

for the term expiring July 1, 1974, vice Francis A. O'Neill, Jr.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1975, vice Glenn T. Seaborg.

William Offutt Doub, of Maryland, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1976, vice Theos J. Thompson, deceased.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 21, 1971:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Col. Walter B. Staudt, XXXX FG, Texas Air National Guard, from further consideration for appointment as a brigadier general, Reserve of the Air Force. His name was submitted along with 20 other nominees for appointment to Reserve of the Air Force general officer grades on April 19, 1971.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 1971:

IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Clinton D. Upham, to be captain, and ending Sydney R. Withers, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 19, 1971.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 21, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord God will help us: Therefore we shall not be confounded.—Isaiah 50:7.

Almighty God, our Father, amid the disturbances of these demanding days, unsure as we are about many things, help us to be sure of Thee. In these times which try our souls and tempt our spirits as we endeavor to make our Nation safe for democracy and secure for freedom, we pray for courage to keep our spiritual foundations strong knowing that without Thee all our labor is in vain.

Bless Thou our President, our Speaker, and our Members of Congress as they face the difficult duties of these disturbing days. May Thy wisdom make them wise, Thy strength keep them strong, and Thy love lead them in the paths of righteousness that our Nation may continue to be a channel through which liberty and justice can flow to all people. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4590. An act relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore; and

H.R. 9388. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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. 2296. An act to amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9417, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. FLYNT, OBEY, YATES, GALIFIANAKIS, MAHON, MCDADE, WYATT, DEL CLAWSON, and Bow.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE TO BE NAMED "WILLIAM H. BATES"

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the perusal of my colleagues a resolution petitioning the Secretary of the Navy to name a nuclear submarine in memory of the late Congressman from Massachusetts, William H. Bates, passed by the Massachusetts House of Representatives on June 22, 1971.

Congressman Bates served in the House for 19 years and was the ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee. As a member of the Massachusetts delegation, I concur with the sentiments expressed in the resolution and ask that all Members who knew and remember William Bates direct their attention to this resolution.

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO NAME A NUCLEAR SUBMARINE IN MEMORY OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. BATES

Whereas, Congressman William H. Bates of Salem, Massachusetts, Representative in Congress, 81st to 91st, died June 22, 1969; and

Whereas, Congressman Bates was educated at Salem High School, Worcester Academy, Brown University and Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; and

Whereas, He rose from rank of Apprentice Seaman to rank of Captain in the United States Navy; and

Whereas, At the time of his death, he was a ranking member of the House Armed Services

Committee and the second ranking minority member of the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy; and

Whereas, He served his country with honor, distinction and dedication in World War II and while a member of Congress; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Secretary of the Navy to name a Nuclear Submarine in memory of Congressman William H. Bates; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9844, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AT BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce my intention to offer an amendment to H.R. 9844, the military construction bill, when it is considered by the House. My amendment would delete from the measure the authorization for further military construction at Bolling Air Force Base in the District of Columbia. Bolling Air Force has not had a significant mission for many years now. The land on which the base sits is located in the Anacostia section of Washington, D.C., an area devastated by serious housing and economic problems. The Bolling Air Force Base site is one of the few tracts of undeveloped land left in the District of Columbia, and it offers a unique opportunity for the building of housing and for economic development for the people of the city generally, and for the long-forgotten residents of Anacostia in particular. For several years, the District government, the National Capital Planning Commission, and community groups in the city, with the encouragement of the Federal Government, have been planning for civilian use of the facility. Authorization of further military construction would seriously undermine all of the planning that has been done, striking a serious blow at efforts to provide a decent environment and new civilian job opportunities for the people of the city.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 8630, TO EXTEND AND EXPAND PROGRAMS FOR NURSES TRAINING FACILITIES

Mr. STAGGERS. I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be permitted to appoint two additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 8630.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints as additional conferees: Messrs. PREYER of North Carolina and CARTER.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 8629, EXPANDING PROGRAMS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL FACILITIES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be permitted to appoint two additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 8629.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints as additional conferees: Messrs. PREYER of North Carolina and CARTER.

FOOD INSPECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Special Studies Subcommittee of our Government Operations Committee, which I am honored to head as chairman opened hearings yesterday inquiring into the methods by which inspections of food retailing establishments are made in the District of Columbia, and the effectiveness of procedures by which adherence to sanitary standards is enforced in the Nation's Capital.

As Members may have read, the press coverage indicates serious violations of health standards. But I take this time to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the Special Studies Subcommittee is not interested in publicity but only in ferreting out the facts. If there are deficiencies in the law or regulations covering the sanitation of restaurants and other food establishments or if enforcement has been ignored, certainly then we want to find out to give protection to the consuming public, including thousands of visitors in Washington each year.

The Special Studies Subcommittee has no preconceived conclusions. Our final report will be drawn in the form of recommendations when the hearings are completed. I wish to assure the House membership this subcommittee will proceed on this matter with complete objectivity.

PRESIDENTIAL VISIT TO CHINA

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as is true of most Members of this body, I have applauded the efforts of the President to seek means of normalizing relations with China, one bold step of which is the planned Presidential visit to that nation.

The speculation—indeed the hope—is widespread that the ultimate visit by the President to the People's Republic of China relates strongly and directly to a solution to the war in Indochina.

I sincerely hope that the aura of optimism created by the President's announcement will not lull anyone into forgetting the urgency of our disengagement from Indochina. Altogether too many die each day; altogether too many American servicemen become ruined for life from the disastrous and cruel hard drug environment; and altogether too many suffer as American POW's or as families of POW's. The situation demands new, fresh American initiatives at Paris now, not after an indefinitely scheduled Presidential visit to China.

I would hope, too, and assume that the President is fully sensitive to the fact that the strongest ideological and logistic ties are not between North Vietnam and China, but between North Vietnam and the U.S.S.R. Moscow is in a much stronger position to help resolve the conflict. I think the President would be well advised to arrive in Peking following a visit to Moscow.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the activities of another subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, that of the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, which I am privileged to chair and which is now carrying on hearings on the operations of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

This is the program for which we just appropriated \$698 million the other day. It began with \$60 million in 1969 and has been multiplied 10 times since then. The authorization for 1973 is \$1.75 billion.

Yesterday our committee heard about the activities under this program in Alabama. Today we discussed the Florida experience. It is clear that many questions have been raised about this program. We of course are not finished at the present time. We are not now going to reach any final conclusion. We believe that all aspects should be examined and they are being examined. We believe that in view of responsibility of our committee and the House for guaranteeing the proper expenditure of American tax funds, we are doing a responsible job, and we hope that all Members will follow the activities of this subcommittee.

COMMENDATION OF WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEES ON SPECIAL STUDIES AND LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take just a moment to affirm the statements made by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) whose respective subcommittees are doing very good jobs.

One is in the field of meat inspection, which is atrocious. In the District of Columbia the witnesses who have appeared have testified to the point that people have practically no protection here in many of the restaurants and other places that serve food. This is something which needs to be brought out in the open.

In the case of the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) the gentleman is going into the law enforcement assistance funds to the States. The witnesses have already testified that in different areas there has been in the past a great deal of waste and inefficiency.

While neither is ready to make a report at this time, I would say they are doing a valuable piece of work for the benefit of the Congress and the people of the United States.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7109, NASA AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction and facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-368)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, 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 amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development", for the following programs:

- (1) Apollo, \$612,200,000;
- (2) Space flight operations, \$702,775,000;
- (3) Advanced missions, \$5,500,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$112,800,000;
- (5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$301,500,000;
- (6) Space applications, \$185,000,000;
- (7) Launch vehicle procurement, \$146,100,000;

(8) Aeronautical research and technology, \$122,500,000;

(9) Space research and technology, \$75,105,000;

(10) Nuclear power and propulsion, \$70,720,000 of which \$58,000,000 is to be used only for NERVA engine development and related nuclear propulsion activities;

(11) Trucking and data acquisition, \$264,000,000;

(12) Technology utilization, \$5,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Modernization of the 40 x 80-foot Wind Tunnel, Ames Research Center, \$6,500,000;

(2) Centaur Modifications to Titan III launch area, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$10,700,000;

(3) Alterations to Launch Complex 17, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$4,500,000;

(4) Space Shuttle Facilities, as follows: Main engine sea level test stands (2), Mississippi Test Facility, \$11,000,000;

Main engine altitude test facility, Air Force Arnold Engineering Development Center, \$2,000,000;

Auxiliary propulsion test facilities, undesignated location, \$1,500,000;

Thermal protection system development facilities, Ames Research Center, \$3,000,000, Langley Research Center, \$500,000, Manned Spacecraft Center, \$1,200,000, Undesignated location, \$800,000;

(5) Power Plant Replacements, Goldstone, Calif., \$370,000, and Santiago, Chile, \$230,000;

(6) AST Ground Station, Western Europe, \$500,000;

(7) Facility rehabilitations and modifications, various locations, \$10,000,000;

(8) Expansion of the Visitors Information Center, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$2,100,000;

(9) Facility Planning and Design, \$3,500,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$693,350,000, of which not to exceed \$529,916,000 to be available for personnel and related costs.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and sup-

port services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$100,000.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby the total of any of the amounts prescribed by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward of 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (9) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and

Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of amounts for personnel and related costs pursuant to section 1(c) to exceed amounts authorized for such costs.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such

individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(c) (1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

SEC. 7. Section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476), is amended as follows: (1) subsection (a) is hereby repealed, and (2) subsections (b), (c), and (d) are renumbered as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1972".

