the fact that the old theories no longer work, and that we need to develop new formulas to meet new conditions.

His suggestions for new ways of dealing with new conditions in world trade make sense to me. I would like to share his ideas with my colleagues, and so I am including this article in the RECORD at this point.

#### A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON WORLD TRADE

(By Howard D. Samuel)

Most of us grew up in a climate of free trade. The spirit of Cordell Hull reigned supreme and the philosophy of David Ricardo,

centering on the theory of comparative advantage, still held firm 100 years after it was formulated. Ricardo and Hull both believed that each nation could identify and develop its own economic strengths, yielding its areas of weakness to imports of other nations.

In theory it was a logical and nicely balanced system, and it probably responded quite fairly to the conditions of the world 150 years ago and to a lesser extent 40 years ago. A number of backward nations, endowed with natural resources but without technology or a skilled labor force, could best build their economies around agriculture or mining. And a number of moderately developed nations could only accommodate themselves to a few rudimentary manufacturing processes, such as basic textiles or metals. Finally, a few advanced nations, endowed with both technology and a skilled labor force, could handle the more complex fabricating processes. The higher wage levels of the advanced nations were protected naturally, by technological and capital strength.

For more than 100 years, this formula for free trade made considerable economic sense and, although many nations refused to accept it in practice, in theory it was hard to refute.

For the past several decades, however, the conditions which gave rise to the theory of comparative advantage have been steadily eroding—until today the world economic picture has been so drastically altered that the theory is almost meaningless.

The main factor which has changed has been the world-wide spread of technology. Although many countries still must be classified as under-developed, technological processes have been so rationalized and refined that almost any country can produce almost anything it wants to—so long as it has the necessary capital.

The unschooled girls of Taiwan can do just as well assembling complex TV components as the high school graduates of New Jersey. The untrained workers of Africa or Asian nations can be taught to produce complex products, ranging from tiny transistors to giant turbines, as readily as the skilled workers of Pennsylvania or the West Coast. And the depressed inhabitants of the most squalid slums of the Far East can be taught to make specialty steel products just as well as the experienced workers of Pittsburgh.

The astonishing dispersal of technology is perhaps best illustrated by the case of the General Instrument Corporation, manufacturer of the most advanced kinds of electronic components. General Instrument is the largest single employer in Taiwan—a nation which we would normally classify as under-developed, where native workers would be most suitably employed harvesting rice for export. Instead they are manufacturing diodes—at about 10 cents an hour. Electronic calculators, electric typewriters, automobiles and computer parts are just a few of the kinds of complex technology which have come to roost in what used to be considered the backward nations of the Far East or South America.

Nor is there a shortage of international capital. For the other changing factor has been the spread of multinational corporations—giant companies, most of them based in the United States, others in Europe and Japan, which have set up subsidiaries all over the globe. As one economist, AFL-CIO Research Director Nat Goldfinger, has described it, "through the use of modern means of communication and transportation, through the operation of foreign subsidiary plants and other facilities and through license, patent and other arrangements with foreign companies, these U.S.-based multinationals juggle production, distribution, shipping and sales of parts and components as well as assembled finished products across national frontiers."

This is not a minor part of our trade pattern in 1971. In one way or another, more

than half our total trade is the result of the operations of these multinational companies, beyond the reach of normal competitive transactions between Americans and nationals of other countries.

In 1970 alone, U.S. investment in foreign plants and equipment amounted to \$12 billion. One of the results has been a steady erosion in our balance of trade position. Eliminating government aid programs, the United States has slipped by several billion dollars in trade in the last decade and is now operating at a deficit. Where the United States once benefitted from a trade surplus, exporting more than we imported, today we are importing more than we export. This means a net outflow of trade dollars, a condition which makes even old-fashioned free traders grim—and has contributed to the current crisis for the U.S. dollar in the international market.

These new factors have transformed the shape of international trade. Neither Ricardo nor Cordell Hull would recognize the normal pattern of trade today, which is not the regular and easy flow of raw materials and manufactured products between nations, but the convulsive moves and counter-moves of corporations closing up plants in one nation to open up in another. Comparative advantages still remain, but the exercise of comparative advantage is likely to be controlled not by individual nations choosing their own future destinies, but of corporate chief executives living on another continent. And in most cases the principal comparative advantage which remains to distinguish one country from another is workers' wages.

Technology, capital and skills can and do cross national boundaries. The only factor which is still anchored fast is the wage level. And in the competition between wage levels, the advanced nations—particularly the United States—will always come out the loser.

Few U.S. industries are immune to the new formulation of comparative advantage among nations. It is not just a question of high wage nations giving up the labor intensive industries such as textiles and apparel. Complex electronic products, machinery, automobiles, chemicals, metal products—all these industries find themselves vulnerable to increased imports from nations which we used to call undeveloped but which now have technology and capital—and low wages.

Technology, capital, invention, skills—nothing can give us the natural protection which was once afforded us, in theory and in fact. If the process continues unabated, the final irony is that we could be reduced to the posture of the backward nations of the 19th century, depending on the sales of agricultural products—we are already a major exporter of soybeans—in order to buy the manufactured products turned out by the nations of Africa and Asia. From shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves, in a half-dozen generations—on a global basis!

This is not hyperbole. England and the United States have been playing the role of the advanced nations, exchanging manufactured products for the raw materials of backward nations, along the pattern of comparative advantage drawn up by Ricardo. But the formerly backward nations are now capable of producing computers, airplanes and electronics and they are capable of exporting those products to the United States in trade for our agricultural products.

Does this mean that we should tear down the machinery of trade, close up our ports and retreat behind an impenetrable wall of tariffs and quotas to protect our industrial sector? Of course not. No sensible observer has made the suggestion. But it does mean that we are going to have to recast the economic philosophies of the last century in 1971 terms, to develop new formulas to meet new conditions. We cannot continue to de-

pend on theories which kept us afloat 150 years.

Peculiarly enough, the direction in which we should be heading has already been well charted by many of the same academicians and theorists who today appear to resist any change in our trade policies. For the past 40 years, liberal economists have come to realize that laissez faire—the theory that governed all economics for much of the 19th century—can no longer be supported in today's complex world.

Under the laissez faire philosophy, we got unending and successive cycles of prosperity and depression, unemployment, insecurity, low wage levels, unequal job opportunity, cheating in the market place, monopoly practices, and all the depredations of the public welfare that the robber barons could devise. It became obvious that without government regulations to encourage and enforce a more equal sharing of its yield, the free enterprise system might well be laying the foundation for its own demise. As a result, starting just before the turn of the century and accelerating the past 40 years, we have been passing laws regulating almost every area of our lives.

Finance and banking, utilities, advertising practices, the manufacture of drugs, food and many other products, safety standards, minimum wages, unemployment insurance and social security are just a few of the areas where government no longer allows the free play of the marketplace. Society generally is demanding more controls, not fewer, to assure that the fruits of our labor are shared more equitably and used more productively.

Surprisingly, international trade is one area where the economists still believe in a large measure of laissez faire. International trade, contrary to some claims, does not play an overwhelmingly important part in our standard of living, since it makes up only about 5 percent of our Gross National Product. But because its effects are confined to the industrial area, the damage caused by unregulated trade can be fairly intensive. We can no longer afford unregulated international trade any more than we can afford unregulated security markets or drug manufacturing or food packaging. Regulation of trade, designed to soften the impact of concentrated imports from other nations with lower wage standards, has become an absolute necessity if we are to avoid growing disruption, loss of job opportunities and sharp rises in our costs of job training and public assistance.

There are some economists who insist that adjustment assistance will solve the dislocations caused by international trade. For the first seven years of its existence, from 1962 to 1969, no cases were approved by the Tariff Commission for adjustment assistance. Then the commission changed its interpretation of the law and about 10,000 workers have received some benefits since. But at best, adjustment assistance provides only temporary relief for the worker whose job has been lost to imports and even then only when dislocations can be measured in terms of an isolated factory or shop, or even in terms of a small industry, employing only a few thousand workers.

Today, however, the growing tide of imports threatens whole segments of the economy. Based on the number of firms and workers in the textile-apparel industry, for example, if only 3 percent a year needed adjustment assistance, it would cost the federal budget several billion dollars a year—for only a small slice of only one industry. Obviously adjustment assistance is not the road to a secure trade policy, even though it has its use in certain cases.

Even in terms of the labor-intensive industries, which might be the first to feel the effects, it doesn't make sense for the nation to support wholesale disruption. In our age of technology, labor-intensive industries of-

for a last refugee for the low-skilled, inadequately educated worker, of whom the United States still has millions. Not all of these workers can be directed into the service trades—restaurants, discount stores and motels just doesn't have enough jobs to accommodate them. An industry like textile-apparel offers almost 2.5 million jobs, many of them requiring minimal entry skills. Wholesale failures would have a catastrophic effect on our manpower policies.

Some commentators claim we should put a lid on our wage levels, presumably so we could some day compete with other nations. This suggestion is wildly unrealistic. Many of the principal exporters to the United States—in the Far East and in South America—have wage levels so low that it would take generations for them to catch up even if we stood still. In South Korea, which is a large exporter of textiles, apparel and other products, industrial workers are paid at the level of about 10 cents an hour. In Hong Kong and Mexico, average wages are around 35 cents an hour. Little can be done in the near future to moderate the differential.

And that's not to consider the serious social question of why workers have to subsidize American industry to assure our competitive position in the world. This is a problem involving the entire nation, not just working people—who are the least able to afford competitive pressures—and the solution must come through national policies involving all interest.

Finally, it is questionable whether it would be useful for the nation to try to hold back wage levels. We have built the highest living standard the world has ever seen, not by keeping wages low but by allowing all segments of the community to share in our wealth. The process has been far from perfect, but our goal should be to improve the equity of our distribution policies, not reduce it.

The answer to our international trade problems is not adjustment assistance or reduced wages. The answer is to apply to foreign trade the same degree of regulation and control that we take for granted in our domestic transactions.

Will import controls for disrupted industries lead to a trade war? The free traders would have us believe so, but the facts on record do not support their fears. Nations trade with one another for cold, hard economic advantage. Quotas, tariffs, preferential systems and border taxes are common all over the globe and every nation is used to doing business with other nations as best it can despite the barriers. As a matter of fact, even the United States, although more sinned against than sinning, already has quotas on a few products and no one has seen any sign of trade wars.

The controls we need will not cut off or even reduce existing trade. They will simply assure foreign nations their proper—and properly growing—share of the domestic market, at the same time affording breathing time for domestic industry to adjust to changing market conditions. We have already seen the need for such controls in a few industries, as cotton textiles, oil and sugar, and in general our experience has been that we were able to safeguard the ability of domestic producers to meet the challenge of imports, at the same time to provide us with whatever benefits the imports themselves afford.

Other nations have readily accommodated themselves to these quotas—as well they should, since most nations have far more wide-ranging quota systems than we do. Today we should apply the same approach to all imports, to give us the benefit of a steady growing level of products from abroad, but fending off the numbering effects of sweeping increases.

We should begin to install the same kind of safeguards over our international trade that we have over domestic commerce—and

the most other nations instituted over their trade policies years ago. Unregulated trade once may have made sense—a century ago. Today it is the road to disaster.

#### THE CALL FOR NEW TRADE LEGISLATION

The AFL-CIO Executive Council has called for new trade and investment legislation embracing the following concepts:

One: New tax measures are needed to halt the export of U.S. jobs, remove the incentive to establish production and assembly facilities abroad and create tax disincentives to curb expanded production abroad.

Profits earned by the foreign operations of U.S. corporations should be taxed at the time they are earned. Under present law, corporations are allowed to defer U.S. taxes until they are repatriated to the United States and distributed, which may never happen. Foreign tax payments should be allowed a deduction on U.S. taxes, but the present allowance of a tax credit should be halted.

A Treasury Department study and report should be undertaken to determine the degree of enforcement and compliance with the section of the Internal Revenue Code requiring corporations to attribute their income to the specific foreign subsidiary where the income was earned. Its purpose is to prevent corporations from allocating their foreign income among various subsidiaries so as to pay the minimum possible taxes.

Wherever corporations with global accounting systems are found not in compliance, they should be given a reasonable period for compliance, but compliance should be made mandatory in all instances.

The amount of write-offs that U.S. tax laws presently allow U.S. corporations for depreciation for foreign subsidiaries should be replaced by a sliding scale allowance which relates to the tools, technology and purpose of the facility. If, for example, 100 percent of the capital assets (such as machinery) in the foreign subsidiary was developed at the expense of the U.S. government and the U.S. taxpayer, the depreciation allowed would be zero. However, if the production of the foreign subsidiary serves a great social purpose and has no adverse impact on U.S. trade, the depreciation allowance could be the maximum.

A tax should be imposed on the value of any patents, licenses and technology exported. Further, a tax should be levied on the royalties received by U.S. companies. Items of the Tariff Schedule which invite the transfer of production abroad through low tariffs should be repealed.

Two: Clear legislative direction is necessary to give the President authority to regulate, supervise and curb the outflows of U.S. capital. At the present time, controls on foreign investment are loose, inadequate and not related to trade and production. Authority given the President should include considerations for the kind of investment that would be made abroad, the product involved, the made, the linkage of the investment to the flow of trade and its effect on U.S. employment and the national economy.

The AFL-CIO objects to turning over to multilateral agencies, such as the World Bank, the supervision of private investment abroad for AID purposes.

In addition, a report on enforcement of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is strongly needed. A provision in this law was aimed at keeping development loans from disrupting U.S. production. It requires that not more than 20 percent of production in a foreign factory created by a development loan may be exported to the United States to compete with U.S.-made products. To date no disclosure has been made on the operation—or effectiveness—of this provision.

Three: U.S. government policy has encouraged the export of technology in recent years. U.S. companies have been licensing production to foreign licensees and patentees who

produce behind foreign trade barriers for export to the United States.

This policy should be reversed by giving the President clear authority to regulate, supervise and curb licensing and patent agreements on the basis of congressionally determined standards. These would include the kind of investment, the product involved, the country of investment, the linkage to trade flows from such transfers and the effect on U.S. employment and the economy.

Four: Reports should be made to the U.S. Department of Labor on foreign wages paid by the military and U.S. business. These reports should be on the same basis that U.S. law now requires reporting on wages and hours within the United States. The State Department and other U.S. agencies should press for fair labor standards in trade agreements.

Five: It should be the expressed policy of the United States to recognize that the healthy expansion of the world economy is linked to the continuation of a diversified, productive and fully employed economic and social system here as well as abroad. To assure this policy, mechanisms should be established to avoid the continued displacement of U.S. production, tax-base erosion, market disruption and export of American jobs.

Quantitative restraints, with a base year of 1965-69, should be applied to products and parts of products imported into the United States, allowing for a flexible growth factor related to U.S. production of the item.

Exceptions to quantitative quotas could be made where a legitimate voluntary agreement now exists or is negotiated on the item with other supplying countries and where the failure to import the item would disrupt U.S. production and U.S. markets.

To carry out this program, a single agency with quasi-independent authority to serve the Congress should be established. This agency would determine the quantitative limitations, advise the Congress of necessary interim adjustments for items where data are not available and supervise the maintenance of the program. Because of the broad spectrum of its operation, the agency should be composed of the merged operations of the Tariff Commission with the necessary trade-related parts of the Commerce, Labor and Treasury Departments.

Six: Products should be clearly labeled to show the country of origin for components and parts as well as the final product. For example, a TV set made from parts produced and assembled in Taiwan, Hong Kong, the United States and Korea should show the source of the components as well as the final product.

Seven: All imports should conform strictly to all laws designed to protect the safety and health of American consumers.

Eight: Federal standards for international accounting by U.S. firms with foreign operations should be established and enforced. Such accounting standards should be consistent with the uniform accounting required by the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Under current law Customs officials classify imports under general categories related to the collection of tariffs rather than to the actual description of the imported product. The Census and Customs Bureaus should have consistent reporting systems so imports can be related to production in the United States. The tariff law should be amended to require shipping declarations and invoices to include product descriptions.

Nine: The Antidumping Act of 1921 must be modernized to assure effective action against "dumping," the practice of unloading large quantities at prices below their fair value. Under current operations, dumping findings have taken as much as two years. Interpretations of the law have not made clear that employment and working conditions should be part of the test of injury to an industry. The law should shorten

the period of a finding of dumping to four months, make the injury determination simultaneous with the determination of sales at less than fair value and place the determinations within the single agency established to supervised international trade.

#### PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the President, in vetoing the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, has acted with foresight and responsibility and in the best interests of our Nation.

The Democrats are now claiming that millions of unemployed could have benefited from this act. Not even the most optimistic proponent of this accelerated public works program ever suggested that millions of unemployed workers would find jobs as a result of this bill.

We have only past performance on which we can judge the success of such an accelerated employment program. Utilizing that past knowledge—specifically, the 1962 Accelerated Public Works Act—we see that the peak employment period was reached a full 2 years after the enactment of the legislation. And, at that time, only 46,000 workers were actually employed—a number far short of Democrat claims.

We must also consider that this legislation would bring about an expenditure of \$2 billion over and above the President's budget. This creates intense inflationary pressures which would actually lower the standard of living of millions of Americans on social security and fixed incomes. Furthermore, millions more could be required to pay additional taxes in order to support this unworkable, extravagant, ineffective attempt to combat unemployment.

President Nixon has offered sound, constructive alternatives to accelerated public works, some of which are outlined in his veto message. Others are outlined in his budget for fiscal 1972.

The President has increased outlays for public works projects by \$1.4 billion over last year. He has also requested appropriations of \$2 billion per year for the next 3 years for construction of waste treatment facilities. These sums are planned within the budget and are non-inflationary. But, as the Democrats proposed, to add \$2 billion over and above the President's budgetary allocations is highly inflationary, irresponsible splurging of tax dollars that the Federal Government simply does not have.

Another alternative that the President has already implemented is a multi-million-dollar technology mobilization and reemployment program designed to retrain and employ the scientists, technicians, and other highly skilled workers of the aerospace industry and other technical industries. Unemployment in these fields is at an alltime high. However, the Accelerated Public Works Act which the President has vetoed would in no way whatsoever alleviate unemployment in this area.

An accelerated public works program never has and—by virtue of its nature—never can provide immediate employment. It is a cruel hoax to perpetrate on the unemployed workers of this Nation to lead them to believe that this type of job program can bring immediate help.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore commend President Nixon for he has acted with justification and in the best interests of all Americans. He is attempting to cure the inflationary ills that the Democrats seem bent on continuing and expanding by their reckless spending—regardless of the consequences.

#### U.S. TRADE CRISIS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, for the past month a negotiating team headed by Ambassador at Large David M. Kennedy has been attempting to work out textile agreements with Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan.

Today's news media disclose that during this same period of negotiations our Nation's position in world trade deteriorated seriously. For the first time in 21 years the United States has reported trade deficits in 2 consecutive months.

The textile industry is especially vulnerable to this flood of low-wage imports, some of it from nations which have been the recipients of massive U.S. economic and military assistance and which nevertheless erect unfair barriers to U.S. manufactured goods.

For that reason those of us fighting to preserve the U.S. textile industry are disappointed in preliminary reports which indicate that Ambassador Kennedy has been met with uncompromising and uncooperative attitudes on the part of some of these governments.

According to reports received in this country, Ambassador Kennedy has tried to explain to the leaders of these countries that their virtually unrestrained textile and apparel imports are creating serious economic problems for the American textile industry, an industry which along with apparel manufacturing, provides employment for about 2.3 million Americans. The reports I have heard indicate that Korea and Hong Kong have turned a deaf ear to the Ambassador's proposals.

Imports from the Far East are threatening the very future of one of our most essential industries, one which provides jobs at all levels of skills in 49 of our 50 States. We simply cannot afford to sacrifice this type of payroll, particularly in view of the critical unemployment situation in this country.

In my State of South Carolina, more than 200,000 people are employed in manufacturing textiles, apparel, and manmade fibers. Another 23,000 are employed on cotton farms. And countless others, offering supplies and services to the textile industry, depend upon it for all or part of their income. Over 20 percent of the textile work force in my State is black, and in some areas black employment is as high as 40 percent. The tex-

tile industry is a vital source of jobs for people with all types of skills.

Yet, today, we see Government policies which have permitted low-wage imports, made at a fraction of the wages paid in this country, reach such volumes that they have displaced the equivalent of 300,000 jobs in textiles and apparel. In addition, there has been an actual job drop of 100,000 in the past year. Just think what 100,000 textile jobs would do to get our economy back on its feet.

In spite of these job losses here in this country, the administration has failed to act decisively to slow the tide of imports which is flooding this country from the low-wage countries of the Far East.

In the past 3 years, imports from Korea nearly tripled, from 177 million square yards in 1968 to 300 million square yards in 1970, and they are running at an annual rate of 400 million square yards this year. Taiwan's imports have tripled since 1968, and Japan's textile exports were in excess of 1 billion square yards last year.

According to press reports from the Far East, Taiwan has shown a willingness to discuss limitations on its textile exports to the United States. Korea, on the other hand, has made excessive demands. They not only want to start at the record high level of 1970, but they want fantastic annual increases.

Japan has come up with a totally unrealistic and unworkable plan of self-regulation. We are willing to share a portion of the future growth of our textile market with these countries, but they seem to be asking for all of our future growth. They plead that they are developing countries, which need big export markets. But they must realize that we have serious unemployment problems in this country. We cannot afford to sacrifice our major job-producing industries to help other countries grow fat.

Japan today has the second largest gross national product in the free world. We helped her get into that position with foreign aid and generous trade policies. We opened our markets freely, while she carefully sheltered her domestic industries from outside competition.

Trade among friendly nations must be fair and equitable to all concerned. Our friends and allies in the Far East must realize that we must maintain a strong economy at home if we are to be in a position to help them. Our economy will not regain its strength until we adopt more realistic trade policies especially where textiles and apparel are concerned. Both our foreign trading partners and the current administration must now understand that this Congress is determined to take action. Unless relief is forthcoming shortly through administrative action or diplomacy, the Congress will pass trade legislation. No promise of negotiations, no fake unilateral declarations or threats of veto will deter this Congress from enacting a fair and equitable trade bill is relief is not otherwise forthcoming.

#### VIETNAM POLICY

Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House came close to reclaiming its constitutional position in the field of foreign affairs when 176 Members voted in favor of Mr. WHALEN's motion to instruct our conferees on the Selective Service Act to accept the Mansfield amendment. This amendment would have made it the stated policy of the United States to its military forces from Vietnam, in a prompt and orderly manner, within 9 months. I deeply regret the failure of the House to accept the Mansfield amendment, and I fervently hope that, given another chance, we will accept it, or something like it, in the near future.

Last week, I had the privilege of testifying before the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the subject of our Vietnam policy. I thank Mr. GALLAGHER, the chairman of that subcommittee, for his keen interest in my remarks, and include at this point the text of my testimony:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA ABZUG BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JUNE 24, 1971

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you today. Whatever your individual views on the war in Indochina, I think we can all agree—particularly in view of the disclosures in the Pentagon papers—that these hearings come late on the scene of history.

The interest of the American people and the interest of truth would best have been served if the House Foreign Affairs Committee, acting on its constitutional authority, had held a continuous series of public hearings on the war, beginning in the early 1960's.

Instead, that responsibility to shed light on the sources, rationale and conduct of our nation's foreign policy was, in effect, abdicated to the academic community, which, through a series of public teach-ins, first brought the complex issues of the war before the American people. This was an educational role subsequently taken over by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and illuminated by one startling disclosure after another in the press and on TV.

We've come a long way since those early teach-ins, and for the American people it has been a journey of discovery from initial detachment to skepticism, questioning, disillusionment, moral outrage, and at last, repudiation of the longest war in our history.

As one who opposed America's role in the war from the beginning, perhaps I should find some moral satisfaction in this progression of understanding as to the true nature of this conflict. I cannot. There has been too much blood spilled, too many dead and wounded, too many—both Americans and Indochinese—who are still dying and suffering unnecessarily as we sit here and talk.

The war goes on long after the American people gave a mandate to this Administration to end it. You have heard over and over again by now, I am certain, that 73% of the public favors a prompt end to the war and that among women, 78% want us to get out. These figures merely ratify what many of us know and sense and see as to the mood of America.

The tide began to turn against the war after the Tet offensive, and went rapidly out with each succeeding disclosure of the moral and political bankruptcy of America's policy in Indochina—May Lai, the case of Lt. Calley, the invasions of Cambodia and Laos, and now the latest shocking revelations that Administration after Administration has en-

gaged in calculated deception of the American people.

The response has been successively larger waves of protests, demonstrations and outcries by Americans from all walks of life. In recent weeks we have seen a half million Americans gather on the Capitol grounds. We have seen thousands of Vietnam Veterans baring for us their wounded bodies and consciences. We have seen thousands of young people turning, in frustration, to acts of civil disobedience. We have seen middle America and professionals, lawyers, teachers, businessmen, working people, Blacks, religious groups, the legions of Common Cause, all pleading with Congress to assert its responsibility, to write finis to a war that has brought incalculable torment to the people of Indochina and poison the soul of our own country. It has taken ten years for Americans to learn the truth about this war, even if it is not yet the whole story. And now that they know, they are no longer able to live with themselves, as human beings and as a nation, while this war goes on. And with innate moral courage, they see, too, the outrage of a policy that continues to ask American soldiers to give their lives for a war that has been largely discredited.

The anti-war movement has grown to encompass the vast majority of Americans. It has not failed. It has succeeded in changing the national debate from *if* we should get out of Vietnam, to *when*. But while popular support for the war has collapsed, apologists for a policy that has been exposed as wrong still cling to their enclaves here in Washington, in the White House, in the Pentagon, in our own House of Representatives.

Congress never declared this 10 year war, although under the Constitution it has the sole power to determine when and where this nation goes to war. When Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964 in response to a deliberate trap set by the Johnson Administration, it was abdicating its war-making power to the President. That constitutional power was reasserted in December 1970 when Congress repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, but thus far it has failed to take the corollary action of terminating the President's authority and capacity to continue the war and cutting off funds to sustain it, as it should do.

Americans rightly wonder what it will take to move to Congress to act. Must we top My Lai? Must we go beyond the disclosures of the Pentagon study which, as Daniel Ellsberg pointed out in a television interview with Walter Cronkite last night, in its entire 47 volumes shows no expression of concern on the part of American policy-makers as to how their decisions and escalations of the war would affect the actual lives of the people of Indochina or of the American people.

A few men in high places played war games, manipulated governments and leaders, contemplated employing nuclear weapons, ordered the use of flesh-searing napalm and the destruction of the Indochinese country-side with poisonous chemicals, expanded the war in Laos, turned the skies over Southeast Asia into arsenals of terror against entire populations—and never paused to ask themselves who gave them the right to kill and mangle and displace a million people.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee can and should ask that question. It can, also, of course, conduct lengthy investigations. There is much still to find out. It should, I believe, have access to the complete 47 volume Pentagon study of the war from 1945 to 1967 which has been turned over as a still-classified document to the House Armed Services Committee. The House has the responsibility, I believe, to make that information available to the entire American people.

In a privileged Resolution of Inquiry presented to the House several days ago, in con-

cert with 25 colleagues, I ask that the President be directed to provide the House with the full and complete text of the Pentagon papers. The House Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on that Resolution this Monday. As representatives of the people, the House is entitled to have that report and to make use of it without any restrictions imposed by the Executive Branch.

In another resolution of inquiry, which I hope will have the full support of Members of this Sub-committee, I also ask that the President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency be directed to furnish the House within 15 days with full and complete information on:

1. The known existing plans for a residual force of the U.S. armed forces in South Vietnam.

2. The nature and capacity of the government of the Republic of Vietnam, including but not limited to analyses of their past and present military capabilities, their capacity for military and economic self-sufficiency, including but not limited to analyses of the political base of the Republic, the scope, if any, of governmental malfunctions and corruption, the depth including but not limited to known existing studies of the economy of the Republic of South Vietnam and of the internal workings of the government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

3. The plans and procedures both on the part of the Republic of South Vietnam and the United States government for the November 1971 election and the Republic of South Vietnam, including but not limited to analyses of the United States involvement, covert or not, in said election.

This is information which I believe the Members of the House must have if they are to make accurate evaluation of the President's Vietnamization week, a majority of members of the House were still implicitly adhering to support of that policy by their rejection of the Nedzi-Whalen Amendment.

In turning aside even this mild version of a proposal that a specific date be set for a total withdrawal of American forces from Indochina, the House was going along with the two conditions set by President Nixon for withdrawal: the prior release of American prisoners and the ability of the South Vietnamese government to maintain itself in power militarily. Neither condition is, I believe, in the true interests of the American people, of the prisoners, or of the Vietnamese people themselves.

Americans are properly concerned with the conditions under which American prisoners are being detained and appalled by the failure of the North Vietnamese government to observe the Geneva Convention with regard to treatment of prisoners. However, there is a growing recollection that the release of prisoners customarily comes at the conclusion of a war, not prior to the end. Furthermore, there have been enough statements and signals from the North Vietnamese as to their willingness to negotiate release of the prisoners once a withdrawal date is set for our government to take them up on that and set a date.

The alternative is a cruel impasse in which the prisoners of war will continue to be cast in the role of political pawns and will remain incarcerated indefinitely. And the longer they remain prisoners, the more likely that the executive branch will once again report to reckless military acts that will jeopardize even the current pace of withdrawal.

As for hinging our withdrawal on the liability of the government in Saigon, it has probably been pointed out that President Nixon thus invests President Thieu with a greater say over American foreign policy than he is willing to accord to the elected Congress of the United States.

President Thieu is wholly a creation of American power, and despite the years of coaching he has received from the American Embassy, which still persists in attempting to pass him off as a symbol of democracy, he remains impervious to the fine points of democratic election procedures. After the blatantly unfair election law which he has just forced through the Vietnamese parliament, must we still be insulted by pretext that American bombs and guns are making the world safe for democracy in Vietnam? And must we continue to sacrifice lives for this cause?

We can have no confidence in anything the government of President Thieu says, in proclaiming a victory in Laos or in denying its involvement in drug traffic or corruption. On the basis of the revelations in the Pentagon papers about past weaknesses of various military regimes in Saigon, we can have no confidence in any public statements made about the durability of the South Vietnamese Government by the current occupant of the White House.

It is clearly in order for the House and its Foreign Affairs Committee to demand and to get from the Executive department the complete text of studies on the South Vietnamese government which are known to have been made by the Executive Branch, as called for in my Resolution of Inquiry.

Another resolution that I have introduced calls for an investigation of the relationship between the prolongation of the war and the interests of private American companies in bidding for off-shore oil rights off the coast of Vietnam.

We have a right to know whether there is any basis for persistent reports of long range plans by the Nixon Administration to maintain indefinitely a residual force of some 50,000 men in Vietnam as well as a bombing force stationed in or near Indochina. And we have a right to know if any commitments or even hints have been made to these companies about a continuing American presence in Indochina to protect contemplated investments.

As I said earlier, the House Foreign Affairs Committee could involve itself in lengthy hearings on the war. But I think that not even you would accuse me or other Americans of impatience if we were to state that hearings, even at this late date, are fine, but that at the same time you have a duty, a responsibility, a commitment to conscience to act now to stop the war.

Even without the disclosures of the Pentagon papers, you had ample basis for action. But now there is once again an opportunity to act. As you know, I believe that the war can be ended almost immediately and that the President would have the support of the nation if he would set a nearby date, (I have proposed July 4th of this year), if he would stop sending men to Vietnam and start massive, speeded up withdrawals of our own forces.

Falling this, I have supported the Vietnam Disengagement Bill, which proposed the end of this year as the cut-off point. That too has been turned aside by a Congress that still accords the President, powers far beyond those he warrants constitutionally. Now, in reaction to the events of the past week, the Senate has turned about and has approved the Mansfield Amendment which calls for a total withdrawal from Indochina, no later than nine months after enactment, subject to release of prisoners of war.

The Mansfield Amendment very wisely ignores the Administration's fantasies about the viability of the Thieu government or committing our people to its perpetuation and considers itself solely to the prisoner of war issue calling for negotiations for an immediate cease fire.

Its purposes negotiating an agreement with North Vietnam which 'would provide for a series of phased releases of American

prisoners of War, and for the release of any remaining American prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of all military forces of the U.S. by no later than the date established by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) hereof (the nine months date), or by such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the negotiating parties."

Yesterday, the New York delegation, in keeping with my request, endorsed this proposal and asked that Members of the House be given an opportunity to direct their representatives to support it in House-Senate Conferences on the Selective Service Bill.

I would also urge that this Committee report favorably a counterpart of the Mansfield amendment, which is being introduced in the House. It is my belief that if the Congress finally bends to the will of the electorate and adopts even such proposals as the Mansfield Amendment it can, by this single step, revitalize the negotiations in Paris, elicit a favorable reaction from the North Vietnamese, and finally bring the war to a close.

If the Congress finally takes this necessary action and instructs the President to set a date for withdrawal, I believe that the North Vietnamese and the NLF will by the logic of their own public statements have to begin negotiating immediately for the release of our prisoners. I call on them to make such a pledge.

It has always been in the power of Congress to undeclare the war. It has not chosen to do so. I submit that it must do so now.

Our people are asking for a revolution of values in this country; a reversal of priorities. As their representatives, we need to share in this inner revolution—a revulsion from death and destruction, a yearning for full life, for restoring the health and economy of our nation, and for replacing American's world-wide network of military bases with international agreements for peace and mutual security.

Last week it appeared that the Congress had turned its back on the American people. The Mansfield proposal, approved by the Senate, gives us an opportunity to repair that error and to look at our people in the face with good conscience. I urge you to use the full authority of this Committee to so act.

#### A NEW SCHEME TO ENRICH THE BANKS THROUGH THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the commercial banking system continues in its attempts to reap large profits from the student loan program.

Since the guaranteed loan program began in 1965, the commercial banks have been seeking means of enriching themselves by exacting greater and greater charges on the students and the hard-pressed educational institutions. At the same time, the banks have been making great public relations claims, leading the public to believe that they were carrying out some kind of benevolent campaign to aid education. They have simply been carrying out an effort to increase the profit margins to the maximum extent possible.

Each year the banks come back asking for more. Under the original provisions, the banks could not charge more than 6 percent to the student—a hand-

some sum when the program was enacted in 1965. But the banks came back and got congressional approval for a 1-percent increase in the maximum charge—up to 7 percent. Then in 1969, the American Bankers Association came knocking on Congress door again asking for a 3-percent special remuneration to be paid by the Federal Government. The exact amount of this special fee is set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and varies from quarter to quarter. But it does allow a potential maximum payment to the banks of 10 percent on each student loan. In other words, the banks have an opportunity to obtain yields several percentage points above many loans being made to businesses around the Nation. Most importantly, these loans are all guaranteed fully by the Federal Government and there is not a chance for even the loss of a single dime by the commercial banks. At the present time, there is legislation pending in the Congress which would establish a secondary market for these loans—a still further sweetener for the participating lending institutions.

A rational person might have thought that the banks' greed would stop at this point. But this is not the case and now the commercial banking industry is seeking a change in administrative regulations which will allow them to collect extra charges from educational institutions which participate in the student loan program.

To its credit, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has—to this date—prohibited the payment of points, the maintenance of compensating balances and other schemes which would give the banks a greater rate on their student loans. HEW has been holding the line on these demands—until just recently.

But last Friday, Peter P. Muirhead, Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education, inserted in the Federal Register a proposed change in the student loan program which would allow educational institutions to maintain compensating balances and provide other benefits to lending institutions which participate in the guaranteed loan program. It is my understanding that the maintenance of compensating balances will in many cases raise the yields to the banks on these loans to 13 percent, 15 percent, and even more interest. In fact, the regulation as proposed in the Federal Register puts no ceiling on the compensating balances or the yields to the banks.

The regulation also opens the door to the payment of points by educational institutions on funds obtained for lending to students. The proposed regulation would omit the prohibition against the payment of such premiums by the institutions.

As usual, the proposed changes in the regulation have been done quietly behind the scenes and placed in legalistic language in the Federal Register. It is no secret that the Federal Register is one of the driest publications in town and that neither the press nor the public pays a great deal of attention to its contents. The full meaning of some of these rule changes are not understood until months

after their publication and too late to correct serious injustices. To many, the rule published in last Friday's Register will appear innocuous.

But I hope it is not taken lightly by anyone interested in the future of higher education. Through this new rule the banks will simply be imposing an age-old financial shell game on educational institutions—an age-old shell game known as the compensating balance. Under this device, the borrower must agree to leave a certain percentage of the proceeds of the loan on deposit with the bank.

For example, the borrower of \$1 million might be required to leave as much as one-quarter—\$250,000—on deposit with the bank in return for the loan. He would have use of only \$750,000, thus raising the yield substantially to the lending institutions.

Under the rule proposed by the Office of Education, the banks could demand agreements by schools to maintain a certain level of funds in an account in return for the lenders making loans to the students of such schools. Such an arrangement for compensating balances would raise the cost to the schools substantially and bring the banks millions of dollars in added profits.

It is true that the student will still be prohibited from paying points or other inducements to the banks in return for an educational loan, but the charges will be imposed against the school. And simple arithmetic tells us that these extra charges—imposed by the banks—will be passed on to the students in the form of higher tuition payments and/or poorer quality education. Educational institutions are hard-pressed throughout the United States, faced with rising costs and demands for broader curriculum and they can ill afford to participate in schemes to enrich the banks. Education should not pay this blackmail to lending institutions.

It is difficult to blame the schools which have indicated a willingness to participate in this scheme because they are desperate for funds and extremely anxious to see that the student loans continue. Many of them feel they really have no choice but to go along with the increasing demands of the commercial banks. Many wealthy institutions may be able to meet these demands without great disruption, but for the small and the less well-off institutions, the payment of these additional charges will be difficult in many cases. It is shameful that the Congress has not given these educational institutions more protection and it will be of lasting disgrace to the Congress if we allow this latest bank bonanza to slip through in the Federal Register.

It is regrettable that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—through its Office of Education—has filed this proposed rule change. I regret greatly that the Banking and Currency Committee which maintains jurisdiction over the lending institutions involved was not notified in advance or consulted in any manner while the rulemaking process was underway.

Once again, we see the dangers of allowing major Federal programs to be operated through commercial lending institutions in the form of loan guarantees. These massive loan guarantee programs invariably end up aiding lending institutions and imposing greater burdens on the beneficiaries of the Federal programs.

The origin of the latest rule change on the student loan program can be traced to a secret meeting conducted last January 12. It was in this meeting that the banks made their demands for greater rates, for compensating balances and/or points and other special privileges to increase their yields. Participating in this secret meeting were such groups as the American Bankers Association; CUNA International, Inc.; the U.S. Savings & Loan League; the Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association; the New Jersey Savings & Loan League; the American National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago; the Central Bank & Trust Co. of Denver; the Omaha National Bank; Texas Bank & Trust Co.; and the Bank of America.

The Office of Education has made a grievous error in following the demands of the lending institutions. The proposed rule as printed on page 12110 of the Federal Register for Friday, June 25, should be withdrawn immediately.

The Office of Education should restate a firm position against the charging of points, premiums, the use of compensating balances or any other devices to raise the yield to the banks above the statutory limits.

The banks ought to be making educational loans at cost; they should not be items of profit. And certainly they should not be vehicles for the imposition of backdoor, under-the-table charges to schools and/or students.

If the banks insist on massive profits from schools and students, the Congress should reconsider the entire student loan guarantee program. The interest charges allowed under the student loan act are much too high, both to the student and to the Federal Government and the Congress would be derelict in its duty if it allowed extra charges to be imposed on top of these already massive bank charges.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that we are all indebted to the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to an infinite number of subject matters in which he has been zealous to protect the public interest.

In this case I want the gentleman to know that this is a matter of vital concern to many constituents who are concerned about the growing cost of education, many of my own constituents, who have written to me in the last month in more than 150 instances seeking information on how to obtain these loans. The gentleman is to be congratulated for bringing this insidious situation to the attention of the House, and I do hope

that the Congress will act upon the gentleman's recommendations.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for his comments and his remarks. I have had the same experience from constituents in my district by the hundreds. They are writing in every day. They cannot understand why we have this extortionist, excessive, usurious interest charge imposed upon the young people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, instead of teaching young people how to pay interest on top of interest, we should be teaching young people how to be thrifty. However, we are not going in that direction. This is a terrible thing, to start young people out paying this excessive, exorbitant interest.

We are paying \$160 billion a year, the people of the United States, every year just for interest. That sum is not paid for something that you can wear or something that you can consume by eating or something that is necessary for a family. That is something over and above the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should begin to look around and see if we could not have a thrift campaign and encourage young people to pay their debts and not go into debt unless they absolutely have to do so. But, above all, stop this high interest problem. It is absolutely ruining the country.

Again, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his contribution.

#### THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—VII

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice declined to follow a full and vigorous prosecution of Mr. Frank Sharp because that would have proved embarrassing to the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Will Wilson, who does not want it known just how closely he worked with the fabulous fraud from Houston. Mr. Wilson and his boss would be embarrassed if all this were to become generally known. Accordingly, when the Sharp case became public knowledge, Wilson immediately gave notice that he was disqualifying himself from the case, leaving the way clear for Mr. Kleindienst to take any and all steps necessary to keep Wilson from ever being involved, either as prosecutor against his old friend, or as a witness in the case. The first problem, to keep Wilson from prosecuting his old friend Sharp, was taken care of by the disqualification of Wilson himself, the second problem, keeping Wilson from being identified in any way with Sharp, was taken care of by the infamous deal arranged by Kleindienst and the U.S. Attorney in Houston, one Anthony J. P. Farris, to decline any real prosecution of Sharp.

Mr. Sharp received immunity from further prosecution. To show you the real extent of his immunity from further criminal prosecution granted by Judge

Singleton in Houston, it has been extended to Sharp to all and sundry kinds of litigation, civil litigation, other prosecution, and the like.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has had to vigorously protest this and say that the immunity order entered by Judge Singleton in Houston does not cover civil cases and that Mr. Sharp please be made to answer in a court of justice in a civil suit.

It seems that Wilson readily admits to having been a private attorney who did some legal work for Sharp—in fact, he wanted me to think that it had been the casual attorney-client relationship that arises in the course of a man's practice. The truth is that there was far more to it than just that.

It seems that for some time, and right up until the time he left Texas to become Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Will Wilson was one of Frank Sharp's very closest associates, advisers and counselors. When Sharp's biggest base of operations was the Sharpstown State Bank, the general counsel for the bank was none other than Will Wilson. That relationship lasted until about January 15, 1969, when Wilson assumed his present post.

Not only was Wilson general counsel for the Sharpstown State Bank, he arranged to even expand his law firm to bring in a good real estate man, Joe Ridings, to help Sharp's bank work its grandiose real estate schemes. In fact, the law firm had offices right in the Sharpstown State Bank, furnished at the expense of the bank itself, rent free.

Mr. Wilson told me that he did not want Mr. Sharp to get into the insurance business, and that he so advised Mr. Sharp not to buy up this National Bankers Life Insurance Co. But when Sharp decided to buy the company, Wilson negotiated the deal in behalf of Sharp, which brought Sharp 518,000 shares of the National Bankers Life, and control of the company. Wilson says that he was only acting as a private attorney, but the truth is that as soon as Sharp moved into control of that company Will Wilson became its general counsel too, just as he was the general counsel for the Sharpston State Bank.

Further, Mr. Wilson admitted to me that he had no insubstantial amount of shares of stock in this insurance company. He said that he originally bought 5,000 shares, and then an additional 2,500 shares from the vice president of the insurance company, et cetera, et cetera.

Joe Osborn was another Wilson law partner, the third in the firm of Wilson, Osborn, and Ridings. Joe Osborn was on the board of directors of another Sharp company, Olympic Life. When he left that board, Wilson's other partner, Joe Ridings, filled his place. Ridings, and probably Osborn before, carried out legal assignments for Olympic.

So Will Wilson, despite his previous claims that he was just a private attorney, was in fact house counsel for two of Sharp's companies, the biggest two at that. His two partners were house counsel for other Sharp companies. Wilson,

of course, had considerable investments in Sharp companies, as I stated.

Now if the Department of Justice had carefully prosecuted Mr. Sharp, all of this would have been revealed exactly. So they made a deal with Sharp. Wilson says he knew nothing of it. Maybe not, but his boss certainly did, and I believe that Mr. Kleindeinst and his associate Mr. Farries wanted to protect Wilson above all.

Would it not be embarrassing to find the chief prosecutor in the Department of Justice so heavily endowed with the defendant?

Had the plans of the Justice Department worked, Wilson would have been in a very good position to move on up to replace his friend and protector Kleindeinst. In fact, he had been under serious consideration for appointment to head the IRS.

Even better than that, the local U.S. Attorney Anthony J. P. Farris, by carrying out prosecutions of the Governor of Texas, the Speaker of the Texas House, and other officials in and out of the State of Texas, would have built considerable political capital. Indeed, Mr. Farris would like to run for Governor of Texas. In fact, Sunday's paper in one of the largest metropolitan dailies of Texas so announced this on last Sunday.

No wonder then that Mr. Farris indignantly denies all that I have been saying. But he does not really deny it—he just says, What is he talking about? HENRY GONZALEZ does not know anything because he is not down here in Houston. Well, I do not have to be in a room to know that there is a whole package of rotten eggs, long rotten and stinking to high Heaven. Of course, Farris has reason to be defensive, but he knows I am speaking the truth. All he can do is to rail at me and call me libelous for he knows, if he is any lawyer at all, that in libel and slander cases, truth is an absolute defense.

He knows, he and his agent, put chicken thieves in jail for 3-year terms but they did not do much about multimillion-dollar swindlers who happen to be closely associated with his bosses. When that happens, Mr. Anthony J. P. Farris closes his eyes, closes his ears and closes his mouth. He, Wilson, and Kleindienst have suddenly become three silent monkeys. They seem incapable of speaking the clear, plain and whole truth about Mr. Sharp, the deal not to prosecute him and the relationship between Sharp and Mr. Wilson, who happens also to be the boss of Mr. Anthony J. P. Farris.

I certainly think that Mr. Farris has a right to be defensive about his actions in this case. He has even said that I do not have any right to speak about it. But the Members of the House know that the Justice Department of late has been habitually trying to tell people what to say, what to print and maybe even what to think, so they are not greatly surprised by such an outburst from a local attorney, the same one and only Anthony J. P. Farris.

I seriously question whether he should have ever been given this type of position even as a district attorney if he is this careless and this guilty of misfeasance

and malfeasance in seeking the minimal prosecution of the culprit.

I have been waiting for Mr. Farris to disprove and deny the categorical statements, plainly stated, that I have made. I have even invited him to come and I will extend to him—if I cannot do it myself I will prevail upon one of our colleagues representing that area—or even the Speaker himself—to permit him to come and sit right at the Speaker's front row in the gallery so that he will get the story straight and not get any second handed version.

Well, we have it essentially as we have pointed it out. We have had six particular addresses to make in this respect up to this time and there has been absolutely no rebuttal up to this time.

There has been absolutely no rebuttal. Who knows what tomorrow will bring? I am sure, God willing, I will be back on the floor tomorrow with some additional documentation and with some additional remarks to make. I will wager that there will be yet more evidence to support all these claims plus others. The Justice Department not only did not carry the ball in the case of the United States against Sharp, but it deliberately dropped the ball. Now, grounding the ball intentionally in football calls for penalty. In this case the penalty is going to be revelation of the full facts.

I intend to continue this discussion tomorrow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained a copy of a Soviet publication entitled "Caution: Zionism!" This booklet, written by Marxist "historian" Yuri Ivanov and published in Moscow by Progress Publishers, is a most vicious anti-Semitic piece of work.

Throughout the booklet, the terms "Zionist" and "Jew" are used interchangeably—just as many on the American right use them interchangeably—and the net effect of this blurring is to permit the U.S.S.R. to attack the Jewish religion and culture under the guise of attacking Zionism. Soviet anti-Zionism, in short, provided a political cover for anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism:

Modern Zionism is the ideology, a ramified system of organizations and the practical politics of the wealthy Jewish bourgeoisie which has closely allied itself with monopoly circles in the USA and other imperialist countries.

Again I note this is precisely what many non-Communists—indeed, anti-Communists—do in America today.

The above passage may be found on page 6 of the preface of "Caution: Zionism," which was printed in the U.S.S.R. in 1970. It may also be found, masterfully plagiarized, by V. Bolshakov in his article, "The Zionists' Profession—Anti-Semitism," which appeared in the April 1971 issue of International Affairs, a leading directive publication of the Communist Party, Soviet Union.

The booklet accuses Jews throughout the world of being involved in a grandiose conspiracy. Historian Ivanov drew a picture of a meeting in Paris of Czechoslovakian Zionist counterrevolutionaries who would establish in the French capital a center and a newspaper. Funds would be forthcoming, via the Discount Bank in Tel Aviv, from financiers and business interests in France, such as those of Rothschild and Dreyfus, who were milking the workers of France of their savings. The implication by Ivanov was that the French workers were unwittingly financing the counterrevolutionary Czechoslovak Zionist agents and spies.

If this was not enough intrigue for his readers, the Soviet Marxist historian wove into this synthetic conspiracy the Roman Catholic Church. The instrument by which the Jewish church would work its will was Cardinal Augustin Bea, "who had long ago abandoned his Jewish faith to embrace Catholicism in order to help cement the alliance between the Catholic and the Jewish Church" which would be achieved by means of the Second Vatican Council Declaration of November 20, 1964, and a "cheque in favor of the Vatican."

The Soviet booklet, not only exploited this personal factor in Cardinal Bea's life in order to make it appear that a grand scheme was being perpetuated but also employed the same tactics used by German Nazis to classify Jews. That is, anyone born of Jewish parents regardless of his actual religion was eligible for the infamous "final solution." The old Nazi fantasies about the vast and far-reaching influence of the international Jewish bankers had come full circle as Moscow replaced the Berlin of the early forties as spokesman for such pipe dreams.

To round out the conspiratorial circle, Ivanov tossed in for good measure the neo-Nazis.

There is another line of approach to the investigation of a fact that is becoming plainer and plainer all the time, and that is that Israel's militarism and West German neo-Nazism are fed from the same source.

The Soviet's local branch office here, the CPUSA has duly received the message. Its internal publication, "Party Affairs," April 18, 1969, warned the party faithful:

A fear has arisen in this country about the Jewish question; a "dirty word" has been created—"anti-Semi!"

The party's directive organ observed:

Many of our members and followers fear to speak out what they know is the truth unless they be labeled "anti-Semi." It is about time to look this situation in the face.

Obviously, the junior party is embarrassed by both the adverse anti-semitic image again on the increase in the U.S.S.R. and by its own activities and attitudes here.

Mr. Speaker, it is also disquieting for me to observe that some anti-Communist conservatives fall into the anti-Semitic trap, either inadvertently or because they are simply anti-Semitic. Communism feeds on such attitudes while Americanism suffers on such unwholesome fare. Hatred of race or religion, or both, by

Americans provides additional grist for Soviet propaganda mills.

As a conservative myself, I am disappointed when I see otherwise intelligent Americans of the Right fall for this self-defeating, prejudicial trap. To try to blame the Jews, the blacks or the Anglo-Saxons as a race or class is both un-American and naive. There is all too much of this polarization today and people of good will should fight these prejudiced attitudes. I have always felt a responsibility to counter attitudes that I feel are wrong among those of my own camp.

#### THE PARTY LINE AGAINST JEWS

This Communist publication "Caution: Zionism," has attempted to wed Zionism with neo-Nazism. This has to be the most ambitious piece of editorial sleight of hand ever tried since World War II. Even the American Communist-front publication, "Jewish Currents," direct successor to "Jewish Life," could not digest this morsel of misinformation. "Jewish Currents"—and its predecessor—is edited by identified Communist Party member Louis Harap.

In its lead editorial, "Questions for the Soviet Party Congress," March 1971, it stated, regarding the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party that—

Will a halt be proclaimed to the provocative practice in the Soviet press of trying to equate Zionism with Nazism or Israeli practice and policies with Nazi theory and practice? We non-Zionists are as much offended by this nasty distortion as are the Jewish people as a whole, and democratic and humanist opinion in general.

To the profound disappointment of Jews everywhere and of friends of the Soviet Union especially, anti-Semitic events and publications did not end with the public recognition of the crimes of the Stalin era.

Referring to the economic trials of 1961-63, "Jewish Currents" stated:

Criminality was associated with Jewishness, and synagogues as institutions were depicted as centers for criminal and anti-Soviet, unpatriotic activities.

Blatant anti-Semitic tracts were published in many parts of the Soviet Union under the guise of anti-religious propaganda. . . . Restrictions on the practice of the Jewish religion continued. The Yeshiva for training Rabbis set up in 1957 was suffocated after a few years. . . . Jews continued to be represented in heavily disproportionate numbers in science, the arts, journalism, medicine and technological and cultural activities.

\* \* \* \* \*

Like the Arabs, Soviet publicists are not too scrupulous in avoiding identification of Jews and Zionists, and the attack often passes over into outright anti-Semitism.

One consequence of this campaign, stated the Communist publication, has been to accelerate requests for emigration to Israel.

It is hardly to the credit of a socialist country that Jews should wish to emigrate. \* \* \* What is saddening is that after 53 years of socialism, the fact as reported by the Moscow correspondent of the Italian Communist daily, *L'Unita*, Jan. 7, that a few tens of thousands of Soviet Jews wish to leave is evidence that something is wrong with Soviet Jewish policy.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with Soviet Jewish policy is merely symptomatic of what is wrong, fundamentally, with

the Communist system in general. One need search no further back than May of 1971 when, in South Vietnam—of which Korea and the refusal of Communist POW's to be repatriated was the prolog—540 North Vietnamese POW's refused to return to their own homeland. Those who live within the so-called socialist system of Communist bloc nations "want out," while those who are, wish to remain out, be they Jew or non-Jew, friend or former foe. It is simply that elementary. Indeed the grass has never failed to prove actually greener beyond the oppressively drab and dreary life of socialism.

The ink had hardly dried on this critical March issue of "Jewish Currents" when the April 1971 issue of International Affairs, a major directive document of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, pointed out that—

From the outset, the Soviet Government started a drive against the Zionist underground which was actively working with the counter-revolutionaries. This policy was not, of course, determined by any kind of "anti-Semitism" on the part of the Bolsheviks, as the Zionist then loudly claimed—and as they continue to do today.

Zionists, non-Zionist Jews, and non-Jews everywhere all attest to the continued wholesale harassment of Jews within the Communist-bloc nations, particularly the U.S.S.R. If, by some strange fate of circumstances, Moscow is somehow unaware of this tragedy, it perhaps should subscribe to the Communist-front publication, "Jewish Currents," particularly its April issue for a listing of Soviet measures taken against its second-rated citizen, the Jew. And I use the term "citizen" in this context, more than charity warrants.

Lenin stated in 1919, according to the official Communist publication, "Lenin on the Jewish Question," that—

Enmity against the Jews can only exist where the landowners and capitalists have kept the workers and peasants in complete illiteracy.

If that be true how is it that one finds the most severe and unrelenting pressure directed at the Jews in the U.S.S.R. after the landowners and capitalists had long since ceased to exist institutionally. Socialism officially came into being in 1936, the year of the Soviet Constitution. This would mark technically, the demise of capitalism and implicitly the eradication of any remaining remnants of anti-Judaism, at least if one were to accept Lenin's view.

The facts are to the contrary, however, according to hearings held by the Committee on Un-American Activities June 19, 1968.

Rabbis testified at the hearing that when the Communists took over Russia in 1917, a "massive campaign" to do away with Jewish communal institutions was undertaken by the Jewish section of the Communist Party known as the Yevsekzia. All existing Jewish communal and religious organizations were to be smashed and replaced by a network of Communist-oriented Yiddish-language institutions. "Religion was the special target of the vicious fury of the Yevsekzia.

On the basis of eliminating religious superstition, the Communists hastened to sequester synagogues and convert them into Communist youth clubs called Kom-somols. Rabbis and teachers who secretly taught youngsters religion and Hebrew were arrested. Religious schools were closed and "the great Russian Judaism began to dry up at its source—the child and his studies. The word of God was no longer heard on the lips of Jewish children, and what the Czars with all their tyranny had never done, the Communists were now accomplishing."

In 1929, the year of the implementation of the Soviet's first 5-year plan, which had been approved the previous year, calling for the creation of a massive industrial base and the collectivization of the peasants and agriculture, Rabbi Yesroel Meir Hacohen of Poland wrote of the trials of his Russian Jewish brethren:

Most bitter and fearful is the situation of our brethren in Russia and the Ukraine, may God have mercy. Almost three million Jews find themselves in great danger (aside from the fact that a great portion of them have no economic status and are simply starving). One's hair stands on end hearing of the great suffering of our brethren in Russia due to the overwhelming wickedness of those who desire to uproot our Holy Torah.

They closed the Hebrew schools and Yeshivas. Those Roshel Yeskivas and teachers, who continued to spread learning privately, were sent to Siberia. \* \* \* Those whose livelihood depends on the government are afraid to Judaize their children.

As the years went by, the Yeveskizia grew more vicious, the witness testified. Its schools, forums, newspapers, and books mocked Jewish laws and customs and distorted Jewish history. Wedges were deliberately driven between children and their parents and grandparents. The new generation was being ripped from the bosom of its heritage. Zionism, too, was brutally hunted down and show trials were held for Zionists accused of imperialist's conspiracy against the state.

By 1936, the final liquidation of Soviet Jewry began with the mass arrests of writers and artists. This was also the year of the establishment of the fundamental law of the U.S.S.R., its constitution, which, according to article 124, "recognized for all citizens" freedom of religious worship. Fittingly, 1 year later Yiddish elementary and secondary schools were abolished.

During the Second World War, 3 million Jews vanished in Soviet-controlled areas, according to a featured article entitled "What Stalin Really Did," which appeared in U.S. News & World Report, August 28, 1967.

In one specific geographical area, the eastern portion of Poland controlled by the U.S.S.R. as a result of the 1939 Nazi-Soviet pact and the aggression of those powers against Poland, the Communists arrested "about a million Jewish people who were sent to Siberia." This information was developed in hearings held by the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, on September 22-23, 1954, as related by Herschel Weinrauch, a Russian journalist.

Khrushchev, who condemned only portions of Stalin's crimes, continued to persecute the Russian Jews when he

assumed the leadership of the U.S.S.R. While his anti-Semitic policies were less drastic—and less publicized—because of the "new look" image which he attempted to foster, they were nevertheless effective.

Rabbi Harry Bronstein, vice president of the Rabbinical Alliance of America, official organization of orthodox rabbis, who had made nine trips to the U.S.S.R., testified that spiritual genocide was being conducted against the Soviet Jew. In a country which had boasted of having had thousands of synagogues in the past, there were presently about 60 which might be considered active in the Soviet bloc including only one in all of Moscow. From 1949 to 1956, about 450 synagogues were closed on the basis of one or another pretense. In these instances, the police were aided by the synagogue's presidotsels, or presidents, some of whom were police informants. The witness stated that about one of every fourth citizen was an informer in the U.S.S.R.

Jews were not permitted to bake matzoth, a term which means "liberty" or "freedom." The Communists were aware of its meaning. The talis or religious shawl, vital to Jewish religious ceremonies could not be obtained in the Soviet Union because its manufacture had been forbidden when the Communist took power in 1917. Jewish calendars have not been printed in over 50 years and here too the Communist were aware that this omission would curtail religious services because Jews would not know when to observe such special days as Rosh Hashana. Although 5,000 prayer books were published in 1957, they were for foreign consumption rather than for the Soviet Jews. For half a million Jewish residents in Moscow, there was no Jewish cemetery, said Rabbi Bronstein. Jews would sell their few possessions in order to transport their deceased relations to a city where such a cemetery might still exist.

Propaganda which claimed that communism and religion are compatible was the "greatest lie," the rabbi asserted. The fact is that the Communists "are becoming more aggressive toward religion than they have in the past," he concluded.

Hitler had referred to the Jewish situation in Germany and to its resolution as the "final resolution," that is liquidation. Lenin, and his successor characterized the "problem" as the "Jewish question." In essence both regimes meant the same thing and used the terminology they did because they considered the Jew to be expendable. Human beings do not require "solutions," issues do; human beings are not "questions"; they resolve them. Hitler, Stalin, and his successors, were and are constitutionally incapable of grasping the basics of the human equation, the former viewing the Jews in ethnical terms, the latter, including Lenin, in religious and class concepts.

Lenin signed the following decree on August 9, 1918:

The Jewish bourgeois are our enemies, not as Jews but as bourgeois. The Jewish worker is our brother. The Council of People's Commissars instructs all Soviet deputies to take

uncompromising measures to tear the anti-Semitic movement out by the roots. (Lenin on the Jewish Question, International Publishers, New York)

In fact, however, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proceeded to tear Judaism out by the roots and made no such distinction between the "good" Jewish worker and the "bad" Jewish businessman.

The most saddening commentary contrasting, on the basis of sheer, raw brutality, the Communist system with that of the Nazi, was eloquently described by a prominent Lithuanian Jewish leader, Dr. Julius Margolin. He had regarded himself as a friend of the Soviet Union until World War II when, together with hundreds of thousands of other Lithuanians, he was deported to the Siberian slave labor camps. His comments, published by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Internal Security, in 1970, in a committee print entitled "The Human Cost of Soviet Communism," urged that the cruelty which prevailed in the Soviet system "constitutes the primary obligation of every man in the world."

He wrote:

Until the fall of 1939, I had assumed a position of benevolent neutrality toward the U.S.S.R. \* \* \* The last 7 years have made me a convinced and ardent foe of the Soviet system. I hate this system with all the strength of my heart and all the power of my mind. Everything I have seen there has filled me with horror and disgust which will last until the end of my days. I feel that the struggle against this system of slavery, terrorism, and cruelty which prevails there constitutes the primary obligation of every man in this world. \* \* \*

Millions of men are perishing in the camps of the Soviet Union. \* \* \* Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have executed more victims, than all the other camps—Hitler's included—together; and this lethal engine continues to operate full blast. (Introduction by Senator Thomas J. Dodd to the Committee study, prepared by Robt. Conquest, English expert on Soviet Affairs, and based upon his book, *The Great Terror*.)

In July 1962, Herbert Aptheker, leading spinner of ideological webs for the Communist Party, USA, wrote in his pamphlet, "The Fraud of Soviet Anti-Semitism," that—

The Soviet government is not guilty of anti-Semitism; on the contrary, it is one of the few governments in the world . . . which illegalizes all expressions or manifestations of anti-Semitism or any other form of racism.

In May 1971, "Young Worker," house organ for the CPUSA's Young Workers Liberation League put it in stronger terms:

The myth of Soviet oppression of Jews is one of the greatest hoaxes of all times.

Only 1 year before Aptheker had written the above, in defense of U.S.S.R. policy, six lay religious leaders in Moscow and Leningrad were secretly arrested and the presidents of six synagogues in provincial cities deposed. Those arrested were held in prison until October, tried in secret, convicted of alleged espionage and sentenced to prison terms. Following the publication of Aptheker's anti-

anti-Semitic booklet, the great synagogue in Lvov, the only remaining prayer house in the Ukraine, was closed on the alleged charge that it was the center for illicit currency dealings. Other temples in smaller towns were also closed on charges that they were centers for drunkenness, espionage, and black marketing.

This campaign reached its peak in 1963 with the publication of Trofim Kichko's "Judaism Without Embellishment," a villainous anti-Semitic piece which, according to Maurice Friedberg's article, "The Plight of Soviet Jews," carried in *Problems of Communism*:

Combined fabrications about the teachings of Judaism (claiming for instance, that Judaism permitted stealing from non-Jews) with cartoons that were so blatantly racist that they were denounced even by a number of Communist parties in the West.

One of the most succinct summaries of anti-Judaism activities was prepared by Rabbi Meir Felman of Brooklyn, who was a member of the International Affairs Commission of the Synagogue Council of America, and who testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, on May 11, 1965. He said:

While I will address myself briefly to the Soviet oppression of Jewry and Judaism, the problem as a whole is much larger than only the religious aspect.

Certainly, the religious aspect is, in our values and concepts, a tremendous segment of the total situation. The Soviet campaign of discrimination is a religiously addressed assault and has, since Stalin, taken a tremendous toll of lives and effect on our Jewish brethren.

Let me tell you briefly what the components of the Soviet assault on the Jews as a religious community are:

1. Closing of synagogues and prevention of prayer meetings (*minyomim*). In 1956, there were 450 synagogues and now there are only 86. Many have been demolished and a great number have been closed for various tenuous reasons.

2. Many cemeteries have been desecrated and many have been destroyed outright. For the past 2 years, in Moscow, burial in accordance with Jewish ritual is practically nonexistent. Many Jews are now being forced to be buried in secular, (nonsectarian) ground. No new Jewish cemeteries are being permitted to be opened. In this manner, religiously observant burial rites are being hindered.

3. Although, there is no prohibition against circumcision, officially, every effort is made to discourage Jews from circumcising their male born children. Those who dare to bring their sons into the Covenant of Abraham either lose their position or lose every chance of promotion in their particular field of activity.

4. Jews are denied the right to manufacture or import religious articles such as prayer shawls, phylacteries, torah scrolls, magillos, prayerbooks, religious calendars, and other religious items.

5. The Soviet Government prevents free production of import and distribution of matzoth and kosher food.

6. The publication of Bibles and religious texts are prohibited. It is over a decade since prayer books, even in small quantities, are being permitted to be printed. The printing of Hebrew language papers and periodicals are prohibited.

7. The study of Hebrew is not permitted even in the privacy of one's home.

8. All Yeshivas and Talmud Torahs have been closed. In 1962, there were five stu-

dents in the Moscow Yeshiva. Now there are none. Many stumbling blocks are placed in the path of willing students, such as resident permits, and so forth. Travel permits are not issued to prospective students to attend such schools, even if they were reestablished.

9. Seminary applicants are not permitted to travel abroad to study either in Europe, Israel, or America.

10. Synagogues are infiltrated with state commissars who "control" institutions.

11. Soviet Russia does not permit organization of federation of synagogues or official exchange between synagogues. The small number of existing Russian synagogues cannot affiliate with international federations of synagogues, such as World Union of Orthodox Synagogues.

12. Soviet Jews are not permitted to make pilgrimages to holy places in Israel.

13. Those who hold firmly to the tenets of their faith are many times subjects of violent diatribes. The synagogues are portrayed in, to put it mildly, most disparaging terms.

14. The Soviets are seeking destruction of Soviet Jewry through religious oppression, imprisonment of Jewish leaders, accusations of subversion and economic trials, deprivation of the most rudimentary needs to exist as a religious community. Coersion of Soviet Jews through processes of registration and discrimination in selection and allotment.

15. A rampant campaign, bitterly anti-Semitic, has raged in the public press and on radio against Jews and Judaism in all its aspects and values.

16. Jews who have been separated from their families because of the war and other reasons are not permitted to reunite. Jews, except in rare instances very old people, are not given immigration permits to other countries such as Israel or our country, to be reunited with their families.

"Let my people go" has again become the clarion call to Soviet powers by religious leaders throughout the world.

Yet, in spite of evidence such as this, Aptheker could unhesitatingly pen his, "The Fraud of Soviet Anti-Semitism." Moreover, he could write—after denying that any anti-Semitism existed in the U.S.S.R.—and with a straight literary face that—

Would, as an American, that I could say the same about the United States.

Rabbi Felman implicitly responded to this allegation during the course of his testimony when, in criticizing the publication, "Soviet Life," which is printed in this country, remarked:

America, thank God for the blessings we have here, that we can read and argue and that we can discuss what is going on.

Aptheker would not, "as an American," say the same thing about the United States as had Rabbi Felman because he could not, as a Communist.

The status of the Jews in the U.S.S.R. is complicated by the fact that they have been treated not only as a "bourgeois class" but as a nationality. In 1929, for example, the U.S.S.R. decided to create a Jewish national territory, Birobidzhan, an "autonomous" region on the Amur River on the Manchurian border. This effort to "bus" the Russian Jew, after confiscating his belongings and businesses, across thousands of miles of U.S.S.R. territory to a barren Siberian wasteland was an experience which proved to be a colossal flop because it attempted to make peasants out of townspeople, Asiatics out of Europeans. In the first 6 years 19,000 Jews were

transported to Birobidzhan, 11,000 of whom left.

Nevertheless, in spite of having their own Soviet "homeland," Jewish citizens were required to carry internal passports, as of course, are other nationalities, but in the case of the former the word "ye" for Yeuerei or Hebrew was stamped thereon. According to C. Sulzberger of the *New York Times*, the only Hebrew nation which Soviet Jews, Zionists, or other non-Zionists Jews could remotely claim is Israel.

The whole problem is, of course, an embarrassment in logic for the U.S.S.R. They will not let the Jew emigrate because to do so would reflect on the "paradise" of socialism. But if he stays he will not assimilate in the Socialist manner required by the Communist Party; that is, he will not forgo his religious beliefs or his cultural heritage.

Soviet anti-Zionism has become a convenient weapon to fight Judaism. And to the Russian Jew, the "distinction between Zionist and Jew is a very fine one," according to Ben Wattenberg, writing in the *Washington Post*. He cited the remarks of a woman from Minsk who had stated:

When the government blames "Zionism" for Russian problems, it becomes very easy for the plain people to blame Jews.

And hence, very easy also to blame Judaism for Soviet adventures abroad in having backed a horse that never left the starting gate in the 6-day Mediterranean melee of 1967. Moscow cannot rationalize her problems or her Jewish persecutions on the basis of Israel which was founded in 1948 because Soviet problems, most of which were self-created, predated the creation of the Jewish nation and, in fact, extended back to the founding of the Bolshevik monstrosity of 1917.

Indeed, it is not at all surprising that the long-suffering Russian Jew—one hesitates to characterize him as "Soviet" Jew—wishes to leave the U.S.S.R. whether for Israel, the U.S.A., Europe, etc. In fact, one would be surprised if a substantial number of Jews, given the opportunity to leave, would remain in the U.S.S.R. whether an Israel existed or not excepting extenuating circumstances of a personal nature. Indeed, has there not been an exodus, of a magnitude unrecorded in history, of the persecuted of all denominations numbering in the millions fleeing from all Communist bloc nations? Their method of departure staggers the imagination but is nonetheless indicative of the hopelessness of their plight. For example, only recently several Red Chinese nationals fled by means of the ingenious technique of floating to freedom across 5 miles of Deep Bay near Hong Kong by grasping on to plastic bags which had been stuffed with Ping-Pong balls to provide buoyancy. Obviously, the little white spheroids may serve a positive purpose on occasion instead of a diplomatic stratagem.

Today, the harassment of the Russian Jew has increased to the point where he has been tempted to commandeer, as Soviet authorities allege, large jetliners for purposes of fleeing tyranny. The Soviet Party-State would best look to the conditions which it has created which

have led to such drastic measures in the first instance. There have been skyjackings in the U.S.A. also but by and large, these have been the work of individuals with severe personal problems, real or imagined. The first and immediate cause of alienation and disaffection in the U.S.S.R. is the overwhelming smothering of the human spirit by the blanket of Marxism-Leninism.

According to Mr. Friedberg, Trofim Kichko author of the anti-Semitic tract, "Judaism Without Embellishment," was awarded a scroll of honor for his "services to atheist propaganda." Shortly after receiving this "honor" Kichko published another gem for atheism, entitled "Judaism and Zionism" which "linked directly the practices and beliefs of Judaism to a hostile political ideology", that is Nazism.

Kichko, stating that Judaism educated the Jews in a "spirit of contempt and even hatred for other people," drew a parallel between the "chauvinist idea of God-chosenness of the Jewish people" and the concept of Messianism and of ruling over the peoples of the world, with the neo-Nazi concept of the superiority of the Aryan race.

Ivanov, in his anti-Semitic diatribe, "Caution: Zionism!" had also asserted that Judaism was characterized by hatred of man, preachments of genocide, cultivation of love of power, and praise of criminal methods for the achievement of power.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian has an opportunity today to come to the assistance, long overdue, of a fellow member of the "religious community"—the Jew. The practicing Christian—Communists worry naught for the other kind—is a threat to the practicing Communists. Such Christians rank high on the liquidation list, as noted below, of Marxist-Leninist governments. Millions of Christians have been sorely affected for striving to live by the bare minimum of their beliefs. They know what suffering is all about as numerous refugees testify, and for this reason Christians, real Christians should be the first to relate to the Jews in this their moment, and it has been a long moment, of need. I am afraid, however, that too many Christians compose a "silent majority" concerning the plight of the Russian Jew.

While, for historical and other reasons, Jews and Christians have been "badly alienated" from each other, as the Rev. Edward H. Flannery recently wrote in his article, "Christian Ignorant of Jews' Trials in History", in "The Catholic Virginian," there is much which unites them including a common enslavement by a common enslaver. Real Jews and Christians, who are God-loving peoples, enjoy nothing in common with that hard-core, man-hating, power-worshipping cult of super-materialists, the Communists.

In the report, "Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe," prepared by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the clergy and lay membership of various Christian religions "have suffered prodigiously" in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. Testimony before that committee revealed:

55 bishops, 12,800 priests and religious, 2.5 million Catholics (have been) killed. 199 bishops, 32,000 priests and religious, 10 million believers, imprisoned or deported. 15,700 priests and religious forced to abandon their profession and seek other jobs. 8,334 seminaries closed. 1,600 monasteries nationalized. 31,779 churches closed, 400 newspapers prohibited.

In his article, Father Flannery proposed that because of the Jews' special place in God's revelation and because of the Jewish-Christian estrangement, the dialog between them should command the highest ecumenical priority. Reverend Flannery declared that the Christian was "completely ignorant" of those pages of history from the first century onward which depicted the persecution of Jews. On the other hand, the Jew should understand, he states, the fact of this Christian ignorance of history. If the dialog of reconciliation is to move to better ground, he said, Christians must learn the "facts of history, even the murderous facts."

Christians in this country, however, cannot but be mindful of the tragedy that severely decimated the ranks of European Jews in World War II. They seem less aware unfortunately of the degree to which Moscow succeeded Hitler as head executioner.

Soviet harassment against the Jews has been intensified of late. It would appear most appropriate for today's Christians to ally themselves with the efforts of American Jews and use whatever means they have at their disposal to alleviate the sufferings of the followers of Judaism within the Communist bloc.

As noted above, the Christian and Jew share a common plight, perpetrated by a common antagonist by virtue of their common membership in the religious community of men. In their belief in a greater authority than the state will the Christian and Jew find a mutual solace and a mutual strength.

"Communism and religion are irreconcilable," stated the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in its excellent study, "The Profile of Communism," adding that "Communism in theory and practice is atheistic." Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical on Atheistic Communism, declared that "Communism is intrinsically wrong." Genuine Christians, he wrote, should not "collaborate with it in any undertaking whatever." Pope Paul VI in his recent Apostolic Letter of May 14, 1971, also stressed the impossibility of coming to terms with Marxism. He said:

It would be illusory and dangerous to . . . accept the elements of Marxist analysis without recognizing their relationship with ideology, and to enter into the practice of class struggle and its Marxist interpretation, while failing to note the kind of totalitarian and violent society to which this process leads.

The B'nai B'rith study, noted above, stated that the Judaean-Christian tradition treats each man as being individually important while communism treats man as an instrument of the state. "Few enemies of Judaean-Christian ethics," it said, have been as unashamed as the Communist in expressing their own amoral philosophy:

Communist ethics make it the highest duty to accept the necessity of acting wick-

edly. . . Evil transforms itself into good through the dialectic of History (George Lukacs, Commissar of Education in the post-World War I Bolshevik government of Hungary).

The Ecumenical Council, held in Rome, 1963-65, in its Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, part 4, of October 28, 1965, declared that that Synod recalled "the spiritual bond linking the people of the New Covenant with Abraham's stock." It recalled too that "from the Jewish people sprang the apostles, her foundation stones and pillars, as well as most of the early disciples who proclaimed Christ to the world." Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is thus so great, the declaration went on, it wished to foster and recommend "mutual understanding and respect" which is the fruit above all of biblical and theological studies, and of brotherly dialogs. The Vatican II document concluded:

The Church repudiates all persecution against any man. Moreover, mindful of her common patrimony with the Jews, and motivated by the gospel's spiritual love and by no political considerations, she deplores the hatred, persecutions, and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews at any time and from any source.

Mr. Speaker, the term, "Soviet persecution of Jews" can be a misleading phrase because the Jews have undergone severe hardships in other communist countries as well. "Communist persecution of the Jews" would indeed be a more apt expression. The hardships faced by Jews in the countries of Eastern Europe, as well as in Communist countries elsewhere clearly reveals that where Marxism-Leninism reigns supreme, there too may be found religious persecution. On Eastern Europe the B'nai B'rith report found that—

Generally, throughout the satellites, all formerly independent Jewish religious, educational and social activities have been nationalized and are operated by communist party members or have been abolished. All Jewish political parties have been dissolved. The numbers of Jewish schools are dwindling. In some countries the teaching of Hebrew is forbidden. In Hungary, Jewish teachers have been ousted from the public school system and Jewish pupils are compelled to attend school on the Sabbath.