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
CARL T. CURTIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management 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:

The NASA request for Fiscal Year 1972 totaled \$3,271,350,000. The House authorized \$3,433,080,000 and the Senate amendment authorized \$3,280,850,000. The Committee of Conference agrees to a total authorization of \$3,354,950,000.

The points in disagreement and the conference resolution of them are as follows:

1. The House authorized \$745,275,000 for Space Flight Operations, which is an increase of \$72,500,000 over the NASA request of \$672,775,000. This would allow for \$15 million

for Skylab rescue capability, \$30 million for studies of a second Skylab flight or Saturn IB applications flights, \$25 million for additional shuttle development work and \$2.5 million for additional shuttle experiment definition.

The Senate amendment authorized \$672,775,000, which is the exact amount of the NASA request.

The Conference substitutes \$702,775,000 for Space Flight Operations, which is \$30 million more than the NASA request; \$15 million is for the Skylab rescue capability and \$15 million is for the space shuttle.

2. The House authorized \$10 million for the Advanced Missions program, which is \$8,500,000 more than the NASA request of \$1,500,000. These funds are for studies for information retrieval, equipment retrieval, payload handling, large equipment erection and handling, orbit analyses, and lunar resource and base utilization.

The Senate amendment authorized \$1,500,000, which is the exact amount of the NASA request.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$5,500,000 for Advanced Missions, which is \$4 million more than the NASA request.

3. NASA requested \$110,300,000 for the Physics and Astronomy Program. The House authorized \$112,800,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 for additional support of the scientific effort which utilizes sounding rockets and balloons.

The Senate approved the amount of the NASA request.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision.

4. NASA requested \$311,500,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration Program, which included \$30,000,000 for the Outer Planets Missions using Thermoelectric Outer Planets Spacecraft (TOPS) for the Grand Tour missions in the latter half of the decade of the 1970s.

The House approved the full amount of the NASA request.

The Senate approved only \$10,000,000 for the Outer Planets Missions and therefore authorized \$291,500,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration Program, a reduction of \$20,000,000.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$301,500,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration Program, including \$20,000,000 to support initiation of the Grand Tour missions.

The Conference agrees that NASA should examine the TOPS concept with the view to designing a less sophisticated, less expensive spacecraft for carrying out the Grand Tour missions in the latter half of the decade of the 1970s, and to consider subsequent opportunities to explore the outer planets during the 1980s and 1990s using vehicles incorporating the NERVA engine.

5. NASA requested \$182,500,000 for the Space Applications Program.

The House approved the full amount of the request.

The Senate authorized \$185,000,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 to support additional aircraft-type Earth Resources Survey pilot projects and data analysis in cooperation with appropriate government agencies, industry, and universities.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

6. The House authorized \$134,500,000 for Aeronautical Research and Technology, which is an increase of \$24,500,000 over the NASA request of \$110,000,000. The House increase is designed to deal with a number of serious problems in aviation including noise abatement, safety, the need for a short take-off and landing aircraft system, and the need for new, younger individuals in aeronautics research and development. A proviso was included that none of the funds in this area would be used to finance research with respect to construction of airports on lakes or their tributaries.

The Senate authorized \$110,000,000 because it did not agree with the necessity for the House increases; however, it does support a strong national aeronautics research and development program.

The Conference substitute authorized \$122,500,000. Flexibility is granted to NASA for the allocation of the \$12,500,000 increase; however, the allocation should be made in keeping with the serious nature of problems identified by both the House and Senate dealing with noise abatement, congestion, safety and the need to attract new, younger scientists and engineers into aeronautical research and development. The restrictive language on airport research was not included.

7. NASA requested \$27,720,000 for the Nuclear Power and Propulsion program, of which \$15 million was for nuclear propulsion.

The House authorized a total of \$67,620,000, adding \$39,900,000 for nuclear propulsion, making a total for nuclear propulsion of \$54,900,000.

The Senate authorized \$70,720,000 for the Nuclear Power and Propulsion program, and added language to the Act which provides that \$58 million of the \$70,720,000 is to be used only for NERVA engine development and related nuclear propulsion activities.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provisions.

8. The House authorized \$6,000,000 for the Technology Utilization program, which is \$2,000,000 more than the NASA request. The increase was designed to allow for increased effort across a number of areas, each of which is intended to enhance and increase the transfer of NASA's advanced technology into the public domain.

The Senate authorized \$4,000,000, which is the same amount as the NASA request, while at the same time agreeing with the House that this is an important activity. The Senate would maintain the program at the same funding level as for FY 1971.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$5,000,000 for a number of the purposes identified by the House. Flexibility is granted to NASA but emphasis should be maintained on transferring technology to attack urgent national problems.

9. The House approved \$58,630,000 for construction of facilities, an increase of \$2,330,000 over the NASA request of \$56,300,000. This increase provided for the construction of a Space Information and Education Center at John F. Kennedy Space Center, Cape Kennedy, Florida.

The Senate approved the NASA request. Additionally, the Senate adopted a modification to this section (Sec. 1b) to specify the facility construction project authorized, and the estimated cost thereof, which limits it to its stated function and justified need, rather than, as in past years, specifying a sum of money for various NASA locations without designating the facilities authorized.

The Conference substitute approves the expansion of the existing Visitors Information Center at the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Florida, to accommodate the anticipated visitor loads at the Kennedy Center. The total amount approved for construction of facilities is \$58,400,000, including \$2,100,000 for the expansion of the Visitors Information Center. The Conference also adopts the Senate legislative language for Section 1(b) of the Act specifying the construction of facility projects.

10. The House increased the NASA request of \$697,350,000 for Research and Program Management by \$9,500,000 for a total authorization of \$706,850,000.

The Senate made a reduction of \$16,000,000 for an authorization of \$681,350,000. Additionally, language was included in the bill stipulating a limitation of not more than \$517,916,000 for personnel and related costs.

The Conference substitute approves a total

amount of \$693,350,000 for Research and Program Management and includes language stipulating that not more than \$529,916,000 can be utilized for personnel and related costs.

11. The Committee of Conference agrees to a change in Section 2 to conform with the changes resulting from the Conference substitute for Section 1(b).

12. The Senate modified Section 4 of the bill with an addition which restricts the amount authorized by the bill for personnel and related costs. Also any reprogramming for increased expenditures for personnel and related costs shall be subject to the approval of the Congress in accordance with the reprogramming procedure specified in that section.

The House had no provision on this subject.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate modification.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
CARL T. CURTIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH E. KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE DOES NOT OVERLOOK ACUTE NEED IN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chairman JOHN BLATNIK and the House Committee on Public Works for the timely action taken today to report out a new bill to extend the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

Of particular interest to me was the committee's action to increase the authorization in section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act from \$500 million to \$800 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years to expand support for redevelopment areas.

The new bill provides for not less than 25 percent or more than 35 percent of the total authorization—\$800 million per year—to be used for short-term relief in areas that are experiencing high unemployment.

This will serve to fill, to some limited degree, the vacuum created by the Presidential veto of the original bill which contained the accelerated public works proposal.

Chairman BLATNIK and his committee have acted with dispatch without ignoring the need for immediate assistance to areas of high unemployment. The increased authorization will beef up the Economic Development Administration's ability to cope with the mounting problem of unemployment.

ANNUAL ROLLCALL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night, July 15 to be exact, was a time that will long burn in the memory of man as a truly historic evening. First came the big GOP machine's swift destruction of the Democrats in the annual Rollcall Congressional Baseball Game at RFK Stadium.

Hardly had the spikes and gloves been packed away, the postgame interviews completed, and the hapless Democrats swept from the field, when President Nixon electrified the world with his dramatic announcement of the breakthrough in our relations with Mainland China.

I have written the President commending him on his bold initiative with China, and also on his timing. Only a true sports fan would have waited for the conclusion of the Congressional Baseball Game before taking the airwaves with his most welcomed news.

Not to belabor the report on the baseball game, Mr. Speaker, but I must report the score was 7 to 3; it was the eighth straight win for the Republicans; and the prospects for the future are for continued GOP supremacy.

BOB MICHEL, the wily veteran chucker from Peoria, again tasted victory and made the baseball world forget Vida Blue for an hour or so. The big bats of veterans "VINEGAR BEEND" MIZELL and DON CLAUSEN, combined with the good glove work of younger players such as BILL FRENZEL and BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., and the hustle of JOHN ROUSSELOT and many others, has caused the press of the country to label this club as a young dynasty.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP is ready for 1972.

BELGIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Belgium are today observing their Independence Day. It was on July 21, 1831, that King Leopold I swore allegiance to the constitution of the nation that had but recently secured its freedom.

The Belgians, who had been ruled by Spain, Austria, France, and the Netherlands, have maintained their independence for 140 years, but they have experienced many difficulties. Their precarious position as a buffer state was not changed by their new status and the little nation continued to provide a battlefield for other countries.

When the forces of the German Empire invaded Luxembourg and Belgium at the beginning of World War I, King Albert I declared that "Belgium is a nation, not a road." While the Belgium army could not turn back the forces of its powerful neighbor, it was able, with help from the French, to slow down the drive toward Paris. Led by King Albert and inspired by Cardinal Mercier, the heroic resistance of the Belgians aroused the admiration of people throughout the world.

Belgium was again invaded, subjugated, and occupied during World War

II, when National Socialist Germany brutally attacked it, along with Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The Nazis were eventually defeated, just as the forces of Kaiser Wilhelm II had been finally beaten a generation earlier.