Jewish charity organizations, including orphanages, children's homes and hospitals have been liquidated. Jewish foreign relief organizations have been ousted. Jewish papers are permitted to publish only communist views. Government spies sit in the synagogues, many of which have been invaded and desecrated.

Mr. Speaker, by merely substituting the word "Christian" for the word "Jew," and "church" for the word "synagogue," in the above passage, one would have a fairly accurate rendition of the tribulations suffered in Communist countries by Christians, also.

If the free world had the political clout—and the will to use it—to raise the barriers which cruelly confine the inhabitants of the USSR and its satellites, and the facilities to accommodate those long-suffering humans, the staggering westward exodus would depopulate those nations to the point where their industry

and agriculture would come to a virtual standstill. Both free and the unfree nations know this.

What can be done? The trend of events today would seem to indicate that under the policy of so-called peaceful coexistence, in which the free world has apparently acquiesced, nothing. But this does not necessarily have to be. There have been instances of altruistic intervention on behalf of the Jew by American officials in the past. Protests were made to the Governments of Morocco in 1863, Persia in 1897, Syria and Persia in 1915, Italy in 1938, North Africa in 1942, and Argentina in 1943, and on numerous occasions, Nazi Germany. In December 1970, Senator CHARLES MATTHIAS cited a few historical intercessions made on behalf of victimized Jews in Russia:

In 1881, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen directed a strong protest to the czarist court regarding pogroms inflicted on Jews in Warsaw. Again in 1903 President Theodore Roosevelt forwarded to the czar a petition signed by thousands of American citizens of all religions protesting the Kishinev massacre. In 1906, the Senate and House of Representatives passed a joint resolution condemning the continued mistreatment of Jews in Russia. As this proved unavailing, the House of Representatives in December 1911, voted to terminate the treaty of 1832, which had governed trade and commerce with czarist Russia for almost a century.

The plight of the Jew is, or ought to be, the active concern of conservative and liberal Christians alike for the very basic reason that religious persecution is above philosophical politics. An aroused citizenry has every right under the modern ground rules of international affairs to expect their government to express and to take an active interest in considering appropriate measures to let the USSR know of the displeasure in the West concerning the treatment of Jews within their jurisdiction.

Those who would say that this is interference in the internal affairs of another nation are simply unaware of global developments since the end of World War II. Communist nations have persistently injected themselves in U.S. affairs, the affairs of other free world nations, and, particularly in the past decade, in subverting the development of third world nations. In fact, the U.S.S.R. has been conducting such activities, as the public record amply bears out, since its very inception. "Peaceful coexistence" is a hoax dating back to at least the Comintern meeting of 1928. The only countries with which the U.S.S.R. coexists in any sense of the term, is its own satellites and in most instances this has proven to be a rather unpeaceful existence.

Diplomatic notes of protest concerning the attacks on Judaism, are not sufficient to even warrant a low-level meeting in the Kremlin. The only feasible method to arouse a materialistic Socialist Leninist government to take, or resist any kind of action is to materially affect the Communists where it most counts—in material goods. In mid-1968 U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. bloc grew substantially. In October 1969 the U.S. embargo on over 1,000 products, many of a war-useful nature, was lifted. Exports for 1971 may reach a

third of a billion dollars as a result of this development, and the political forecast points to further increases. This is where the issue must be joined if the Russian Jew is ever again expected to live other than a subhuman existence. Legal demonstrations at Soviet facilities will bring but momentary relief, if that. But representations directed at selected U.S. officials which have the authority to revise or revoke trade relations with Communist bloc nations can prove more effective. The economic clout has a telling effect far greater than that of the political—as the United States has itself discovered by cutting off its own supply of rich chrome ore from Africa and replacing it with a cheaper grade, Soviet ore.

#### THE VETERANS INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create a veterans incentive program. My bill is designed to encourage young men who are leaving active duty in the military to participate in the Reserve Forces.

By approving competitive pay scales for our men in uniform, both the House and the Senate have taken a significant step toward ending reliance on the draft. Important as this action has been, we should not be content until this Congress has enacted all of the manpower reforms required to produce a highly motivated, effective volunteer force. The 2-year extension of the draft is permissive, not obligatory, and there can be no excuse for delaying actions needed to bring an end to inductions. Changes in military housing and personnel management must be made if we are to enhance the attractiveness of a military career, and I am hopeful that the Defense Department will not tarry in recommending whatever is necessary to achieve this goal.

As we move away from reliance on compulsion, and as we reduce the size of our active force, we will have to place increasing reliance on the Reserves and National Guard to maintain our ability to mobilize in time of emergency. Recognizing this need, Secretary Laird, consistent with his commitment to ending the draft, has declared:

Guard and Reserve units and individuals of the selected reserves will be prepared to be the initial and primary source for augmentation of the active forces in any future emergency requiring a rapid and substantial expansion of the active forces.

The administration has implemented this policy by reversing the equipment drain associated with the Vietnam buildup, and by supplying the Guard and Reserves with modern tanks, ships, and planes. There can be no doubt that the opportunity to participate in a unit with a clearly defined mission, and to train on combat-ready equipment, will substantially improve the readiness of the Reserve Forces.

The new role of the Reserve Forces is intimately linked to ending conscription. As Assistant Secretary of Defense Roger T. Kelley said during recent House Armed Services Subcommittee hearings:

This policy . . . means, first of all, that the Guard and Reserve Forces have a vital national security mission. Men should join these units because they want to be a part of that mission, and not to avoid real military service.

Critics of the volunteer force, however, have claimed that the reserves will not be able to meet their manpower requirements in the absence of the draft. These skeptics point to surveys which show that between 70 and 80 percent of the men currently on reserve duty are "draft motivated." It should be remembered, however, that entry pay of a reservist for a full weekend drill is only \$17.92—far less than he could make at any part-time job. While it is true that pay alone will not attract men into serving their country in the Reserves, it should be clear to all that present drill pay is a disincentive to such service. As Deputy Assistant Secretary Mr. Theodore Marrs recently noted:

I believe there are plenty of people around who would like to become members of the Guard and Reserve, but plainly can't afford to with some of the current limitations on time and money.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real tribute to the patriotism of our young people that nearly 30 percent of our Reserve Forces are true volunteers in spite of such low rates in pay. As a result of the tireless efforts of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), active and reserve pay has been raised to a level that is competitive with salaries in the civilian world. These pay scales approximate those recommended by the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force to sustain nonprior service accessions to the Reserves—see chapter 9 and appendix IV-2 of the Commission report.

The primary source of entrants into the Reserve structure should be the combat tested veteran. As the Commission noted:

The man who separates from active service is a highly prized candidate for service in a reserve unit. He has had two or more years of training and experience which qualify him not only for immediate assignment to fill a unit vacancy, but often for a leadership role as well.

The veteran can fill the Reserves requirements for high quality and experienced personnel. Unfortunately, however, although over 1 million first-termers have separated annually in recent years—see exhibit 1—very few have volunteered for Reserve duty. In part, this was due to the low pay and secondary mission of the Reserves, and in part it resulted from the desire of the veteran to concentrate on obtaining meaningful civilian employment.

Mr. Speaker, I have developed a proposal to make participation in the Reserves attractive to the young veteran. Currently, it costs about \$3,100 to put a nonprior service individual through his

basic training—but for every veteran who enlists in the Reserves, we will need to enlist one less nonprior service recruit. This will not only save \$3,100, but it will also give the Reserve Forces a soldier whose effectiveness has been proven by sustained performance on active duty. Consequently, it make more sense to me to provide the veteran with an incentive to join the Reserves, than to continue paying the cost of \$3,100 for unproven recruits.

My proposal, which is simple and cost-effective, would allow the services to pay an incentive of up to \$3,000 for veterans who join the Reserve Forces. In addition, the legislation is designed to give the maximum flexibility to the services to vary the incentive depending on the criticality of the skill and the cost of individual training.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of a reenlistment incentive, which has been actively promoted by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), has been endorsed by Assistant Secretary Kelley. In hearings on the Reserves he stated:

Part of the virtue of these financial incentives is that even though they cost a lot of money they should cost the taxpayers ultimately less than if we permit a swinging door, highly volatile turbulent operation to turn over people, making it necessary to train new people.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, my proposal is designed to save money. Moreover, the funds to cover initial implementation of this program exist in the President's budget. According to Defense Department testimony during the draft hearings, the \$100 million contingency fund in the Project Volunteer account might be applied in the following manner:

As reliance on the draft declines, it may be necessary to provide additional incentives to insure adequate accessions for the reserve components. The contingency fund provides a means of doing this in FY 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this program will be beneficial for the reserves, and should be enacted now. At the same time, I am confident that it will be attractive to our veterans, who are seeking the means to reestablish themselves in the civilian community, and are also interested in continuing their service to the Nation. Most importantly, it is one more means by which the Defense Department can fill our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the text of the bill:

H.R. 9511

A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide a Veterans' Incentive Program for participation in the Ready Reserve

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof: "§ 313. Special pay: Participation in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve"; and

(2) by adding the following new section at the end thereof: "§ 313. Special Pay: Participation in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve

CXVII—1423—Part 17

"(a) A person is entitled to special pay computed under subsection (b) of this section if—

"(i) he has served in the armed forces on active duty (other than for training) for at least two years unless sooner released because of a reduction in force;

"(ii) on active duty (for training and for other than training) for a period which, when added to his period of satisfactory participation in the Selected Reserve, would qualify him for discharge or transfer from the Selected Reserve.

"(iii) he is accepted for enlistment, reenlistment or extension of enlistment in a unit of the Selected Reserve, and if a prior member of the armed force in pay grade E-3 or above; and

"(iv) he agrees to remain a member of the Selected Reserve for a period of not less than one year.

"(b) The amount of special pay to which a person covered by subsection (a) is entitled is—

"(i) for persons possessing critical military skills as determined by the service concerned, up to \$3,000 for a six year enlistment, or extension of enlistment with payments for lesser enlistment, reenlistment or extension of enlistment periods limited to 10% of the total for one year; 25% of the total for two years; 40% of the total for three years; 55% of the total for four years; or 75% of the totals for five years; or

"(ii) for persons not covered by clause (i) of this subsection, up to \$2,000 for a six year enlistment, reenlistment or extension of enlistment with payments for lesser enlistment,

reenlistment, or extension of enlistment periods limited to the same proportionate values as contained in clause (1) of this subsection.

"(c) Special pay authorized under this section—

"(1) may be paid in a lump sum; or installments;

"(2) is in addition to basic pay and any other special pay, incentive pay, or allowance to which the person concerned is entitled;

"(3) is payable for any periods of enlistment, reenlistment or extension of enlistment in a unit of the Selected Reserve which, when added to the person's initial period of military service as required in clause (1) or (ii) of subsection (a) of this section, does not exceed a total period of twelve years military service as computed under section 1332 of title 10.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and regardless of the amount of any previous active duty served by him, a member who voluntarily, or because of his misconduct, does not complete or does not perform satisfactorily during, a period of service for which he received special pay under subsection (b) of this section shall refund that percentage of the amount prescribed by subsection (b) which corresponds to the period of unsatisfactory performance or unfulfilled service.

"(e) This section shall be administered under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the armed forces under his jurisdiction, and by the Secretary of Transportation for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy."

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF 1ST ENLISTMENT, ACTIVE FORCE PERSONNEL BEING SEPARATED ANNUALLY BY FISCAL YEAR

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971 <sup>1</sup>	1972
Army.....	238,000	294	274	452	552	597	548	462
Navy.....	139,000	122	154	160	182	222	194	153
Marine Corps.....	38,000	33	54	81	98	143	108	64
Air Force.....	129,000	117	123	123	183	158	151	140
Total.....	544,000	565	605	816	1,015	1,120	1,001	819

<sup>1</sup> Includes projections.

PANAMA CANAL: THE QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress who have specialized in the study, clarification, and presentation of vital issues over a period of years at times see their works reflected in scholarly writings, both articles and books. This has been notably true in the case of the Panama Canal, a subject to which I have devoted a lifetime of study, spoken often, and written extensively. Such consideration in historical writings is the greatest single compensation for the effort involved in responsible leadership in the Congress.

Especially gratifying to me has been the number of students in various colleges and universities who have been choosing subjects dealing with various aspects of the interoceanic canal problem and writing papers thereon using the voluminous documentation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other congressional sources. For such research, my volume on the "Isthmian Canal Policy

Questions," published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, has been a prime source of authentic information.

A recent notable contribution to the cumulating canal literature is a 1971 paper prepared at the University of California, Santa Barbara, by Margaret Swope, a student at that great educational institution. Exceptionally well researched and logically reasoned, this paper establishes a high standard in realistic historical appraisal that could well be emulated not only by students at other centers of learning, but also by educators and authors, especially those who have been so glibly expressing their views in certain recent books on canal problems.

For many months, the revolutionary government of Panama has carried on an organized campaign of unjustified, hate-infected invective and vilification against the United States. One of its typical slogans is "Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone or death." In an address to the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, 1971, under the title of "Panama Canal: Intense Panamanian Hostility Campaign Against the United States," I tabulated some of the

cleverly worded diatribes and distortions published in the Spanish language press of Panama attacking U.S. indispensable treaty based sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. These attacks are being done under government direction as part of its program for securing new canal treaties that would wrest control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal from the United States.

Regardless of what surrenders that may be contemplated in any agreements reached in the current negotiations, attention is invited to article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress—House and Senate—and not alone in the treaty-making power—President and Senate. This constitutional provision, which is summarized in the eighth whereas clause of the pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions introduced or cosponsored by more than 60 Members of the House, is controlling as regards the Canal Zone and the extensive installations therein including the Panama Canal as it would also be in the event of an attempted cession of Alaska to the Soviet Union, the Louisiana Purchase States to France, and Texas and the vast Southwest to Mexico. The courts of our Nation have repeatedly upheld the force and validity of this wise and protective constitutional provision.

The paper by Margaret Swope is so timely in connection with the Canal Zone sovereignty question that I quote it as part of my remarks along with the text of the Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions now pending and extend to her my warmest congratulations:

THE PANAMA CANAL: A QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

(By Margaret Swope)

Theodore Roosevelt: "We have not the slightest intention of establishing an independent colony in the middle of the State of Panama, or of exercising any greater governmental functions than are necessary to enable us conveniently and safely to construct, maintain and operate the canal, under the rights given us by the treaty."

Since Panama won its independence from Colombia in 1903, the question of sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone has been a source of constant friction and at times open conflict between Panama and the United States. Although the Republic of Panama owes its existence to the canal enterprise and its continued independence to the efficient management and operation of the canal by the United States, radicals in Panama are attempting to force the United States out of the area. Under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 Panama surrendered her sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity. The Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired territory of the United States yet since 1936 the legal position and bargaining power of this country in Panama has been lessened. United States sovereignty over the area has not been affected although our government has been following a policy of appeasement to the demands of the Panamanians. In several cases the President and the Department of State have acted against the expressed will of the Congress. The 1960 decision by the Eisenhower Administration to allow the flag

of Panama to fly over Canal Zone territory is but one example.

It is more important now than ever before for the United States to assert its sovereign control over the Canal Zone since the Communists also have designs on the Panama Canal. Soviet interest in the canal dates back to the Russian Revolution in 1917 and with the nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956 they turned their attention to the Panama Canal. Having launched a program of agitation and turmoil against the authority of the United States in the Canal Zone, the Communists continue to pursue their policy of gaining a monopoly over key water routes of the world. "The real issue at Panama is not academic or hypothetical, it is not United States control over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian, but United States sovereignty over the zone versus Communist control." If the United States were to withdraw from Panama, the economy as well as the very independence of that country would be in great peril. It is therefore imperative that the United States maintain its jurisdiction over the canal which Congressman Daniel J. Flood calls an "interoceanic public utility". As the center of civilian and military communications and international security and commerce, the Panama Canal must be kept out of the hands of the Communists. By studying the historical background of the canal and the development of U.S. policy pertaining to the possession and control of the Canal and the Canal Zone we will better be able to understand the gravity of the situation which now faces our country.

Historical Background and Development of United States Policy of Sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

The first attempt to construct a canal across Panama was made by the French under the guidance of Ferdinand de Lesseps. In the context of the Monroe Doctrine, President Rutherford B. Hayes commented in 1880 on the French attempt to build a canal:

"The policy of this government is a canal under American control. The United States cannot consent to the surrender of this control to any European power or to any combination of European powers. The capital invested by corporations or citizens of other countries in such an enterprise must in a great degree look for protection to one or more of the great powers of the world. No European power can intervene for such protection without adopting measures on this continent which the United States would deem totally inadmissible."

Continuing he stated:

"Our merely commercial interest in it [the Canal] is greater than that of all other countries, while its relation to our power and prosperity as a nation, to our means of defense, our unity, peace and safety, are of paramount concern to the people of the United States."

In 1889 the French left Panama in defeat and the United States did not have to enforce the Monroe Doctrine.

Although the United States had shown some interest in an interoceanic canal, it was not until the Spanish-American War that our attention became focused on the necessity of such a canal. When the battleship *Oregon* took over two months to reach Cuba from the Pacific by way of Cape Horn—arriving in time to take part in the last naval battle of that war, leaders of this country realized the need for an interoceanic ship canal for the national defense. With two coasts already to defend, the United States had new responsibilities in the Pacific with the acquisition of the Philippines and the Hawaiian Islands. In December 1898 President McKinley pointed out the necessity of a canal and added that "our national policy now more imperatively than ever calls for its control by this Government."

Before any action could be taken on building a canal the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 between the United States and Great Britain had to be abrogated. Under this treaty both countries agreed to the neutrality of any transisthmian canal and that neither would "fortify or colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America." Fortunately for the United States, Britain was willing to waive its rights to a canal in Central America. The British obstacle to a canal under U.S. control was removed with the signing of the second Hay-Pauncefote Treaty on November 18, 1901. By this agreement Great Britain yielded its rights for a transisthmian canal and acknowledged the exclusive right of the United States to build and regulate a canal. In the same understanding the United States agreed to follow the main points of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 in its operation of the new canal. Thus it was stipulated that the canal should be "free and open" to "vessels of commerce and of war" of "all nations" on equal terms and the United States was empowered to defend it from "lawlessness and disorder."

It next had to be decided where the new canal was to be built. By an act of Congress the Isthmian Canal Commission was established in March 1899 to "determine the most feasible and practicable route" for a canal across Central America. When the French Company, which stood to lose its entire investment, accepted the U.S. offer of \$40 million the Commission presented a supplementary report advising in favor of the Panama route. (In an earlier report a Nicaraguan Route had been recommended.) As part of its report the commission stated that any rights given to the United States for a Canal Zone "must not be for a term of years, but in perpetuity, and a strip of territory from ocean to ocean of sufficient width must be placed under the control of the United States. In this strip the United States must have the right to enforce police regulations, preserve order, protect property rights, and exercise such other powers as are appropriate and necessary." Thus U.S. policy concerning the sovereignty of the Panama Canal existed before the canal itself.

Once it was decided to build in Panama the United States had to gain permission from Colombia, which had sovereignty over Panama, to acquire the holdings of the New Panama Canal Company and to acquire other rights essential to U.S. control of the Panama Canal. Under the Spooner Amendment, which passed Congress in June, 1902, the President was authorized to pay no more than \$40 million to the New Panama Canal Company, of France, "to acquire from the Republic of Colombia, and for and on behalf of the United States, upon such terms as he may deem reasonable, perpetual control of a strip of land" for the Canal Zone, and to begin construction of the canal.

The Hay-Herrán Treaty between Colombia and the United States allowed the U.S. to obtain the holdings of the New Panama Canal Company and to begin construction of the Panama Canal. Although Colombia gave the U.S. rights to a six-mile wide strip of land, she maintained "the rights and privileges granted to the United States" in this agreement were not to "affect the sovereignty of the Republic of Colombia over the territory within whose boundaries such rights and privileges" were to be exercised. This system of dual ownership was to last "for a term of one hundred years, renewable at the sole and absolute option of the United States." Though the terms of the Hay-Herrán Treaty were not those specified in the Spooner Amendment and proclaimed by leaders in this country as being essential for our control of the canal, the Senate of the United States ratified the treaty on March 17, 1903. In

Colombia, however, the treaty was unanimously rejected on August 12, 1903.

According to the Spooner Amendment, permission for a route in Nicaragua was to be obtained if the President was unable to reach an agreement with Colombia. Panamanians had never felt a close alliance with Colombia so when it saw the possibilities of losing the canal it decided to break its ties with Colombia and reach its own agreement with the United States. On November 3, 1903 Panama declared its independence from Colombia. Three days later on November 6 the United States recognized the independence of Panama and on November 18 the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty was signed by Secretary of State John Hay and Panama's representative Philippe Bunau-Varilla. This treaty with Panama followed the Hay-Herran Treaty with a few major exceptions. Under Article I of the United States was to insure the independence of Panama. Articles II and III gave the United States "in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control" of the Canal Zone as "if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." The existence of the new Republic of Panama was dependent upon the U.S. guarantee of its independence and the success of the canal enterprise. Bunau-Varilla realized that the sharing of sovereignty had been a weakness of the Hay-Herrán Treaty and he wanted "to avoid any sharing of sovereignty in the Canal Zone, a thing which always causes litigation on one point or another."

Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Charles Evans Hughes were three of the important framers of the United States policy over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone. Roosevelt recognized the strategic value of the canal, its effect on the commerce and international prestige of this country, and he was one of the first to understand the advantages a canal would have.<sup>5</sup> He felt that a canal connecting "the Atlantic and Pacific oceans as must be built by the United States or not at all."<sup>6</sup> Internationalization of the Panama Canal was inconceivable to Roosevelt for "it is our Canal." It is little wonder that Theodore Roosevelt was extremely proud of the Panama Canal and especially the part he played in making the canal a reality.

As Secretary of War, President, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court William Howard Taft advocated U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone as an absolute necessity. In 1909 President-elect Taft contended that the 1903 treaty entitled us to:

"Exercise all the sovereignty and all the rights of sovereignty that we would exercise if we were sovereign, and Panama is excluded from exercising any rights to the contrary to those conceded to us. Now that may be a ticklish argument, but I do not care whether it is or not. We are there. We have the right to govern that strip, and we are going to govern it."<sup>7</sup>

Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes was as adamant in his position concerning Panama as were Roosevelt and Taft. When Panama asked for increased sovereignty over the Canal Zone in December 1923, Hughes replied "this government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama."<sup>8</sup>

In 1914, the year the Panama Canal was opened, the United States negotiated a treaty with Colombia in which this country expressed regret for the part it played in the Panama revolution and offered Colombia \$25 million as compensation. Roosevelt and others denounced the treaty and were able to block its passage in the Senate. Ratification

of this Thomson-Urrutia Treaty did not come until March, 1922. In this treaty Colombia recognized the independence of Panama and further recognized that the authority over the Panama Canal and railroad were "vested entirely in the United States, without any incumbrance or indemnities whatever." As a result of this understanding Colombia was given certain preferential rights to the use of the canal and a cordial friendship between Colombia and the United States was restored.

The Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936, between the United States and Panama, marked the beginning of a process of deterioration of U.S. jurisdiction over the canal. Article I of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, which guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama, was abolished. After the 1922 agreement with Colombia, Panama felt its independence was a certainty and that it no longer needed the U.S. guarantee. Although this treaty did not seriously impair the principles of U.S. sovereignty over the canal, the United States relinquished some of its power and authority to Panama. Among the rights ceded by the United States was its right to intervene in Panama's internal affairs. The annuity to Panama was increased from \$250,000 to \$430,000. Contracted without consent of the Congress, the Hull-Alfaro Treaty met opposition in the Senate and was not proclaimed law until July 27, 1939.

A "hate America" campaign was undertaken by the Communists in Panama in 1946 and 1947. In 1951 President Juan Domingo Perón of Argentina tried to undermine the loyalty of Panamanians working in the Canal Zone. President Remón of Panama desired a revision of the existing treaties between his government and the United States. When President Eisenhower invited Remón to Washington in 1953, he sent two Ambassadors to represent Panama in the new negotiations.

In 1955 further concessions were made to Panama. The Eisenhower-Remón Treaty of 1955 gave additional U.S. rights and properties to Panama and increased the canal annuity from \$430,000 to \$1,930,000. One of the most important features of the treaty was that the United States was to yield property of the Panama Railroad without the authorization of Congress. To prevent the giveaway of the Panama Railroad, Congress stepped in. The railroad had been acquired by the United States by law and treaty. Colombia's rights to the railroad, granted to her by the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty, were ignored. By the time Congress took action it was too late to prevent the terminal yards and passenger stations from coming under the control of Panama. We now have a railroad without its terminal stations and yards.

With the nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt on July 26, 1956, the situation in Panama changed. The Government of Panama endorsed the Egyptian takeover of the Suez Canal. With the backing of Communists, students in Panama began to call for the nationalization of the Panama Canal. Congressman Flood, who for many years has been an advocate of maintaining U.S. control of the canal, realized the danger this posed to the United States. On June 27, 1957, he introduced a resolution in Congress to reaffirm U.S. sovereignty and our Isthmian Canal Policy. Unfortunately Congress did not take action on this measure. This was only the beginning of the conflict between the United States and radicals in Panama who want to gain control of the Panama Canal and drive the United States out of their country.

On May 2, 1958 university students in Panama planted Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone. "Operation Sovereignty" had begun. This was the beginning of the psychological warfare of the Communist party. President Ernesto de la Guardia of Panama announced he would not let the flag issue drop and that he would ask to have the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone.

When a Communist-led movement tried to overthrow the Panamanian government, rioting broke out in the streets of Panama City. Before the students were forced to draw back, ten people had been killed. (It was in this same month, May, 1958, that Vice President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon were on a good will trip to Latin America. During their visit they were the victims of attacks made by Communists in Peru and Venezuela.) This was however, only the first of several clashes that had resulted over the question of sovereignty.

Later in that same year, December, 1958, Panama attempted to encircle the Canal Zone by extending its territorial limits to twelve miles into the sea rather than the three mile internationally recognized limit. The United States, however, rejected Panama's plan to extend her boundaries. In a note to Panama in January 1959 the Department of State brought out technical objections. Thus, in an attempt to surround the Panama Canal and make it another Berlin, the Panamanians were reminded who had authority over canal activities.

From their base in Cuba the Communists continued their propaganda campaign against the United States. In April 1959 a group composed of Communists from Cuba and radicals from Panama advanced upon the Republic of Panama with the aim of overthrowing the U.S. control of the Panama Canal. This attempt, fortunately, was a failure for the Communists.

On November 3, 1959, the anniversary of Panama's independence from Colombia, there was renewed violence. When the mob marched in to Canal Zone the Governor of the Canal Zone called the U.S. army out for protection. In the disorders of that day the American flag was desecrated in front of the Embassy and a Panamanian flag was raised in its place. Further demonstrations took place on November 28, 1959. Although these events received little attention in the United States, they were of great value to the propaganda campaign of the Communists.

The House of Representatives passed a resolution on February 2, 1960 rejecting the right of Panama to fly its flag over the Canal Zone. One day after Congress adjourned, September 17, 1960, President Eisenhower instructed that the Panamanian flag was to be flown next to the flag of the United States at Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone. In taking such action, the Eisenhower Administration acted against the expressed wishes of the Congress.

By 1960 the people of Panama were becoming obsessed with the question of sovereignty of the Canal. In hopes of preventing only further trouble in Panama, President Roberto Chiari sent a letter to President John F. Kennedy on September 8, 1961 stating that the terms of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were "a source of constant frictions, disagreements and conflicts between the two Governments and between the Panamanian people and the North American population residing in the Canal Zone." He asked for new talks between the two governments so that they could "find adequate formulas to resolve, once and for all time, a stable and lasting association which" would "enable them to carry out harmoniously the common destiny set out for them by the Panama Canal." President Kennedy was not willing to negotiate a new treaty or to hold talks until the United States had re-evaluated its position in Panama. One reason for Kennedy's reluctance to hold new talks was that the possibilities of building a new sea-level canal were again being considered in Washington.

In 1962 Chiari came to Washington to hold talks with President Kennedy. It was decided that consideration of a new treaty would have to wait until a study of the needs, possible routes, construction methods, and cost of a new canal could be completed. A joint communique issued by Ken-

Footnotes at end of article.

nedy and Chiari on June 13, 1962 called for discussions by high-level representatives of provisions of the 1903 treaty which "are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties." Talks were begun in July 1962.

The Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the canal was the scene of new problems between the United States and Panama. On October 12, 1962, just a few days before the Cuban Missile Crisis, the dedication ceremony of the bridge was disrupted by Communists. Panamanians were unhappy that the name of the bridge had been decided by the United States and wanted the name changed to the "Bridge of the Americas." Seeing this as an opportunity to further their cause, the Communists came in and played upon the already high emotions of the people of Panama.

While the situation in Panama remained tense, talks were taking place between the two governments. A joint communique, issued on January 10, 1963, listed the points which had been agreed upon. As a result of these talks the Panamanian flag was to fly alongside the flag of the United States at all points in the Canal Zone where the flag was flown by civilian authorities. Further, Panamanians working in the Canal Zone were to receive increased benefits from the government of the United States. Yet many of Panama's demands, especially their desire for a new treaty, were not met. Frustrated by the slow pace and the lack of accomplishment of these talks, President Chiari ended the talks on July 22, 1963, a year after they had begun.

Relations between the United States and Panama continued to worsen. Zonians (North Americans who live and work in the Canal Zone) felt that the flying of two flags would lead to the eventual loss of control of the Canal Zone by the United States. Gerald Doyle, a United States citizen, filed a suit in the U.S. District Court in the Canal Zone to prevent the flying of the Panamanian flag in the zone. His motion, however, was dismissed on July 8, 1963. A short time later, on August 3, 1963, the United States Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, who was trusted and respected by the people of Panama, resigned. Tension mounted and yet nothing was done by the United States to assert its rights of control over the Canal Zone. U.S. bargaining power and prestige in Panama continued to decline. By 1964 Communist propaganda had softened Panama for its most serious attack on U.S. sovereignty.

The Johnson Administration continued the Kennedy policy of flying both flags. Schools, however, were excluded from this agreement. In January, 1964 students at Balboa High School in the Canal Zone returned to school after Christmas vacation to find that the American flag had been taken down. (Schools were considered a difficult problem so it had been decided that neither flag would be flown over schools.) Feelings of protest developed rapidly among the student body, 96% of which were U.S. citizens. To demonstrate their disapproval of the discontinuance of the flying of the American flag a group of students decided to raise the U.S. flag in front of their school and did so on the morning of January 7, 1964. Officials of the Canal Zone felt this was a violation of the agreement with Panama and lowered the flag while the students were in class. When the students returned after class and found that the flag had been taken down, they raised another U.S. flag and pledged allegiance to the flag. After school students remained to insure that the flag stayed up until it was to be lowered for the night. The next morning they again raised the flag and marched around the flag pole demanding that the flag stay up. That afternoon the Governor of the Canal Zone

issued an appeal to the public "to abide by the official commitments of their government." Defying the request of the Governor, the flag was raised on the morning of January 9, 1964. In the afternoon a group of Panamanians marched to Balboa High School to raise their flag. When American students tried to stop the Panamanians, the Canal Zone police interceded. In the fighting that followed a Panamanian flag was damaged. As the Panamanians left the Canal Zone, the first of several nights of serious rioting broke out in Panama City and Colon. On January 12, the last night of violence, a battle occurred between citizens of Panama and U.S. troops. Before it was over twenty Panamanians and four U.S. soldiers had been killed.

There is no doubt that the Communists had a part in the disturbances that rocked Panama early in 1964. Inactivity by this government to affirm its sovereignty and continued concessions to Panama led to an explosive situation which blew up in the face of the United States. During the riots, the United States military forces never left the Canal Zone. It was their job to protect the Canal Zone, and that is what they did; they never stepped outside of their jurisdiction. Relations between the United States and Panama had reached a new low, yet Washington was not yet willing to affirm the sovereignty of the United States over the canal.

Diplomatic relations were severed between the two countries on January 10, 1964. In a complaint presented to the Inter-American Peace Committee of the O.A.S. Panama charged the United States with aggression. This group, however, was unable to settle the problem. Both countries said they were willing to hold formal discussions on existing problems between Panama and the United States. On April 3, 1964 diplomatic relations were restored and special Ambassadors were named to seek a prompt elimination of the causes of tension between the two countries.

In September 1965 President Johnson expressed his willingness to negotiate a new treaty to replace the 1903 treaty. This new treaty would recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone and would expire after a pre-determined number of years. Talks were begun to discuss this new treaty and the possibility of a second treaty if it were decided to build a new canal in Panama. Progress in these discussions began to wane, however, as it became increasingly necessary for the representatives to consult their governments on their positions.

President Johnson began studies in late 1964 for a possible new canal. The final report of this study was presented to President Nixon in December 1970. After a six-year study, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission gave its recommendations for a new canal and concluded that the present canal is very important to the defense of the United States and that "the United States should retain an absolute right to defend the present canal and any new Isthmian Canal system in the foreseeable future."

#### ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE CANAL ZONE

The most pressing cause of concern in U.S.-Panamanian relations has been and still is the question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone. While Panama's claims to sovereignty are not new, it has been only more recently that demands have been made for the United States to turn the control of the Canal Zone over to the Panamanians. Under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, however, Panama gave "all the rights, power and authority within the zone" to the United States for its perpetual use and "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama any such sovereign rights, power or author-

ity." Thus the United States and Panama have claimed sovereign rights over the Canal Zone.

The claim to "titular sovereignty" over the canal by Panama is not new. When Secretary of War Taft first used that term in 1905 he made it clear that "titular sovereignty" was only valid if the United States failed in its treaty obligations. Panama's claim to "titular sovereignty" has been described as an "absolute futility" and a "barren idealism." In 1923 Secretary of State Hughes stated the position of the United States that "It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903."<sup>9</sup>

Even before considering the idea of building a canal in Central America, the United States realized that if a canal were ever built it would have to be under the perpetual and absolute sovereignty of the United States. Under Articles II and III of the 1903 treaty, Panama gave this country the exclusive rights to sovereignty it needed to efficiently operate and manage the Canal. The Canal Zone is the constitutionally acquired territory of the United States. If rights of sovereignty had not been conceded by Panama, the United States would not have used taxpayers' money to build and maintain a canal in an area as politically unstable as Central America. Perpetual and absolute sovereignty was and is a necessity for this country to continue to operate the canal.

The Panama Canal was built for the benefit of world commerce and the defense of the Western Hemisphere. According to law the canal must be self-sustaining, a business enterprise completely separated from the Republic of Panama. Under treaty obligations the United States is responsible for maintaining and keeping the canal open for the use of all nations on equal terms. With improvements in air, land, and sea power, the canal is perhaps not as important for our defense as it was in 1903, but it is the center of commerce, communications, and defense for the Americas. Most of the ships, approximately 70%, that use the canal are either going to or departing from a United States port. The Panama Canal is then an interoceanic public utility and as such it is imperative that the United States continue to maintain and operate it.

Since 1939 the United States has been making continued concessions to Panama which have taken away some of our power, but have not impaired our sovereignty. At times when our sovereignty should have been reaffirmed, such as in 1956 after the Suez Crisis, leaders in Washington were following a policy of appeasement to Panamanian demands. The Republic of Panama seems to forget that it owes its independence and prosperity to the United States and its successful operation of the canal. Panamanians continue to make demands. Much of the recent trouble in Panama can be traced to the effect of these concessions on the people of Panama. For example, the decision to fly the Panamanian flag with the U.S. flag was interpreted by some as a sign of Panama's sovereignty. The late Senator Everett M. Dirksen thought the riots of January 1964 were the result of allowing the Panamanians flag to fly over the Canal Zone. "As more concessions are made and United States influence is phased out, nationalism increases. So intense has this nationalism become that some Panamanians go to great lengths to annoy the United States, and have demonstrated their contempt by supporting such opponents of democracy as Algeria's Ben Bella and Cuba's Castro."<sup>10</sup>

Communists interest in the Panama Canal can be traced back to 1917 and John Reed,

Footnotes at end of article.

an American Communist newspaper reporter. It is the aim of the Communists to gain control of all major maritime transportation arteries. After the Suez Crisis of 1956, the Communists turned to a propaganda campaign in Panama. When Castro came to power in 1959, they gained a foothold in the Western Hemisphere and a base from which they could launch further attacks against Latin America. We have already seen how the Communists were able to play on the emotions and sense of nationalism of the people of Panama to further their cause. The Flag Riots are but one example of how the Communists were able to take advantage of a situation in which Panamanians felt their national pride had been damaged. There is evidence that many of the incidents that occurred in January 1964 were well calculated and executed by trained Communists. Although friction existed between the United States and Panama before the Communists became active in that area, they were able to heighten the tensions that were already there to turn the people against the United States.

If the United States were to turn the Canal over to Panama or to some international organization, the Republic of Panama would face disaster. The economy and independence of Panama, both of which are dependent upon the United States keeping control of the canal, would be destroyed by the Communists. In their attempts to gain sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the Panamanians are acting against their own best interest. Yet it has reached a point where politicians in Panama must be nationalistic to remain in power. In advancing a policy against "Yankee imperialism" they are hurting themselves as well as all other nations that use the Panama Canal.

Time after time our government has not taken action to reaffirm its sovereign control of the canal. Instead it has continued to follow a policy of appeasement. Time is beginning to run out. Since October 1969 over 100 members of the Congress of the United States have sponsored resolutions stating their belief that the United States must not yield any of its sovereign rights or jurisdictions over the canal to Panama or to an international organization. Rather we must maintain our exclusive rights to Sovereignty.

If the United States had taken a stronger position earlier many of our present problems in Panama might have been avoided. By continually giving into the demands and pressure of the Panamanians, we have been playing right into the hands of the Communists. Just 90 miles off our coast is the island of Cuba, the Communists' base in this hemisphere. We can no longer refuse to recognize this threat or afford to act indifferently to it. The U.S. policy developed by Hayes, Roosevelt, Taft, Hughes, and others, seems to have been forgotten. None of these framers of our policy would have thought of giving away any of the rights of the United States gained in the 1903 treaty. The situation in Panama is explosive. To avoid further violence, such as that of January 1964, leaders in Washington must take some positive action which has been lacking since the 1939 Hull-Alfaro Treaty. Affirming our sovereignty should have been the continued policy of this government. Somewhere along the way we forgot our history and the reasons Roosevelt and others developed our policy of sovereignty as they did. Before it is too late we must assert our treaty rights and powers over the Canal Zone, for if we lose the Canal we lose our key to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. As Congressman Flood has stated, "the real issue at Panama" is "U.S. sovereignty over the zone versus Communist control."

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Daniel J. Flood, *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone-Panama Canal Sov-*

*ereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal, Selected Addresses by Representative Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania.* (Eighty-Ninth Congress, Second Session, House Document No. 474, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 521.

<sup>2</sup> Dester Perkins, *The United States and the Caribbean*, Revised Edition. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Alexander De Conde, *A History of American Foreign Policy*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 376.

<sup>4</sup> Philippe Buneau-Varilla, *From Panama to Verdun, My Fight for France*. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1940), p. 157.

<sup>5</sup> Dwight Carroll Miner, *The Fight For the Panama Route*. (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1966), p. 587-388.

<sup>6</sup> Norman Padelford, *The Panama Canal in Peace and War*. (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1942), p. 27.

<sup>7</sup> Flood, *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions*, p. 217.

<sup>8</sup> Flood, *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions*, p. 153-154.

<sup>9</sup> Flood, *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions*, p. 78.

<sup>10</sup> Sheldon B. Liss, *The Canal: Aspects of United States Panamanian Relations*. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967), p. 168.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bunau-Varilla, Philippe, *Panama: The Creation, Destruction, and Resurrection*. London: Constable and Company, Ltd., 1913.

———, *From Panama to Verdun, My Fight for France*. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1940.

———, *The Great Adventure of Panama*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1920.

*Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*. New York: Bureau of National Literature, Inc., Vols. 14 and 15.

*Cuba and the Caribbean*. Hearings before the subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-First Congress, Second Session, p. 204-231. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

De Conde, Alexander, *A History of American Foreign Policy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963, pp. 376-383.

Dubois, Jules, *Danger Over Panama*. New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.

Du Val, Miles P., *And the Mountains Will Move*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1947.

———, *Cadiz to Cathay*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

*Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone-Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal*. Selected Addresses by Representative Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania, Eighty-Ninth Congress, Second Session, House Document, No. 474. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Liss, Sheldon B., *The Canal: Aspects of United States Panamanian Relations*. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Miner, Dwight Carroll, *The Fight For the Panama Route*. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1966.

Padelford, Norman J., *The Panama Canal in Peace and War*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1942.

*Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks*. The Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., Special Report Series: No. 3, March, 1967.

Perkins, Dexter, *The United States and the Caribbean*. Revised Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Rippy, James Fred, *The Caribbean Danger Zone*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940.

Tomlinson, Edward, *Battle for the Hemisphere*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.

Tondel, Lyman M., Ed., *The Panama Canal: Background Papers and Proceedings on the Sixth Hammerskjold Forum*. Richard R. Baxter and Doris Carroll, authors of the working papers. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceans Publications, Inc., 1965.

## H. RES. 154

Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone.

Whereas it is the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people of the United States that the United States maintain its indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between the United States and Great Britain, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for the operation, regulation, and management of said canal; and

To express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone.

Whereas by the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between the Republic of Panama and the United States, the Republic of Panama granted full sovereign rights, power and authority in perpetuity to the United States over the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Panama Canal and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority; and

Whereas under the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between Republic of Colombia and the United States, the Republic of Colombia recognized that the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad is vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States and the United States granted important rights in the use of the Panama Canal and Railroad to Colombia; and

Whereas from 1904 through June 30, 1968, the United States has made an aggregate net investment in said canal, including defense, or over \$5,000,000,000; and

Whereas said investment or any part thereof could never be recovered in the event of Panamanian seizure, United States abandonment of the canal enterprise, or under any other circumstances; and

Whereas under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the power to dispose of territory or other property of the United States is specifically vested in the Congress; and

Whereas 70 per centum of Panama Canal traffic either originates or terminates in United States ports; and

Whereas said canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States as well as of Panama itself; and

Whereas, during the preceding administration, the United States conducted negotiations with the Republic of Panama which resulted in proposed treaties under the terms of which the United States would relinquish its control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal with the gift of both to Panama; and

Whereas the present revolutionary Government of Panama seeks to renew negotiations with the United States looking toward a similar treaty or treaties; and

Whereas the December 1, 1970, report by the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission revives the entire canal situation, including surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama and operation of the Panama Canal by an international organization not subject to laws of the United States.

Whereas the recommendations of said Commission would place the United States in a position of heavy responsibility without requisite authority and invite a takeover by Soviet power of the isthmus as occurred in Cuba, other Latin American countries, and at the Suez Canal: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said Canal Zone and Panama Canal and that the United States Government should in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights, jurisdiction, territory or property to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization, which rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction are indispensably necessary for the protection and security of the entire Western Hemisphere including the canal and Panama.

#### CLEVELAND'S SUPER SESQUICENTENNIAL—175 YEARS YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I address the House today on the magnificent city from which I come. This year, Cleveland celebrates its 175th birthday anniversary with fanfare and celebration throughout the year, culminating in the coming month of July with great and elaborate programming of history and a great and long view to the future of our metropolitan area.

I think it is very important that the public have a chance to understand the rich heritage and background which has made our area of such importance to the Nation as a whole.

In that connection, I wish to include in my remarks at this point, an extensive history written by Clay Herrick and updated by my good friend, Mr. Sam Abrams, about our rich heritage. It is my hope that the public will enjoy it as much as those of us from Cleveland who take pride in it. The story of Cleveland's 175 years of existence follows:

#### CLEVELAND'S SUPER-SESQUI STORY

(By Clay Herrick)

##### THE BACKGROUND

Back in 1662, King Charles of England very generously gave to the little colony of Connecticut, "claim to the strip of land lying between the 41st and 42nd parallels (the width of their colony), and extending westward to the South Sea (then the name for the Pacific Ocean). Of course, no one knew then how wide the new land was, exactly . . . but Connecticut had its "claim", "from sea to sea."

In 1786, after all Thirteen States agreed to relinquish disputed lands to the new Federal Government as a requirement of being admitted to the Confederation, Connecticut asked to reserve a part of that land as compensation for her small size. This area she named The Western Reserve; it extended westward for 120 miles from the Pennsylvania line. Some called it New Connecticut.

The Ordinance of 1787, passed by the Congress of Confederation, established the Northwest Territory, of which Connecticut's 3,500,000 acres of land was a part. In 1792 Connecticut set apart 500,000 acres to compensate citizens who had suffered losses by fire or otherwise during the Revolution, known as

the "Fire Lands." The remaining tract was put up for sale in 1795, and bought by the Connecticut Land Company, a group of 49 shareholders who paid 40¢ an acre for unsurveyed lands they bought sight unseen. The \$1,200,000 proceeds gave Connecticut a permanent school fund which provides revenue for the State's public schools to this day! General Moses Cleaveland was selected by the group to lead a party of surveyors to go out and "find out what they had bought."

##### THE "BEST LOCATION" CONCEPT

Twenty six years before Moses Cleaveland founded his city, George Washington predicted its location and importance. While surveying in Western Pennsylvania in 1770, Washington studied the crude maps drawn by traders and observed that "where the Cuyahoga River flows into Lake Erie shall arise a community of great commercial importance." He could visualize connecting the Cuyahoga and the Muskingum rivers to link the Ohio River with the Great Lakes—60 years before it was accomplished!

Cleveland is a "natural" best location because of its position on the map, at the halfway point between New York and Chicago. By land, roads and railroads followed the water-level route along Lake Erie until they reached the end of the Appalachian plateau at Cleveland. Then they could fan out south and west—to Cincinnati, Indianapolis and St. Louis as well as Chicago. Going east, all paths funneled through Cleveland to avoid the hills and mountains of eastern Ohio and Pennsylvania.

By water, Cleveland was first accessible from Lake Erie, then became the northern terminus of the Ohio Canal; later became the logical port for ore mined near Duluth; and finally became a world seaport with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

By air, Cleveland originated the National Air Races here, built one of the nation's first municipal airports, and trained the first astronauts at NASA here in preparation for their historic flights "into space."

In 1950 an Illuminating Company executive gave Cleveland the title of "The Best Location in the Nation."

##### PIONEER VILLAGE

General Moses Cleaveland's party of 45 explorer-surveyors spent all of June, 1796, getting to the new territory. They arrived at Conneaut Creek on July 4th, 1796—the 20th anniversary of American independence, and christened the place Port Independence. They feasted, toasted the President, the State, the Land Company, the new territory, and each other—and fell asleep.

Here, Cleaveland divided his party. Some followed the Pennsylvania line southward to the 41st parallel, traveled west five miles and north again, to the lake. Over five miles, they headed south again, charting the new land in five-mile segments which are reflected in the north-south roads you see on Ohio's highway maps today.

Cleaveland's half of the party followed the Lake Erie shoreline and finally reached the Cuyahoga River and the location of the new "captiol town" on July 22, 1796. His party urged General Cleaveland to name the new town after himself, and the leader self-consciously agreed. They completed the initial survey by October, when the party returned to Connecticut, saying, "it was a nice place to visit, but—". Only four persons stayed in Cleveland that first winter: young Job Stiles and his 19-year-old wife Tabitha; Joseph Landon and Edward Paine. The first white child born in this region was the Stiles' baby boy Charles, who arrived January 23, 1797. The young couple and their baby moved back east when warm weather came; Landon moved on and Edward Paine started a new lake shore community he called Painesville. The first permanent settler came here in

1797: Lorenzo Carter, who arrived in May from Vermont—with his brother-in-law Ezekiel Hawley. Both names are familiar to this day in hotel names: Pick-Carter, and Hawley House.

##### THE VILLAGE GROWS

When Ohio obtained statehood in 1803, Cleveland had one frame house and one whiskey still; no church, no school, no minister. Not until 1810 did the first doctor, David Long—and the first lawyer, Alfred Kelley, arrive. At its first election in 1815 there were 12 voters who produced nine office holders. By 1817 there were seventeen families who raised nearly \$200 to build the first school house. In 1818, Andrew Logan brought in the first printing press and produced The Gazette & Commercial Register for a community of 172 persons. By 1820 there were 606 inhabitants, and a touring theatrical company stayed here a week.

Cleveland's first shipyard, which built the first steamboat on the lakes, was started in 1824. In 1828 George Worthington opened a hardware store: Cleveland's oldest business still in operation. The following year the first church building was constructed, which later became Old Stone Church. Meanwhile Trinity Parish had been the first church group, started in 1816 with seven members.

Meanwhile the religious order of Shakers had moved into the area southeast of Cleveland, known as Shaker Heights. They arrived in 1822, flourished for awhile, then moved out in 1888, having left a deep and favorable impression on the entire area.

In nearby Hudson, Ohio, Western Reserve College was started in 1826. Later it moved to Cleveland in 1882 and the Hudson College became Western Reserve Academy. The country's first coordinate college (admitting women) was started at Oberlin in 1833; Hiram College in 1850 and Lake Erie College at Painesville in 1856.

By 1830 the population had grown to 1000 persons.

##### THE CANAL BOOM

After the Erie Canal opened in New York State during the 1820s, a great demand arose for an Ohio Canal. Chief protagonist was Alfred Kelley, the city's first attorney, who legislated for it and made sure that Cleveland was its northern terminus. The Ohio Canal was opened to Portsmouth and the Ohio River by 1832, and suddenly Cleveland had a business boom, at 3 miles per hour! Merchants began to offer products from sister cities, and the sleepy little village started to become a trading area. Northward came wheat, flour, pork, lard, whiskey and rough logs; southward went fish, salt, cut lumber, factory goods and bag iron. From Pittsburgh came glass and printers' supplies; pottery from Cincinnati, woollens from Steubenville and iron from Canton and Youngstown.

The first load of coal in Cleveland was hard to sell. Wood was plentiful and housewives disliked the dirty, black fuel. Industry liked it, however, and soon coal was firing the foundries and steamboats that were now appearing.

In 1836, Cleveland was incorporated as a city, much to the annoyance of Ohio City (now Brooklyn), the community on the west bank of the Cuyahoga River. Soon a "war" broke out between the two, threatening the existence of the two bridges which connected them. Finally, a "merger" was brought about after 20 years of feuding, when Mayor William B. Castle of the west-bank Ohio City became the first Mayor of the united City of Cleveland, in 1854. Three new bridges were built, and the new metropolis moved forward, united.

During the "Golden Age," the Plain Dealer was started in 1842, the Medical Department of Western Reserve began in 1843, and National City Bank in 1845. The first through train to Cincinnati ran in 1851—the same

year the first Christmas tree in America was displayed on a Public Square: Cleveland's.

#### THE STEEL BOOM

By 1850, Cleveland's population had grown to 17,034. Then years later it had jumped to 43,838, the result of blending iron ore and coal in Cleveland. Charles Whittey, a Cleveland geologist, found iron ore in the Upper Michigan peninsula, led there by friendly Chippewa Indians in 1846. After the first six barrels of iron ore arrived in 1852, Cleveland industrialists predicted that the city might become "another Sheffield!" Lawyers, bankers and merchants joined the visionaries and pitched-in feverishly to build Cleveland's greatest industry: iron and steel. Fleets of carriers were built to make Cleveland a shipping center and names still familiar appeared here; Mather, Hewitt, Tuttle, Oglebay, Norton, Brown, Hanna and others. Then converters for boiler plate, rails and other steel products appeared: Otis, Chisholm, Ford, Jones and Stone, among others.

Amasa Stone came from New England to build the Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati Railroad, which opened in 1851. The first rails were imported from Europe, but soon thereafter were made right here in Cleveland. In 1866, Cleveland opened "the finest Union Depot west of New York." It was the terminal for six major rail lines.

Steel and shipping formed the basis for many fortunes made in Cleveland. It made the city a social and philanthropic center, and the main street of "The Forest City" soon became known as "Euclid—the avenue of beautiful homes." In 1873 this avenue was changed from wooden-planks to a paved street. Each winter, sleigh races were a highlight of the social set on the snow-covered street.

In the mid-twentieth century, Republic Steel opened the largest strip mill (96") in the world, here in Cleveland.

#### OIL BOOM

In 1859, Col. Edwin L. Drake drilled the world's first producing oil well—at Titusville in Pennsylvania, only a hundred miles east of Cleveland. This caught the fancy of a drygoods clerk, John D. Rockefeller, who went to see it, and was much impressed. Rockefeller's friend, Samuel Andrews knew how to refine the oil to extract kerosene and paraffin. The gasoline part was then thrown away as useless. In 1862 they built the first refinery where Kingsbury Run meets the Cuyahoga River. Soon they added Henry M. Flagler to their partnership and these three set up The Standard Oil Company.

Soon thereafter they added Stephen Harkness, a descendant of Nathaniel Doan, and the new company set out to dominate the new industry. They cut out the middleman (crude oil dealers) and thereby offered lower prices than their competitors. They established the AGW railroad from Meadville to transport the crude oil from Pennsylvania. They dickered with other railroads to obtain a kickback on rates and thus were able to undersell their competition. Thus they left a trail of ruined and humiliated competitors. When Rockefeller moved to New York and later offered a large bequest to Western Reserve University, the trustees refused the money, and it went to the University of Chicago. However, Rockefeller gave his Forest Hills home to the cities of Cleveland Heights and East Cleveland . . . an area known as Rockefeller Park to this day.

Other Rockefeller bequests gave park land from the Shaker Lakes to Lake Erie; built Alta House in "Little Italy" and new buildings on Case School campus. These brought applause but little affection to the world's first industrial millionaire.

#### THE ELECTRICAL BOOM

Inventors in this area suddenly "electrified" the world. Charles Francis Brush, in his home where the Cleveland Arena now stands,

invented the arc lamp: a bright light resulting from the spark gap between two carbon arcs held close together. On April 29, 1879, Cleveland's Public Square became the first spot in the world to be lighted electrically. People came from miles around to witness the event, and brought smoked glasses to prevent eye damage from the intense light they anticipated. Brush's dynamo, driven by a huge windmill in his front yard, was strong enough to power the first electric streetcar in the world: here in Cleveland, in 1884.

Meanwhile, another inventor was at work on a different kind of electric light. Thomas Alva Edison, working in Milan, Ohio 60 miles west of Cleveland, invented the incandescent lamp and brought it out just a few months after Brush's lamp: Oct. 21, 1879. Edison's electric lamp truly transformed the world from a daytime civilization to a day-and-night world. Some time thereafter Brush and Edison joined forces and their tiny companies formed the nucleus for the General Electric Company.

Just before World War I, NELA Park was formed—the first research campus in the United States, and forerunner of scores of research centers in this area. Using the initials of the National Electric Lamp Association, NELA Park quickly became the "light center of the world".

Just a few years before this activity, Jephtha H. Wade had invented the telegraph key and organized the Western Union Telegraph Company here. He even strung some of the lines himself to get his telegraph underway faster. Later he gave to Cleveland Wade Park, the site of the Art Museum, and land for Flora Stone Mather College.

#### THE INDUSTRIAL BOOM

By the turn of the century, Cleveland had become a diversified industrial center. The steel, oil, shipping and electric booms had made their impact. Meanwhile two young men had ventured into the paint and varnish business: Henry Sherwin and C. P. Williams had pulverized pigments and experimented with oils to produce paints for commercial and home use. They started the Sherwin-Williams Company, which figuratively "covered the earth" and made Cleveland the paint capital of the world.

Meanwhile Worcester Warner and Ambrose Swasey had started making machine tools and turret lathes which industry needed. Swasey previously had gained fame for his precision telescopes, used by astronomers everywhere. Later, he gave the huge observatory to Case School which stands on the hill in East Cleveland overlooking Lake Erie.

White Manufacturing Company, founded by Thomas White in 1865, was making bicycles and sewing machines. With his sons, White then turned to automobiles, trucks and buses, in addition to improved sewing machines . . . the foundation of two great companies in the city.

By 1920 there were six major car manufacturers in Cleveland in addition to White: Peerless, Jordan, Chandler, Stearns, Winton and Baker. There have been 80 different cars manufactured here! Cleveland produced 85,000 cars in 1920, worth \$40 million dollars.

Automotive Cleveland is still the major producer of components: bearings, parts, sheet steel bodies, engines, assemblies, tires, road machinery and countless small parts. Alexander Winton built the first car for sale in the United States, in 1898: a Winton "one-lung chugger" which sold for \$1000.

#### POLITICAL GIANTS

President James A. Garfield was the first of nationally prominent Clevelanders in politics. His assassination in 1881 shook the community as well as the country. Then Marcus Alonzo Hanna came into prominence. After making a fortune in coal and shipping, Hanna went into politics, and became Wil-

liam McKinley's closest advisor. His efforts put McKinley in the White House, and Hanna gained the title of "the President-maker." Hanna was elected U.S. senator in 1897, served until his death in 1904. He was chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1896 until 1903. McKinley, a native of Niles, Ohio, in the Western Reserve, also was a martyred president.

However, it was Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1909, who started the new era of politics here. Elected on a "3-cent fare" for street railways, Johnson's efforts produced the Taylor Franchise in 1911, in which the city became the owner of the transit system. It was Tom Johnson who gave Cleveland the nation's first municipally-owned garbage plant. He created Warrensville Farms for the care of the unfortunate. He renamed Cleveland streets by number in 1905, admitting that it was less sentimental, but far more efficient. He envisioned the Group Plan on the Mall. The Federal Building and Court House were built in 1911, City Hall in 1916, Public Auditorium in 1922, and Public Library in 1925—surrounding the Mall.

Newton D. Baker became Mayor of Cleveland in 1914. He commissioned Archibald M. Willard to paint his "Masterpiece Version" of "The Spirit of '76" for the Great Lobby of City Hall—where it remains on display to this day. After a notable administration in Cleveland, Mayor Baker was selected by President Woodrow Wilson to become Secretary of War during World War I. 20 years later, Mayor Harold H. Burton moved from Mayor, to Senator, to U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice.

Political leaders who distinguished themselves and their city of Cleveland after World War II included Frank J. Lausche, two-term Mayor, who became Governor of Ohio and U.S. Senator from Ohio; Anthony Celebrezze, who moved from Mayor of Cleveland to Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under President John F. Kennedy and subsequently became U.S. District Court Justice; and George M. Humphrey, former president of the M. A. Hanna Company, who became Secretary of the Treasury under President Dwight Eisenhower.

#### THE CULTURAL EXPLOSION

From the days of the business tycoons at the end of the 19th century through the expansive days following World War I, Cleveland took strong leadership in cultural activities. In 1900, the Associated Charities was formed to aid the less fortunate. This grew in stature until 1913 when the Cleveland Community Chest became the world's first coordinated fund drive to help deserving charities throughout the city. What became the nationwide United Appeal had its origins and patterns set right here in Cleveland prior to the first World War. The Cleveland Foundation was established in 1914, and the Welfare Federation soon thereafter, for allocating funds to worthy causes. The School of Art was established in 1906 and the Museum of Art ten years later. Cleveland's famed Symphony Orchestra was formed in 1918, and reached its international fame under Conductor George Szell who directed it during world tours up until his death in 1970.

The School of Music and Natural History Museums were formed in 1920; the Cultural Gardens, conceived by Leo Weidental and opened in 1926, were the first of their kind in the world, saluting the ethnic groups which had built this great city by working together. Observed one leader: "Although Cleveland's ethnic groups do not merge, they do know how to cooperate!"

The Cleveland Playhouse, the first continuous repertory theatre in the United States, opened in 1927 with Frederic McConnell its Director Severance Hall and the Lakeside Hospital group opened in 1931 and started an expansion in the University Circle area which has continued for forty years and is projected to greater growth during the next

forty years or more. University Circle has become nationally famous as a concentration of cultural institutions unequalled anywhere. In 1940, the Health Museum was opened on Euclid Avenue just west of University Circle and its capacity is being doubled during Cleveland's Super-Sesqui year. Blossom Center, 30 miles south of the city in the broad Cuyahoga valley is the summer showplace for the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, and was opened in 1968.

#### REBIRTH OF THE INNER CITY

When the Terminal Tower was built in 1928 by O.P. and M.J. Van Sweringen, critics observed that they were a generation ahead of their time. Yet the 52-story Terminal building became the tallest structure west of New York City, was the symbol of the Vans' mushrooming railroad empire, and the beacon of travelers from the Shaker Heights community which they developed along with the Rapid Transit system which became the model for many other cities. In the 1960s the expansion of Cleveland's Rapid Transit system to the Hopkins Airport made Cleveland one of only three cities in the world which has rapid transit rail service to its airport!

Meanwhile slum areas and blighted sections have given way to an Innerbelt system that speeds traffic through congested areas. Declining neighborhoods close to downtown have vanished and the Erieview Complex has started to grow and replace them. First the Erieview Tower itself, then the Chesterfield residence, new Federal Building, new Investment Plaza, new Central National Bank, new East Ohio Building, new Cuyahoga Savings Building and new Bond Court. Others are starting up also.

From the Lakefront southward along East Ninth Street (originally Erie Street), the transformation of a re-awakening Cleveland is most apparent. Its new piers to serve Ocean-going vessels through the St. Lawrence Seaway give it an international, cosmopolitan flavor. Its City Hall proclaims that Cleveland became the first major city in the United States to elect a black mayor and that Mayor Carl B. Stokes has given stature to himself and his race in a most creditable manner. He and civic leaders are meeting the problems of a changing city, with its many new crises and opportunities that spell expansion in the future. The entire appearance of the city along Ninth Street southward to the new Cleveland Trust Tower(s) symbolizes the rebirth of the downtown area, and proclaims that we are on the threshold of another boom and that Cleveland's Super-Sesqui Year is truly ushering in a "GREATER Greater Cleveland", by bringing unity in the community and a new goal of growth throughout the Connecticut Western Reserve.

When a city has a history and heritage like ours, a location and potential like ours, a talented people and a civic heart like ours, it can only grow to new greatness so that the Bicentennial of Cleveland in 1996, will be something tremendous, indeed!

#### COTTER OPPOSES I-86 THROUGH EAST HARTFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of this House the plight of the citizens of East Hartford who are being inundated in a sea of concrete. They have appealed to me for help because no one seems to be listening to their plea that "enough is enough."

Briefly, East Hartford does not want one more square foot of its land taken

for highway purposes. I do not think this is unreasonable when you consider that about 7 percent of the town is dedicated to highways—exclusive of town streets—and that a proposed new highway, I-86, would raise that figure to an incredible 10 percent.

Their pleas have fallen on deaf ears largely because the highway decision-making process is such a protracted, impersonal process that it is almost impossible to mount effective opposition.

The Congress recognized this in 1968 when it passed Public Law 90-495, section 24, which requires a State highway department to consider "the economic and social effects of (a proposed highway location), its impact on the environment, and its consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

Unfortunately for East Hartford, when the location decision for I-86 was made more than a decade ago, no such requirement was included in the law. There was no concern for the environment. No concern for its social effects. No concern for its consistency with community goals and objectives.

The plight of East Hartford is best summed up in the following letter I received recently from the chairman of the town council:

EAST HARTFORD, CONN.

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER,  
U.S. Representative, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For many years we in East Hartford have boasted that our Town is the "Crossroads of New England" but little did we realize that a callous and unconcerned State Transportation Commission would take us literally and attempt to bury East Hartford under miles of concrete highways.

Our present dilemma is the proposed construction of five miles of Interstate Highway 86 through some of our best residential areas causing the loss of at least forty-five homes and adding to the pollution and further fragmentation of our neighborhoods.

Even before I-86 is constructed we have approximately seven percent of our area under the concrete of interstate highways. It is anticipated this will increase to approximately ten percent if I-86 is constructed as is the present plan of the State Transportation Commission on the basis of studies it made twelve years ago. The Town Fathers and responsible citizens—ten thousand of whom signed petitions against I-86—have exercised and coordinated efforts to convince the State Transportation Commission, State Senate, and the Governor, of the severe consequences that East Hartford will suffer if this road is built. However, up until now our pleas have apparently fallen on deaf ears.

About two years ago a delegation from East Hartford carried our problem to Washington to your predecessor, the two U.S. Senators and Mr. Volpe, and this also has apparently borne no fruit.

I have been asked by our Town Council to carry out pleas to your office. We do not feel that I-86 is necessary and we seek your assistance to prevent its construction through East Hartford. We hope that you might intervene with Mr. Volpe's office to insist that the U.S. Department of Transportation takes a harder look at plans formulated by state transportation commissions with a view to preventing the damage and obvious lack of concern such plans have on our community and other communities throughout the country that suffer the same rape and frustration we are now experiencing.

Furthermore, in those instances where citizens suffer the loss of their homes as a

result of interstate highway construction, largely funded by the federal government, there is a great need for suitable and equitable financial relief. True, the State claims that it pays present market value for properties. However, those who have paid-up mortgages or those who now enjoy five percent or six percent mortgages find themselves in the position of replacing their homes with more costly real estate on today's market and required to incur mortgages of eight percent.

I know that you are quite familiar with East Hartford and have a true appreciation of our problem. Thousands of us in East Hartford consider you not only our Representative in Congress but are proud to consider you our friend and champion at the federal level. It is our sincere hope that you will exert the influence of your office to help us in our present plight.

May I extend my own personal sincere good wishes to you and may you remember that a warm and friendly welcome is always available when your busy schedule might permit a visit to East Hartford.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. DWYER,  
Town Council Chairman.

Since the decision to build I-86 along the proposed East Hartford corridor was made without regard to the factors recognized as important by the Congress in 1968 and since circumstances have changed dramatically thus warranting a review of the decision, I have today written the following letter to the Federal Highway Administrator:

FRANCIS C. TURNER,  
Administrator, Federal Highway Administration,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TURNER: I respectfully request that you withdraw the approval granted by your predecessor, Bureau of Public Roads, to the location of the East Hartford, Connecticut segment of I-86.

Circumstances have changed considerably since BPR approved the proposed corridor a decade ago. These circumstances warrant your reexamination of the project and, I submit, your withdrawal of approval of the location.

Since that approval was granted, East Hartford has become an asphalt jungle with almost 7 percent of its land dedicated to highways (exclusive of land dedicated to municipal streets). If this program goes through, about 10 percent of East Hartford will be under the concrete of the highway system. This is an outrageous burden in comparison to the average of 1.8 percent for other Connecticut communities.

A highway which will cut a couple minutes off the traveling time between New York and Boston does not justify the further rape of East Hartford and the taking of one more home, let alone 45 as presently contemplated.

The fact that 10,000 citizens in a town with a population of 57,500 have expressed their opposition to the highway in a petition is ample evidence of the community's concern about the impact of this road.

I ask that you give this request priority attention before East Hartford becomes inundated in a sea of concrete.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. COTTER,  
Member of Congress.

I expect a quick response to this letter. The people of East Hartford desire immediate action and I will stand by them in their fight.

#### PUBLIC AID FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Supreme Court ruling, which severely limits public aid for nonpublic schools, cannot help but shock and dismay all those concerned for the quality of education in this country.

Presently the Nation's parochial school system, which serves over 4 million students through 11,000 schools, is facing an unparalleled financial crisis.

I am most disturbed by their plight, because it is the schools in the inner city, where their services are most needed, which are closest to bankruptcy. One-third of the parochial schools in northeast Ohio, serving over 11,000 students, face serious budgetary difficulties, and almost all of those are located in the urban areas of Cleveland, Akron, and Lorain. Without additional aid these schools will be forced to close, and their students required to attend already overcrowded public schools in the inner city.

Just last month the President's Commission on School Financing issued a preliminary report which underscores the seriousness of the private schools' financial crisis. The panel stated that it could now identify certain dangerous trends which, if unchecked, "will hasten a collapse whose consequences will adversely affect the public interest."

Yet the Supreme Court has now chosen to erect another road block to the establishment of the type of governmental aid program which is vitally necessary if this collapse is to be avoided.

Using narrow and legalistic arguments, the Court refused in this decision to recognize that aid for parochial education is now a fact of life. In a contradictory ruling, the Court admitted as much by permitting Federal aid for construction at parochial colleges.

Similarly, the Court refused in this decision to recognize that this country has a responsibility to provide all of its citizens with a basic education so that they will be useful citizens. By restricting Federal funds, the Court has denied the children of Catholic parents this right. These parents must pay for a public education which they do not use, and then pay again for parochial schools.

One of the Supreme Court's main objections to existing aid programs is that they will result in "excessive entanglements" of the Government in the affairs of the parochial schools. One of the best ways to provide financial aid to parochial schools within the constitutional restrictions is through the voucher plan. This plan would give parents "vouchers" to buy their children's education at the school of their choice.

The quality of education could be substantially improved through this program, because there would for the first time be competition among the public, and parochial schools. This form of financing would let parents choose the best school for their children, a decision now denied to most parents who are forced to send their children to neighborhood schools in the inner city.

I commend the initiative of the Office of Economic Opportunity in establishing

test voucher plans in several cities, and I urge that we in the Congress do all that we can to facilitate the establishment of such a program for financing education.

#### CHAPTER IV—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 fourth 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 and comprehensive health projects and maternal and infant care projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 65 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 am 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— NEW YORK, N.Y.

The New York City Maternity and Infant Care-Family Planning Projects program is one of the largest of the over 50 similarly funded programs in the country. Designed to "bring care to the patient," it began service in 1964 with two Health Department maternity clinics in ghetto areas. Now, in 1971, the nearly 700 employees of the MIC-FP Projects provide prenatal, postpartum and family planning care in 12 clinic locations in Brooklyn, the Bronx and Manhattan, and family planning services in 12 additional centers in the 5 boroughs of the city. 16 of these 24 clinic locations are in or within five blocks of the Model Cities areas of the Bronx, Brooklyn and Manhattan.

The objective of the authorizing legislation was to provide comprehensive maternity and infant care of high quality to women (and their infants) who are receiving poor or no prenatal care because of low income or for other reasons beyond their control, who experience a high rate of complications of pregnancy, and who deliver prematurely two or three times as often as the national average . . . all in an effort to prevent mental retardation of the infants born to them. Evidence of progress toward reaching this goal is the achievement by MIC for in patients of perinatal mortality rates 17% lower than those for all private and non-private patients in New York City—this in those areas of the city with the highest such rates and where the worst socio-economic conditions prevail.

Medicaid cutbacks and recent changes in hospital fee collection policies have caused an increased flow of patients from the hospital clinics to MIC-FP centers for prenatal care and family planning services. Word of the high quality of care offered by MIC continues to spread, and, with the help of intensified efforts in community education, is probably responsible for some of the increase in patient census noted in 1970: a 13% increase in new prenatal cases, and a 29% increase in new family planners. A total of 149,000 patient visits for prenatal, postpartum and family planning care were served by MIC-FP during the year.

Physical plant expansion has not kept pace with program expansion, and attempts to gain additional space in existing Health Department facilities and to expand the numbers of sessions offered in shared space have proven largely unsuccessful—due equally to lack of funds for acquisition of space and new staff to handle increased caseload, and to the fact that most of the shared facilities are already operating to full capacity with other much needed services.

In the clinics, free prenatal care is currently provided to approximately 13,000 women each year—about 20% of the city's general service prenatal patients. Care includes the services of obstetricians, Certified Nurse-Midwives, public health nurses, nutritionists, social workers, dentists, laboratory technicians and Health Education Technicians. Employees drawn from the communities to which the clinic patients belong are trained and assigned as Public Assistants, Health Education Technicians, Social Work Technicians, translators, clerks, messengers, Family Planning Counselors, etc. They, like 95% of the patient population, non-White (usually Black or Puerto Rican.) Most are bi-lingual in Spanish and English.

Each one of the maternity centers is set up in close relationship with an affiliating teaching hospital (municipal or voluntary), which provides the MIC patients with medical services, including delivery, not available in the centers themselves. These hospitals also provide medical staffing of the related centers with Board Certified and Board eligible obstetricians and Certified Nurse-Midwives, all under the supervision of the Director of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology of the hospital.

29% of these prenatal patients are teenagers, and 58% of the teens are unmarried. Special programs for pregnant adolescents have been developed and are in operation in several centers. 38% of all MIC prenatal patients in New York City in 1970 were not married.

It is well known that for the woman of childbearing age, MIC-FP may be her only medical contact during the year unless she suffers an acute episode of illness. Furthermore, the total professional services available from MIC-FP staff during the periods of prenatal, postpartum and family planning care are far more extensive than are now available from most obstetrician/gynecologists in private practice. Yet continued increase in patient population threatens MIC's ability to maintain its open-door policy of patient intake in the present overcrowded facilities and by an overtaxed staff. The MIC-FP Projects have devoted the seven years of their existence to teaching the patient population the value of preventive health care—and a great injustice will be done if such health care is not readily available in the future—either from the Maternity and Infant Care—Family Planning Projects programs or from other agencies in the city.

##### MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT— BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The project was funded August, 1966. Since that date, judicious use of these funds

(no significant increase since the original grant) has enabled a health department and a University Hospital to work together as a unit and provide *exemplary care to all pregnant women and their newborns in the low income group of the entire country.*

Each year 2600 to 2800 women receive prenatal care in clinics of the health department without cost to the patients. These clinics are located in easily accessible health centers over the county. Patients with complications, needing inpatient or outpatient services of the hospital, are seen at the University Hospital. Fees are paid by the grant. All patients are delivered at the University Hospital. Hospitalization is bought for the high risk maternity patient and the high risk newborn by the grant.

Personnel and equipment from Maternity and Infant Care has helped establish the high quality of care available to all patients on the obstetrical service and in the nurseries of the University Hospital. This hospital serves the low income group.

#### MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROJECT— MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

Maternal and Infant Care Project No. 504 is located in the Monongalia County Health Department in the mountainous Appalachian region in the center of the bituminous coal fields and rural farming sections of north central West Virginia. The project offers comprehensive health services including inter-conceptual care to the indigent and medically indigent women of a nineteen county area.

Hospitalization is covered for low-income mothers with hazardous conditions relating to childbearing. In the past year, 65 per cent of our maternity patients were in the high-risk category.

The greatest problems in health services in the state of West Virginia have been determined to be:

- (1) Education
  - (2) Funding
  - (3) Transportation
  - (4) Lack of manpower.
- (1) Through patient and community education, there has been an increase of 40 per cent in the number of patients coming for prenatal care in the first and second trimester of pregnancy and a *decrease to 2 per cent* of patients admitted at the time of delivery with no prenatal care.
- (2) Funding has been held at the same level for the last three fiscal years and has in the current fiscal year been cut back. Despite these limitations the clinic attendance continues to rise and the project must curtail the number of supportive services in the field.
- (3) Public transportation is poor or non-existent. Many patients do not own a road-worthy vehicle. Without pick-up and delivery attendance at clinic for medical care is not possible.
- (4) The prevalent problem of lack of manpower is solved in part by the cooperating agency, West Virginia University, especially its Medical School. This institution offers staff resources as in-kind service and sponsors innovative educational programs which add to project professional staff.

An inter-disciplinary staff works closely with the individual patient to offer supportive services in clinic and home. The staff includes obstetricians, pediatricians, public health nurses, a nurse aide, social workers, a nutritionist and a home economist. An automotive driver and state vehicle answer some of the need for transportation to clinic in hardship cases. Clerical and administrative personnel keep necessary records and provide fiscal management.

Since its inception in May 1964, 3,235 maternity patients and 2,606 infant patients have been authorized for project services.\*

Family planning and Child Spacing Clinics were established 1 July 1967 and 1,424 women have enrolled for this care.

Two prenatal clinics, two infant clinics and on Family Planning Clinic are offered each week. Individual patient visits to all clinics now total 31,492 for the seven year operation. In Monongalia County which enrolls 60 per cent of maternity cases, there are 3,385 medically indigent women of child bearing age. An average year of project enrollment would offer care to only 360 women of this total number. The balance of population *at-risk* would be 3,025 women—a target population with great needs for comprehensive, continuous health care.

Maternal and Infant Care Project #504 is located in the mountainous Appalachian Region in an area of intense health needs. It serves a rural, low-income population where economic distress is reflected by inadequate housing, poor nutrition, and scarcity of medical care.

Project #504 is a cooperative program of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, West Virginia State Health Department, West Virginia University Medical School and Hospital and the Monongalia County Health Department. It was established in May 1964 with the assistance of a Federal grant matched on a ratio of 3:1. These funds are channeled through the State Health Department to two MIC projects in West Virginia. There are no possible means by which State and local sources could support this program of comprehensive health care for mother and infant.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT NO. 607— COLUMBUS, OHIO

Project 607 began in June 1966. Since that time this project has provided health care to approximately 14,000 registered C & Y patients who have had a total of about 100,000 out-patients and 1,800 in-patients admissions. This project is located in the Out-Patient Department of Children's Hospital, Columbus, Ohio. Children's Hospital has for many years provided reduced rate or free care to many low income children of the community. Because of this arrangement, our C & Y project provides many special services—i.e., psychological evaluation, nutritional guidance, hearing and speech evaluation, social services, genetic counselling, etc., to an additional 30,000 children from welfare and low income families who are not registered as C & Y patients.