For centuries the people of Belgium were the pawns of their more powerful neighbors and their country was the property of alien dynasties. In our own day they have tasted the bitter dregs of defeat and have seen the lights of freedom extinguished as an arrogant totalitarian regime occupied their land.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether appropriate that Belgium's Independence Day should be celebrated at the midpoint of Captive Nations Week. Belgium has been fortunate in that it was able to emerge from the ignominious position of a captive nation under National Socialist tyranny to the proud status of a free country. May God speed the day when present-day captive nations will be able to throw off the shackles of Communist tyranny.

EXPENDITURES FROM CONTINGENT FUND FOR ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 457) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 457

Resolved, That (a) until otherwise provided by law, the Committee on House Administration may, as the committee considers appropriate, fix and adjust from time to time, by order of the committee, the amounts of allowances (including the terms, conditions, and other provisions pertaining to those allowances) within the following categories:

(1) for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia—allowances for clerk hire, postage stamps, stationery, telephone and telegraph and other communications, official office space and official office expenses in the congressional district represented (including, as applicable, a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia), official telephone services in the congressional district represented, and travel and mileage to and from the congressional district represented; and

(2) for the standing committees, the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, the majority and minority whips, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster of the House of Representatives—allowances for postage stamps, stationery, and telephone and telegraph and other communications.

(b) The contingent fund of the House of Representatives is made available to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 198]		
Abourezk	Flynt	Mitchell
Abzug	Foley	Murphy, N.Y.
Adams	Gallagher	Pepper
Alexander	Gibbons	Pike
Anderson, Ill.	Halpern	Purcell
Baker	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Blanton	Hébert	Runnels
Celler	Hosmer	Ruppe
Clay	Hungate	Satterfield
Conyers	Jarman	Scheuer
Culver	Kee	Schmitz
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Sikes
Dellums	Kyros	Sisk
Diggs	Long, La.	Smith, N.Y.
Dingell	McCulloch	Stokes
Donohue	McKinney	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	Mayne	Yatron
Esch	Melcher	Zion

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 9922

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file the report on H.R. 9922, to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9270

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 9270) making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

EXPENDITURES FROM CONTINGENT FUND FOR ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us, House Resolution 457, is very simple and very understandable. It provides that until otherwise provided for by law the Committee on House Administration may as it considers appropriate fix and adjust from time to time by order of the committee amounts of allowances for Members of the House in a number of areas.

The fundamental reason for this is to spare the House the time consumed each session in considering eight or 10 privileged resolutions on these various subjects. For example, when the postal rate

increase recently went into effect, the committee computed the percentage increase in postage rates and brought forth a resolution increasing the Members' postal allowances by that percentage increase. After the matter was carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Accounts and the full Committee on House Administration, valuable time of the House was spent in discussing the privileged resolution on that routine housekeeping matter. House Resolution 457 would eliminate the need for coming to the floor a number of times each session with privileged resolutions on postal and other routine allowances.

There are two inherent safeguards in this resolution. As the report indicates, it is the intention of the committee to keep the House informed through the RECORD of its actions on the day following any such action. Of course, all authorized allowances are dependent upon appropriations, which come under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee chaired by our distinguished colleague from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS).

It is a perfectly straightforward resolution, Mr. Speaker, and one which I believe the great majority of the Members will support in order to save their time and in order to modernize a really ancient and absurd practice of bringing to the floor every bit of minutia with respect to the routine daily operations of this side of the Congress.

I shall be glad during the brief time I hope this debate lasts to answer any questions, but I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) for purposes of debate only.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, if I might have the attention of the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, we had a great deal of talk in committee about this particular resolution.

It is my understanding—and I would like to establish this as a matter of legislative history—that whatever action, if this resolution should pass, is taken will be automatically printed and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following day; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. I would like to reiterate the statement which I made a minute or so ago and point out to the Members of the House the language which appears on page 3 of the report which indicates that the Committee on House Administration did discuss this, as the gentleman says, at considerable length. The language says that following any action, such action will be published and explained in full in the following day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is our intention so to do.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. First, let me go on record by saying that I do oppose this resolution but not without some soul searching. I have the greatest confidence in the integrity and ability of the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the sub-

committee and I would certainly hate for this to be considered as some sort of personality thing, because it is not.

I feel that the best interest of the taxpayers could be served by a restraining influence of debate, if necessary, and certainly floor action on certain items.

What this resolution does is provide that the House Administration Committee have the authority to set clerk hire allowances. This means the total amount you will have to pay your employees, the amount that you will have to pay for postage, the amount that you will have to pay for stationery. What does that mean? That means your stationery account can be increased at the discretion of our committee without floor action. I think the figure now is \$3,000 for stationery. I have forgotten the exact figure.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The figure for stationery is \$3,500 a year. I might point out that all of the Members of the House currently expend the full amount of that allowance.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the subcommittee chairman.

Also, this resolution encompasses your telephone and telegraph allowances which will be set without floor action. Also office space in your district will be set by the committee. This means that if you now have one official office in an official building—a GSA building—and at the present time you may also lease space if there is none available through GSA or have two offices—this allows our committee to fix the number of offices that you have now and also increase the rental available to you to pay for this.

I am not against paying a reasonable amount for rent. It is just that I think that the taxpayers' interest is best protected by the scrutiny that comes from the searchlight of public disclosure on the floor of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As the gentleman knows, the current statutory allowance for district offices is \$2,400 per annum for offices not located in Federal buildings.

Under the new Postal Corporation, if the Post Office Department occupies 55 percent of a Federal building, title to that building has been transferred from GSA to the Postal Corporation. I understand that GSA will pay the rent for congressional offices located in buildings which have been transferred to the Postal Corporation. I might point out that at the moment the average Member expends \$1,069 of the \$2,400 allowance. In many instances, as the gentleman has pointed out, in the high rate metropolitan areas some Members are having to spend out of their own pockets up to \$3,000 in addition to their allowance. It depends, of course, on the rents in a particular area.

I might point out that the Members—

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

And I thank the gentleman for yielding further to me.

I might point out that the Members have been extraordinarily responsible in the use of this allowance. You will note that barely half of the amount on the average is used.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman.

One of the things that will be included here in addition to the number of offices you can have in your district, and the amount of money that will be paid for rent, as well as the number of your trips home. When I first came to the Congress, which has not been very long ago, my recollection is that we were entitled to two trips a year home at the taxpayers' expense. That has been expanded two or three times since then to the point where now each Member is entitled to one trip home per month at Government expense.

Some of the Members have asked, and there are some resolutions, at least, that are pending now, that would increase this amount still more.

So all of these matters that I am discussing now will be within the jurisdiction of the committee. The committee can act upon them, and I predict the committee will act. I think it is very good for the Members, and it makes it very comfortable for them, but I think it is very bad for the taxpayers. I think that some restraints are indicated, and I think that I for one, as a member of the committee, do not want to take the blame for all that goes on for all of the Members.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the Members of the House that this discussion is getting off the track when it turns to the need or lack of need for more office clerks, and other allowances. The real question, the gut issue here and now, is the turning over to a little handful of 13 Members the ability to fix all the allowances without any further approval or disapproval by the House. That is the issue before us.

I do not understand this sudden burst of speed to make life more comfortable for all the Members of the House.

Mr. DICKINSON. I might say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that if you want more clerk hire, a larger postage allowance, stationery, telephone, and office space, or more offices and more trips home, then vote for the resolution. If you do not want that, then do not vote for it.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is opposing the resolution would then insist that the question as to whether or not the amount of postage allowance that each Member gets should

be a subject which the entire Congress can decide, is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. I see nothing wrong with it. I think there are many small housekeeping chores that need not come to the floor.

Mr. PODELL. But that is the position that the gentleman takes?

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes, but you could consider that in connection with other minute examples, but when you consider clerk hire, that is no small matter.

Mr. PODELL. But the gentleman believes that whether or not we increase the postage allowance for each Member of the House by \$100 is a matter for the entire Congress to decide, or whether or not that should be within the hands of one committee.

Mr. DICKINSON. In answer to the question put by the gentleman from New York, I think it is sort of a foolish thing to have to come here on minuscule things such as postage stamps so as to raise the amount of the postage allowance commensurate with the amount that the postage rates have gone up. I think it possibly unnecessary, but on the other hand some of the things in here contain a great deal of money, and should be left to affirmative action of the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee's recommendation. House Resolution 457 represents a significant step toward equipping Congress to exert its rightful influence in relation to the other branches of the Government. I welcome the changes proposed here because I am tired, as I am sure most of my colleagues are tired, of hearing this body referred to as the "separate but unequal branch." The worst of that title is that we have often deserved it.

This bill will authorize the Committee on House Administration to fix and adjust a number of housekeeping allowances without bringing them to the floor for item-by-item approval. We all know the temptation to indulge in prolonged bickering on the floor on matters of housekeeping and the temptation to "grandstand" a little. Public access to the information will be assured because the committee chairman and the subcommittee chairman have agreed that the decisions of House Administration will be published promptly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to note. At all times the expenditures will be under the ultimate control of this House.

As the responsibilities of Congressmen change and increase, we expect corresponding changes in our capability to meet the problem. The committee's bill will allow these adjustments to be made on a continuing basis without having to tie up valuable floor time to debate them. The flexibility of this approach is not only attractive, it is essential if we are to preserve the necessary role of the legislative branch against the continuous encroachments of the executive.

There is no question that Congress has allowed itself to be outstaffed and outgunned by the executive branch for years, even for decades. The executive branch, with our permission and our appropriations, has become the most significant force in the conception, development and enactment of new substantive programs. This is not right. The stark fact is that neither Congress nor its committees has the capability—without total reliance on the informational and analytical resources of the Executive—of developing coherent Federal programs, or of effectively overseeing them.

I want a strong and more effective Congress. What if Congress had equipped itself before the 1960's to analyze and weigh the underlying policies proposed by the Executive? Foreign policy assumptions that we now know were questionable went unchallenged by a Congress used to acquiescing to the administration. We might not have avoided this tragic war, but the effort might have changed the nature of the conflict.

Under the simple concept of checks and balances, the people are ill served by a legislative branch that neglects its obligation to counter the other branches. Competition between the executive and legislative branches is inevitable, and must exist without regard to political party in control of either branch. The question is: Will we equip ourselves to hold up our end?

The proposals before us today have been tried and found helpful in a number of State jurisdictions. In the assembly of my home State of California, for instance, a rules committee, with much the same functions as the House Administration Committee has been delegated responsibility for determining, on a continuing basis, the number and compensation of staff personnel, the allotment of office space and equipment, postage, phone, and most other housekeeping activities.

The assembly rules committee is, of course, controlled by the majority party, but it has acted responsibly to strengthen the legislature without partisan favoritism.

The key to the California Rules Committee's success is the degree of consultation with the leadership of both parties that precedes its actions. The spirit of cooperation in which the committee operates has had a positive effect on the quality of the staff effort throughout the assembly. Unqualified people are no longer selected for assembly staff positions because of careful, bipartisan review.

California's use of a system such as proposed in House Resolution 457 has freed the assembly's floor for more important concerns, and has beefed up the assembly's ability to effectively compete with the Governor. I will remind my colleagues that the California Legislature was recently rated the most effective in the Nation, and I can tell you that improvement in effectiveness came in recent years as the rules committee provided the necessary support for its members.

But California has not been the only State to recognize the value of delegating its housekeeping responsibilities to a

body able to cope with problems after study in depth on a basis if necessary, rather than crowding housekeeping matters on the floor calendars. Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Texas have all adopted procedures more or less the same as House Resolution 457 proposes for the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will capitalize on the experience of our State governments, that is what federalism is all about. I urge my colleagues to join with the committee in enhancing the independence and stature of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, this House of Representatives established the House Committee on Administration as the housekeeping committee for the House of Representatives, and it is entirely appropriate that this House give to the committee they established authority commensurate with their responsibility.

The truth is that the vast majority of the Members of this House want this committee to have this authority. The problem is the majority, or maybe too many at least, of the Members of this House are unwilling to do something on the record that might be interpreted as having done something for themselves.

Let us face up to this thing like men. If any man who sits in this House was a member of that committee, as 25 Members are at the present time, they would resent the implication that they would ever act except in the best interests of the House of Representatives or the taxpayers. I would if I still sat as a member of this committee, as I once did.

The idea that turning over to this committee will of itself automatically bring about inordinate increases in some of the allowances available to us is without merit, because 2 years ago this House gave to the Committee on House Administration when I was chairman of one of its subcommittees the authority to establish your allowances for furniture and office equipment and, gentlemen, those allowances have not been increased since that time because the need has not been demonstrated. But let us think about it in a little bit different way.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. What the gentleman just said about office equipment and furniture allowances is not only true, but the fact is that thanks to that responsibility and the wonderful work the gentleman from Louisiana did during his chairmanship, we embarked on a leasing program which is saving the Government literally hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman for that action.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Let me make one statement and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The situation is simply this. Why should we in the legislative branch of the Government give a blank check to the executive branch of the Government and to the judicial branch of the Government to establish their allowances in these same areas—for telephone, for telegraph, for travel—for all these other things that they find absolutely necessary—and then put restraints on ourselves that do not allow us to do exactly the same thing? It is just that simple.

Anybody who does not want this money can turn it back, as in some instances I have been doing, and in some instances many of you probably have been doing. But every one of these districts are different. Every man operates his office in a somewhat different way. So what applies to one is not necessarily to be applied to the others. We have rural districts, we have urban districts, we have inner-city districts, districts have grown in the last 10 years. This committee is responsible. They are the duly constituted housekeeping committee. They are responsible people sent here by their voters. They will, as they have, act responsibly, and they will not act under the table. What they will do will be known.

My friends, we will be making a terrible mistake if we do not let them have this authority.

I am happy now to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is not every standing committee of the House of Representatives a housekeeping committee?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No, in no respect. Only to the extent of their own internal operations are they a housekeeping committee. They are in no way a housekeeping committee for 435 Members of the House of Representatives. They are oversight committees.

Mr. GROSS. They are housekeeping committees in relation to the entire Federal Government; are they not?

Mr. WAGGONNER. They are housekeeping committees to the extent that the House Committee on Administration gives them authority, but to no other degree.

My friends, I urge you to stand up like men and vote for something you know ought to be voted for.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), a member of the committee.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to suggest to other Members what they should do on this resolution. I know what I am going to do. I am going to vote against it on a very basic philosophy or principle. It is a matter that I think such things involving postage and involving stationery and involving telephone calls and other communication services, involving office space and district offices and office services, involving clerk hire and allowances and the number of trips for the Members and staff—I think these are of interest to the people of America, the taxpayers, the people who will be required to pick up the check.

Mr. Speaker, I have no reflections whatsoever to make on this committee. I am proud to be a member of it, although it is not popular to be on this committee.

Either we give goodies or we do not, and if we do not, we are not very popular, but this is a matter of principle as to whether or not these matters should be handled in the relative secrecy of a committee room and later published, the following day or in the following issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or whether they should be resolved on the floor as most other matters are for the Congress of this Nation.

The committee has not in the past been penurious in any sense of the word. I recall that 13 years ago, when I came to the Congress, we received one roundtrip a year travel allowance, and then it went to three, and then to five, and now it is one roundtrip per month while in session. I do not think that is penurious or miserly or stingy on the part of the House. But that matter was publicly resolved. I think the same thing applies to the number of persons on the payroll.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, speaking of the roundtrips to the districts, I am not indicating that perhaps we need more—I do not know—but does the gentleman from Ohio know what the Legislature of Ohio allows its members?

Mr. DEVINE. I have no idea.

Mr. HAYS. It is one roundtrip per week.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if we think that is a meritorious idea for this House, we should bring it to the floor and let the Members decide, but I do not know why 25 Members should act on behalf of the 435, and do it in relative secrecy. The committee points out that on the day following the hearing the action will be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is after the fact. But it is a matter of principle, and I think it is a matter of principle that we should have to stand up and be counted on in a roll-call vote.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

I oppose the resolution for the reasons set forth by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON). I also wish to be associated with the position which will be set forth by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD). I regret there is not more time to debate this issue. It seems strange to me that with all the talk we hear about the public's right to know, we propose to hide from the public the matter of our allowances, some of which are already too generous.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me say I firmly believe that Members of Congress should be adequately paid. Equally Members of Congress ought to have adequate allowances for the proper operation of their

offices and for the proper conduct of their responsibilities as Members of the House of Representatives.

I believe, however, those standards in pay and allowances can be better achieved by the method that we have used all the time that I have served. I believe that in the case of pay we could have done it more properly under the procedure that was in effect prior to the procedure we have at the present time. I feel the question of allowances can be properly handled under existing procedure—not under the proposed procedure of House Resolution 457.

Mr. Speaker, I think the present system has worked. With few exceptions the amounts of the various allowances in my judgment are adequate today. They certainly are infinitely more generous than they have been over the past years. In other words, the House, by the procedure we have at the present time, has increased the number of trips back to the districts where the Congress pays the bill.

The House, under the present procedure, has adequately increased the number of units allowable for telephone and telegraph services.

The present system has achieved the objectives which I believe are desirable—adequate pay and adequate allowances.

There are some pitfalls that every Member ought to be warned about in respect to this resolution. Members are turning over to 25 Members the responsibility that 435 Members ought to have. If by chance the committee makes a mistake, those who turned the responsibility over to them will have to bear the responsibility for any errors.

What are the possibilities? We must recognize that what happens in the committee room is not nearly as exposed to the press or to the public as what happens on the floor of the House. Is it not paradoxical that we are demanding more public opportunity to see what goes on in many, many areas, and on this we are in effect changing the rules so there is less public exposure?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. On that point I respectfully argue that the gentleman is in error. Under the present procedure all of these matters are privileged. There has been in the past no history of public hearings on them, and no advance notice in the RECORD, as I assure my distinguished friend there will be in the future. The activities in the future, because of the commitment which is made in the report and in this colloquy, will be better known than ever in the past, I assure the Members of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I respectfully disagree with my friend from New Jersey. The procedure is just reversed under what is recommended in the resolution.

In addition, there is no vote by the 435 Members of the House. The responsibility under this resolution falls precisely on 25 Members and cannot be revoked unless we change the provisions of this resolution.

The public information, under the proposal of the resolution, comes after the fact, not before it.

Let me point out something which happened in the Michigan Legislature quite recently. The Michigan Legislature apparently turned over to a relatively small committee broad housekeeping responsibilities. Certain actions were taken by the committee beneficial to the Members. The press did not know about it. The public did not know about it.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes, for debate purposes?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for debate only I yield the distinguished minority leader a maximum of 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was telling a story about the Michigan Legislature. The legislature gave to a very small number of its members broad housekeeping authority. This very small group went out and added some very nice extra allowances to all of the members. The members accepted them.