In 1970 we saw:

1. 4,650 C & Y registrants who made 20,168 OPD visits.
2. 8,865 Welfare patients who made 30,653 OPD visits.
3. 6,761 low income children who made 20,104 OPD visits.

In 1968 we saw 8,237 C & Y registrants who made 32,262 visits.

The reduction in C & Y registrants between 1968 and 1970 is due to a reduction in available funds for support of the project. These services, as well as similar services throughout the country, will have to be drastically cut unless funding continues.

There is good reason to believe that programs which emphasize preventive and comprehensive care will eventually save money. For example, comprehensive health care asks about the child's environment. Is his home adequate? Is he likely to get lead intoxication?

Does he have adequate nutrition? One case of severe lead poisoning can require months of hospital care (for which someone must pay) and in many cases a lifetime of custodial care since permanent brain damage is a frequent sequela.

Immunizations save money as well as lives. Medical care for 10,000 children who don't get immunized for measles would be:

Acute care cost.....	\$50,000
Long term custodial care (for those who get encephalitis).....	90,000
Total .....	140,000

Cost for immunizing the same 10,000 children \$50,000.

Evidence from a number of studies indicates that comprehensive care can reduce hospital admissions and length of hospital stay. In the Columbus Project, average length of hospital stay for C & Y patients in comparison with others was:

	1968	1969
C & Y Patients.....	4.59	4.05
Private Patients.....	5.34	5.32
ADC Patients.....	6.04	5.11
Service Patients.....	7.51	6.96

We also have reason to believe that these projects have contributed to a lowering of the infant mortality rates. In the Columbus Area the rate has fallen:

	1964	1969
Franklin County.....	18.6	17.9
Columbus City.....	20.6	17.3
Poverty area of Columbus*.....	27.6	24.6

\* Nine contiguous census tracts in the central city—#28, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 53.

This project is providing a great deal of badly needed health care to children who will not be able to obtain it if the program is discontinued.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT NO. 648— GALVESTON, TEX.

The Galveston Children and Youth Project is responsible for the total comprehensive care of indigent children in the City of Galveston. The project functions as an integral part of the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Texas Medical Branch. During its three and one-half years of existence 8071 children have been completely evaluated. Inpatient service is provided at the University of Texas Medical Branch Hospital with funds from the project reimbursing the state for the children's hospitalization. The project provides out-patient services, both at the university and at a Satellite Clinic in the heart of the poverty area of the city. This clinic operates two nights a week to allow patients of working parents to be able to attend without any loss of income to the family. Dental services are provided through the Galveston Independent School District Dental Clinic. Funds for this purpose are provided by the Children and Youth Project. This clinic is also located in the poverty area.

The project works closely with some nineteen community agencies. Many of the core staff of the project serve on the advisory boards of such organizations as the Galveston Day Care Center, Family Services, etc. In addition the project works closely with the School Health Program of the Independent School District and the Galveston City Health Department. There are no funds, other than those from the Children and Youth Project available at the present time for payment for in-patient or out-patient services for these children, except for the small number of families who are on the aid for dependent children program. The latter are eligible for medicaid benefits. There is no hospital district in Galveston. The funds provided by Galveston County for patients hospitalized at the university have been limited to adults from the City of Galveston and adults and children from the mainland.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT NO. 640—SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

The San Francisco Children and Youth Project was funded in the spring of 1967 and has been in continuous operation since that time. The project is housed in Mount Zion

Hospital which is the only general hospital in the Western addition, a major poverty area.

Ninety-six per cent of the 2,200 children now enrolled in the project are black and approximately 75% of the children come from families on Public Assistance. For these children and their families the project and the hospital clinic (which provides services to adults) are the sole sources of dignified and comprehensive health care. Prior to the project's advent, pediatric care was fragmented and crisis oriented. At this time, close to 90% of the project's registrants are in the stage of health maintenance, receiving planned, preventive medical services and such supportive care from the paramedical staff as is necessary. One aspect of the program is a comprehensive health, counselling and educational service for teenage-pregnant girls and their infants.

In addition to direct care to project registrants, the staff is elaborately enmeshed with other community agencies and organizations in the provision of cooperative care arrangements, consulting and educational services. A particularly effective program has been developed in cooperation with the San Francisco public schools. The project works closely with its active Community Advisory Board. At a time when county and state medical programs are being severely curtailed, the discontinuance of the project would have a dire effect on health care in the Western addition community. Medical care would inevitably regress to the provision of minimal crisis services. Such significant supportive programs as public health nursing, social services and counselling to families, specialized group programs, nutritional education, the surveillance of children's school progress, special services to children with learning disabilities and all other comprehensive, multi-disciplinary preventive services would cease altogether.

#### LIMITS OF DUTY

(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 wish to bring to my colleagues' attention a noteworthy and perceptive article written by Charles A. Reich in the June 19 issue of the *New Yorker* magazine. Mr. Reich thoughtfully points out that our technological society is hastening the disappearance of moral and legal responsibility for the decisions we make and the actions we take within such a system:

#### THE LIMITS OF DUTY

In Washington, D.C., during the May anti-war protests, police in automobiles and on scooters aimed their vehicles directly at demonstrators and drove toward them at high speeds in order to herd them off the streets. If one of the protesters had been hit and killed, the police officer driving the vehicle would have been guilty of murder. Not accidental killing or manslaughter but murder. Thus, every one of these officers was potentially guilty of a crime similar to that for which Lieutenant Calley was tried and convicted.

The applicable principle is deeply embedded in our common law. A leading early example is *Halloway's Case* (King's Bench, 1628). *Halloway* was the woodward of woods belonging to the Earl of Denbigh. He discovered a boy named Payne in a tree, attempting to steal wood. Payne had a rope tied around his middle, probably to aid him in climbing trees. *Halloway* ordered the boy down from the tree, and when he descended struck him two blows on his back with a cudgel. Then *Halloway* tied the other end of the rope to the tail of his horse. The fright-

ened horse dragged Payne three furlongs, killing him. The question was whether this was manslaughter or murder, and the court held it to be murder, for *Halloway* knew, or should have known, the reckless and wanton risk he was taking with the boy's life. In such a case, the specific intention to kill is not required. The deliberate taking of the risk is enough. *Halloway* was hanged.

Students at Yale, where I teach in the law school, tell me that District of Columbia bus drivers also aimed their buses toward protesters at high speed and drove ahead without slowing down. How strange that those long-suffering civil servants the bus drivers are now guilty of reckless driving and assault, and, but for the agility of their potential victims, would be guilty of murder. Yet this is not an aberration. It is a pattern that is crucial to understanding what has gone wrong with America. Evil now comes about not necessarily when people violate what they understand to be their duty but, more and more often, when they are conscientiously doing what is expected of them. And for this evil the question of individual blame seems almost irrelevant.

Two oil tankers collide on a foggy morning in San Francisco Bay. The bay and ocean are contaminated, beaches are coated, wildlife is exterminated, a fragile beauty is destroyed for millions of people. Yet the tanker captains were doing their duty to move the oil on time, and behind them were company officials concerned with the maintenance of production schedules. No investigation, no technical fixing of blame would be likely to disclose what we have normally imagined to be the root of crime—a guilty mind or a malign heart. And what is true of the San Francisco oil spill is true of the other major evils that we see around us. From wiretapping to the prosecution of the Vietnam war, our crimes have been started and carried out by men zealously attempting to serve as they have been taught to serve.

It is this altered problem of evil that rightly troubles us in the Calley case. I believe that Calley was properly convicted of murdering Vietnamese civilians, even though the same result produced by different means is officially held to be wholly legal. Yet we must all believe that Calley, in his own wrong and frightened way, was seeking to perform his duty—to do what was expected of him. The enterprise upon which he was engaged is not condemned, only the means he chose to carry it out. Hence the profound disquiet among so many Americans, taught to serve employer or country, who cannot understand why the law apparently no longer cares about goals but only about a nicety of method. Plainly, our long-accepted criminal law concepts do not fit the crimes of today.

The central reality is that evil today is the product of our system of organization and our technology, and that it occurs because personal responsibility and personal awareness have been obliterated by a system deliberately designed to do just that—eliminate or minimize the human element and insure the supremacy of the system. The whole purpose of this system is to reduce the human component; that is why we have organization charts, a hierarchy of supervision, divided responsibilities, specialization. In the main, it is this rational organization of human effort that has brought us to our present stage of civilization, but we should realize that inherent in the very design of the system is the disappearance of individual blame, and hence the obsolescence of our concepts of individual criminal responsibility.

Let us follow the process of creating an evil more closely. A scientist who is doing his specialized duty to further research and knowledge develops the substance known as napalm. Another specialist makes policy in the field of our nation's foreign affairs. A third is concerned with maintaining the

strength of our armed forces with the most modern weaponry. A fourth manufactures what the defense authorities require. A fifth drops napalm from an airplane where he is told to do so. The ultimate evil is the result of carefully segmented acts; the structure itself guarantees an evasion by everyone of responsibility for the full moral act. Indeed, the system, especially when it is combined with advanced technology, makes it unlikely that those who participate in the process will have any real awareness of the ultimate consequences. Neither the scientist nor the man in the State Department nor even the pilot actually sees the horrors of burning napalm on human flesh. The basic result of our system of doing things is to destroy awareness, alienate all of us from the consequences of our actions, and prevent the formation of that very responsibility which has been at the center of our idea of criminal justice.

Our traditional criminal law is based on a standard of conduct that assumes each individual to be a morally responsible human being. A man who runs a speedboat carelessly and kills someone is guilty of manslaughter if his actions fall below the standard. A man who allows his passions or desires to direct his actions so that he harms another person is guilty of assault or murder if, according to the standard, he should have controlled himself. The standard represents an ideal. Sometimes it is a cruel and unreasonable ideal, because the individual defendant lacks the capacity for measuring up to it. But the ideal does have a vital function. It establishes a large, even exalted, concept of man.

In the famous case of *The Queen v. Dudley and Stephens*, decided in 1884, four English seamen were cast away in an open boat on the high seas sixteen hundred miles from the Cape of Good Hope. After eighteen days, they were reduced to the utmost state of desperation, with neither food nor water. *Dudley* and *Stephens* then said that if no hope of rescue appeared one of the four should be sacrificed, so that the others might live. A third man refused to consent to the plan. The fourth, a boy of seventeen or eighteen, was not consulted; he was then in a helpless and weakened state. *Dudley* and *Stephens* spoke of their having families, indicating that the boy should be chosen. On the twentieth day, no help appearing, the defendants, after praying for forgiveness, killed the boy, and the three men fed upon his blood and body for four days, after which they were rescued. *Dudley* and *Stephens* were brought to England and tried for murder. It was acknowledged that if the boy had not been killed all four would probably have perished before rescue, and the boy would probably have died first. Yet the two men were found guilty.

The opinion of the Queen's Bench was delivered by Lord Coleridge, the Lord Chief Justice of England. Acknowledging that the temptation had been great and the suffering awful, he declared, "We are often compelled to set up standards which we cannot reach ourselves, and to lay down rules which we could not ourselves satisfy." And he went on: "Though law and morality are not the same, and many things may be immoral which are not necessarily illegal, yet the absolute divorce of law from morality would be of fatal consequence . . ."

Rather than kill the boy, said Lord Coleridge, the men should have been willing to lose their own lives:

"To preserve one's life is generally speaking a duty, but it may be the plainest and the highest duty to sacrifice it. War is full of instances in which it is a man's duty not to live, but to die. The duty, in the case of shipwreck, of a captain to his crew, of the crew to the passengers, of soldiers to women and children, as in the noble case of the *Birkenhead*; these duties impose on men the

moral necessity, not of the preservation, but of the sacrifice of their lives for others, from which in no country, least of all, it is to be hoped, in England, will men ever shrink, as indeed, they have not shrunk . . ."

Although the circumstances make this case unique, the basic ideal is found throughout the Anglo-American common law. *Commonwealth v. Pierce* (1884), a classic American case, written by Mr. Justice Holmes, then a member of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, dealt with the problem of a physician whose patient died after he had treated her by keeping her wrapped in flannel saturated with kerosene for three days. Admitting that the physician's intentions were good, Holmes said that if the treatment was morally reckless, judged by the standards of a reasonably prudent man, then the defendant must answer for consequences that he neither intended nor foresaw. If the treatment was dangerous according to common experience, "we cannot recognize a privilege to do acts manifestly endangering human life, on the ground of good intentions alone." Holmes also wrote:

"The very meaning of the fiction of implied malice in such cases at common law was, that a man might have to answer with his life for consequences which he neither intended nor foresaw . . . his failure or inability to predict them was immaterial if, under the circumstances known to him, the court or jury, as the case might be, thought them obvious."

Recently, I was watching the C.B.S. evening news when a few minutes were devoted to films of one of the favorite antipersonnel weapons used by Americans in Vietnam. It consists of a rocket tightly packed with many ordinary nails. The rocket is fired from a helicopter. The nails scatter widely, propelled with such force that they will go right through the body of anyone in their path. One of the advantages of the weapon, it was explained, is that the gunner doesn't need to see the target at all. The consequences can only be imagined, but what can they be except the reckless maiming of all human beings, old or young, innocent or guilty, who happen to be in the way? Lieutenant Calley is guilty, we are told, but the men who designed these instruments, the men who built them, the men who ordered them to be used, and the men who actually used them were all simply doing their duty. What a diminished view of man this purported version of the law gives us! It tells us that we are all "universal soldiers," in the phrase from one of Donovan Leitch's recordings, morally oblivious of the consequences of our actions. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge completed his argument for full moral responsibility by saying, "It is enough in a Christian country to remind ourselves of the Great Example whom we profess to follow." What has happened when the hard-working God-fearing people of America are expected to be moral robots, making and firing the nails for mass killings?

Obviously, our thinking has been strained to adapt itself to the realities of technology and organization. That is why all those fixtures of the old criminal law, the guilty mind, the malign heart, actual or presumed malice, the common experience of prudent men, seem so out of place—indeed, ironic—in the Calley case. We all understand that such standards of responsibility are not expected of any of us. Nor would we feel more comfortable about the prosecution of high-ranking generals or political leaders under the Nuremberg theory. They too, would be found to have been doing their duty.

The Calley case represents a momentary, vestigial reminder of the old law of responsibility. It was unfair to single out one man for such a revival of the old law, to be sure. Still, the reminder sent a shudder of awareness through all of us universal soldiers back home. It was not surprising that Presi-

dent Nixon hastily intervened. What led to his intervention was not just his seeming unconcern for legal processes, or his desire, as the *New Republic* put it, to coddle this particular criminal. The President insists, in every speech he makes, that we should do our small, segmented duties while he—or those in authority—assumes responsibility. The President's intervention was no surprise, because the Calley case confronts us with standards of responsibility that do not fit what the President and others insist are our duties and the limits of our duties. We are all supposed to be motorists on a highway where the maximum speed is sixty and the minimum speed is fifty-nine.

Perhaps the best way to understand those who have resisted the draft—by seeking conscientious-objector status, by going to jail, by fleeing to Canada—is to acknowledge that they are demanding to live and to be judged by the old standards as fully responsible moral beings. They are seeking law, not evading it. Finding no acceptable standard of conduct available in today's organizational society, they have gone to standards that are not their own personal fiat but the old, traditional standards of religion, ethics, and common law. They are saying that they refuse to act in a way that common experience tells them will produce evil—evil that we know about or should know about. There is a revolt for a larger view of man. And for all of us it poses a necessary question: Given that we must all live and work within large organizations, that we must all take only a small part in a large enterprise, how can we restore the awareness, the responsibility, and the law that are the moral essence of free men?

An organization is a hybrid form of machine—one part a tool or system, the other part human. We have made too little use of the human part. We have thought of the humanness as something to be suppressed for efficiency's sake, not something to be valued because it might supply a quality that would otherwise be lacking. All of us who work in organizations should begin to assume a responsibility that is larger than the particular job we do, and this responsibility should ultimately be recognized, protected, and enforced by law. It might take many forms. Perhaps there should be a right—analogue to the long-recognized right to strike for economic objectives—to refuse, on a selective moral basis, to do certain work and perform certain duties. Perhaps this right should be guaranteed to individuals as well as to organized groups. Perhaps the organization should be answerable, on a democratic basis to those who work within it, for its policies and their probable consequences. Surely the present rigid hierarchy of authority must give way to a concept that in an organization all the members have a share of authority.

A corollary to this is that law should be based on the assumption that institutions, far more than individuals, are likely to go astray. Perhaps the primary regulatory work of law should be shifted from that of managing people to that of managing organizations while safeguarding the individuality of the people within them. Because organizations are the most characteristic element of our civilization, the scope of action by the members, employees, or consumers must be widened, and the scope of action by systems and machines must be narrowed and must be supervised by law. In the deepest sense, the purpose of such changes is nothing less than a restoration of one of our richest and most neglected resources—the human potentiality of the great mass of our people. Government by a managerial élite deprives us of the humanity of the many. Policy is made by a few, and the rest are coerced into following by laws that speak in the name of duty. The assumption is made that those who get to the top are naturally qualified to manage and plan for the rest of us, that we must accept what they require of us without

allowing our moral knowledge to intervene. Such a neglect of our moral resources is as great a loss as our now well-known neglect of our environmental resources. We need the full participation of each individual. We can no longer afford to be a people who unthinkingly serve.

This brings us back to what happened in Washington. The procedures used against demonstrators who tried to block traffic were flagrantly un-Constitutional. There were arrests without cause—mass roundups, which often included any young person, however innocent, who happened to be visible to the police. Prisoners were not subject to normal arrest procedure. Many were kept at detention centers without being afforded the basic rights of arrested persons. All this, like the murderous driving, was not the product of officers gone berserk but was part of coldly rational plans sanctioned, and later praised, by high authorities. Indeed, the same high authorities have recommended that similar tactics be used again. Can the policemen and bus drivers in question say they are doing all they can to respect the fundamental law of the land if they simply follow orders? Can the civil servants who drove to work that morning, maybe sympathetic to the peace movement but afraid of a demerit, call themselves law-abiding? I am suggesting that following orders is no longer good enough for any of us—not if we want our Constitution preserved. Each of us has a permanent and personal duty to the supreme law of the land. I do not mean the "law" that the Nixon Administration speaks of—something that I would call "force," or "state power." I think the Nixon Administration is deeply contemptuous of law. We cannot count on Attorney General Mitchell to preserve the law, nor, I fear, can we count on the courts. And, from a certain point of view, that is as it should be. It is our Constitution, not theirs. (Charles A. Reich.)

#### SIXTY DAYS: ENOUGH

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, I introduced H.R. 8606, a bill to shorten presidential campaigns to 2 months by preventing the nomination of candidates for President more than 60 days prior to election.

Recent developments in the field of campaign reform have made congressional consideration of this legislation imperative. In the Senate, for instance, the Committees on Rules and Commerce have reported out two different campaign proposals, and the Senate Finance Committee, the third committee with jurisdiction over reform, has failed to report legislation within the period established by the Senate leadership.

The Congress as a whole is finding difficulty with the complexities of various spending limits, media versus nonmedia regulations, and disclosure requirements. Each person is pushing the merits of his particular remedy, and while many of these suggestions have merit, unfortunately genuine reform is restricted in the abundance, technicality, and politics of the proposals now before us.

Because of this apparent stalemate, I am today reintroducing my 60-day campaign bill as a simple, direct approach which is, at least for presidential campaigns, both workable and enforceable and avoids the complexities that Congress is now struggling with. I am pleased to have as cosponsors of this legislation the following: the gentlewoman from Con-

necticut (Mrs. GRASSO), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLINS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

The advantages that would accrue from the 60-day presidential campaign are numerous. Election spending, for example, is historically related to campaign length, and controlling length will contribute greatly to controlling expenditures. The short campaign will also avoid the tedious over-exposure of our candidates, relieve the electorate of the boredom of a drawn-out campaign, and shorten the interruption in our affairs of state. Campaign excesses can in most cases be directly related to campaign length. Shortening the campaign will automatically reduce and possibly eliminate many of the abuses Congress is now attempting to regulate through other means.

There is of course no special magic to the number 60, and I would be content with even a shorter time period if that appeared desirable. Sixty days is simply a reasonable and adequate time period for voters and candidates to communicate. William Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System in 1953 noted that year that long campaigns were once necessary. He stated:

Those were the days before airplanes and broadcasting. Today a campaign period of four months seems clearly obsolete.

A limitation on the length of our presidential campaigns would not be unique to this country. Nearly every other large democratic nation in the world, including England, Canada, India, and Israel, conduct their national campaigns in approximately 1 month, with no adverse effects upon the electoral process. I would therefore suggest that the 60-day campaign is a workable and enforceable means by which the United States can exercise the same common sense, and at the same time attack a number of ills in our electoral process. The 60-day campaign has received considerable grass roots and editorial support over the years, particularly after an election. It should be made a part of any campaign reform package to emerge from the Congress.

#### VFW RESOLUTION ENDORSES DRUG BILL

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a complete set of the resolutions which were considered by the delegates to the 51st Annual Convention of the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars held in Hartford on June 11, 12, and 13. These resolutions will serve as the basis for the policies, programs, and goals of the VFW organization during the coming year.

Resolution No. 14, "Combatting Drug Abuse and the Rehabilitation for Servicemen Addicted to Narcotics while in Service," is of particular interest to me

and to the cosponsors of H.R. 8216, The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971, which I first introduced on the House floor on May 10.

The key provision of my bill, that servicemen afflicted with drug abuse problems be rehabilitated before being discharged from the service, has been fully approved by the VFW Connecticut Department. I am happy to endorse the work of the VFW in the critical area of drug addiction among our servicemen and to request support for their proposal and for my own bill from my colleagues.

I include VFW Resolution 14 for insertion in the RECORD at this time.

#### RESOLUTION NO. 14—COMBATING DRUG ABUSE AND THE REHABILITATION FOR SERVICEMEN ADDICTED TO NARCOTICS WHILE IN SERVICE

Whereas, the abuse of drugs of all kinds has increased considerably during recent years and is reaching alarming proportions in the military service; and

Whereas, servicemen are sent to some world areas where one must defend America's cause and at the same time defend himself from harmful drugs and narcotics that flourish and seem to be a way of life for that area's inhabitants; and

Whereas, when some of these servicemen procure and are found to be addicted to narcotics, they are finally given a discharge other than honorable, depriving them of their rights as veterans and citizens; and

Whereas, there is presently insufficient research data concerning the problems of drug abuse to warrant intelligent consideration of the problem; now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that more funds and efforts by civilian and military officials be directed toward research, mass instruction, and indoctrination in combating drug abuse; and be it further

Resolved, That proper and essential steps be taken to pursue the cause of rehabilitation for servicemen addicted to narcotics while serving their nation's cause; and be it further

Resolved, That a serviceman should first be rehabilitated and then discharged from service and further that such servicemen be afforded all veterans benefits upon discharge from service.

#### MORE SUPPORT FOR DRUG CONTROL ACT

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced H.R. 8216, The Military Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971 on May 10, I have been gratified at the extent of debate and discussion which has been generated concerning military drug abuse and the problem of drug abuse in the larger society. I was pleased also to note that the President has taken into consideration my proposal, as well as those of other Members, in formulating his attack on drug abuse.

Ideas must continue to be generated which may lead to the solution of this pressing social problem. As an example of the continuing valuable examination of this field I commend to the attention of the Members the following column which appeared in the Hartford, Conn., Courant of June 23, 1971, by Mr. James

J. Kilpatrick, the noted newspaper columnist and commentator:

#### NEW URGENCY SEEN ON DRUG PROBLEM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Mr. Nixon's four-point plan for attacking the critical problem of drug addiction includes a stepped-up assault on the heroin pushers, but Iran, I think, has a better idea. Iran puts them to death. Since 1969, according to a recent House report, 86 convicted pushers have been executed by Iranian firing squads.

The President was not prepared last week to recommend any such drastic measures here, but he might find surprising public support for the Iranian approach.

In urging a \$100 million crash program, Mr. Nixon spelled out four areas of necessary action—education, rehabilitation, prosecution, and foreign assistance aimed at curbing the poppy harvest in Turkey and in Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, on the Hill, Congressman John Monagan of Connecticut and Senator Harold Hughes of Iowa have stepped up their own efforts to cope with addiction among U.S. troops in Vietnam.

These manifestations of concern are fully justified. Weighed against the frightening problem of hard drug addiction, the marijuana problem, serious as it may be, dwindles to insignificance. A two-man House study mission (Morgan F. Murphy of Illinois, and Robert H. Steele of Connecticut), in an excellent report on May 27, placed the number of heroin addicts in the U.S. at 250,000. To this should be added an estimated 30,000 to 40,000 addicts among U.S. troops in Southeast Asia.

Under the circumstances, it is difficult to single out one area of overriding concern. Senator Hughes is concentrating his energies upon a plan of amnesty and rehabilitation among the armed forces. He is convinced that "it is utterly unrealistic to assume that the drug epidemic can be controlled by shutting off the supply." He may be right, but Murphy and Steele, of the House study mission, make a convincing case that little will be accomplished until the production of heroin is attacked at the source in Turkey and Southeast Asia.

Turkey has been making some progress toward reducing its poppy harvest. Since 1967, the number of provinces legally permitted to cultivate poppies has dropped from 21 to 7; three other provinces will be eliminated next year. But Turkey has yet to adopt a licensing law, and illicit production continues.

The Turkish poppy gum, converted to a morphine base, is smuggled chiefly into France. There it is processed into the heroin that supplies the bulk of the U.S. market. The House study mission was able to report "a steadily increasing spirit of aggressiveness" on the part of the French, but the number of convicted processors is pathetically low.

The obstacles against "attacking the source" in Southeast Asia are plainly formidable. Widespread corruption feeds upon the drug traffic, and customs controls provide no effective restraint. But the U.S. does have leverage here, and Mr. Nixon must put it to work.

There is no one answer. My own imagination wanders back to Iran.

#### THE UNITED STATES IN SPACE—A SUMMARY

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

Mr. FREY, Mr. Speaker, this is the final paper in a series of seven articles in which I have discussed our U.S. space program. The purpose of the first six

was to provide my colleagues with an in-depth background of our activities in space—to provide them with the proper information upon which to base a decision on this year's NASA authorization bill.

That bill has now passed. By a convincing margin of 302 to 64, the Congress reaffirmed its faith in the progress and benefits of this Nation's work in space.

The vote this year was particularly critical. First, the final budget which was passed was raised by the House to a level above that submitted by NASA. Although this increase was less than last year's rate of inflation and will still require program and personnel reductions, our approval was testimony that this Congress opposes the continued curtailment of our space work. By a vote of 302 to 64, we have gone on record against the further erosion of our technological and scientific base of expertise.

The second reason I was pleased at the response of Congress was because this vote demonstrated our program in space has and will continue to stand the legislative test—the test of guaranteeing to the taxpayer a maximum return on every dollar he invests. I hope that the same arguments will be persuasive when the NASA appropriations are considered on Wednesday.

Every year, health, welfare, defense, ecology, and space must compete for dollars. Certain of our programs address today's most pressing needs; certain are more oriented to the future; a few work for both today and tomorrow. The goal of Congress must be to provide for a proper balance between the most desirable of the programs proposed. I, for one, am thankful that there are those who understand the role which research and development play in the growth of a nation. We will always be confronted with those who believe the telephone came as a natural and inevitable step in the refinement of the semaphore, or the airplane as some kind of magically transformed ground transportation. But the majority of the American people appreciate that the steps we have taken to advance our society—regardless of the basic field in which the change occurred—I have had science and technology at their origins.

I think our people further realize that these quantum steps are also the direct result of dollars, hard work, and far-sightedness. These three factors have been the essential ingredients in most of the progress which this country has enjoyed thus far, and to no less an extent, will they be the ingredients of the progress our Nation will make in the future.

But permit me to return to our aerospace industry to put straight this point of the relationship between our advancement in research and technology and the growth of our Nation. I think that within the total aerospace industry we can find an interesting and very current example of how we have ignored this relationship and how we are about to suffer the disastrous consequences.

The error we committed concerns the airline industry. Anyone who has traveled by commercial aircraft, I am sure, is very much aware that the overwhelming majority of commercial airliners in

the world today are manufactured by U.S. companies. Even in Europe, which has a developed airline manufacturing industry in its own right, a quick inspection at any major airport reveals the heavy reliance upon U.S. aircraft. In fact, statistics show that over 80 percent of the world's aircraft are U.S. manufacture and that over 90 percent of the total airline mileage logged in U.S.-produced aircraft.

How did we gain this predominant position? Dollars, perseverance, and far-sightedness. I must also add that to a certain extent the leadership which produced this advantage was the direct result of judicious decisionmaking on the Federal level. The taxpayer may not have understood the necessity of buying new and improved military aircraft, but, with only minimal modification or adaptation of design, our Nation's taxpayer, and for that matter, the entire world, was presented with safer and better commercial air transportation. And just as important, if this country would not have provided the DC-3, or the 707, or the 747, some other nation at some later point in time would have.

Let us continue on with our examination of the commercial airline industry before we return to our discussion of space. But now, instead of examining the 1960's, let us talk of the 1970's. It is true that this decade is only just upon us, but I think that the United States was offered a glimpse of the next 10 years at the 1971 Paris air show. I have heard it called the show that Europe stole and I think that the description is very appropriate.

The new aircraft which were on display no longer bore a U.S. trademark. The latest and most advanced products were from Europe and the U.S.S.R. And the significance was lost on no one. America's undisputed lead in airline manufacturing is being seriously challenged for the first time since World War II. Most European aviation experts are, in fact, astounded at the seemingly purposeful relinquishment by the United States of our lead in aviation.

Here is the point I wish to make. This country as it strives to maintain its leadership in high technology products must continue to commit the necessary dollars and manpower to the task. It is essential to realize that our lead in advanced technology—a lead that produced a favorable balance of trade stronger than in any other general area of export—cannot be maintained without a positive and meaningful commitment. What we must also recognize is that other countries throughout the world are no longer willing to take a back seat to the United States in terms of technology advance. And by technology products, I mean products for space as well as aviation.

What does this mean in terms of our Nation's space program? Throughout most of the past decade this country has held a clear-cut lead in space. We all know of the benefits we have enjoyed in terms of more economical long-distance communications and more accurate weather forecasting, not to mention the many technological spinoffs which are in everyday usage. But what are we doing

to provide for our continued growth in the field? How are we guaranteeing our future advance? That is my concern. And I think the airshow might provide the clue.

We should again recall those new aircraft on display. With the introduction of commercial supersonic passenger service by foreign carriers, our carriers will be compelled to update their fleets correspondingly. It would appear only a matter of choice as to whether the U.S. carriers purchase their SST's in Europe or the U.S.S.R. Similarly, the Europeans displayed a new wide-bodied short-range aircraft design touted as the "DC-3 of the 1970's." If the plane lives up to expectations, we can hardly expect our carriers to await the 2 or 3 years before U.S. aircraft manufacturers begin producing a comparable U.S. version.

The impact of the large Russian cargo carrying helicopter was no less profound. All 15 of the major oil firms involved in the exploration of Alaska's North Slope expressed interest in the aircraft. This machine is able to carry more than five times the cargo of the largest U.S. design, and, of course, needs none of the runway facilities required by a fixed wing aircraft. The oil companies were only some of the first queuing up to learn the cost and availability of the aircraft.

Clearly, the United States would appear to be relinquishing its long-held lead in the aircraft industry and if either money or general activity are meaningful indicators, we are headed into a similar retreat in space. A closer look at these two indicators shows that the aviation and aerospace industries are all too analogous. Money? As our space spending hits new lows, the spending of the U.S.S.R., which surpassed ours 2 years ago, continues to climb. The U.S. investment of \$3.2 billion is only 65 percent of the Russian investment in their civilian space effort. Activity? In 1966 the U.S. enjoyed a comfortable annual launch lead over the Soviet Union of 73 to 44. In 1970, the figures were totally reversed. The United States launched 29 vehicles to the Soviet Union's 81. So far in 1971, Russia is launching at a rate which is 46 percent higher than their record launch rate of last year.

While this Nation remains convinced of the benefits which space will bring—such as communications, earth resources, weather prediction and control—we nonetheless appear intent upon turning our back on the facts. Surely none of us is so naive to think that space will go unexplored or that our international neighbors are so dependent upon us that little will be done without the United States at the helm.

We now see this Nation on the verge of purchasing European and Russian aircraft in order to maintain our service on a par with that of the rest of the world. I frankly must ask myself how far off we are from leaning on the space technology of foreign countries in order to bring the latest and fullest benefits of space to our people.

Today, the International Intelsat communication satellite network operates satellites 90 percent designed and built by this country. We can be proud of that,

but statistics of this sort are fast becoming monuments to the past. The Europeans are now contemplating implementation of a highly advanced communication satellite system based totally upon a European design. Even more impressive, the Europeans are boldly planning to develop and operate a new navigational satellite system which the United States may very well have to depend upon for precise transoceanic navigation. And how big a step is it before we are depending upon Europe or the Soviet Union for weather or agricultural data or even mineral resources obtained from outer space? The three Soviet cosmonauts who are circling the earth at this moment in the world's first orbiting laboratory are performing important experiments in meteorology, agriculture, forestry, and resource detection. We will not have the same information until 1973, 2 full years away. I pose my thought again. This Nation, as it now contemplates buying Russian helicopters and European SST's, could be heading for a similar dependency upon international space powers for the latest advances in space technology. This could be the future of space to as certain a degree as we have now arrived at that point in aviation.

As grave a threat as foreign dependency may pose and as tragic a loss as our leadership in space may represent, there are even further grounds for concern. I am speaking now in terms of the economic impact of the space program and its overall effect on the country. This merits taking a closer look at the program cost and what it provided, and in this way attempting to understand the implications and dimensions of a program reduction. And we should make this assessment by looking at all parameters—dollars invested, jobs created, and people's lives bettered.

First of all, we should realize that over the past decade the United States has been in space, the \$38 billion cost of the space effort has amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. There is no doubt that \$38 billion is a great deal of money, but we should also appreciate that this country spent almost \$350 billion on health and welfare programs, and over \$625 billion on national defense programs during that same 10-year period.

A look at the ratios between expenditures is even more revealing. The ratio of dollars spent in the space program to dollars spent on health and welfare is 1 to 9. The ratio of national investment in space to investment in the defense effort was approximately 1 to 16. And let us examine these ratios for the fiscal year.

During 1971, the country will spend no less than \$77 billion on social programs which will exceed even the defense budget of \$73 billion. This fiscal year, therefore, we will run budget ratios of 1 to 24 and 1 to 22 for space to social programs and space to defense programs respectively. These figures explain the little tolerance I have for those who would reduce or curtail our national space effort in the interest of increasing spending for social programs. Total

elimination of the space program would provide a whole 4-percent increase.

I think we can see from these numbers that the money directed to our space program is not out of proportion to Federal spending in other categories. But let us talk more about jobs and people.

The aerospace industry and our space program as a major segment of that industry is America's largest manufacturing industry. At its peak production in the late 1960's this industry employed more than 1.4 million people doing an annual business of over \$28 billion. More important, \$14 billion was the annual payroll for the industry.

There is also an additional aspect to the industry's impact. In the 1960s, during the first decade of our space program, this country saw its gross national product grow from \$460 billion to more than \$900 billion. Approximately half of that real growth of the gross national product, according to economists, can be attributed to the stimulus of new technological knowledge from research and development investments. And no less than 25 percent of this country's total research and development expenditures was invested directly in our space program.

Looking at NASA in particular, we should realize that the money we have invested in our space program was spent in one of the most labor intensive sectors of the economy—a sector in which the ratio of manpower costs to material costs is on the order of 9 to 1. And this money returned to the economy as wages and salaries to an average of 250,000 people per year. Just as important, the benefits in wages and jobs were felt nationwide. More than 90 percent of our expenditure in space went to 20,000 industrial and business firms in 30 States and 177 cities.

There are other measures of the space program's impact, such as the economic growth from our space effort in terms of the regional impact of space facilities. Employment levels, standards of living, educational opportunities, and industrial development have been multiplied many times with the establishment of such facilities as Cape Kennedy, Houston, and Huntsville. The demand of the space program for highly skilled and highly qualified people clearly exceeded available talent pools and therefore had to be met by training and general upgrading of skill levels. Individuals who received this training have undeniably benefited from the demands imposed upon them by working within the aerospace environment. The increment of skill which was added to the inventory of the individual worker represents a distinct contribution of the space program of permanent value.

I think another observation is in order when we speak of the impact of the space program on the economic growth of our country over the past decade. We must realize that many new and important industries were developed during this period as a direct outgrowth or result of the aerospace industry. Perhaps the most spectacular example is the growth of the computer industry—an industry which

developed primarily as a result of NASA's requirements for improved and advanced computer support and as a result of the hardware innovations brought about by space-related technology.

We can use any number of impressive statistics to study the movement of the computer industry to prove the point. As an example, from 1960 to 1970, this country added over 65,000 new computers to its existing base of 5,000. That is a 1,300-percent increase. We can also use investment as a measure. In 1960, U.S. businesses and institutions spent less than \$1 billion on computers, data processing equipment, and operating staffs. In 1970, these same businesses and institutions spent almost \$25 billion for computer hardware and services. That represents a growth in sales by a factor of 25 with the 1970 dollar expenditure corresponding to over 2 percent of our gross national product.

I emphasize again that the major factors in the growth and dynamism of the computer industry were the demands placed upon computers by NASA and the contribution to the field by our technical space expertise. Clearly, the space program provided monumental impetus to our economic growth—growth which meant jobs and progress both in the space industry and in the many space-created industries.

It is difficult to imagine, therefore, how we can now choose to abandon the space program. But we are gradually doing just that. We are incrementally reducing support in a manner calculated to undermine the entire program. For in the interest of providing continued stimulation to our economy and in the interest of providing greater economic growth and expanded employment, this Nation has chosen to reduce spending in one of the areas most critical to the future health and stability of the economy of our Nation. Our space effort as it returned over \$30 billion in salaries to the economy, and as it provided for the gainful employment of over 450,000 skilled workers—our space program has fallen from an annual budget of \$6 billion to just over \$3 billion.

Jobs and personal advance? Scientific and technological superiority? Increased quality of life? International respect and prominence? The money this country invested for space made a powerful contribution in addressing each of those goals. But incredibly, we now prepare to sound a retreat.

I must stress it is not my intent to alarm. I am convinced that this Nation remains committed to our national space program and that the NASA budget authorized by my colleagues for this year provides for our continued advance. But we nonetheless must recognize that the budget we have recommended is at a minimal level. It is a budget that delays and defers programs which in the national interest should be permitted to progress at a faster pace. And I refer to a faster pace not only in terms of providing quicker return to the public for the tax dollars which have been invested, but also in terms of countering the important advances being made by other

members of the international space community. I believe that the recent successes of the Soviets in space, as an example, particularly in manned operations, make it clear that space is no longer simply a place for investigation but a place to utilize and control. The military implications of the recent Russian lab are apparent. We must understand that the rest of the world is intent upon following its own path into space regardless of the plans of America. We must also understand that without continued emphasis in space by the United States, this Nation will soon find itself seriously outdistanced by its international neighbors.