The difficulty was there was no publicity given to these added benefits. Finally the press found out about it. There were headlines all over the State of Michigan which condemned every member, not just the members who signed the contract for the additional benefits. The exposure to the public and to the press was very, very harmful to the legislative branch as a whole.

I fear this could happen to this House under the procedure recommended in this resolution. For that reason I am opposed to it.

I will stand up and be counted on any justifiable increase. I believe the record will indicate I have. But I want the responsibility for making that decision on my shoulders, not transferred to 25 members of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. SISK. I thank the minority leader for yielding.

I do raise one question on this. Certainly the authority given here to the Committee on House Administration in no sense relieves the full House of the responsibility for what occurs.

As a member of the Committee on Rules—and I can only speak for myself—let us say if this committee ran away with its new-found authority, then I am sure that through a resolution by a Member of the House or the Committee on Rules, that could very quickly be pulled back into line. I do not interpret this as turning over complete authority to 25 people.

Does the gentleman from Michigan agree that the final authority still rests in the House and through resolutions to the Committee on Rules there would be ample ways to correct any erroneous mistakes made?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me answer the gentleman from California.

In theory he is correct, but the practicalities of the situation are that once this authority is given to this committee, 25 Members out of 435, it will never be retrieved by the House as a whole until

and unless there is a scandal. I think the better way to avoid that scandal is to require these additional benefits be voted on in the House by each and every Member of the House. That is why I oppose this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House some of the things that this committee does now.

We have jurisdiction over all electrical and mechanical equipment. That has not run wild. We now, in the last 3 months, have had jurisdiction over the House restaurant which was subsidizing, to use the press term for Members—and I might say for the press, also, because I see as many of them down there as I do anybody else—which was subsidizing its operations to the tune of half a million dollars a year. We have reversed that, and in the last month we cut that deficit in half. I think we may wipe it out altogether.

I had on my desk last week—and I do not think I signed it and, if I did, I will take my name off it—a request for four new electric typewriters for the press corps. We furnish them, the poor taxpayers do, and not these wealthy newspapers.

I am on a parking committee and we cannot get parking space for our employees in the Capitol because we have too many parking spaces for the members of the press.

I could go on and on.

This committee has been responsible. I like to think we have been more than responsible and have picked up some of the slack around here.

I can tell you that it is not going to become irresponsible if it gets this additional housekeeping task. This is the committee that made the investigation in the Adam Clayton Powell affair. I happened to be the chairman of that subcommittee. I think we acted responsibly there. I just happen to know that the California Legislature, which was rated by a group from the press as the highest and best in the country, gives its members certain perquisites through a committee like this.

When I came here, Mr. Speaker, the Members paid their own phone bills. Some of you new Members do not know that, but we did. We have done something about that.

Who checks on the executive branch of the Government and who checks on their travel? You get on any airplane going to Europe, and if you are traveling tourist class, just walk up to the first-class section, and I promise you that 90 percent of them are members of the executive branch.

The Founding Fathers talked about a coequal system of three divisions: the judicial, the legislative, and the executive.

Does anyone think that the legislative branch is equal to the executive branch?

Do you know what I found out? I think I told the House this the other day. We are still talking about how much a com-

puter bill retrieval computer system is going to cost—and I am going to ask that it be established and ask for money for it, but do you know what the Office of Management and Budget has done? They are renting a computer in order to give them instant retrieval on the progress of any bill pending in the House and Senate, but I did not hear anyone down here shedding any tears for the poor taxpayer, and you can bet that if they do it, every branch of Government will do it, but we have not done it for ourselves. We hobble ourselves and handicap ourselves and then we cry because the executive branch is able to push us around. Of course, we do not always get it reported when there is a little pushing done on the other side. The gentleman from New Jersey—I cannot think of his name at the moment—

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think that is my distinguished colleague (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. HAYS. No; I am talking about the Democrat (Mr. GALLAGHER). I do not know why I could not think of his name, because he sits near to me.

Mr. GALLAGHER offered an amendment in the committee the other day to bar any further aid to Pakistan, except economic aid, until the situation in West Bengal was settled. And, do you know what the Washington Post did in an editorial yesterday? They said that the Foreign Affairs Committee had been reformed by the vigorous chairmanship of four young Members who had been elevated in the committee by the Democratic Caucus by adopting the Hansen of Washington committee report. I think that was my amendment. However, they gave these four Members, all of whom are friends of mine, credit for the Pakistan amendment and never mentioned Mr. GALLAGHER's name.

You know when they talk about the unwinking eye of CBS, they have a point. We are seeing some of it today. They said that when the House faced the unblinking eye of CBS the House blinked, and it did; it did.

Now, you are facing the prospect of whether or not we are going to do a modest amount for ourselves.

Do not blink.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing in mind at the moment that this committee is going to do, but if it happens, as some Members tell me it is going to happen—that this new Postal Corporation says to you, "Boys, your offices in the post office buildings will not be available to you and get out." I hear they are going to do it. Then, you will have to go out on the market and rent office space, you may come to the committee and say, "Why, boys, what are you going to do for me? Am I going to have to pay this out of my own pocket?"

Further, what if Mr. Blount's corporation raises the amount of postage again?

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If the executive branch of Government is abusing its prerogatives, why does not the Congress pull the string rather than let those officials get away with it? That scarcely entitles us here to repeat the abuse.

Mr. HAYS. I do not say that it entitles us to repeat any mistake. I am simply saying that we ought to computerize and equip ourselves at least as much as does the executive branch in order to find out the information which we need.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have heard the gentleman from Ohio over the years make some statements on these House administration resolutions and I have found myself in agreement with many things which he has said in the past. Most of them have had a very incisive and clear ring to them.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this resolution. I do not know whether it is popular or not. I think my credentials as a member of the economy bloc are reasonably well established and it is not likely that I would lose them on this vote any way.

First of all, I happen to believe that every Member of Congress does have a vote because, in effect, you will have to vote on each one of these items when you use or decline to use the allotments, authorizations, clerk-hire, reimbursements or what have you which have been approved by the Committee on House Administration. In other words, if you vote against further staff employment and then use the clerk-hire authorization, you have, in effect, voted for it regardless of what you say here or do today. I might lose some votes by voting for this resolution but I have confidence in the committee members and, further, I do not need to use any authorization I consider unnecessary.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think the gentleman will. The gentleman is exactly right and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to embarrass anyone, but some of the Members who voted against the pay increase—and I had a little record prepared by the Clerk's office—were the first ones to sign up for it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I, frankly, find myself in that position. I at one time voted against an additional clerk-hire allotment, but 2 years later I used that staff allotment. My point is that by using the clerk-hire authorization I voted for this authorization no matter what the recorded vote might show.

So I say we do have a vote because, when we decide individually to use or not use the telephone allowance, the district office allowance, travel, clerk-hire or other office allotments under the supervision of House Administration, we are voting "yes" or "no" regardless of what the record shows here. So I am willing to vote in that way, "yes" or "no" on any changes you make. And I might add that I have returned a number of my allot-

ments in the past and will continue to do so where they are unnecessary in the operation of my congressional office.

Mr. HAYS. I am aware that the gentleman is returning money and I would say to you that I am not using all of my clerk-hire at the moment, and I have no one from my committee in my office, and I am not using all of my district office expense at the moment—although the telephone company that serves my office went before the public utility commission in Ohio and asked for a 30-percent increase, and I may have to.

I have said a thousand times that that public utility commission in Ohio is misnamed, they ought to knock the word "Public" out of it and call it the "Utility Commission of Ohio" and I know that they are going to get an increase.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would merely point out that in listening to the debate, that I feel as one Member that I do have a vote regardless of whether we turn these decisions over to the Committee on House Administration or we do not, because if I do not use the allotments then I have voted against it, and if I do use it then I have voted for it. All too many of my colleagues are good losers. They vote publicly against these allotments and then, being good losers, they go ahead and use the precise allotment they opposed.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a disgrace. I am ashamed of the view expressed by so many that we as representatives of the people can properly delegate responsibility to set the allowances of our office to a committee or any other group than ourselves. This is the sort of action which inevitably reflects discredit upon representative government. I do not know whether devolution is intended, but it certainly will result and we shall rue this day.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker 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. 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 233, nays 167, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—233

Abbutt	Aspinall	Bolling
Abernethy	Badillo	Brademas
Abourezk	Baring	Brasco
Addabbo	Barrett	Brooks
Alexander	Begich	Broomfield
Anderson	Bell	Brown, Mich.
Callif	Bergland	Broyhill, Va.
Anderson,	Blaggi	Burke, Mass.
Tenn.	Bingham	Burleson, Tex.
Annunzio	Blatnik	Burlison, Mo.
Ashbrook	Boggs	Burton

Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Peyster
Cabell	Hays	Pickle
Caffery	Hébert	Pike
Carey, N.Y.	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Carney	Helstoski	Preyer, N.C.
Casey, Tex.	Henderson	Price, Ill.
Chamberlain	Hicks, Mass.	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Hicks, Wash.	Pucinski
Clark	Hogan	Purcell
Clay	Holifield	Rangel
Collier	Howard	Rees
Collins, Ill.	Hull	Reuss
Conyers	Ichord	Riegle
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Cotter	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Crane	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio
Daniels, N.J.	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Danielson	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Davis, Ga.	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Davis, S.C.	Kluczynski	Roush
Delaney	Koch	Rousselot
Dellums	Landrum	Roy
Denholm	Leggett	Roybal
Dent	Lennon	Runnels
Diggs	Lent	Ryan
Dorn	Link	St Germain
Dow	Long, Md.	Sarbanes
Dowdy	McClure	Scheuer
Downing	McCormack	Schwengel
Drinan	McDonald,	Celler
Dulski	Mich.	Schiberling
Eckhardt	McFall	Shipley
Edmondson	McKay	Sikes
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Sisk
Eilberg	McMillan	Slack
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald,	Smith, Iowa
Fascell	Mass.	Staggers
Fish	Madden	Stanton,
Flood	Matsumaga	James V.
Foley	Mazzoli	Steed
Ford,	Meeds	Stephens
William D.	Metcalfe	Stratton
Fountain	Mikva	Stubblefield
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Frenzel	Mills, Ark.	Symington
Fulton, Pa.	Minish	Taylor
Fulton, Tenn.	Mink	Teague, Tex.
Fuqua	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Gallifanakis	Mollohan	Thieman
Gallagher	Monagan	Udall
Garmatz	Montgomery	Ullman
Gaydos	Moorhead	Vanik
Gialmo	Morgan	Veysey
Gibbons	Morse	Vigorito
Gonzalez	Moss	Waggonner
Grasso	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Watts
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	White
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Whitten
Griffin	Nix	Wilson,
Griffiths	O'Hara	Charles H.
Hagan	O'Konski	Wolff
Hamilton	O'Neill	Wright
Hanley	Passman	Wyatt
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	Wydler
Hansen, Wash.	Patten	Yates
Harrington	Perkins	Young, Tex.
Hathaway	Pettis	Zablocki

NAYS—167

Andrews, Ala.	Coughlin	Harvey
Andrews,	Daniel, Va.	Hastings
N. Dak.	Davis, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.
Archer	Dellenback	Hillisi
Arends	Dennis	Horton
Aspin	Derwinski	Hunt
Belcher	Devine	Hutchinson
Bennett	Dickinson	Jacobs
Betts	Duncan	Jarman
Bevill	du Pont	Johnson, Pa.
Blester	Dwyer	Jonas
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Keating
Boland	Erlenborn	Keith
Bow	Esch	Kemp
Bray	Eshleman	King
Brinkley	Findley	Kuykendall
Brotzman	Fisher	Kyl
Brown, Ohio	Flowers	Landgrebe
Brownhill, N.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	Latta
Buchanan	Forsythe	Lloyd
Burke, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	Lujan
Byrnes, Wis.	Frey	McClory
Byron	Gettys	McCollister
Camp	Goldwater	McDade
Carter	Goodling	McEwen
Cederberg	Gross	McKevitt
Clancy	Grover	Mahon
Clausen,	Gubser	Mailliard
Don H.	Gude	Mann
Clawson, Del.	Haley	Martin
Cleveland	Hall	Mathias, Calif.
Collins, Tex.	Halpern	Mathis, Ga.
Colmer	Hammer-	Michel
Conable	schmidt	Miller, Ohio
Conte	Harsha	Mills, Md.

Mizell	Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.
Mosher	Ruppe	Steiger, Wis.
Myers	Ruth	Talcott
Nelsen	Sandman	Teague, Calif.
Nichols	Satterfield	Terry
Obey	Saylor	Thompson, Ga.
Pelly	Scherle	Thomson, Wis.
Pirnie	Schmitz	Thone
Poage	Schneebeli	Wampler
Poff	Scott	Ware
Powell	Sebelius	Whalen
Price, Tex.	Shoup	Whalley
Quile	Shriver	Whitehurst
Quillen	Skubitz	Widnall
Railsback	Smith, Calif.	Wiggins
Randall	Snyder	Williams
Rarick	Spence	Wilson, Bob
Reid, Ill.	Springer	Winn
Rhodes	Stafford	Wylie
Robinson, Va.	Stanton,	Wyman
Robison, N.Y.	J. William	Young, Fla.
Rogers	Steele	Zwach

NOT VOTING—33

Abzug	Edwards, La.	Mayne
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Melcher
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Mitchell
Ashley	Hanna	Pepper
Baker	Hosmer	Reid, N.Y.
Blanton	Hungate	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Kee	Stuckey
Chappell	Kyros	Van Deerlin
de la Garza	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Dingell	McCloskey	Yatron
Donohue	McCulloch	Zion

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

On this vote:
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Baker against.
Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Van Deerlin for, with Mr. Zion against.
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Vander Jagt against.
Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Smith of New York against.
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Melcher against.
Until further notice:
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Mayne.
Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 699, VESSEL BRIDGE-TO-BRIDGE RADIOTELEPHONE ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 549 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 549

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 699) to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fish-

eries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 549 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 699, the purpose of which is to require a system of bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communication on certain vessels in specified waters.

For a number of years certain whistle signals have been required by law; however, there have been problems of failure to understand them, failure to hear or respond, and/or failure to establish direction and nature of source.

From 1965 to 1969, there were 309 collisions involving 618 vessels of the type which would be covered by this legislation. These collisions resulted in 115 deaths and some \$20 million in property damage.

The bill would apply to the following vessels while navigating:

Power-driven vessels of 300 gross tons or more;

All passenger vessels of 100 gross tons or more, carrying one or more passengers for hire;

All towing vessels 26 feet or more in length at the waterline; and

All dredges or similar vessels likely to obstruct navigation.

All such vessels would be required to have a radiotelephone capability to transmit and receive information on a frequency designated by the FCC. The communications equipment would be used exclusively by the master or person in charge of the vessel, or the pilot. A listening watch must be maintained continuously while the vessel is navigating.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the bill may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 549 makes in order for consideration of S. 699, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of the bill is to require radiotelephones on certain types of vessels using the navigable waterways of the United States.

Currently ships signal to each other using a system whistle signals. Often these signals are not heard, or are misunderstood. This problem with the present signal system is clear when vessel collision statistics are examined. Between 1965 and 1969 some 618 vessels were involved in collisions which resulted in 115 deaths and some \$20 million in property damage. Most of these collisions could have been avoided if the vessels involved had been able to "talk directly"

to each other and know precisely where each was and where each was going. The statistics further reveal that most—95 percent—of the collisions have involved tankers, freighters, and large towing vessels.

The bill requires that radiotelephones be installed and operable on all vessels of 300 gross tons or larger, and all towing vessels 26 feet or longer at the water line. Such equipment is for the exclusive use of the vessel's master or pilot in charge of the movement of the vessel.

The legislation will not require any additional cost to the Government, except a cost of about \$300 per vessel to equip all Navy, Coast Guard, and Geodetic Survey vessels with the required equipment. Total cost will be about \$500,000.

There are no minority views. The bill is supported by the departments involved, although the Navy would like to have an exemption added for the Navy until July 1, 1975, by which date they believe they can have all ships so equipped. Other departments and agencies have no problems meeting the effective date, which is 6 months after regulations are promulgated to implement the act.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is long overdue and the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4354, MOTOR BUS WIDTH LIMITS ON THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 546 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 546

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4354) to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to increase such limitations for motor buses. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the

House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 546 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4354 to provide vehicle-width limitations on the Interstate System. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 4354 is to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase by 6 inches the width limitation for motor buses operating on the Interstate System.

Under present Federal law, buses wider than 96 inches are prohibited from operating on the Interstate System except in those States or localities where the operation of wider buses was lawful on July 1, 1956. The maximum width of buses permitted to use Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System is regulated exclusively by the States.

Approximately 40 percent of the transit fleet and practically all new transit buses are 102 inches wide. The wider buses are used in the major cities throughout the country. They are not only safer but have far more comfort than the buses 96 inches wide because of the differences in tires, brakes, suspension, and height.

This is permissive legislation that would authorize each State to permit the use of 102-inch buses on its Interstate System. A number of States have already passed such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the legislation may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has adequately explained House Resolution 546 and I concur in his remarks and join therein.

I would simply like to state, Mr. Speaker, that this does not have anything to do with trucks. We have had a bill up a couple of times before having to do with trucks and buses to allow additional weight on rear axle of the trucks, the length and so forth. This bill has nothing to do with that and it has nothing to do with the fact that two Presidents were reportedly opposed to that particular bill.

This measure has to do merely with buses. It would extend the width from 96 to 102 inches, which is 6 inches wider, on the Interstate Highway System only. The cities, counties, and States can still control their own highway requirements. Most buses are now at that particular

width. In fact, there are some 22,000 such buses now in use nationally, and if they can use certain city and county streets, and cannot then get on the Interstate Highway System, it puts them at a tremendous disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also states that it has to be a safe operation from the standpoint that it is permissible where the lanes are 12 feet wide, unless the Secretary of Transportation reports to the Congress that the use of such buses would be unsafe and their use could not be made safe by the promulgation of safety regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I think there is some objection to the bill on the part of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENDEL), who has filed minority views, and I believe he has sent several letters to Members explaining his position. He will undoubtedly oppose the bill or offer some amendments to it.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I guess it is pretty well known to the House that I am very much opposed to this legislation, and I think I will present some good arguments in support of my position. I shall not oppose the rule. I hope as we enter the debate we will recognize some of the inconsistencies and the inadequacies that are presented.

I point out the administration has not endorsed the bill. They are not in favor of it, and there are some good reasons that will be presented for that position. I will vote against the rule because I feel strongly about this legislation, but I will not insist on a rollcall vote. I hope you will listen attentively to some of the facts and some of the pertinent issues that are involved and then let your conscience be your guide.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

VESSEL BRIDGE-TO-BRIDGE RADIOTELEPHONE ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 699) to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States.