Thus, while Europe and the U.S.S.R. press on with vigorous and expanding space programs, the United States must continue in its pursuit of space at a level which is at best marginally adequate. I believe that those of my colleagues who have closely examined this year's budget will find that it does not fulfill the many opportunities that this Nation has before it for the full utilization of space. And they will also see that the resources and the people we are committing have declined from past levels. But we can be satisfied that the NASA program for this year does preserve our capabilities in the most essential areas.

I therefore congratulate my colleagues for the role they have played in providing for our future progress in space. I believe we all recognize that the techniques and technology we are developing in the conquest of space are our Nation's newest and richest natural resources. We are truly developing the tools and materials which will serve as the keystone for all future progress. And we can rest assured as we venture out to the extremes of space that we will have made the earth a better place along the way.

#### COLLEGIATE CARPETBAGGING

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I realize it is only a matter of time until the required number of States will have ratified the amendment to the Constitution approved by the Congress granting 18-year-olds the right to vote. However, I was among those voting against this amendment primarily because I was not satisfied that we had addressed ourselves to the problem facing communities around the country who might happen to be the location of colleges or universities.

It was my concern that university students might be able to join together in support of candidates or issues that might be contrary to the best interests of the permanent residents of a local community and that there was a possibility of irreparable harm being done by the actions of a few radicals who might be able to influence enough impressionable young people to support harmful programs or candidates.

For example this past spring there was an election in Dane County, Wis., for the county board. A college student, Mr. David Stodolsky, had been elected on April 6 as a county supervisor to repre-

sent District 5, a University of Wisconsin campus fringe area. Other county board members had been puzzled by Mr. Stodolsky's absence from board meetings, and the mystery was finally cleared up when it was discovered that he had enrolled as a graduate student at Irvin University in Newport Beach, Calif., on April 9—just 3 days after his election to the Dane County Board. He apparently had run for office on a bet or dare and was elected.

I hope those who contend that the reduction of the minimum voting age to 18 does not present any potentially serious problems for college and university communities will take note.

A paper entitled "Collegiate Carpetbagging" written by Mr. Philip M. Sellinger, research director for the Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce, recently came to my attention, and while the thrust of this article is the problem confronted by communities in the State of Wisconsin, it has general application throughout the country I believe, and I ask that the text of the article be placed in the RECORD at this point, as well as a story appearing in the Wisconsin State Journal in the November 3, 1970 edition.

#### A CLEAR AND CONTEMPORARY DANGER— COLLEGIATE CARPETBAGGING (By Philip M. Sellinger)

An apparent oversight by members of Congress—in their haste to demonstrate a willingness to "listen to" the Youth of America by reducing the voting age to 18 years—has created a potentially serious situation which conceivably could reduce City Hall in many university-host communities to a civic disaster area.

Pending a test of constitutionality, 18-year-old voting would appear to be virtually a *fait accompli*. Thus, no useful purpose can be served by still another review of pro & con arguments which already have been well-"ventilated" in both the public and legislative dialogue.

Nonetheless, a persuasive—if not compelling—case can be made for serious consideration and further action by Congress to provide realistic, equitable, and Supreme-Court-proof safeguards for the permanent, taxpaying residents of university-impacted communities in the conduct of their local government and public affairs.

It is relevant here to note that the term "impacted" undoubtedly will be understood by those Congressmen whose Washington-area property tax burdens are substantially reduced by the federal funds appropriated for the "federally-impacted" elementary and secondary school districts in which they live.

While it is true that 21-year-old undergraduates or graduate students, by meeting minimal residency requirements, already are eligible to vote in municipal elections of many host communities, they represent only a fraction of the total enrollment. However, reduction of the voting age to 18 years under present eligibility requirements conceivably can qualify virtually the entire student body of a university to participate in local elections during three or more years of temporary residency as undergraduates and/or graduate students.

Thus, with exploding enrollments, and in the absence of more definitive franchise requirements, it is entirely possible that university student bodies could constitute a very influential—if not decisive—bloc of votes within the permanent, taxpaying electorate of many host communities. Given emotionally-oriented "issues" or circumstances, the demonstrably volatile, sometimes unstable

and transient *body academic* conceivably could have substantial power to influence long range public policy at the local level of government in communities where they essentially are temporary residents.

For example, the current enrollment of more than 35,000 students at the University of Wisconsin—with a planned expansion to 42,000 by 1975—already is equal to 45% of the residents registered in the city of Madison, Wisconsin. Three students, elected by their 21-year-old campus contemporaries from three off-campus student-dominated residential wards, currently sit on the city council—with several more on the Dane County Board.

The student-body/resident-voter ratio in host cities for Wisconsin's state university system is even more unnerving. Following are the enrollments expressed as a percent of the permanent-resident voters registered for the spring municipal elections of the nine host cities in 1970:

Eau Claire State University, 43%; La Crosse State University, 31%; Oshkosh State University, 45%; Platteville State University, 144%; River Falls State University, 156%; Superior State University, 20%; Stevens Point State University, 95%; Stout State University (Menomonie), 144%; Whitewater State University, 280%.

Thus, with the entire student body potentially qualified to vote under the reduced voting age, and in the absence of clearly-defined, viable safeguards, in 4 of the 9 host-cities the student body conceivably could elect one of its own peers as mayor, pass or defeat city-wide referenda, and have a substantial influence on the election of state legislators from the district.

In 4 of the remaining host communities—as well as in Madison—the student bodies unquestionably could have very potent ballot-box "clout" if they choose to participate in local and legislative elections.

The possibility of university students exercising this option is illustrated, perhaps, by a long-standing legend at Dartmouth College—where for many years the student body out-numbered the townspeople of Hanover, New Hampshire. By virtue of their presence in the community during the academic year, according to the legend, Dartmouth undergraduates were qualified to participate in the town meetings at which the public business of the community was conducted.

As a result, at one point Dartmouth students "took over" and voted to: (a) pave Hanover's Main Street with gold bricks, and (b) construct a high school 800' long, 20' high, and 10' wide. Despite the obvious frivolity involved, according to the legend, this action had the force of law—until it was eventually rescinded by the New Hampshire legislature.

Admittedly, with each re-telling, any "legend" tends to be exaggeration-prone, but many of them demonstrably have some basis in fact. In any case, under the conditions existing on the campuses of higher education today, it is not unreasonable to concede the possibility of a latter-day repetition of the situation, on a nation-wide scale, by the more politically-conscious and-exploited university students of the present "under-30 Generation."

Emphatically, it is not the intent here to impugn the basic sincerity or motives of the vast majority of *responsible* undergraduates in higher education. At the same time, however, the possibility of massive student response to the exploitation of emotionally-potent socio/political problems or "issues" at the local level of government in their host-communities cannot be wholly discounted—if only because of recent past experience in "town & gown" confrontations throughout the nation.

With all due respect for the undeniable intelligence and sincerity possessed by the normal undergraduate, there is no real

basis in fact for the hyperbolic "Generation-Of-Geniuses" syndrome so high and widely touted in the current political dialogue today. Nor is there overwhelming evidence that exposure to exploding fields of knowledge and technology, in and of itself, necessarily constitutes "education"—or automatically confers upon the exposee *instant* maturity or infallibility of judgement in the conduct of public affairs at any level of government.

In fact, the demonstrably low flash-point of emotionalism and volatility on university campuses during recent years, and the anatomy of "protest" demonstrations and riots, provide a number of persuasive reasons why the possibility of collegiate carpetbagging in local elections under the reduced voting age should not casually be dismissed as unlikely—especially since a stated major purpose of reducing the minimum age is to provide a "constructive alternative" to mob-violence and disruption on the campus by allowing and encouraging students to participate in the due process of orderly elections.

On campus after campus across the nation, student militants and radicals have repeatedly demonstrated their ability to fabricate and exploit emotional issues and involve thousands of their less aggressive but conscientiously-concerned contemporaries in disruptive demonstrations on the streets of host-cities. Furthermore, in many cases, they have been equally successful in "radicalizing" many hundred times their number into committing wilfully unlawful violence, fire-bombing, property destruction and other acts of anarchy—all in the name of "free speech" and academic freedom.

On the basis of their record in the streets and mass rallies on the campuses, therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that these self-styled revolutionary reformers and militant activists will continue to fabricate and exploit a whole catalogue of socio-political "causes"—as a means of involving their less activist but concerned campus brethren in local public affairs via organized "ballot-box protests."

In this context, it can be anticipated that even when the War in Vietnam and the draft are no longer catalysts for student activism there will be a succession of domestic problems and issues for student and faculty militants or radicals to exploit—and translate into undergraduate political action at the local level of government.

For example, University of Wisconsin students comprised over 90% of the unlawful mob which last year seized the State Assembly Chambers to demand an increase in welfare payments—for a handful of actual welfare recipients who remained on the periphery of the near-riot which resulted in mobilization of the National Guard to protect the capitol building from further disruption and destruction. At the same time, increased welfare benefits have been a principal "plank" in the platforms of 21-year-old student-candidates for the Dane County Board from student-dominated residential wards contiguous to the campus.

Arrests made during the seizure and subsequent "seige" of the state capitol during the welfare protest illustrate a key problem in the question of collegiate carpetbagging in local government affairs. More than half the students taken into custody were not residents of Wisconsin—and neither they nor their parents would have been required to pay the increased state & local taxes for financing the welfare benefit increases which they were "demanding" for recipients in Wisconsin.

It is relevant here to note parenthetically that Wisconsin ranks 9th in the nation for state & local expenditures for welfare programs (per \$1,000 of personal income), while it ranks 19th on the basis of per capita income available for financing welfare programs and other costs of state and local gov-

ernment—a comparative burden which is substantially higher than that in many of the "home" states of the protesting nonresident students.

Be that as it may, with the increasing acceptance of the collegiate dogma that political participation is an inherent and essential facet of the educational "experience," local government obviously provides the most readily accessible "laboratory" for political experimentation by newly-franchised undergraduates who have no real interest in, or responsibility to, the future of the host community beyond their graduation day.

Moreover, prominent leaders in the field of higher education have expressed the fear that "politicization" of university campuses, in some cases, already has passed the point-of-no-return—at least for the immediate future. In the lexicon of the student/faculty militants, this distortion of the role of higher education means "reconstituting the university function to make the campus and curriculum a center for political action."

Here again, local government provides the most convenient arena for such action, and the opportunity for more direct personal involvement with more immediately-visible and tangible results—especially for undergraduates exercising their newly-found political "muscles."

The key to the quandry, obviously, lies in the residency requirements for voter-eligibility. Under present laws in Wisconsin, for example, as interpreted by an Attorney-General, a "statement of intent" to become a permanent resident of Madison currently qualifies a 21-year-old (soon to be 18-year-old) University of Wisconsin student from another state to register and vote in state & local elections. For students who are residents of other communities in Wisconsin, presumably, the residency requirement is even less demanding.

The out-of-state student from New York, Long Island, New Jersey, Illinois or California, for example, can demonstrate his "intent" to become a permanent resident of Madison by registering his car and acquiring a Wisconsin driver's license. In any case, this is a matter of sound economics since Wisconsin's motor vehicle registration fee is substantially lower than in a majority of the states.

It can—and probably will—be argued that a significant majority of the newly-enfranchised undergraduates throughout the nation will prefer to participate in the public affairs of their "home" communities by absentee ballot—or that they will not necessarily abuse the franchise if they choose to register and exercise it in the host community of their temporary academic residence.

While there may be some validity in this assumption—at least as it pertains to the majority—it can be noted conversely that no-one buys liability insurance because he expects to have an accident. He simply recognizes the possibility.

On the basis of this omnipresent possibility, a persuasive case can be made for legislative "insurance" to preclude irresponsible collegiate carpetbagging—even by a minority of radical, militant undergraduates—before a political "accident" occurs, with unhappy or serious civic consequences. This can be accomplished without impairing the right of students to vote in their home communities via an absentee ballot.

Obviously, a simple statement of intent to become a permanent resident of the host community is subject to change "without notice" on graduation day and not an irrevocable guarantee. Yet it would permit undergraduates, as temporary residents, to exert possibly significant influence on long-range public policy, planning and local property tax burdens—with which permanent, tax-paying residents would have to live long after the students had completed their education and departed for home or elsewhere.

Without seeking to impugn the basic sincerity or sense of responsibility of those students who might "opt" to participate in local elections, it should be noted their participation could create other undesirable effects similar to those resulting from their involvement in policy-making and curricular-determination on the campus. With an almost complete turn-over in the composition—and, therefore, the socio/political concepts and philosophies—of a university's student body every four years, its potential influence in local political affairs could make a shambles of continuity and stability in local planning and policy.

The need for legislative or, preferably, constitutional clarification of this situation is further underscored by the reports of boasts by 21-year-old University of Wisconsin students who publicly announced that in the 1968 elections they had cast two ballots for president—once as a registered voter in Madison, and once by absentee ballot in their home communities.

Here again, it should be emphasized that it is not the intent here to question the basic honesty and good faith of the average undergraduate. Reasonable adults share the confidence in American youth expressed by Congress in reducing the voting age to 18 years.

Nonetheless, the extension of the franchise to a large and essentially "floating" segment of our population undeniably escalates the possibility of abuse of the one-man, one-vote principle—and a further threat to the integrity of our elective process which already is seriously compromised by blatant vote-stealing techniques in districts or cities controlled by long entrenched political machines.

Aside from socio/political considerations of student activists, at least in the case of undergraduates from other states, there could be a significant economic motive for establishing legal residence in the host community for voting purposes.

In many states, there is a very substantial difference in the tuition fees for non-resident and resident students—a difference which could amount to several thousand dollars over a period of 4-6 years. In the absence of further clarification, it would seem logical to assume that "legal residence" in the host community for voting purposes under the newly-extended franchise would also qualify students from other states for the lower tuition fee.

In any case, the question is: what can Congress, or a state legislature do—if anything—to provide equitable, realistic and viable safeguards for the permanent, tax-paying residents of a university-impacted host community?

A minimal provision would seem to be an unequivocal statement that any undergraduate enrolled in any university or college outside of his or her "home community" must be considered—for voting purposes—as a transient who is ineligible to vote in the elections of the "host" community or state UNTIL after he/she has received a *bona fide* bachelor's degree.

This provision would serve to separate the political and/or economic opportunists among the undergraduates from the graduate student whose "statement of intent" to become a permanent resident—or at least semi-permanent—while seeking a master's degree or doctorate would be somewhat more credible.

Unfortunately, there is no real assurance that a requirement of this kind would not be over-turned by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Not long ago, this same judicial body invalidated state-enacted one-year residency requirements for welfare benefit eligibility. The justices ruled that such requirements "violate" the constitutional right of welfare recipients to move to states with the most generous welfare programs—without any loss of continuity in their public assistance.

On the basis of this somewhat exotic backward-leap-in-logic, it must be assumed that The Court similarly might throw out any attempt by state legislatures to limit participation by transient university undergraduates in local elections—on the equally esoteric grounds that such legislation violates their constitutional right to attend the university of their choice without loss of their constitutional "right" to participate in the elections of the community in which they are—at least temporarily—residents, subject to the civil & criminal laws thereof.

This very real uncertainty with regard to the whims & wisdom of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices illustrates the prudence of President Richard Nixon in preferring the constitutional amendment approach for extending the franchise to 18-year-old citizens.

With a provision to clarify residency requirements for purposes of voting—especially under the unusual circumstances facing university-impacted communities with undeniably "transient" student populations—even the Justices, for all their superior and infinite wisdom, might find it difficult to declare as "unconstitutional" an amendment to the constitution which has been duly approved by the legislatures of the several states through a procedure established by the constitution.

Unfortunately, a majority in Congress, in their infinite wisdom—and/or preoccupation with demographic predictions of the vote-potential involved—so far have seen fit to by-pass the constitution in this major departure from established procedures in the elective process—while at the same time opening what could be a real "can of worms" for those responsible for the conduct of local government in America.

*Sic transit gloria libertati Americani.*

SUPPLEMENT: "COLLEGIATE CARPETBAGGERS"

Comments by Madison City Clerk Eldon Hoel in the news report reprinted on the following page underscore the potential for vote-fraud in a university-impacted community under the reduced voting age UNLESS residency requirements are clarified—or procedures for registration validation are strengthened.

As City Clerk Hoel points out, names of registered voters are not removed from the registration lists until they have failed to vote in two successive general elections. Thus, students who have registered to vote during their temporary 4-year residence as University of Wisconsin students are automatically "registered" for two years AFTER they have left the University and City of Madison.

As a result, their names can be kept "active" as voters by other students voting in their names. Conceivably, any group of radical or dissident students—such as the members of the Basset/Mifflin Street Hippy Commune in Madison—could develop and maintain a substantial catalogue of ghost-voters to be passed from class to class as their predecessors graduate and leave.

While it is true there is nothing to prevent them from undertaking this kind of vote fraud at present—if they are not already doing so—reduction of the voting age to 18 years will sharply increase the potential for abuse. There will be an increase in the number of students available to vote in the name of those who have departed as well as in the number of "vacated" names still remaining on the registration lists.

In view of their publicly-stated attitudes and frequently unlawful conduct to achieve their goals, there is little or no reason to share City Clerk Hoel's optimism that vote fraud by this type of student is improbable. It is germane to note that more than 75% of the students attending the university of Wisconsin live off-campus—and approximately 20% of them are from out-of-state.

According to the president of the University student body, there are at least some

6,000 radical students on the campus—ready to go to any lengths to achieve their goal of destroying both the University and our free society. Given their obvious ability to influence many times their number with emotional "causes," their use of a ghost-voter operation could have a serious adverse effect in state and local elections in the Madison area.

At the present time, it would seem that the Wisconsin State Legislature must take the first step to clarify the residency requirement to protect university-impacted communities from undue interference in the conduct of their local affairs—while at the same time preserving the rights of University students to vote in their home states and communities by absentee ballot.

IT'S MATTER OF HONESTY: VOTE FRAUD POSSIBLE, BUT NO PROOF IN CITY

It would be easy to vote illegally in Madison, although there are no firm indications that fraudulent voting occurs.

To vote illegally, a person would have to be dishonest, but not very deceptive.

That's because state law requires only a sworn statement of eligibility before a person can vote.

"I can't really believe there's much of it (illegal voting) going on," said City Clerk Eldon Hoel, who is responsible for supervising city elections.

He said he based this on the skimpy file of election complaints he has after being with the city for 23 years. And even those complaints rarely deal directly with illegal voting, but rather with protests about poll procedures.

In 1968, for example, a citizen claimed he wasn't allowed to watch the canvass of a voting machine in the Sixth Ward. In the same year, there was an unconfirmed report that a 14-year-old voted in the 14th Ward.

The greatest possibility for irregularities is in the central city wards, where University of Wisconsin students live.

For example, a spot check of one such ward Thursday showed 10 former students registered to vote who no longer are in the city, according to the ward alderman.

The registration of these people has not lapsed because they had voted within the last two years. After that time period, a person's name is taken off the poll lists.

If an unregistered person knows of someone who has voted recently and no longer is in town, that person could vote today, using the name of the person who has left.

Because of the transient nature of the student community, there probably are several hundred registered voters who are not in Madison. This situation applies to anyone who has left town but has voted within the last two years.

For example, a resident of the 18th Ward showed a reporter Monday that the couple whom he purchased his home from have moved elsewhere but still are registered. If this couple registers elsewhere, officials in that city could notify Madison and their names would be removed from the poll list.

In addition to this type of situation, the process of declaring eligibility is open for deceit. A person merely must swear he is 21, has lived in the state for six months and his precinct for 10 days, and intends to remain a state resident.

State law does not require a person to show proof, although Hoel said registration officials will ask for identification if they are suspicious.

A matter of some confusion has been the requirement that a person "intends" to remain a state resident. There is no way to prove intent, nor is there a stipulated time period other than the six-month requirement.

A student, therefore, could know he plans to leave Madison after graduation but still get away with voting. On the other hand,

there are many students who end up living in Madison.

The situation boils down to a matter of honesty.

"If the time comes when we can't accept oaths from people, we're in trouble," said Hoel. He explained that it would require unrealistic amounts of time and people to scrutinize and doublecheck the almost 85,000 registered voters in Madison.

"In the 23 years I've worked with the city, I don't recall ever seeing any intentional fraud," he said. He added that the installation of voting machines in 1948 eliminated considerable mistakes that caused paper ballots to be thrown out.

Examples would be people who voted for more than one candidate for a given office, or crossed party lines in a primary.

Hoel also said the practice of having neighborhood poll watchers from each major party would tend to reduce the possibility of irregularities.

#### DECISION TO CALL A STRIKE

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9458 to provide employees the right to decide by secret ballot whether or not to strike—or, if they are already on strike, to decide whether or not they want to continue on strike.

Working men and women should have an effective voice in their union's decision to call a strike. I am pleased to report that many workers do have such a limited voice now. My amendment will assure this voice for all—not just before a strike is called, but also at intervals while the strike is continuing. As a practical matter, today's prestrike vote means very little because in too many cases it is a mere show of hands by those who attend a prestrike union meeting. It is seldom democratic; it is not now a legal requirement.

The nearest provision we have in present law for a strike vote is the provision of section 203 of the Taft-Hartley law. That provides that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service will try to persuade the parties to settle their dispute by some means other than work stoppages. The statute states that this will include "submission to the employees in the bargaining unit of the employer's last offer of settlement for approval or rejection in a secret ballot." This, of course, is a purely voluntary undertaking and there is no requirement in the statute that a vote be conducted. Also, the statutory language indicates that any vote is to be conducted prior to a strike.

Under these circumstances there is no true opportunity to assess the last offer proposed by the employer. It generally amounts only to a broad vote of confidence in the union leadership which may be useful as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The statute does not give employees the chance to vote on a particular and identifiable offer. My amendment will provide this additional opportunity, without impairing in any way the opportunities which these employees now have to vote and express themselves on any and all other aspects of their relationship with their employer.

The amendment I offer here today, Mr. Speaker, improves upon all procedures

now available. It permits a meaningful vote 30 days after a strike has started, with authority to repeat that vote at succeeding 30-day intervals. Obviously, it would be necessary that a majority of those voting have control over whatever action would be taken pursuant to my amendment. However, the balloting itself—either prior to the strike or while the strike is in process—could be called on the petition of the union, the employer, or 10 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit.

The balloting would be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, following its regular secret balloting procedures. It would be an unfair labor practice for a union to call a strike or continue a strike after a majority of the employees had voted against such strike in such a secret election. Additionally, an employee would lose his status as an employee under the law if he took part in a strike after the majority of his fellow union members voted in such an election against such a strike.

My bill would also authorize injunctive relief in the Federal courts upon a showing of reasonable cause to believe that a strike is being carried on in violation of this secret ballot decision of the employees.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know that strikes have become an uncivilized and unnecessary means of settling disputes between employees and employers who should be working cooperatively toward the same objective of supplying better products or services for the consumer.

Until a better legal mechanism can be designed to replace the strike, I believe the worker should have a real voice, and a democratic procedure for participating, in labor negotiations affecting him and his family. I believe the union negotiator also wants, and urgently needs, a legal procedure to which he can refer to enable the rank-and-file union members to share the responsibility of labor negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, my bill seeks to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give the rank-and-file union members this democratic voice in their vital union affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill merits the early attention of the House.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Safety Council, over 50,000 people died, 2 million people were injured, and \$8 billion in property damages were sustained as a result of traffic accidents on the Nation's highways last year.

Throughout the decade of the sixties, upwards of one-half million men, women, and children were killed, over 32 million were injured, and \$90 billion in economic damages were sustained.

This is an appalling squandering of lives and treasure. The gravity of the situation is illustrated by the fact that highway deaths outnumbered combat

losses in Vietnam over the same period by a margin of 10 to 1.

Indeed, since the dawn of the automobile age, more people have been killed on highways than in all the wars this country has fought since its founding.

To me, one of the most disturbing aspects of these tragic statistics is that problem drinkers were a factor in almost half of all highway mishaps in which a death resulted. This frightening correlation was highlighted not long ago in a speech by Secretary of Transportation John Volpe before the National Safety Council:

An astonishing 44% of the drivers killed in accidents lost their lives because the other driver was drunk.

The percentage would undoubtedly have been higher if drug-related deaths were included.

Back in 1966, the Congress passed the Highway Safety Act. Its aim was to provide the legislative wherewithal for mounting a nationwide campaign to reduce the escalating carnage on our highways. I am sorry to report that from the beginning the safety program has been hampered by a shortage of funds. Particularly in the critical area of research, development and implementation of effective alcoholic countermeasures has this been evident.

Forecasts indicate that by the mid-seventies, over \$4 billion annually will be required to fund the safety program at the Federal, State, and local levels. If the past be prolog, such estimates will likely prove to be on the low side. Under the circumstances, it seems clear that if safety goals are to be achieved, that is if accidents and injuries over the next decade are to be reduced to an irreducible minimum, an adequate and dependable source of funding must be found.

I should like to suggest a novel one for your consideration. It was first suggested to me by our former colleague, now U.S. district court judge, Robert Denney. Reasoning that since upwards of half of all highway fatalities were attributable to alcoholic abuse, he proposed that half the revenues derived from the sale of alcohol each year be allocated for safety purposes.

My bill embodies this approach. Specifically, it will provide that an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenues generated from Federal taxes on alcohol be set aside to fund the highway safety program.

My aim in introducing this measure is twofold:

First, to provide a legislative vehicle for exploring various approaches to funding the highway safety program, and

Second, to focus attention on what I regard to be perhaps the most difficult aspect of the entire safety problem—the drinking and drug-abusing driver. Believe it or not, if we could completely eradicate the depredations of the problem drinker, we could save 20,000 lives annually—and that is a conservative figure. In addition, we could prevent upwards of 1 million injuries and save literally billions of dollars in property damage.

In introducing this bill, I want to emphasize that this is a bipartisan effort.

Over 50 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined as cosponsors—Chairman BLATNIK of the Committee on Public Works among them.

Because of this joint sponsorship, I look forward to early consideration and action on an approach which I believe will add a new dimension to highway safety by correcting one of the major shortcomings of the present program—a lack of adequate and dependable funding.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Americans often ignore situations that threaten the public safety until a personal experience hits them so forcefully that they finally resolve to take preventive measures.

The lives of all who use the streets and highways of this Nation are being threatened daily by those whose immoderate drinking habit is combined with a determination to drive—at any cost.

According to the National Safety Council, over 55,000 people died, over 2 million were injured, and \$8 billion in property damages were sustained as a result of traffic accidents on the highways last year.

Throughout the decade of the 1960's, 475,000 men, women, and children were killed, over 17 million were injured, and \$90 billion in economic damages were tolerated.

This is an appalling squandering of lives and treasure. The gravity of the situation is illustrated by the fact that highway deaths outnumbered combat losses in Vietnam over the same period by a margin of 10 to 1.

To me, one of the most disturbing aspects of these tragic statistics is that problem drinkers were a factor in almost half of all highway mishaps in which a death resulted.

Back in 1966, the Congress passed the Highway Safety Act. Its aim was to provide the legislative wherewithal for mounting a nationwide campaign to reduce the escalating carnage on our highways. I am sorry to report that from the beginning the safety program has been hampered by a shortage of funds—particularly in the critical area of research, development, and implementation of effective alcoholic countermeasures.

On Tuesday, June 29, I plan to introduce unique legislation that I believe will, at least partially, remedy the problem of inadequate funding in this area and, thus, be a tremendous encouragement toward reducing accidents and injuries to an irreducible minimum. I am asking my colleagues to join me as cosponsors for this urgently and, at the same time, seek support from the residents of their districts for strict enforcement of present laws and new programs of highway safety.

If there is any doubt as to the need for this bill, I should like to point out a series of articles contained in the Hearst newspapers recently. In a series of five

articles, this newspaper group has graphically and dramatically explained the need for increased efforts in the area of highway safety, especially that dealing with drunk drivers.

I commend these articles to my colleagues:

UNITED STATES TO YANK DRUNK OUT OF DRIVER'S SEAT—I  
(By Edwin Martin)

WASHINGTON.—In the United States today 500 graves are filled each week by victims of highway accidents involving alcohol.

Week after week, the toll goes on. Battle deaths in Vietnam, in numbers, are paltry in comparison. Yet the strangely apathetic attitude of Americans toward the drunken driver persists.

The federal government has set out to shake that apathy. It is now embarked upon a program of massive proportions to reduce the number of traffic accidents caused by drunken drivers.

By year's end, drunken drivers in at least 40 states will find themselves the No. 1 targets of traffic patrolmen, prosecutors and judges.

Warnings like that one have been issued many times, of course, and the inclination is strong to shrug off this one, too.

It is undeniably true that the principal weapon against drunken drivers for decades was propaganda—tons of statistics, dire predictions, pleadings and advertising gimmickry. But no more. This time the \$40 million federal program to get the drunk out of the driver's seat has teeth to it.

"I place the highest priority on our alcoholic countermeasures program," says John Volpe, the dapper little building contractor and former Massachusetts governor who heads the U.S. Department of Transportation.

"We mean business. I just hope that all those who are tempted to indulge in an alcoholic beverage before driving will pay heed."

The current federal campaign against the drunken driver had its beginnings in 1968.

It started with Dr. William Haddon, a lean, intense, often arrogant physician who was the first director of the U.S. Highway Safety Bureau.

Dr. Haddon supervised the preparation of a report that was a bombshell in its day, the "1968 alcohol and highway safety report."

For the first time the effects of alcohol on a driver were scientifically documented. Facts replaced preaching.

Perhaps the most startling single item in the Haddon report was the news that most serious crashes are caused by a tiny fraction of drivers who have been drinking far more than the amount of alcohol consumed by most people at a sitting.

The "problem drinkers" number only between 1 and 4 per cent of those on the roads, some seven million individuals. But they are responsible for almost half of the total traffic deaths.

This was a significant finding. At one stroke it exonerated the social drinker as the main villain in traffic accidents.

Says Dr. Haddon:

"The man who downs one or two drinks at the end of the day is generally blameless in highway accident fatality tolls. The hard drinker—there's the enemy.

"Most people have rarely, if ever, experienced the level of intoxication scientists have learned to expect as commonplace in drivers involved in the most serious crashes."

In a Westchester County, N.Y., study supervised by Dr. Haddon, almost half of the drivers killed in single-car crashes during the period 1950-58 had a blood alcohol concentration of .15 of 1 per cent by weight.

To reach that percentage, a 150-pound man would have to drink eight ounces of 80-proof liquor on an empty stomach, or 10 ounces on a full stomach, within an hour.

That much alcohol—four or five times as much as the amount consumed by the social drinker—has a devastating effect on anyone driving a car. Alcohol causes progressive deterioration of such driving skills as judgment, comprehension, ability to concentrate, coordination—and vision.

Alcohol's effect on vision has been compared to the effect of placing a pane of gray glass in front of the eyes.

Strong illumination is needed to distinguish objects through such a barrier, and dimly lit objects will not be seen at all.

The more alcohol consumed, the grayer the "glass" obscuring vision. Eventually, there comes a point, just as folklore has long held, when alcohol makes a drinker "blind drunk."

Letting the social drinker off the hook, focusing attention on the problem drinker, has shaped the entire approach of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in devising counter-measures against the drunken driver.

Running NHTSA's operation is a crusty, 30-year Navy veteran named W. Y. Howell, who heads the Office of Alcoholic Counter-measures.

Howell, who admits to being a social drinker himself, says the federal effort is not intended to change the drinking habits of the ordinary American.

It does aim to alter the easy acceptance of drunken driving by many Americans, those who take the "there but for the grace of God go I" attitude.

"European countries have far less acceptance of drunken driving," observes Howell. "They carry out very tough programs indeed against drunk driving."

Finland, Norway and Sweden are among the strictest nations in dealing with drunks at the wheel.

The Finns allow absolutely no alcohol at all to be found in a blood alcohol concentration test of a driver. If the slightest bit shows up, it's too bad.

Finnish penalties are stringent: Up to five months in prison for a drinking driver even when no accident occurred, and imprisonment at hard labor when a drunken driver injures or kills someone.

Norway is almost as tough. A blood alcohol concentration of .05 is allowed but beyond that figure the penalty is a nonappealable jail sentence of at least 21 days.

Sweden attaches great importance to the question of a man's drinking habits when he applies for a driver's license. If he has a record of arrests for drunkenness, even when no vehicle is involved, he cannot get a permit to drive.

The Swedish authorities mete out fines to drivers with blood alcohol concentrations of .05 or less involved in accidents and automatic prison terms to those with higher percentages.

The no-nonsense stance of these Scandinavian countries has resulted in a universal, deep-rooted fear of mixing alcohol and driving.

In Finland and Norway the custom of a driver eschewing alcohol is a way of life. It is commonplace in a Finnish or Norwegian restaurant to see a table of celebrants drinking liquor in huge quantities (and Scandinavians are prodigious drinkers) while one person sticks with soda pop or tea. Invariably it turns out that the non-drinker is ticketed to drive the car of the party.

"If we could only ingrain this custom in Americans, what a long way it would go in cutting the number of alcohol-related accidents," muses Howell.

Emulating Finland, Sweden and Norway cannot succeed here, however, until all state laws on drunken driving are uniformly strict. For fear of certain punishment is the motivation keeping Scandinavians clear of alcohol while driving.

Seeing that all states have uniformly strict laws is a high priority goal of the federal alcoholic countermeasures program.

#### STATE DRUNK LAWS ARE VARIED—II

(By Edwin Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The drunken driver in the United States gets gentle treatment compared with the tough tactics used against him in Sweden, Norway, Great Britain and other European countries.

In Britain, a blood alcohol concentration of .08 per millimeter is considered proof of intoxication. British police are provided with portable breath testing devices which help them to decide whether to arrest a drunken driver.

In Sweden, the laws are even stricter. Anyone with alcohol in his blood amounting to .05 or more is liable to a fine and a prison term if caught driving. Swedish law is based on a premise that "people drive as they live" and a simple drunkenness conviction is grounds for withholding a driver's license for up to two years.

State laws on drunken driving in the U.S. still reflect the permissiveness to be expected in a nation where drinking is so widespread a custom.

To begin with, the legal definitions of "drunken driving" remain on the liberal side in the opinion of medical and highway safety officials.

Only Utah and Idaho define a drunken driver as strictly as European countries.

In both, a drunken driver is one whose blood alcohol level is .08 per millimeter or higher. This toughening of the standards in Utah and Idaho, it should be noted was made much easier by the presence in both states of large numbers of Mormons. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints is widely known for its strictures against alcohol.

In 17 states, the blood alcohol level for intoxication is still .15 per millimeter. Thirty states set .10 as the dividing line for drunken and sober driving. Texas does not test blood for alcohol although the legislature now in session, is considering bills to do so.

The American Medical Association and National Safety Bureau recommend .10 as the point of intoxication. So does the federal government.

In point of fact all of the states which fail to recognize the .10 figure are endangering their share of federal highway funds. The 1966 Highway Safety Act provides that states failing to meet federal standards shall lose 10 per cent of their federal highway money. Penalties, however, have never been applied.

Dr. William Haddon, president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., says .15 per millimeter is excessively liberal.

"This got into the laws of many states before the effects of alcohol on a driver were fully documented," he said. "Legislators wrote the law to cover the rarity—that person whose body can absorb quantities of alcohol without effect."

Dr. Haddon considers .10 more desirable. The ideal would be even lower.

Alcohol has an effect on the reaction time of a driver and his other capabilities even when only one or two drinks are consumed.

A Department of Transportation study concluded that a driver becomes a distinct highway hazard when the level of alcohol in his blood "reaches .04; at .06, it is twice as great as at .04; at .08, it is about four times as great; at .10, more than six times as great; and at .15, about 25 times as great."

Marvin Wagner, a DOT lawyer, heads up the program in the Office of Alcoholic Countermeasures, which seeks to strengthen state laws on drunken driving, bringing them into conformance with federal standards.

"We have a long way to go before our laws equal those in Europe," he admits. "Nebraska, Delaware and New York have gone the farthest. It is illegal per se to operate a

car or other motor vehicle if your body has a blood alcohol content of .10 or more in the case of Nebraska and Delaware or .15 in New York."

Finland is one country with an illegal per se law on drunken driving.

The Finns are adamant: A driver whose blood contains any amount of alcohol—any at all—is subject to a prison term.

Even the advanced laws of Nebraska, Delaware and New York do not go that far.

On another front, the current federal campaign against the drunken driver is striving to change state laws so that problem drinkers and alcoholics are given rehabilitative treatment.

This approach is in line with the Swedish experience and long-standing practice of treating alcoholism and drunken driving as one and the same.

In Sweden anyone applying for a driver's license must provide clear evidence that he is moderate in his use of alcoholic beverages.

The Swedish law says: "Anyone who during the last two years has been convicted of drunkenness may not be issued a driving license, unless it is obviously a question of an isolated lapse by a person who otherwise is of good demeanor."

If the U.S. treatment of drunken drivers followed the Swedish mode, it would mean an overhaul of all state laws governing the issuance of motor vehicle driving licenses.

An applicant's character will play a decisive part in determining whether he would be licensed.

But that is an ideal far down the road. To show just how far away, it is merely necessary to note that more than 20 states still renew driving licenses by mail.

In these states, a driver may have lost an eye, had an arm or leg amputated, suffered complete loss of hearing—or become an alcoholic—since first getting his license, and his application would still be automatically approved upon receipt of a mailed application and proper fee.

"The only way we can take the license of some of the chronic drunks," says a veteran Maryland police officer, "is to remove it from his body when he is killed in a wreck."

#### PROBLEM DRINKERS TARGET—III

(By Edwin Martin)

WASHINGTON.—Quick now, without pausing to think about it, what image springs to mind when you hear or read of a "drunken driver."

In your mind's eye, do you see a character straight out of cartoon, hunched over the wheel of a car being driven recklessly down a highway, tie and coat askew, liquor bottles labeled "XXX" strewn on the seat, tongue lolling, helixes for eyeballs to denote his dazed condition?

That picture is outdated. The drunken driver on the road in the United States today is much more likely to be a neatly dressed man indistinguishable from anyone else until his car crashes into yours.

An estimated seven million persons are driving in this country who qualify as "problem drinkers" in the lexicon of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the federal agency now mounting a campaign against drunken drivers.

The problem drinker could be Dr. Joseph R., a St. Louis physician who was 48 years old when he ran his car off the road and struck a tree, killing him outright. His blood had an alcohol concentration of .18 per cent.