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

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 S. 699, with Mr. REES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in support of this bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone legislation. The purpose of this bill is to require the existing capability and the monitoring of a system of bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communication on certain vessels while navigating on the inland waters of the United States.

This bill would require that all power-driven vessels of 300 gross tons and upward while navigating, all passenger vessels of 100 gross tons and upward, carrying one or more passengers for hire while navigating, all towing vessels of 26 feet or more in length while navigating, and all dredges or similar vessels likely to obstruct navigation have a radiotelephone capability to transmit and receive navigational information on a frequency or frequencies designated by the Federal Communications Commission in consultation with other appropriate agencies.

It should be understood that this radiotelephone communication system between bridges of vessels is presently used voluntarily on a widespread basis. For example, it has been used voluntarily for several years now in the Great Lakes area and in the Delaware River and Delaware Bay area and, in fact, many vessels on all our waters voluntarily carry this capability.

However, I stress the point that its usage until now has been strictly voluntary. S. 699 would make usage of radiotelephones a mandatory requirement. Some may ask if this capability has been used voluntarily with a fair degree of success, why should it now be mandatory? As an answer to this, I would like to point to the tragic collision which occurred in January under the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco Bay.

At that time, two tankers, the *Arizona Standard* and the *Oregon Standard* collided and the result was the spillage of over half a million gallons of oil poured into the waters of San Francisco Bay. This incident indicated, as nothing else could, the necessity for not only a mandatory bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone

capability, but the necessity that a continuing listening watch be maintained on this radiotelephonic system. This bill would require a continuous listening watch on the mandatory radiotelephone equipment.

In the collision in San Francisco Bay just mentioned, the two vessels were equipped with common radiotelephone channels and both had, in fact, communicated with the harbor advisory station. However, one of the two vessels had either secured her radio or shifted to some other channel, so that the other vessel was unable to communicate with her. The most modern and efficient radio equipment in the world is of little use if no one is listening.

This bill really requires two things: First, that the radiotelephone equipment must be on the bridge of the vessel; and, second, that a continuous listening watch is maintained on this equipment while the vessel is navigating. This radiotelephone equipment is for the exclusive use of the master or person in charge of the vessel.

Thus, it is apparent that the requirements of this legislation are essential to reverse the trend toward increased collisions on our inland waters and I urge the support of all my colleagues for this necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the passage of S. 699, the Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act.

On December 15, 1969, nearly identical legislation was favorably considered in this body but failed to become law before the close of the 91st Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are several instances where legislation such as is proposed here would, if in law, have prevented serious injury to vessels, their crews, passengers and cargo—and to the ecology of the coastal zone where the collision occurred. But the most recent instance and most startling evidence—is a west coast tragedy that occurred in January of this year. On January 18, 1971, almost directly under the Golden Gate Bridge, in dense fog, two American-flag tankers, the *Oregon Standard* and the *Arizona Standard* groped their way toward the Golden Gate, the one outbound from the Richmond terminal, the other heading for the same refinery with a full load of oil. Both ships were equipped with radar.

Each was under the command of an experienced captain intimately familiar with those waters. And yet they collided with sufficient force to spill over one-half million gallons of oil. Locked together, they drifted slowly into the Bay as the oil spread rapidly to the shores, and out into the Pacific Ocean along 60 miles of the coast. Only the moderate size of these ships—10,000 gross tons—small by international tanker standards—prevented the total destruction of San Francisco Bay.

San Francisco is unique among our ports in having a harbor advisory radar operated by the Coast Guard. I must stress the term "advisory" since the Coast Guard does not yet have authority to direct vessel movements. On the morning of January 18, the harbor radar operator was in radio communication with the

Oregon Standard and *Arizona Standard*. Minutes before the collision, each ship was clearly visible on his radar screen. Although both ships were equipped with radiotelephones, one ship, the *Oregon Standard*, apparently turned its set off during the final crucial minutes preceding the collision. The Coast Guard radio operator was therefore unable to contact the *Oregon Standard*.

The legislation we are considering today will require that all ships of 300 gross tons and upward, all towing vessels of 26 or more feet in length, and all passenger vessels of 100 gross tons and upward be equipped with a radiotelephone located on the bridge for the exclusive use of the master or person in charge of the vessel. It must operate on a specific frequency designated by the FCC for the exchange of navigational information between ships.

As I have already indicated, the two Standard tankers were equipped with radiophones operating on a common frequency. There was no requirement, however, that anyone turn the set on and listen or that it be located on the bridge within reach of the master or pilot. Had there been such a requirement, as is contained in this legislation, this tragedy might have been averted.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) has fully described the details of this legislation; however, I would like to comment on two points before closing.

The first concerns the continuous listening watch requirement of section 5. The report of your committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries discusses the special problem of pilots guiding foreign-flag vessels into American ports. It is anticipated that in many instances pilots will carry with them a portable radiotelephone as authorized in section 5 of the bill, and that the pilot's radiophone may be the only one on the ship's bridge capable of operating on the frequency required by this legislation.

The pilot may, however, be required to use his phone to contact a tug or call ahead to the pier to arrange for docking. During the time the pilot switches to a different frequency to make such calls, the vessel will be in violation of the law, since a continuous listening watch cannot be maintained.

The Coast Guard may grant exemptions to cover these situations under the authority of section 7 of the legislation when it is determined that marine safety will not be adversely affected. It is my understanding, however, that such exemptions will be granted only after thorough scrutiny and will clearly delineate the waters or portions of a channel where the pilot may shift frequencies for business communication.

The Coast Guard, of course, will not grant such exemptions for waters where congested traffic is common, where adverse weather conditions prevail, or where visibility is reduced due to natural topography or manmade obstructions.

In the final analysis, the burden of this legislation falls on the ship and not the pilot. Every ship entering our waters should be equipped with this relatively

inexpensive device. I urge the Coast Guard and the Department of Transportation to work vigorously through IMCO to secure an international radiotelephone convention.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on the term "exclusive use" as employed in section 5 of the bill. I interpret this phrase literally and do not anticipate that this legislation will require the employment of additional personnel on a ship's bridge. The radiotelephone is for the exclusive use of the person conning the ship. It should be located where he can personally maintain the required listening watch and within his reach so that he can personally respond to an incoming call or initiate contact with approaching vessels.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a vital step forward in maritime safety. Your committee now is holding hearings on a companion bill, the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1971. Passage of this legislation today and the Port Safety bill in the near future will help to insure that the needs of commerce can be met without further degradation of our marine environment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD), a member of the committee.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any substantial opposition to this bill, but many of us are very much concerned about navigational safety in our ever-increasingly congested inland waterways and harbors. I take this very brief time only to express my great interest in it, because recently we have had a number of collisions in San Francisco Bay, one in particular where two tankers collided under the Golden Gate Bridge and presented a real hazard to the ecology of the bay, which is in enough difficulty already.

I would also say that in our committee we have several other pieces of legislation which I hope will be forthcoming very soon, which ought also to contribute to navigational safety in our crowded bays and harbors and inland waterways.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments to my colleagues concerning the bill now before us for consideration and passage. S. 699, would require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States.

The purpose of the bill is to reduce vessel collisions and other marine mishaps by requiring the existing capability and the monitoring of this capability of bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone systems. In simple terms, the master or pilot or person in charge of the vessel on the bridge would be able to pick up the telephone at his elbow and communicate with his counterpart on an approaching vessel with respect to navigational information and intentions as to vessel movements.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries began work on this legislation in 1968, when I introduced a

bill to require radiotelephones on bridges of all vessels in our waters. The committee's efforts were intensified in January of 1969, when the administration submitted an executive communication covering the subject matter. Hearings were conducted in the 91st Congress and H.R. 6971 was reported out by our committee and passed the House on December 16, 1969.

The evidence and testimony presented at the hearings before our committee and on the Senate side indicated the need for this bill and we feel that this legislation adequately meets the requirement, without imposing an unreasonable cost or administrative burden on either the Government or private enterprise.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in support of S. 699. This bill will make the navigable waters of the United States much safer. It is late in coming and badly needed.

Just as we are confronted with problems in our urban centers and ever-increasing fatality rates on our highways—due to increased population and increased mobilization—we are being faced with a similar problem in our ports, harbors, rivers, lakes, and other navigable waters. For the changing times have made their impact there as well.

We are all aware of the great amount of legislation that has gone into making our cities, airlines, and roads safer, but in the same respect there has been a dearth of legislation in the area that this bill covers.

Safety legislation, like all other legislation, has its opposition. But I think you will find that the men who sail these vessels and have the responsibility for the safety and welfare of their crew, passengers, and cargo are overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. Many of those who will be regulated under this bill already realize the need for radiotelephone bridge-to-bridge voice communication and have voluntarily installed radiotelephones on their vessels. At this time, the Great Lakes have been voluntarily using bridge-to-bridge radiotelephones for 37 years, and there are also voluntary port radiotelephone systems in existence in the Baltimore-Chesapeake Bay area and in port areas on the west coast, including San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Puget Sound, the Oregon coast, and the Columbia River Basin. On the east and gulf coasts, you have the Delaware River, the Hudson River, lower Mississippi River, Houston Ship Channel, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Galveston, Tex., city channel, Newark Bay, Tampa Bay and Harbor, and the New York Harbor area, as well as other waterway areas.

Thus it is obvious that great steps have been made already in this direction voluntarily by those who operate on our navigable waters.