It could be David B., a 22-year-old Coast Guardsman, whose car missed a curve at an estimated 100 miles an hour and turned over in Baltimore Harbor, killing him and five companions. His blood alcohol concentration was .21 while the passengers tested at from .09 to .15 per cent.

It could be Horace L., 38, an automobile body assembler, who killed himself and two innocent people in another car in Dallas, Texas, when he failed to stop at a traffic signal. His blood alcohol concentration measured .14 per cent.

Some fairly accurate assumptions can be made about the problem drinker, according to W. Y. Howell, director of the NHTSA's Office of Alcoholic Countermeasures:

The problem drinker is invariably a man. He usually has a blood alcohol concentration well above .10 per cent when tested after being involved in an auto crash, indicating that his consumption of alcohol has been far in excess of a social drinker's.

He has had alcohol problems in the past. Perhaps he was merely arrested once or twice for simple drunkenness, or required hospitalization, or had contact with a social agency.

He frequently has had marital problems, a separation or divorce.

He has often had creditor difficulties. He usually has a reputation for being a heavy drinker, indicating that alcohol is an escape and not a pleasant diversion.

"We are zeroing in on the problem drinker," says Howell. "Our goal is to perfect the means of identifying him."

Howell's office proposes to spend \$40 million in fiscal 1971-72 on the accelerated federal campaign whose target is the problem drinker holding a driver's license.

Demonstration projects in 29 states are underway or ready to begin. Projects in another 11 states are in the works. All are aimed at identifying, separating and treating the problem drinker.

The official policy of the NHTSA is to "separate the problem drinker from the great mass of social drinkers."

"He must be singled out, not just on the highways, even with innovative methods such as the use of video tape recorders and breath testing equipment, but through court records and the resources of social and health agencies, insurance companies and other organizations.

"The program calls for setting up procedures under which these records and other relevant information from police files and driver licensing agencies can be exchanged on problem drinkers and their accident involvement."

"It also encourages social agencies to provide information to driver licensing officials and the courts concerning the identity of problem drinkers, with appropriate safeguards of the physician-patient relationships.

Once identified, the problem drinker who is convicted of drunken driving becomes the problem of the courts and licensing officials.

Those responsible for keeping the problem drinker off the highway can pick and choose from a number of rehabilitative steps.

They can revoke his driving permit outright, secure his cooperation in undergoing treatment for alcoholism or limit his driving privileges.

Alcoholism treatment may include administering a drug called antabuse which, when present in the system, causes vomiting upon ingestion of alcohol.

Limiting driving privileges might involve a restriction on the license prohibiting any driving except to and from work in daylight hours.

A \$1.5 million contract has been signed by NHTSA with Washtenaw County, Mich., which includes Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, to control problem drinkers through antabuse.

Participants come to the county's council on alcoholism once a week where a blood sample is drawn to determine the level of antabuse in their system and they are given a week's supply of the drug.

The project started May 1, and 196 are enrolled.

One of the most comprehensive projects has just begun in Seattle, Wash., where the state of Washington, city of Seattle and King County are all involved.

In the first three months of stepped-up patrolling to stop drunken drivers, the blood alcohol concentration of Washington drivers arrested for driving while intoxicated averaged .16 per cent. The Washington presumptive limit is .10. The figures show that heavy drinkers are indeed the group responsible for drunken driving.

#### DRUNK TEST SEEN NEEDED—IV

(By Edwin Martin)

WASHINGTON.—Your friendly, neighborhood police officer could more effectively keep drunken drivers off the road with the proper tools.

A pre-arrest testing statute in each state similar to the one prevailing in Great Britain is one needed aid.

The problem lies in writing a law which will not abridge the fourth, fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, the ones dealing respectively with search and seizure, self-incrimination and due process.

A case now before the Louisiana Supreme Court was conceived to test the constitutionality of a model pre-arrest statute.

It arose a result of a project in Baton Rouge, La., sponsored by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS), an organization created by the insurance industry to promote traffic safety and thus lessen auto insurance claims.

The Louisiana city was picked because of the interest of Mayor W. W. Dumas in highway safety. The project began last year.

The IIHS provided the Baton Rouge police with two mobile laboratories, each equipped with breath testing equipment. When an officer stopped someone suspected of driving while intoxicated, one of the vans hurried to the scene.

A breath test—quick, easy and painless to administer—helped the officer in deciding on a formal arrest. It backed up his judgment at a crucial point.

This is much more important in the anti-drunken driver effort than it may appear.

While almost all states now have so-called "implied consent" laws requiring a driver as a condition of getting a license to agree to chemical testing to provide evidence of intoxication, these are post-arrest tests.

In other words, they are useless in helping an officer initially to decide whether a driver is drunk enough to warrant arrest.

In practice, this means that most policemen file DWI charges only against the most severely intoxicated drivers, usually those already involved in an accident, or those observed driving erratically.

To charge anyone less visibly affected by alcohol might expose an officer to a false arrest suit. At the least, it might put him to useless work since there is a possibility the arrest will be tossed out by a court.

The Baton Rouge project was an experiment to (1) generate a court test of the constitutionality of prearrest testing laws and (2) field test equipment and procedures. The project was successful on both counts.

While awaiting the outcome of the Louisiana test case, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is planning to put part of the lesson learned in Baton Rouge to work elsewhere.

A demonstration project in San Antonio, Texas, is getting underway. It includes money for two mobile labs. Each of the \$7,000 trucks would be equipped with a breathalyzer for on-the-spot testing of suspected drunken driving.

The \$2.2 million proposed San Antonio demonstration project also includes funds to train police officers in intensified drunken driving enforcement and an alcoholism treatment project at Bexar County Hospital.

In the state of Washington, a \$1.9 million demonstration project with the Department of Motor Vehicles as the contracting agency began at the first of the year and is now well underway.

The federal funds have enabled the Washington state patrol to form an "emphasis patrol" composed of seven troopers which will travel the state highways in King County on days of the week and hours of the day when the highest volume of DWIs can be expected.

Six new officers and a sergeant have been hired by the Seattle police department with money from the federal contract. The new men freed six experienced officers for assignment to a special-anti-drunken driving squad. The King County sheriff's office is also cooperating in the stepped-up campaign against drunken drivers.

The Washington state patrol began its "emphasis" patrol on Jan. 1. Seventy-three DWI arrests were made in January, 77 in February and 64 in March.

The Washington project also includes hiring of pre-sentence investigators who will attempt to aid a judge in disposing of a DWI case by furnishing additional information, including whether the defendant is a problem or social drinker.

Cooperating judges in King County have agreed to delay sentencing of DWI offenders by at least two weeks in order to permit a pre-sentence investigation. Not all judges are cooperating. One declined to have anything to do with pre-sentencing reports. Others limited the reports to second DWI offenders.

The office of alcoholic counter measures of NHTSA also has demonstration projects under way in Denver, Portland, Ore., Wisconsin, Nassau County N.Y., Albuquerque, N.M., Charlotte, N.C., and Vermont.

Twenty other contracts have been awarded to develop proposals for alcohol safety action projects. These include Phoenix, Columbus, Ga., the states of New Hampshire and South Dakota, Indianapolis, Wichita, Kan., New Orleans, Baltimore, Boston, Kansas City, Mo., Lincoln, Neb., Cincinnati, Oklahoma City, Richland County, S.C., Hennepin County, Minn., Cumberland and York Counties, Maine, Fairfax County, Va., Pulaski County, Ark., and Hillsborough County, Fla.

When 11 additional projects are begun, a total of 40 states will be participating in intensive campaigns against the drunken driver—action campaigns, not mere words.

#### PROBLEM DRINKER TARGET-V

(By Edwin Martin)

Preparing to spend \$40 million on the effort in 1970-71, the Federal Government has set sail upon a concentrated campaign to reduce drunken driving by striking at the "problem drinker."

Demonstration projects in 40 states are under way or ready to begin, all aimed at the estimated seven million Americans who are classified as problem drinkers, men and women who are either outright alcoholics or heavy escape drinkers.

But there are dissenters. Not everyone is convinced that problem drinkers are the ones mainly responsible for the 25,000 traffic deaths each year attributed to alcohol-related accidents.

Despite accumulated evidence that the villain is the problem drinker, many still put the blame on the social drinker.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) polled the general public and special groups such as policemen and found that old ad campaigns die hard. The emphasis for years in highway safety programs was on avoidance of alcohol in any amount before driving. These campaigns have had an effect.

In the NHTSA poll, a solid 43 per cent of the general public doggedly insisted that the

social drinker rather than the problem drinker was most at fault in highway accidents.

Those in the 30-44 age group were most firmly convinced of that fact.

Westerners and Southerners were hardest on social drinkers. Respondents in the Northeast and North Central states seemed more aware that the true culprit was the problem drinker. Perhaps because of their greater life experience, the 60 and over group was convinced by a 52 to 27 per cent majority that focusing anti-drunken driving campaigns on problem drinkers would accomplish the most results.

Somewhat surprisingly, the same poll showed that law enforcement officers are among the most skeptical when it comes to blaming the problem drinker for most alcohol-related traffic accidents.

Statistics say otherwise—but many police officers apparently do not trust the statistics.

One who is leery is Capt. Hugh I. Kavanagh, a 31-year veteran on the Maryland State Police Force who is the department's traffic safety specialist.

"I don't approve of drunken driving," says Kavanagh. "But the statistics used by the government to spend millions of dollars are suspicious to me."

He gave an example:

A Navy chief petty officer stationed at Bainbridge, was involved in a traffic accident after drinking liquor.

"He admitted drinking a fifth of whiskey at the service club before leaving the base," recalls Kavanagh. "But the liquor had nothing to do with this particular accident. His car was stopped at a stop sign, and another car plowed into him. The investigating trooper smelled liquor on the sailor and charged him with driving while intoxicated. He became a DWI statistic—yet the accident was the fault of a sober driver."

Kavanaugh maintains that traffic deaths attributed to alcohol are frequently caused by something else. "A driver has a heart attack but drinking is blamed because his blood alcohol concentration was high," he said.

"I have been a police officer long enough to have had this experience several times: A car leaves the road on a certain stretch of highway at a certain hour and the driver is killed. His blood alcohol concentration is high, so it's DWI. Later a car leaves the same road under identical conditions and the driver is sober . . . dead, but sober. What's the explanation?"

While steering clear of whether the NHTSA is putting too much emphasis on drunken driving, Rep. John Moss, D-Calif., is critical of the agency for failing to concentrate on car safety. This is the area, Moss maintains, where action is needed.

"I can't understand for the life of me how Detroit can continue to get away with saying that they cannot build safety features into cars right away. When they cannot sell a model they can sure change in mid-year to another model."

Rep. John Murphy, D-N.Y., another legislator who has taken a special interest in highway safety legislation, would prefer that NHTSA put more of its money in encouraging driver education.

He has introduced a bill diverting one mill of the federal gasoline tax to a fund which would be used to produce and buy time on television stations for 60- and 90-second television spots highlighting defensive driving techniques.

"Anti-smoking commercials on television have had an enormous impact," says Murphy. "Why not reach youngsters in the same way with defensive driving techniques?"

The NHTSA program includes a contract with an advertising agency to develop a program aimed at focusing attention on the problem driver. In addition, such giant com-

panies as Allstate Insurance are spending thousands on advertising to educate the public to the drunken driver menace.

The goals of NHTSA:

To get all states to write laws setting a blood alcohol concentration of .10 or lower as the presumptive intoxication level.

To encourage development of detoxification centers and other rehabilitative programs for problem drinkers to prevent them from becoming drunken driver statistics.

To improve present methods of identifying problem drinkers.

To encourage special enforcement of drinking-driver laws, including assignment of special police patrols at peak hours in areas where past experience has shown drunken drivers are likely to be found.

W. Y. Howell, director of the office of Alcoholic Counter-Measures, says service clubs such as Kiwanis and Rotary could aid the cause by spreading the gospel that problem drinkers cause half of the traffic deaths in the United States.

"An evangelistic approach of this sort will help, especially as we approach the summer months when driving is at a peak."

"Our ultimate goal is to extend proved and effective alcohol counter-measures statewide in every state . . . to reduce the barbaric slaughter being created by abusive drinker-drivers."

#### CURE FOR THE SHORTAGE OF COAL MINERS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, Dr. Elbert F. Osborn, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, made a speech in White Haven, Pa., which may not appeal to the appetites of some segments of the coal industry. Nevertheless, the Director made some dramatic points that bear repeating. The principal theme of his message was this: The cure for declining manpower in the coal industry is strong, effective administration of the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

Many objections have been heard about the act since its passage. Most of the complainers expressed shock at the timetables for meeting the new standards for coal mine safety. The attitude seemed to be—"We are for health and safety in the mines, but give us more time."

Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of the Nation's forward-looking coal producers have recognized the necessity for stringent health and safety standards. They are bending to the task of compliance with the regulations laid down by the Congress in order to improve the lot of the man who labors at the Nation's most hazardous occupation.

Dr. Osborn stated correctly, I believe, that potential miners—

Have been scared by the industry's bad health and safety record.

The purpose of the 1969 Act is to change that record and I am confident that when that is done, the majority of the problems with "manpower shortages" in the coal fields of America will begin to dissipate.

I am positive the Director's speech was not intended to be simply "after dinner" oratory; that is, something to be applauded and forgotten. His speech was a

definite commitment to action by the Bureau through his leadership. Knowing that our colleagues are vitally interested in that commitment, I ask that the full text of Dr. Osborn's excellent address be appended as a part of my remarks.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF ELBURT F. OSBORN, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MINES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE AIME COAL DIVISION MEETING, WHITE HAVEN, PA., JUNE 21, 1971

We are meeting today to discuss manpower in the coal mining industry. I think it is well understood, however, that the specific reason for the assembly of this panel is a widespread and well justified concern about manpower shortages in the coal mines. I have been asked to participate in the discussion as a kind of "outsider"—one who can speak from the viewpoint of the Bureau of Mines, rather than the industry or the professionals it employs. My remarks, therefore, may not sound conventional; this is because my responsibilities as Director of the Bureau require me to use a somewhat different perspective.

Let me begin by analyzing the problem a little further. The term "manpower shortage" refers, not so much to the problem itself, as to the anticipated solution. The real problem is under-production, an excess of demand for coal over output from the mines. Increased manpower could be one solution; improved technology—that is, more productive mining methods—could be another.

There can be no real disagreement about the nature of the problem. Rising coal prices are eloquent proof that demand has suddenly outstripped supply. And future projections for energy requirements leave little doubt that the demand for coal will continue to rise.

Meeting the demand—at least in part—by recruiting more miners is a solution that is both conventional and inevitable. For the short run, at least, there is no other means available to increase production. The problem, however, is that the people who are being solicited to fill the empty jobs are not interested. They have been scared off by the industry's bad health and safety record.

This conclusion may seem harsh, but the facts do not justify any other interpretation. Most of the Nation's coal is mined in regions of high unemployment, yet the industry cannot find enough workers even though the pay is relatively high. The average miner is in his late 40's—an indication that the young men who should make up the backbone of coal's labor force ten or fifteen years from now are staying away in droves, although coal mining has traditionally been one of the occupations taken up by sons in their fathers' footsteps. At the same time, the industry's safety record, the worst in the country, and the black lung problem have become subjects of public controversy. It is obvious that the health and safety issue is responsible to a considerable extent for the industry's recruiting problem.

I frequently encounter people who try to refute this thesis by charging the press, television and radio with distorting the mine safety issue. These media, so the argument goes, have "scared" potential miners away by printing and broadcasting material that exaggerates the mine safety problem. The industry's manpower shortage, it is said, would be far less critical if this kind of "inflammatory" material were not circulated so widely.

Now, I am not going to participate in the current controversy over the performance of the news media. We have our hands full in the Bureau without getting mixed up in that one. But I would like to make two points about the line of reasoning I have just summarized. First, the criticism is not pertinent. According to the National Safety

Council, coal mining is the Nation's most dangerous major industry—by a large margin. Even if the news reports were exaggerated, people who live in the mining regions know perfectly well how dangerous mining is, and they knew before the reporters did. This brings me to my second point. It is an insult to the intelligence of these people to suggest that inaccurate reporting by the news media could have enough influence to keep them out of jobs they desperately need. These people come from generations of coal miners, and they learned about mine safety through generations of personal tragedy. Treating them like the witless pawns of irresponsible media just might make them mad.

It would seem, therefore, that the only way for the coal industry to meet its immediate manpower problems is to make the mines safer and more healthful. In this effort the industry will find its strongest ally in the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau has a legitimate interest in the coal industry from several viewpoints. We have a responsibility for the health and safety of miners under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. We are also concerned, through earlier laws that created and organized the Bureau, with the adequacy of the Nation's fuel supplies. These two roles are in perfect harmony today. The Bureau wants the mines safer because too many miners are being hurt and killed, and because the country needs the coal—in that order.

Among those who are willing to recognize the effect of the industry's bad safety image on its recruiting problems, there are some who view the problem as a matter of "image" alone. Change the image, they say, and the problem will solve itself. This is wishful thinking at best. I say solve the problem and the image will take care of itself. This difference of opinion—to be charitable about it—highlights the question "How will we know when the mines become safer?" I deal with this question impatiently today because I think the answer should be obvious to everyone. We'll know that the mines are getting safer the same way we know they are now extremely hazardous—by looking at the accident statistics. Specifically, the fatality rate per million man-hours of exposure is our most accurate measure of how safe or dangerous it is to be a miner. This rate may not be a perfect gauge, but there is no way to imagine mines getting safer without a drop in this rate.

Another figure that will be widely used as a measure of mine safety is the absolute number of fatalities per year. As a rough measure this number is useful, although it does not take into account such factors as changes in employment and productivity. I think it is worth remembering, in any event, that both the number of fatalities and the fatality rate rose last year. This can hardly be called an image problem.

How do we get those figures to start coming down? Again, I'm talking about the immediate future—this month and this year. The Bureau of Mines will do its part by rigorously enforcing the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. I hope this assertion does not dismay anyone; the provisions of the law, after all, were designed to reduce fatalities in the mines. Since the industry cannot begin to solve its recruiting problems until its fatality figures go down, I would hope that companies seriously concerned about their manpower shortages will begin by taking the law seriously. For those who do not, the law provides an economic incentive in the form of penalties which may become progressively heavier, in proportion to an operator's lack of good faith in correcting violations.

Our role under the law is not limited, of course, to enforcement of health and safety standards. Safety education and training are

important activities on which we are placing more and more emphasis, frequently in cooperation with progressive elements of the coal mining industry. Because mining is dangerous, it is only common sense to teach miners how to protect themselves most effectively.

This approach, however, is most important for new, inexperienced workers, and persuading such men to take up mining in the first place is the problem we are discussing today. Getting substantial numbers of these men to come in for employment and training will require an immediate improvement in the safety record.

I am convinced that a wholehearted, industry-wide attempt to live by the safety standards of the law can bring a dramatic drop in fatalities as soon as this year. Indeed, 1971 could set a new low in coal mine fatalities if we all put our backs into it. The Bureau will do its part by enforcing the law, but improvement will come quicker if operators make up their minds to get fewer violation notices from Bureau inspectors.

As I have said, this is how the industry can best expect to ease the manpower shortage that will cause production problems over the next few months, perhaps the next couple of years. Looking beyond that, however, I don't think we can afford to ignore the option of raising production through the introduction of better technology. It is absurd, in fact, to assume that today's coal mining technology will not be improved on in the next five, ten, or fifteen years. Such an improvement, however, will not automatically spell the end of the industry's production and manpower problems. If coal mining technology continues the haphazard, hasty kind of "progress" we have seen over the past 15 years, we can expect the industry's safety-related manpower problems to continue as well.

If I sound critical of the industry's past technologic advances, it's because I am. These advances, especially the continuous miner, have been widely hailed for their effects on productivity. The survival of the coal industry after World War II, it is said, can be credited to the introduction of mechanized mining techniques that allowed operators to produce a high-volume, low-cost product. This is true enough. It is seldom pointed out, however, that the gains in production were accompanied by an increase—an unnecessary increase—in hazards. And the industry's current manpower shortage can be traced in part to many of these "man-made hazards."

Take the continuous miner as an example. Indispensable as this machine may be, there is no question that, as presently designed and used, it intensifies three of the most serious hazards of mining. First, it exposes new roof faster than supports can be provided. Second, it releases methane in dangerous quantities. Third, it generates large volumes of respirable dust.

All three of these hazards can be adequately dealt with by strict adherence to Federal mine safety regulations. My point, however, is that there should be no need for such regulations in the first place.

Continuous miners could have been designed to minimize such hazards, instead of making them worse. Safety techniques should be built in to mining equipment, not added on later by Federal regulation. A serious systems engineering approach to coal mining could produce technology far more safe and productive than today's.

It may be possible for us to understand why such an approach was not taken in the 40's and early 50's. The industry was fighting for its life, and the concept of systems technology was then in its infancy. There is no excuse for making the same mistake today, however. An industry concerned about manpower shortages should bend every effort toward the development of coal mining tech-

niques that protect miners, instead of endangering them. A commitment to the development of such technology would certainly make a favorable impression on prospective employees. Next to an immediate reduction in the fatality rate, I can think of nothing that would have a better effect on the industry's "image."

Fortunately, attitudes are changing, and I think we can look forward to new safety commitments across the board in the coal industry. In public statements and actions by the industry—and, I might add, in some private communications as well—I sense a willingness to abandon the outworn belief that high levels of safety and production are incompatible with each other.

This willingness is the key to solving the "manpower problem." It will change present trends and attitudes—trends and attitudes that could only perpetuate the manpower shortage, and thus widen the gap between demand and production. If the gap widens, there will be a crisis in ten or fifteen years when the bulk of the present workforce will have retired, unreplaced by younger men. Such a development could only spur desperate research on new production-oriented technology, and such technology would probably turn out to be as hazardous as it would be productive.

I am increasingly confident, however, that this cycle is coming to an end. My faith will be put to a quick test, for if the industry truly wishes to break the patterns of the past it will try to relieve the immediate manpower shortage by working for a quick drop in its fatality rate. The resulting influx of new workers would give the industry more time to push for the orderly development of new, safety-oriented production technology. By the time the new methods and machines begin to appear in the mines, coal mining will have lost its high-risk image, and manpower problems will have become a thing of the past. The industry will have finally freed itself to make its maximum contribution to the growth of America.

#### FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATOR MOVES QUICKLY TO IMPLEMENT INSURANCE LAW

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the phenomenons of our Government that I have observed as a Member of Congress has been the slowness with which the executive branch of Government implements legislation passed by the legislative branch. It is not uncommon for the Congress to pass a law and a year later find that because of redtape at the administrator level that law has not been put into effect or that an agency affected by the law does not favor the law and therefore has used administrative devices to restrain its effectiveness.

In the 91st Congress I authored legislation which resulted in the establishment of a Federal program of crime insurance for homeowners and businessmen. The legislation provided that the Federal Insurance Administration, an agency of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, should survey the availability problem of crime insurance throughout the country on a State-by-State basis and, after reviewing its findings, establish a Federal program in those States lacking such insurance. These programs were to be set up not earlier than August 1 of this year. The

delay was designed to give States an opportunity to develop their own crime insurance package and thus avoid the need for Federal assistance.

When this legislation was passed with the August 1 date, I fully anticipated that the date would not be met and that it would be an additional period of time before such policies could be written. But, I am happy to report to the Members of this body that Federal crime insurance policies will be available on August 1.

George Bernstein, Administrator of the Federal Insurance Administration, has assured me that his agency will begin issuing policies on August 1, even if they have to go out and sell the policies themselves.

This is a refreshing point of view and I feel it is an indication that the crime insurance program will be a great success.

Mr. Bernstein's agency has already published its proposed regulations for crime insurance, as well as the rates for the policies. He has held a hearing on the proposals and is now in the process of finalizing the regulations. Everything points to meeting the target date of August 1.

Although I at times have been critical of Mr. Bernstein, I do want to commend him for the speed with which he has implemented the crime insurance program and for his attitude of wanting to provide insurance for consumers. The May 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star contains an interview with Mr. Bernstein that outlines his deep commitment to the insurance problems of our country. I am including that article in my remarks because it mirrors many of the feelings that I have about the state of insurance in our country.

#### U.S. DEFENDS CRIME INSURANCE PLAN (By Miriam Ottenberg)

Federal Insurance Administrator George K. Bernstein said today the government's new crime insurance program is "not an industry bail-out," but an effort to provide crime coverage as fast, cheaply and efficiently as possible.

"We haven't used this program as an excuse for subsidizing private industry," the man who will run the program said in an interview.

Congress has authorized the sale of federal crime insurance after Aug. 1 in any state where private crime insurance is not available at affordable rates. Bernstein has just issued the ground rules for the program with a list of 16 states, plus Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, where the program is most likely to go into effect.

#### D.C. AN EXAMPLE

Bernstein used the District as an example of spiraling private crime insurance rates.

In 1962, he said, a District drug store paid \$325 for \$7,500 worth of coverage against burglary of open stock. The same coverage in 1969 cost \$827. In 1962, a furniture store paid \$395 to insure \$15,000 worth of stock. The same coverage in 1969 cost \$1,028.

The coverage against robbery has climbed, too, he pointed out. The drug store operator who paid \$212 for \$1,000 worth of insurance against robbery in 1962 paid \$704 in 1969. The furniture store operator paid \$188 for \$1,000 worth of robber insurance in 1962. It cost him \$606 in 1969.

The District area is one of the 30 metropolitan areas labeled as high risk for insurance.

#### "LOW COVERAGE QUOTIENT"

Bernstein, who was first deputy superintendent of insurance for New York State before his federal appointment in 1969, is not at all impressed by the way the insurance industry has run earlier programs spawned by the decreasing availability of private insurance.

He attacked the industry for "stodginess, a lack of creative innovation and a relatively low quotient of courage and responsibility".

Unless there are major reforms, he warned, insurance as a function of private enterprise "will not long survive."

Bernstein thinks the assigned risk plan, for automobile drivers who can't get insurance through the usual sources, and the so-called FAIR plan (Fair Access to Insurance Requirements), for householders who can't get fire and extended coverage, are run efficiently. And he doesn't believe the FAIR plan losses claimed by the insurance companies.

Even accepting the insurance industry loss figures, which he questions, the insurers cleared a profit of \$22 million in two years by surcharging city customers 4 percent and suburban customers 2 percent for riot and civil disorder coverage in the 28 states where the FAIR plan operates, he said.

#### "KICKING AND SCREAMING"

"They're crying about social problems and making a profit on the FAIR plan," he declared. "They were dragged kicking and screaming into the FAIR plan and they run it inefficiently. They could cut costs, be more efficient and not make 700,000 people now under the FAIR plan feel like second-class citizens."

He attacked the insurance industry's "generalized panic," citing policies canceled indiscriminately and increasing difficulty in getting property insured at all.

"Companies," he said, "are not writing as much insurance as they can safely write because they don't want to. In years gone by, insurance commissioners were worried that companies wrote too much for safety's sake. Today, they're not writing as much as they safely could."

The performance of insurance companies in the FAIR plan, he said, provides the lesson that industry pools such as the FAIR plan are not very efficient. So he plans to use individual companies in each state as fiscal agents for the government in servicing crime insurance.

Under the program, insurance agents get a commission for selling federal crime insurance, companies service the policies, and the government pays the bills.

He said the private companies wanted cost-plus contracts to go into the program but he refused.

"We are not going to indulge the inefficiency of the insurance companies," Bernstein said.

He predicted that if Congress believes people can get more for their dollar by a direct federal program of fire and extended coverage, it may push in that direction.

"But I think the FAIR plan can work better and there is no need for direct government writing of fire and extended coverage as there is with crime," he added.

#### CREDIT UNION MAGAZINE HONORS WRIGHT PATMAN—CHAMPION OF THE LITTLE MAN

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of the Credit Union magazine, a monthly publication of the Credit Union National Association, the worldwide credit union trade organization, includes an in-depth article on the distinguished

chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN.

Chairman PATMAN has earned the title of "Mr. Credit Union" in the Congress, for he has been behind all of the successful moves to help credit unions. Since he authored the Federal Credit Union Act in 1934, he has sponsored every piece of credit union legislation that has been enacted.

The Credit Union article provides not only information about his credit union activities, but covers many sides of the distinguished gentleman that have perhaps gone unnoticed about his brilliant career.

I am including a copy of the article in my remarks as a tribute to a man who has dedicated his life to helping the little people of this country.

WRIGHT PATMAN—"CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE"  
"Scourge of the big bankers."

"The bankers' nemesis." "The last of the Populists." "Something of an idealist." "He fights and fights and fights."

These are some of the ways in which headline writers have referred to Rep. Wright Patman (D-Texas). Privately and sometimes not so privately, some of the people with whom Mr. Patman has not seen eye to eye have made much stronger references to his actions, his beliefs, and his character. These have included bankers, politicians (as high as you can go), members of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, foundations officials, and many others.

Something else he has been called, and with good reason, is "Mr. Credit Union," and he is frequently referred to as "the best friend credit unions have ever had in Washington."

Mr. Patman is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, ranking member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, vice-chairman of the joint House-Senate Economic Committee, and chairman of the joint House-Senate Committee on Defense Production.

But he probably is best known for his more than 40 years of continuous battling for plentiful credit on reasonable terms and against high interest rates and tight money policies imposed by the Federal Reserve System.

#### WHAT KIND OF MAN?

At 77, Mr. Patman is a big man, well over six feet, and huskily built. His face shines with the pinkness of health, and his manner is always courteous, gracious, almost grandfatherly. He is admittedly old-fashioned in many of his ways and beliefs, and his speech—usually gentle, with more than a touch of Texas drawl—is completely lacking in pseudo-intellectualisms, legislative double-talk, or affected Washingtonese.

His English is plain, straightforward, and when appropriate, has an edge of rural simplicity about it. He likes a good joke and a good story, and a gentle rustic humor often comes through what he's saying. His courteous, homey attitude is an honest representation of the man, but it should not be mistaken for artlessness.

Someone who knows Mr. Patman well relates that he has seen him questioning a witness who obviously was a little contemptuous of Mr. Patman's abilities—and maybe of his intelligence. "This guy was being evasive and very clever and superior, and maybe not quite honest and responsive to questions. Mr. Patman led him out on a long branch, excusing himself for his plain speech and sort of admitting his lack of finesse, and then all of a sudden he sawed that branch right off." While Mr. Patman may seem to take a kind of simple, downhome approach to things, he is a long, long way from being naive, as many an adversary has found out.

It goes without saying that Mr. Patman is a shrewd and accomplished politician. He has been elected to the House 22 consecutive times; only one man, Rep. Celler of New York, has been in the House longer. Mr. Patman has been elected to office 26 straight times, locally and nationally, and is proud of the fact that he won every time by a clear majority; no runoff election ever has been necessary. You don't do that by being politically inept.

#### WHAT ONE MAN CAN DO

Mr. Patman is tough in other ways, too. It takes courage for one man to challenge the President of the United States (especially when he's a member of the same party); to attack and attempt to impeach the Secretary of the Treasury, when his name is Andrew Mellon; to defy and threaten the biggest banks in the country; and take on single-handedly the whole powerful Federal Reserve system—but Mr. Patman has done all of these and more.

One of the accomplishments he's proudest of was his successful fight for the so-called veterans' bonus back in the 1930s. After World War I a law was passed entitling veterans, based on numbers of days served in this country and overseas, to adjusted compensation for their service. These payments were to mature in 1945, but during the Depression much pressure was put on the government to pay the adjusted compensation in a lump sum. The argument was that veterans needed the money right then, and should not have to wait until 1945.

Mr. Patman agreed, and also believed that the lump-sum payment would inject a much-needed shot in the arm to a lagging economy. Though he was considered a "mere upstart from Texas" at the time, and though it made him "very unpopular on the hill," he fought for several years for his bill providing immediate payment to veterans. President Roosevelt vetoed such a bill in 1935, and Mr. Patman fought him on it, although he had campaigned hard for FDR and of course was a fellow Democrat.

Finally, in 1936, the President's veto was overridden and the then enormous sum of \$2.49 billion was promptly disbursed to ex-servicemen.

While this was a long time ago, its effects extend right down to the present day, and may well explain Mr. Patman's long-standing feud with the Federal Reserve Board. Shortly after the bonus payments were made, the Federal Reserve doubled reserve requirements on U.S. banks. "I have never forgiven them for that, and I don't believe I ever will," Mr. Patman said. "They tightened up the money supply when my legislation was specifically aimed at loosening it. It prolonged our recovery from the Great Depression."

Mr. Patman's championing of the bonus bill—like most of his activity in Congress through the years—points out his consistent and long-standing support of the "little man" and his opposition to the rich, the powerful, and the privileged.

Probably the most dramatic example of this came in 1932 when he got up on the floor of the House and demanded the impeachment of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon for "high crimes and misdemeanors" that included conflict of interest and indifference to the will of the people. Mellon never was impeached; before he had to answer Mr. Patman's charges he was saved by President Hoover, who made him ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. Patman has been in innumerable legislative battles and legal fights since he first decided to run for public office, but probably the closest he came to actual physical harm was back in the 20s when he was district attorney. It was a rough area in those days around Texarkana, Texas; because four states come together there, crime was rampant and escape from the law was made easier by

crossing one state line or another. Mr. Patman was determined to solve the problem of holdups and robbery, and learned that there was a connection between all this violence and the houses of ill fame that abounded in the area.

In one day he padlocked 24 such places. In short order it developed that here was a very definite connection between vice and crime in Texarkana and certain unsavory characters in Chicago, and Mr. Patman learned from the governor of Texas that an assassin was on the way from Chicago to liquidate him. The governor sent a bodyguard of Texas Rangers to protect Mr. Patman as long as necessary, and the Rangers gave him a six-shooter and made him learn to use it.

"I never had to use it," he said. "I never wanted to use it, and I'm glad I never had to. I still have that old six-shooter around somewhere."

#### A THOUGHT TO PONDER

Fighting for what may appear to be unpopular causes doesn't bother Mr. Patman in the least if he's convinced he's in the right. Many years ago he memorized a bit of favorite verse—he doesn't know the author—and he likes to recite it to himself occasionally even today, sometimes, he says, in the middle of the night:

"He has no enemies," you say.

My friend, your boast is poor.

He who hath mingled in the fray of duty that the brave endure Must have made foes.

If he has none, small is the work that he has done.

He has hit no traitor on the hip; has cast no cup from the perjured lip;

Has never turned the wrong to right;

"Has been a coward in the fight."

Mr. Patman is well known for voting the way he thinks, not necessarily the way his party, or even the folks back home, would want and expect him to. He's also well known for working himself and his staff very hard, indeed, and there's a connection between the two.

"When I first came to Congress I sincerely and honestly believed Congress was made up of good people, the best in their districts; educated, cultured people, and that I'd have to work an hour or two a day extra to keep up with the smarter ones. My first impressions have held up; I have worked with 3,000 or 3,500 people in Congress since I came to Washington, and while there is an occasional rotten apple in every barrel, they are the exception, and these people have proved to be fine, hard-working, honest representatives of the people."

Mr. Patman hasn't changed his mind about the character of people who serve in Congress, and he hasn't given up putting in a "little extra time" to keep up with the best of them.

He averages at least 10 hours a working day, and Saturday is "cleanup day" and he's in the office along with part of his staff. On Sundays he's likely to be found in his office before he attends services at Washington's First Baptist Church—and often on Sunday afternoons too, when there's work he feels must be done. He lives 2½ miles from his office in the Rayburn Building, and usually walks either to or from the office, sometimes both ways.

He reads and attends to all the mail that comes into his office, and there is a lot of it. Only a small portion, interestingly, comes from his own district; because of his reputation as a friend of the ordinary or average man, he receives mail from all across the country. He is proud of this mail, and proud of the fact that he often is considered "Congressman-at-large" for people wherever they happen to live.

He reads everything available about credit unions, including publications and other

materials from Credit Union National Association, and he also regularly receives a number of league publications. His staff is instructed to keep up on everything pertaining to credit unions, and to follow up on any credit union matter that needs attention.

Why does he sometimes not vote the way the people back home expect? "I consider that the people sent me here to do what they would do if they were here and voting," he said. "The folks back home must trust me to know more about how to vote than they do; I'm on the scene, I read and study reports, hear debate, keep up with the matter on a day-to-day basis; I must know more about it than they. I have to risk reelection every two years to convince them I was right. They do trust me, as the record shows."

#### A LONG LIST

The Congressman from Texarkana has sponsored, or co-sponsored a lot of major legislation through the years, some of which he is especially proud. Besides the "bonus bill" these include: co-authorship of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, its purpose the protection of small business; authorship of the resolution in 1941 creating the House Committee on Small Business and of most major small business legislation that has passed the House for 20 years; co-authored the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act of 1942; authored the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946; co-authored the Full Employment Act of 1946; co-authored the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961; author of many housing bills including the Housing and Urban Development Acts of 1965 and 1968; and authored much legislation dealing with banks, savings and loan institutions, and the general financial community.

Of course of special interest to the credit union movement is his longtime interest in, support, and sponsorship of legislation for the benefit of credit unions.

It goes back to the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934. "My first credit union connection was back in the early 30s," Mr. Patman recalled, "when I met those fine gentlemen Mr. Flene and Mr. Bergengren. Senator Morris Sheppard of my own state was sponsoring a federal credit union bill, and I told him if he could get it through the Senate I would do my best to get it through the House." Under his co-sponsorship, the bill passed in 1934, and since then Mr. Patman has authored and supported more credit union legislation than any other lawmaker. For this he has earned the movement's highest honor, the Credit Union Distinguished Service Award, and he is one of only three persons ever to receive it. And he has earned credit unions' profound respect and gratitude.

Most recent legislation supported by Mr. Patman, and very important to the future of the movement, was the Independent Agency Bill of 1970, which he originally conceived and of which he was the author. This act established the National Credit Union Administration as a separate agency and gave federal credit unions the same organizational level status as banks and savings and loan associations.

#### WHY LITTLE MAN?

Why has Mr. Patman always stood up for the little man, and always taken his part whenever he saw a confrontation between special interests and the people's interest?

"Because the big boys have everything," Mr. Patman said. "They can afford the best lawyers, the brainiest people, the best public relations people. They certainly don't need me. But what about the middle and low-income people? They just don't have anyone especially charged to protect their interests; they're discriminated against because they just don't have the help and support in Congress they should."

"As a Congressman I think I'm here to help people; I've always had that attitude, though sometimes I've been almost alone in

the positions I've taken. I've taken a lot of heat and unpopularity over the years, but this hasn't deterred me. Somebody has to stand up for the little man."

And that's what chairman Patman does, seven days a week.

#### PENTAGON PAPERS

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, amid all the controversy surrounding publication of the Pentagon papers, the basic issue is still freedom of the press. To date, the Government has failed to demonstrate that there is any clear and present danger to national security that would justify the suspension of this basic constitutional guarantee.

There has been no more eloquent champion of freedom of the press in our times than John S. Knight, president of Knight Newspapers, and president and editor of the Akron Beacon Journal. Two recent articles from the Beacon Journal, one an editorial and the other the most recent Editor's Notebook by John S. Knight, present thoughtful discussions of what is at stake for the press and the Nation in this historical confrontation.

The material follows:

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 17, 1971]

#### WHAT DOES GREATER INJURY TO THE UNITED STATES?

The administration whose activities are described in "the McNamara Papers" went out of office in January 1969. The last of the events the papers cover was apparently at least several months earlier, and the earliest was more than seven years ago.

Therefore the central question in the case of the United States Government versus the New York Times appears to be:

Can "injury of the United States" be reasonably feared through disclosure to the American public, three to seven years later, of fragments of the truth about how an earlier set of leaders involved them in the longest and most futile war in the nation's history?

In his telegram to the Times Monday, Atty. Gen. John Mitchell said that "further publication of information of this kind will cause irreparable injury to the defense interests of the United States," and asked that the Times stop the series.

Then in the hearing Tuesday that led to a court order halting the series temporarily, the Justice Department argued that through publication of the material "serious injuries are being inflicted on our foreign relations, to the benefit of other nations opposed to our form of government."

In both the telegram and the court hearing, it was charged that in publishing the papers, some of which contain information Mitchell says is still classified "top secret," the Times has violated the Espionage Law.

It is up to judges and not editorial writers to say whether this law, intended as a weapon against spies and their informants and not as a device to outlaw telling the American people historical truth, has been violated by the Times—and, for that matter, by the Beacon Journal and every other newspaper publishing the material.

But meanwhile we can wonder which really does greater injury to the United States:

Giving the American electorate a revealing glimpse of how its past leadership has actually governed, or keeping the truth under a tight lid labeled "top secret."

It is, of course, an indefensible oversim-

plification to argue that because the public business is the public's business ALL governmental activities of every kind should be conducted in the open and splashed in the headlines instants after they occur.

The framers of the Constitution operated under no such illusion; they drew up the Constitution itself, in fact, in closed sessions of which no official record was kept—and we still don't know, these 194 years later, exactly who said what there.

But their idea was a division of governmental powers requiring debate that would make major business actually public—and thus give the electorate accurate information on which to judge and choose its representatives in government.

No student of American history could seriously argue that this ever worked perfectly. Still, for a long time we worked toward it, envisioning as an ideal a people with enough access to truth to debate and decide intelligently where their nation should be trying to get and how best to get there.

Then, with the rapid swelling of executive power through the last 40 years, we seemed to start drifting the other way. More and more, with spreading secret—or at least unreviewed—executive commitments, our government has come to operate on the Machiavellian principle:

The prince knows best, and selects for release to the "peasants" only that information—and misinformation—which will generate sentiment in support of decisions already made.

"Realistic" government, in this view, is cloak-and-daggerism, manipulation, and then the engineering of public consent. Secrecy becomes a comfortable habit, and the "secret" stamp spreads ever farther. This, after all frees the hand for carefully managed "scenario" and "orchestrations" for the public.

Mentioned in the same breath as the Indochina procedures of the Johnson administration revealed in the McNamara Papers, and the wide-eyed dissembling at home, the Wilsonian hope of such things as "open covenants openly arrived at" seems a sort of sick joke, the dream of a child.

And maybe it is. But if it is only a foolish dream, then so is the hope of Lincoln for an unperishing government "by the people." So is the whole American dream that has made this country unique among the great nations of history, the dream of a people who could become capable of governing themselves.

The McNamara Papers are a product of the Johnson administration, and they can tell us only what that administration did. The Nixon administration insists that it is different—but the public opinion surveys demonstrate that its protestations have not yet sufficed to convince most Americans that Machiavelli has moved away.

Is it, then, really good for us—or for our present leaders—that they shield us from further exposure to these unpleasant bits of truth? Does their suppression help to protect our "form of government"—whatever meaning you give that term in the light of the new information—from its foreign enemies? Will the United States be less "injured" because its people are prevented from learning the truth?

We don't think so.

#### THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—PRESS IS GUARDING YOUR RIGHT TO KNOW

The raging storm of controversy over publication of the Pentagon papers by the New York Times and other newspapers has, if nothing else, given the American people a new insight into the clandestine workings of government.

From the outset, it should be conceded that government must of necessity work in secret with respect to diplomatic negotiations and

certainly withhold information which is considered inimical to our national security.

So the question really turns upon the need for preserving confidentiality, and whether—as stated by the Justice Department—"the nation's security will suffer immediate and irreparable harm" with continuing publication.

Editors of the Knight Newspapers do not believe our published portions of government documents constitute any threat whatsoever to national security.

A case can be made for the government's claim that publication endangers confidentiality of communications with other governments. To this the Los Angeles Times offer the observation "It would be much more a consideration if democratic governments around the world did not continually spill the diplomatic beans; and if officials of the American government, from the President down, did not tell state secrets as they saw fit and for their purposes."

As for the breach of security charge, the fact is that the McNamara study is merely a recitation of history and was directed by the former Secretary of Defense, for precisely that purpose.

The revelations deals with the past, not with present or future operations. So one must strain the imagination to detect anything in the Pentagon documents which violates the Espionage Law or endangers the lives of our citizens.

It is interesting indeed that President Nixon, whose Justice Department is now prosecuting the New York Times and the Washington Post, did as a United States Senator accuse the Truman administration of holding back classified documents for political reasons.

The case involved secret talks between Gen. Douglas MacArthur and President Truman on Wake Island on Oct. 15, 1950. Sen. Nixon declared that Gen. MacArthur was being "smeared in the press through connivance with the administration." "Certainly," Sen. Nixon said, "if classified documents are now to be made public, the committees of Congress and the American people should be entitled to see not only those documents which might reflect against MacArthur, but also those which might reflect in his favor."

When the Truman administration did eventually release the documents, as requested by Nixon, it like the present administration, expressed fear of danger to the national security. In 1951, Gen. MacArthur remarked that the six-month-old documents had "just about as much bearing on the problem of Korea as a report on the military operations of Bunker Hill."

The doughty General neatly epitomized our own thoughts on the Pentagon papers, and the ridiculousness of charging that their publication is a threat to national security.

The Chicago Tribune, always a stout defender of the people's right to know but presently pouting that "the Pentagon papers have found a fresh outlet through the Chicago Sun-Times," can recall at least two instances when it was treading deep water on the question of military security.

On Dec. 4, 1941—three days before Pearl Harbor, the Tribune published secret Army war plans. And during the battle of Midway, a Chicago Tribune story revealed on June 7, 1942, that we had broken the Japanese naval codes.

Either of these stories, writes historian Arthur Schlesinger, "might well have caused irreparable injury to the defense interests of the United States. The Roosevelt administration could have made quite a case against the Tribune 30 years ago but in the end declined to do so."

"The question is," Schlesinger continues, "what sort of case the Nixon administration,

in these far less stringent and perilous days, can bring against the Times."

In justice to the Chicago Tribune, there was no censorship code in existence before Pearl Harbor. Nor did its publication of the makeup of the Japanese fleet approaching Midway violate censorship since there was no provision in the code at that time which would bar this story.

While government talks of "irreparable injury" to national security or "exceptionally grave damage to the nation," the case of the Pentagon papers has yet to be made.

For surely, no revelations vital to the national defense have been published, nor are they likely to be.

Having served in the Bureau of Censorship, both at home and abroad during World War II, I can testify that the indiscriminate stamping by the military of government documents as "top secret" came to be regarded with extreme skepticism.

For here in many instances were papers having absolutely no relationship to national security, yet stamped as such according to the whims of those who were exaggerating their own importance.

In such clashes of judgment as came between Censorship and the military, President Roosevelt invariably sided with the Bureau. In that declared war, there were no intentional breaches of security by the press, then operating in cooperation with the government under a voluntary code of compliance.

Such demands for censorship as have been made by the military in this undeclared war are of no validity whatsoever since the Congress has never invoked a state of national emergency.

It is useful to make that distinction before denouncing the editor, or charging that he is a subversive character who ought to be tried for treason.

Finally, it is well to know that our government often makes classified information available to reporters and editors. Why is this done? Benjamin C. Bradlee, executive editor of the Washington Post, explains in the text of an affidavit submitted to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia:

1—To influence a reporter's story in a manner which the government official believes is in the best interest of his country, his particular branch of government, or his particular point of view.

2—To create a climate of public opinion—national or international—favorable to such beliefs.

3—To test a climate of public opinion on certain options under deliberation by the government.

4—To curry favor with a particular reporter or a particular newspaper.

5—To influence the American electorate, and in certain instances, a foreign electorate.

It is most important to the American public to realize—as Ben Bradlee points out—that in a totalitarian state, where the press is not free, the government uses the press as an instrument of state. Thus the press prints nothing that is not favorable and advantageous to the state.

Under a democracy such as ours, there exists a free flow of reporting and opinion—a normal, productive adversary relationship between government and the press.

If the press reported only what is advantageous to the government, where lies the protection against exploitation of the people by the government?

And yet, unhappily, a growing percentage of our citizens and especially of our youth, appears to be favoring restrictions upon freedom of expression by the media.

The press is not about to betray this nation.

It seeks rather to enlighten and to serve as a guardian of your precious liberties as

granted and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States for nearly 200 years.

#### THE PEDAGOGICAL DABLERS

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of June 27 carried an article which could well be indicative of the direction in which the field of education is heading if the principle of accountability is not applied to education as in other fields. Louis A. Schuker, the retiring principal of Jamaica High School in Queens in New York City, has for his 44 years in the city public schools, realized his responsibility in providing to the best of his ability an education for those under his direction. He has, as in the case of thousands of teachers and school administrators the country over, held himself accountable for performing the basic function of the academic community—preparing the young with the basic knowledge and principles for later life.

Mr. Schuker, who I have never met personally, became controversial when he refused to allow his school to be used as a forum for radicals and steadfastly confronted any efforts to distort the basic educational function. Blessed with good health and a love of his work, Mr. Schuker enjoyed the fruits accruing from dedication and persistent effort. In the Times article he stated:

I have pride in my school, in its superior faculty, in its excellent, wide-ranging curriculum with provision for all elements in the educational spectrum, in its achievements—musicales, dramatics, publications, athletics, state scholarships, Westinghouse honors—you name it, we're always first or second in the borough.

He struck an oft-repeated theme in questioning the new innovative trend in education:

One way to innovate is to start new things if you've thought about them or haven't thought about them. You can experiment with almost anything. You can take your food backwards if you want to. An education experiment should be just as experimental as a medical experiment. A doctor should not be an innovator fooling around with his patient.

He continued:

Today it is a school without walls, or an open campus or a parkway school. I think the basic thing is to have a good school and teach the kids something. I like to see achievement and time that is not wasted.

How many dedicated educators like Mr. Schuker are leaving the field of education because of the pedagogical dabblers is hard to ascertain. One thing is certain: until these experimentalists are held accountable for the students in their charge, the situation is bound to worsen. When parents adamantly insist on an education for their children based on time-proven methods and principles, the Mr. Schukers will once again be more in evidence in our educational system.

The Times article follows:

**CONTROVERSIAL PRINCIPAL AT JAMAICA HIGH SCHOOL RINGS BELL FOR THE LAST TIME**

Louis A. Schuker, the controversial principal of Jamaica High School in Queens who has built a reputation as an iron-willed, independent administrator and outspoken proponent of the merit system in hiring educators, is retiring.

He was honored last week at a retirement party in Great Neck, L.I., given by some 500 colleagues and friends from throughout the city.

Mr. Schuker, a past president of the High Schools Principals Association, who has devoted 44 of his 65 years to the city public schools, has decided that, despite his good health and love for his work, this year would be his last at Jamaica High, which he has served as principal since 1955.

His reasons, at first puzzling to those who know him well, were stated recently in a letter to a friend at the Board of Education.

"Jamaica High School, integrated with a 65/35 ethnic ratio [65 per cent white, 35 per cent black] has all the well-known problems of a difficult urban school. We have the usual percentage of sick kids. We also have a number of paranoid blacks (sporting Panther and Liberation buttons) who have been inspired to look for trouble.

**"A HANDFUL OF LEFTISTS"**

"We have a handful of white New Leftists. Though I can name them on my fingers, they keep the pot boiling because they're constantly coached by the New York Civil Liberties Union.

"The Board of Education seems utterly indifferent to the imminent destructive effects of this triple combination, constituting at Jamaica of less than 2 per cent of the entire student body. I keep them under control so that we may have a secure and viable school for blacks and whites—but at the expense of becoming more a policeman-detective-district attorney-lawyer rather than a school principal.

"Third: I have pride in my school, in its superior faculty, in its excellent wide-ranging curriculum with provision for all elements in the educational spectrum, in its achievements—musicals, dramatics, publications, athletics, state scholarships, Westinghouse honors—you name it, we're always first or second in the borough.

"However, despite this justifiable sense of success and warm relations with an appreciative community, my amour propre has been assaulted by a Chancellor, who announces with wearisome repetition that the merit system and school system are failures, that the schools should be turned around, that we need fundamental restructuring and that it's five minutes to midnight."

"I am surprised that he's negative in his attitude toward any administrative practice of mine," commented Dr. Harvey B. Scribner, Chancellor of the city schools. "I understand he is one of our finest principals and I've never had any questions about it."

Working within the system has been the trademark of Louis Schuker's administration at Jamaica.

**SCHOOL IS 45 YEARS OLD**

He is proud of the fact that the aging hallways of the 45-year-old high school are virtually spotless; that his students have won Westinghouse scholarships every year since he became principal; that his school has led in programs for the disadvantaged, and that the lawns and fields around the sprawling complex are green and have not been vandalized.

But Mr. Schuker's philosophy has also led to a bitter confrontation with elements of the 4,000 students at Jamaica.

In October, 1969, Raymond Miller, a 17-year-old student, was suspended by Mr.

Schuker for refusing to stand up or leave the room when his class pledged allegiance to the flag.

Young Miller was permitted to return to school three days later when a Federal judge enjoined the school from suspending him on the ground that he was not infringing on the rights of other students.

Mr. Schuker was again threatened with contempt charges last December for allegedly harassing students who remained seated during the Pledge of Allegiance.

The petition, filed by the New York Civil Liberties Union on behalf of several students, charged that Mr. Schuker and members of his staff had been putting students under pressure to rise during the salute and warning them of reprisals and bad records if they failed to do so.

Recently, a suit was filed in Queens Supreme Court charging Mr. Schuker with keeping a political dossier on David Shaikin, a militant who criticized Jamaica High School and its administration in a radio program on station WBAI.

In a letter to Abraham Wilner, an assistant superintendent at the Board of Education, Mr. Schuker conceded that he had recorded on the student's record the fact that Mr. Shaikin had made disparaging comments about the school and Mr. Schuker.

"We note many things on our record cards when they concern a pupil's activities," Mr. Schuker explained. "The principal of the school has the right and the obligation to record factually any noteworthy activities on the pupil's part, especially if they affect the school."

Mr. Shaikin is asking that the notation be removed from his permanent record card.

Mr. Schuker makes it no secret that his great adversaries in these times are not the students or parents or even American Civil Liberties lawyers, but the people who run the Board of Education.

"They have a man they brought in as Chancellor saying, 'Boys, you have got to innovate.'

"Well," Mr. Schuker continued, "one way to innovate is to start new things if you've thought about them or haven't thought about them. You can experiment with almost anything. You can take your food backwards if you want to.

"An education experiment should be just as experimental as a medical experiment. A doctor should not be an innovator fooling around with his patient.

"Today it is a school without walls, or an open campus or a parkway school. I think the basic thing is to have a good school and teach the kids something. I like to see achievement and time that is not wasted."

The principal has been a strong critic of experiments such as is taking place at John Dewey High School in Brooklyn that has attempted to offer more flexible programing as an alternative to the traditional semester system.

And he has defended the Board of Examiners, which he believes once accounted for higher standards among city educators than is demanded now.

Mr. Schuker opposes decentralization in its present form because he believes it weakens the system and he is against promoting student activism because he feels it is not the job of the school to propagandize.

"We are in a civil liberties syndrome," Mr. Schuker said. "Teachers and principals are looked upon as enemies of the children. If you make a procedural mistake in pressing charges against a student, you stand to lose the case."

Louis Schuker was born in 1905 in Cheyew, Poland. His parents brought him as a child to Columbia, S.C., where his father, Morris, had set up a general store.

In 1919, his family moved to the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn, where he worked

while studying at Eastern District High School and later at City College.

His wife, Millicent, is a guidance counselor in the city school system and his four children, all grown up, are all pursuing careers in the teaching and medical fields.

Mr. Schuker recalls as his greatest moment a reception a large segment of the student body gave him during a farewell speech in an assembly two weeks ago.

As Mrs. Rose Kirchman, chairman of the speech department and a Jamaica High School teacher for 18 years, describes it, "There was an instantaneous ovation from 1,200 students as he finished his speech.

"Even though they have complained and find that the school is not full of what they expect, they cheered the man," Mrs. Kirchman said. "I don't think he has ever sought popularity for its own sake."

Mr. Schuker is uncertain of his future.

Chances are he will lock up his airy office on Thursday as he always does, bid goodbye to his remaining staff, and drive his sporty gray Mercedes once more around Grand Central Parkway and 175th Street.

"I've been sort of a mayor here," he remarked.

**REVENUE NEEDED TO PAY FOR ESSENTIAL SERVICES**

(Mr. SANDMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point remarks that I made yesterday before the House Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY (2ND)

Mr. SANDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished Committee on Ways and Means. I am Charles W. Sandman, Jr., a Member of Congress representing the Second Congressional District of New Jersey. My district is comprised of the state's four southernmost counties of Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland and Salem.

Knowing how busy members of this Committee are, Mr. Chairman, I will endeavor to be brief. I am prepared to defend and elaborate on any point of theory or fact mentioned or referred to in my statement.

**PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

My appearance here this morning is not for the purpose of joining the bandwagon to heap more proof on the record that some states, counties and cities need new revenues to pay for essential services. I accept this premise as valid.

Taxation on the current sources of state and local revenues is, in too many cases, already excessive. Perhaps a better word is repressive. There is a limit on the extent to which a revenue source can be taxed. And I am prepared to accept the overwhelming opinion of the Governors and Mayors of the nation that such a limit has been reached on main source of state and local revenue: property taxes in particular.

Nor have I asked for these few minutes of your time to dwell upon the obvious shortcomings of the Administration's general and special revenue sharing proposals and the various proposed amendments to them.

I have stated my own objections in the past and others have done likewise during the course of these hearings. Further critical testimony would be, I think, an exercise in overkill.

**A SPECIFIC SOLUTION**

Given the need, a clear Congressional desire to meet it and the lack of any fully acceptable solutions proposed to date, my purpose today is to offer a specific plan I feel,

based on over 15 years of both state and federal legislative experience, will meet the need and be acceptable to all concerned.

My plan, simply, is for the federal government to relinquish to the states and local governments sources of new revenues they can tax directly to meet their specific needs for new funds.

#### "REVENUE SOURCE SHARING"

I call this plan "Revenue Source Sharing." Instead of forcing the Governors and Mayors of the nation to continue to beg to Uncle Sam for larger and larger annual handouts, my plan would give them new sources of revenue for them to tax as necessary.

The sources of revenue I suggest be turned over to states and local governments are (1) all federal excise taxes except trust funds, and (2) the estate and gift tax.

These are the two revenue sources I urge be turned over to states and local governments so they can tax them directly.

#### TAX YIELD IN CASH

The President projects that the estate and gift tax will yield \$5 billion, \$300 million in fiscal 1972. And it is anticipated that the undedicated excise taxes in fiscal 1972 will yield \$11 billion, \$115 million. Currently, these tax receipts are considered general funds of the federal government: they are not assigned to any purpose.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my "Revenue Source Sharing" plan would enable states and local governments to impose, collect and keep taxes from these sources alone in fiscal 1972 in the amount of \$16 billion, \$415 million, all in cash.

This compares most favorably with the Administration's proposals for revenue sharing that would provide states and local governments with only \$5 billion in cash plus an estimated \$11 billion in categorical grant programs in fiscal 1972.

It is my opinion that \$5 billion in "no strings attached" cash is totally inadequate to meet the need for state and local revenues. My plan would provide over \$16 billion, all in cash.

#### TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION

The one most attractive aspect of the President's "special" revenue sharing proposal is the assignment of administrative responsibility for some 130 "narrow categorical grant programs" grouped under six broad headings to State and local governments.

This is an effort to decentralize decision-making and to allow state and local governments to administer programs they know best how to handle. These six broad program groups are rural community development, urban community development, education, manpower training, law enforcement and transportation.

The Administration's "special" revenue sharing proposal would give state and local governments wide latitude in determining whether or not they wish to participate in any or all of these 130 separate programs. Clearly, speaking of my state of New Jersey, there are many programs that are of no particular benefit to our citizens.

The second major point of my "Revenue Source Sharing" plan, therefore Mr. Chairman, is for the federal government to relinquish its responsibility completely for the administering and financing of these programs.

In other words, my plan goes one step further than the President's. Instead of just relinquishing the administrative responsibility for these categorical grant programs, my plan also relinquishes all financial responsibility to state and local governments.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS

When I first read the Administration's "special" revenue sharing plan and noted the

transfer of administrative responsibility for these 130 narrow categorical grant programs from the federal level to the states, I assumed the federal government would realize considerable savings resulting from elimination of several thousand employees now administering these programs and the millions of dollars in overhead assigned to them.

I waited over three months for a Presidential message specifying such a cutback in the federal bureaucracy. When such a message failed to materialize Mr. Chairman, I called The White House to find out about it.

The response I received was unbelievable. The Administration's position is that there are no plans, at least publicly now, to cutback on the number of employees and the costs of administering the agencies that currently handle these 130 programs being turned over to the states. Several more recent inquiries have confirmed this position, as preposterous as it sounds.

I am told that all of the current employees in these agencies will be transformed overnight into advisors and overseers to assist the states in taking over these programs.

Equally as shocking was my discovery that apparently nobody knows what it costs the federal government to run any of these programs or even how many employees are assigned to them. I asked the White House through three Special Assistants to the President; I asked the Bureau of Management and the Budget, the Comptroller General's office, the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of the Treasury and others, but nobody has any idea how many employees are involved or what it costs to administer these programs.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the third major point of my "Revenue Source Sharing" plan is to instruct the Executive to phase all of these agencies out of existence during the first fiscal year this plan is in effect.

Specifically, the agencies or parts of agencies that should be phased out are those that currently (1) collect the undedicated excise taxes and the estate and gift taxes and (2) administer the 130 separate grant programs to be turned over to the States and local governments.

I also propose that Congress instruct the Comptroller General to conduct a continuing investigation of the Executive's progress in phasing-out these agencies and to report regularly to Congress.

#### FINANCING "REVENUE SOURCE SHARING"

As most of you on this distinguished Committee are, I am proposed to deficit financing. I believe strongly that before Congress enacts any program, we should know where the money is coming from to pay for it and the necessary steps should be taken in advance of enactment to secure the necessary funds.

In the case of my "Revenue Source Sharing," we are not talking about increasing federal expenditures. Quite to the contrary, we are talking about decreasing federal revenues by over \$16 billion, using the fiscal year 1972 projections.

To make up for this \$16 billion in "lost" revenues the States and local governments would be collecting, my plan calls for decreasing federal expenditures by \$16 billion. This is not as hard as it sounds.

Right off the bat, there would be a cut in federal expenditures of approximately \$10 billion, using the President's figure, by turning over the financial responsibility for the 130 grant programs to States and local governments.

Secondly, another \$1 billion earmarked by the Administration as "hold harmless" money will be unnecessary under my plan. That leaves a \$5 billion deficit to cover.

There will be significant savings—though nobody knows how much—from eliminating the agencies specified previously in this testimony.

To make up for the difference, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the imposition of a four percent surcharge on federal income taxes until other budget cuts can be made or until we know actually how much this program will cost in "lost federal revenues." The Internal Revenue Service estimates that such a four percent surcharge would yield \$5 billion in fiscal 1972.

#### THE TAXPAYERS ARE WILLING

Three months ago, in preparation for this proposal, I included an item in my annual questionnaire to my constituents about revenue sharing. To the question: "Do you favor the Administration plan giving New Jersey \$154 million even though it causes a \$5 billion federal deficit?" 23% of the 13,022 persons responding said yes, 71 percent oppose the Administration's plan and 6 percent were undecided.

To the question: "Do you favor a return of the Federal alcoholic beverage tax to states which would give New Jersey \$290 million and would be supported by a federal 4 percent surcharge on your federal income tax?" my constituents replied as follows: 75 percent favor "source sharing," 20% oppose it as stated and 5 percent were undecided.

I cite these poll results of my constituents Mr. Chairman to point out that even though the questions asked are not as exacting to the two proposals as might be desired, there is a willingness on the part of taxpayers to bear a surcharge burden if necessary. And it is clear that my constituents favor giving New Jersey new sources of revenue rather than more federal handouts.

It seems to me that such a small surcharge is a tiny price to pay for the tremendous benefits of this plan.

#### THE NECESSARY LEGISLATION

In a nutshell, legislation to implement my plan would have to repeal all undedicated federal excise taxes and the estate and gift tax. It would relinquish federal responsibility for the administration and financing of the 130 programs and it abolishes the various federal agencies that will no longer be needed.

#### MAJOR BENEFITS TO STATES

Briefly, my "Revenue Source Sharing" plan has the following major benefits to States and local governments as compared with the Administration's proposals:

- (1) It provides them with sources of over \$16 billion in new revenue, all in the form of cash, instead of only \$5 billion in cash and \$11 billion in categorical grants.
- (2) It eliminates the expensive "federal middleman." States would impose, collect and keep all of the shared revenues instead of having it go through the Federal Treasury and various Federal agencies.
- (3) It returns a meaningful amount of financial and administrative responsibility to State and local levels of government, thereby contributing to a much needed decentralization of public power.
- (4) It more clearly defines federal jurisdiction in relation to that of state and local governments.

I am providing this Committee with copies of a chart which compares my plan with the Administration's proposals. Also provided is a similar chart with respect to the effect of both proposals on my State of New Jersey.

#### SUMMARY

I have appreciated this opportunity to present my views and specific plan to this Committee, Mr. Chairman. And I hope this testimony has been helpful and constructive.

The need for increased State and local responsibility and revenues is clear. Both Congress and the President are sincere in trying to find the best way to meet this need. And I respectfully submit that the best way to do so is through "revenue source sharing."

**A COMPARISON OF COSTS AND EFFECT BETWEEN THE RSS PLAN AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S GENERAL AND SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PLAN**

**NATIONAL COMPARISON**

*Amount of funds to be shared*

Nixon plan: \$16,000 million.  
Sandman plan: \$16,415\* million.

*Type of shared funds*

Nixon plan: \$5 billion in cash plus \$11 billion in programs.  
Sandman plan: \$16,416 million—all in the form of cash.

*Source of shared funds*

Nixon plan: Federal taxes and added Federal debt.  
Sandman plan: State collected taxes from sources turned over by U.S. Government.

*Effect of Federal spending*

Nixon plan: Increase.  
Sandman plan: Decrease.

*Effect on Federal revenues*

Nixon plan: Increase.  
Sandman plan: Decrease.

*Restrictions on use of funds by States and localities*

Nixon plan: None on \$5 billion; Severe on \$11 billion.  
Sandman plan: None.

*Effect on Federal agencies now administering the 130 grant programs*

Nixon plan: No stated change in cost of operations.  
Sandman plan: Total Phase-out of these agencies.

*Effect on Federal agencies now collecting the two relinquished taxes*

Nixon plan: None.  
Sandman plan: Total phase-out of these agencies.

*Effect on the size of the Federal bureaucracy*

Nixon plan: None.  
Sandman plan: Significant Decrease.

*Distribution of funds to States and localities*

Nixon plan: Arbitrary Formula.  
Sandman plan: Based on State-imposed rates on certain excise and all estate and gift taxes.

**A COMPARISON OF COSTS AND EFFECT BETWEEN THE RSS PLAN AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S GENERAL AND SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PLANS**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

*Cash funds shared*

Nixon plan: \$154 million.  
Sandman plan: \$419 million\* (minimum).

*Program grants available if State wants to participate*

Nixon plan: \$295 million.  
Sandman plan: Not applicable.

\*Projections are based on excise taxes being imposed at point of productions which are the only figures available. Collected at point of purchase, the same taxes would have the same approximate national totals, but it would be more evenly distributed between the states.

NOTE: Currently, federal excise taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco are collected at the point of production. The only state by state breakdown of receipts are on this basis. For the RSS Plan to be most equitable, collections should be made at a point of purchase. The figures listed above are based on the point of production statistics available. It is certain that if point of purchase statistics were available, New Jersey's receipts via RSS would be significantly higher than listed above.

For More Information, Contact: U.S. Rep. Charles W. Sandman, Jr., 115 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. (202) 225-6572.

*Total shared funds for New Jersey*

Nixon plan: \$449 million.  
Sandman plan: \$419 million (minimum).  
*N.J. taxpayers' Federal tax burden to pay for shared funds*  
Nixon plan: \$736 million.  
Sandman plan: None. No Federal funds will be involved.

*Federal taxes from New Jersey to pay for shared funds but not returned to New Jersey*

Nixon plan: \$287 million.  
Sandman plan: None. 100% of money for RRS to stay in N.J.

*Increased Federal taxes assessed to New Jersey taxpayers for shared funds programs*

Nixon plan: \$287 million.  
Sandman plan: None.

**TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA**

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

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

The United States has the greatest length of highway in the world with 3,704,914 miles of graded roads at January 1, 1968.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through Thursday, July 1, 1971, on account of official business.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARCHER), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENDEL, on July 6, for 1 hour.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. COTTER, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL, on June 30, for 10 minutes.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. THONE in two instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. PETTIS in two instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. STEELE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. ASPIN in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mrs. MINK in two instances.

Mr. FAUNTROY in two instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. COTTER in six instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. ECKHARDT.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina.

**SENATE BILLS REFERRED**

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 137. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 432. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Salmon Falls division, Upper Snake River project, Idaho, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 488. An act to prohibit the licensing of hydroelectric projects on the Middle Snake River below Hells Canyon Dam at any time before September 30, 1978; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4724. An act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5257. An act to extend the school breakfast and special food programs; and

H.J. Res. 744. A joint resolution making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1971, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

909. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Assistance and Sales), transmitting a report for the third quarter of fiscal year 1971 on deliveries of excess defense articles at acquisition cost and at the value specified in section 8(c) of Public Law 91-672, pursuant to section 8(d) of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

910. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 6, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Murrell's Inlet, Georgetown County, S.C., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted August 31, 1965 and May 5, 1966 (H. Doc. No. 92-137); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

911. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the sale by the Federal Government of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

912. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

913. A letter from the Tulsa regional solicitor, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the decision on appeal in the matter of the heirship determination of Eliza-

beth Carbonau Vertifelle, deceased half-breed Kaw allottee, pursuant to Private Law 90-318; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. NEDZI: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 111. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune (Rept. No. 92-311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1700. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury (Rept. No. 92-312). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8699. A bill to provide an Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States (Rept. No. 92-313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8805. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of non-mailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to improve the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 517. A resolution providing for the consideration of 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. 92-315). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report of the administration of the National Environmental Policy Act (Rept. No. 92-316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 8825 (Rept. No. 92-317). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. Nix, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELBERG, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 9475. A bill to provide for the detection and treatment of members of the Armed Forces who are narcotics addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM:  
H.R. 9476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9477. A bill to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 9478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN (for himself, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina):

H.R. 9479. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to increase the rate of duty on certain tops, rovings, and yarns containing over 20 percent by weight of animal hair and on certain woven, knitted, or nonwoven fabrics chiefly used for paddings or interlinings in wearing apparel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9480. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9481. A bill to provide emergency authority for the guarantee of loans to aid certain business enterprises to meet temporary and urgent financial needs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. GROVER, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCHWENGL, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ZION, Mr. DORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. THONE, Mr. ROE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 9482. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. POWELL, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BARING, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 9483. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional

funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, and Mrs. DWYER):

H.R. 9485. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 9486. A bill to suspend the death penalty for 2 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9487. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 9488. A bill to improve education by increasing the freedom of the Nation's teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits through establishment of a Federal-State program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 9489. A bill to provide an incentive for the production of motion pictures in the United States by excluding from gross income, for Federal income tax purposes, a part of the gross income derived from the distribution or exploitation of motion pictures produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9490. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for maximum entrance and retention ages, training, and early retirement for air traffic controllers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9491. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9492. A bill to provide for a study of the feasibility of the establishment of a quasi-public corporation for oceanographic research and development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9493. A bill for the relief of the city of Glen Cove, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 9494. A bill to provide for a program of Federal financial assistance for the installation of noise-suppression devices on aircraft to suppress aircraft noise pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 9495. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft into or over the United States until certain findings are made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9496. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to establish an emergency Federal economic assistance program, to authorize the President to declare areas of the Nation which meet certain economic and employment criteria to be economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9498. A bill to establish a national recreation area in San Francisco and Marin Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 9499. A bill to provide home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 9500. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9501. A bill to amend the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9502. A bill to establish a national system of solid waste management; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDS) (by request):

H.R. 9503. A bill to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug-dependent members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9504. A bill to provide a Federal income tax deduction for expenditures for purchase and installation of air pollution control devices on used vehicles, and to provide for certification of such devices by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 9505. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of charitable contributions of copyrights, artistic compositions, or a collection of papers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 9506. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move amphetamines and certain other stimulant substances from schedule III of such act to schedule II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. MORSE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9507. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9508. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which presently prevent an individual from enrolling in the supplementary medical insurance program more than 3 years after his first opportunity to do so; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 9509. A bill to expand and extend the desalting program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 9510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the determination of reasonable additions to bad-debt reserves for loans by banks in the manner for such determinations by mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9511. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide a veterans' incentive program for participation in the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 9512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an itemized deduction for motor vehicle insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9513. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to give 50 days, notice to Congress of any proposed change of regulations or rulings having a substantial revenue effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9514. A bill to provide benefits for sufferers from byssinosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 756. Joint resolution; Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 757. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 758. Joint resolution; Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.J. Res. 759. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of Judges of the Supreme Court and of inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 760. Joint resolution; Seebee Memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. RUTH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, and Mr. STEELE):

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution relative to control of the production and traffic in illegal drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. HOGAN):

H. Con. Res. 353. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

229. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Tehama-Coulusa Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

230. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the expenditure of Federal funds to reduce unemployment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## 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:  
H.R. 9515. A bill for the relief of Milda

Risso Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9516. A bill for the relief of Gisela Hanke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9517. A bill for the relief of Pietro Campagnuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

93. Mr. HUTCHINSON presented a petition of Ruth Fischer and 910 other citizens of Berrien County, Mich.; protesting the tax burden upon the workingman resulting from welfare claims, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE—Tuesday, June 29, 1971

(Legislative day of Monday, June 28, 1971)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of us all, as we prepare to celebrate our national freedom make us mindful of all who are less free—the victims of injustice and oppression, all those yet enslaved, and all those whose personal and national destinies are determined by forces beyond their own control.

Hear our prayer once more, O Lord, for our own people who are prisoners of war, for men missing in action, for sons and fathers and brothers whose lot is known to Thee alone—and for loved ones who lonely wait the day of reuniting. Hear our prayer that they may have bread by day, rest by night, relief in suffering at all times, and in the long and lonely vigil the awareness of Thy presence.

Guide the leaders of the world in the ways of peace. Lead us to the time when the knowledge of Thee and the values of Thy kingdom guide all men and nations.

And to Thee shall be all the praise and glory. Amen.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 28, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 28, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9271) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

The bill was then referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Subsequently, Mr. ΜΟΝΤΟYA, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 92-243) thereon, which was printed.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 28, 1971, be approved.

CKVII—1425—Part 17

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

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees, with the exception of the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, which I have been requested to except be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 230, 231, and 234.

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

## STATUS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENT CLINICS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to express the sense of Congress relative to certain activities of Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have before us a concurrent resolution that requires that the Public Health Service hospitals and clinics system remain open and continue to perform their responsibilities through fiscal year 1972.

The resolution is made necessary, Mr. President, by the administration's plans to make basic changes in this congressionally mandate system, including the manner in which health services are provided to Federal beneficiaries.

We first heard of these plans through insistent rumors that HEW planned to close these facilities. Later, the President's budget for fiscal year 1972 reflected a radical decrease in funds and staff which gave credence to the rumors.

Together with 29 of our colleagues, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 on February 11 in order to give the Senate an opportunity to review the administration's plans. Since that date, the Health Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has held hearings on these matters.

We have found that the administration does intend to make profound changes in the Public Health Service hospital system. Plans are in preparation to turn the facilities over to the

community control. Moreover, while closure of the facilities is not the goal of the plans, the administration is unwilling to rule out closure of some facilities.

Mr. President, the Public Health Service hospital system is one of the oldest and most venerable health institutions in America. It represents one of the earliest attempts by the Federal Government to respond to special health problems among a segment of the American people—namely the merchant seaman. These Public Health Service hospitals and clinics have over the years broadened their services and have established affiliations and associations with other institutions in their communities to assure that they offer the best medical care possible. They have become community landmarks in the areas they serve.

We understand that problems of utilization and efficiency exist in these facilities, and we do not wish to restrain creative responses to these problems.

However, the Congress should insist that any plan for the hospitals and clinics, first, assure that the Federal beneficiaries committed to HEW's charges are provided accessible, high-quality health care at a cost comparable to that currently paid by the beneficiary and by the Government; and second, assure maximum use of these institutions for providing health care to the community in which they are located.

The resolution before us would constrain the administration to a schedule that allows the Senate to review with the Secretary of HEW detailed proposals for each of these facilities in light of these concerns.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Congress must emphasize its right to review administration actions of this magnitude. The General Counsel of the General Accounting Office has indicated that the proposed changes are contrary to the intent of current legislation. Nevertheless, it was clear from the administration's testimony that these plans went a long way before Congress was informed or consulted. The budget has never been changed—it still reflects, for example, a cut in full-time positions from 6,242 in fiscal year 1971 to 970 in fiscal year 1972. Frankly, Mr. President, I do not see how the hospitals can operate until the end of this calendar year—as administration has promised—with these low staffing levels. Every concrete indication I see indicates the administration intends to proceed with their plans with or without congressional consent.

Moreover, it was clear from our hear-