As I stated previously, very few bills are fortunate enough to become law without some sort of difference of opinion

or opposition. And here may be some here today who can present logical arguments as to why one class of vessel or one geographical area should be excluded and they could, in support of their argument, present admirable safety records which would indicate justification for an exclusion under this bill.

To these people, I can only say that they are to be congratulated for their records in the past, but that the purpose of the bill is not only to deal with the hazardous conditions of the present but also to deal with the potentially hazardous conditions which prevail today as well as the hazardous conditions which present themselves in the future. We know what has happened to our cities and on our roads because preventive measures were late in coming and we also know that corrective legislation would not be necessary if there had been preventive legislation first. For these reasons, I fully endorse this bill and urge the support of my colleagues for this needed legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, S. 699 would require certain vessels to have a radiotelephone capability to receive and transmit navigational information, and would apply to all power-driven vessels of 300 gross tons and over 100 tons and over vessels carrying passengers for hire, and all towing vessels over 26 feet in length.

Further, the bill would require that, while navigating, a continuous listening watch be maintained over the radiotelephone by the master or person in charge or the person designated to pilot the vessel. The bill prescribes that the radiotelephone is for the exclusive use of the master or designee, and that additional crew are not to be added for this purpose.

I and members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have labored for some time over this legislation in the belief that it can provide an added measure of safety in our ports and harbors. However, there is one aspect of the bill which troubled me as being unnecessary.

In our consideration of the legislation, the Coast Guard and others repeatedly acknowledged the excellent safety record of the passenger vessels operating in our inland waterways and in our harbors. With this in mind, I felt it would perhaps be unnecessary to include the class of passenger vessels of 100 tons and above which eventually were written into the bill. I believe their safety record negates any argument in favor of including these vessels; and I feared that the new requirement would be construed so as to compel the operators to add an additional man to the bridge watch of such vessels, raising costs in operations that are often marginal in achieving profits. I was therefore pleased that that report on the bill No. 92-346 made it perfectly clear on page 5:

The committee would like it clearly understood that it is not the intention of this legislation that an extra man be added to the crew to operate this equipment.

Indeed, the language of the bill and its legislative history indicate not only that the radiotelephone equipment required by this bill should be operated by the master, mate or person in charge of the vessel in the wheelhouse, but that in some other person were added to the crew for this purpose, it would tend to defeat the basic purpose of the legislation. In this connection the Coast Guard indicated that not only do they not envision such an addition of vessel personnel, but they would regard it as being highly undesirable.

Thus, in the absence of deleting this class of vessels from the legislation, we have made it absolutely clear that the legislation does not require—or desire—additional personnel to operate the new radiotelephone.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, during the period of deliberation and preparation of this legislation, I had very serious misgivings about at least one serious effect of this bill. That is the necessity of employing additional personnel working economic hardship on boat lines.

It has always been my understanding that there must be a constructive purpose for legislation. However, during the period of deliberation in the committee that understanding was somewhat shaken by the provision requiring this additional equipment on a class of vessels that have a safety record without peer.

We in New York have the Circle Line, which has as its president a Mr. Frank Barry, who has been operating that line for some 30 years without a single, solitary accident. It is a line that has made 262,000 trips around the Statue of Liberty without an incident. It is a line that has made a trip around Manhattan, which I am sure many of my colleagues have made, and enjoyed, some 50,000 times without an accident. This, mind you, without a single taxpayer's dollar as a subsidy—in this day of foreign shipbuilding. Mr. Barry continues to build his ships in American shipyards.

He runs a tight ship with integrity and diligence. Rather than be burdened, he should be lauded and encouraged. The Circle Line safety record should serve as an example for all shipping companies to emulate.

In view of the aforementioned, it appeared to me in committee that any action on our part that would impose any costs or restrictions would be, to say the least, ill advised.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment in the subcommittee, together with my colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY). We advocated our position there. I would not have been in a position today to support this bill but for the language and for the understanding of the committee of the position which we maintained. I am gratified by the language which I read in the report, No. 92-346, wherein it says very clearly:

The bill indicates that the radiotelephone required by this act is for the exclusive use of the master or person in charge of the vessel, or the person designated by the master or person in charge to pilot or direct the movement of the vessel, and so forth.

Our concern was that additional personnel would be employed as a result of

this legislation. I was assured by the chairman of the committee that this was not the intent. I am confident this is not the intent. My concern was really with the labor-management relationships in the New York area. Absent the reassurance I find in the report and the language in the bill itself, I would continue to have that same concern.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Because of your insistence and that of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), this is included in the report.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman. May I address one question, just for further clarification and in order to get it in the Record, to the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. CLARK. Surely.

Mr. BIAGGI. It is in your contemplation that this legislation does not require any additional personnel?

Mr. CLARK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. This radiotelephone, based upon my understanding of the hearings and the testimony of the Coast Guard, is designed for a listening watch of the captain and that to add another person in the wheelhouse would create a distraction. At all times the specific attention of the captain is directed to this radiotelephone. Now with reference to the particular boats to which the gentleman has addressed himself and which have not had an accident in 30 years of operation, this will be an additional radiotelephone that will be in those wheelhouses. This is an extra precaution that I think was really intended for towing vessels where the vast number of accidents were on a national basis.

I think the Coast Guard statistics show that there were three accidents in 5 years involving vessels of 300 tons or less in the passenger carrying capacity on a national basis; of course, none of them in New York. But it is perfectly clear to me and perfectly clear to the committee and now to the House that the listening watch of the captain himself is the intent of this particular radiotelephone in this particular instance.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) for his very fine and detailed explanation.

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for putting my mind at rest by providing what I feel is so important in the process of legislation dealing with the effect of legislation not only in this country but throughout the world as it touches the people. Of course, I know in talking about the operations in and around New York Harbor it may seem to be quite a parochial interest, but the point has universal application.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for taking this particular action that I am delighted to support.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such

time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of S. 699.

This bill would require radiotelephones on all foreign and domestic vessels of 300 gross tons and upward, passenger vessels of 100 gross tons and upward, and towing vessels of 26 feet or over in length, when they are navigating in specified area; it also includes dredges and floating plants engaged in operations which are likely to restrict or affect the navigation of other vessels.

The bill, although requiring a radiotelephone, provides that a portable radiotelephone satisfies the requirement of the act. The major difference between this bill and H.R. 6971, the bill that was passed by the House in the 91st Congress, is the requirement for a constant listening watch. The prior bill allowed the master or person in charge to permit the use of the radiotelephone on other authorized frequencies whenever there was no risk of collision.

This change to a constant listening watch has met with full accord by the Coast Guard, the Federal Communications Commission, most industry and labor organizations, and I am satisfied that any increase in inconvenience which the requirement may occasion is more than compensated for by the increased safety it will afford.

I think that it is also significant that the bill gives the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating the authority to issue exemptions from any of the provisions of this act if he considers that marine navigational safety will not be adversely affected or where a local communication system fully complies with the intent of this concept but does not conform in detail. This gives administrative flexibility which makes the measure a much stronger piece of legislation. Thus, I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile and needed bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to address a few questions to the chairman of the subcommittee that passed out this important legislation.

First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) for chairing this important legislation.

As I recall, the bill is in response, in large part, to the recent collision that many of us from the committee investigated in California, the collision of the Standard Oil tankers in San Francisco Bay that had radiotelephones.

I wonder if the gentleman could explain to me how this bill would have avoided the collision that occurred in San Francisco Bay where, allegedly, the tankers have the kind of equipment that is called for in this legislation.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Both of these ships that collided had radiotelephones that would be made necessary through the passage of this bill. However, this bill makes it mandatory that there is a watch on board listening at all times. There was not at the time of the collision. One of the vessels did not have its radiotelephone turned on, and the other one did.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I recall, they had the radio tuned in on different channels and it is my understanding that this legislation would actually require by regulation that a common frequency be listened to by vessels transgressing certain inland waters where they would choose to control the traffic; is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. LEGGETT. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Also in San Francisco Bay at the time of this collision we had the Coast Guard monitoring by radar the actual collision as it took place. What would this bill add to the Coast Guard's authority, if any, to control the vessels if they had such monitoring activity going on?

Mr. CLARK. This bill has nothing to do with that; that is in the coast and harbor safety bill.

Mr. LEGGETT. So that we are not going the full distance in this legislation? We are not covering water traffic as we control air traffic with the air traffic controllers?

Mr. CLARK. That is right.

Mr. LEGGETT. I understand the chairman indicates that we are holding hearings on legislation that would look into water-traffic control which would actually give authority to the Coast Guard, or other agencies, over the traffic in some of these congested inland harbors?

Mr. CLARK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman very much for his answers. I think this is a very important bill.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the radiotelephone bill is to reduce vessel collision. The intent is to lessen the many deaths and allay the high cost in property damage. In addition, given the present stress on clean environment, the radiotelephone bill would protect our harbors and coastlines from disastrous oil spillage, fire, and other tainted accidents.

The Federal Government and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have been considering bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone legislation over the past 4 years.

During this period, it has become clear that a mandatory radiotelephone system is essential to safe marine navigation. On March 16, 1968, the cargo vessel, the SS *African Star* collided in the Mississippi River with the M/V *Midwest Cities*. Twenty-one lives were lost. The National Transportation Safety Board, who investigated the accident, found that the probable cause of collision was the lack of a common radiotelephone frequency on the two vessels.

The most recent and near tragic col-

lision occurred in San Francisco Bay on January 18, 1971. The *Arizona Standard* and the *Oregon Standard* collided in a thick bay fog near the Golden Gate Bridge. The result was the spillage of over a half million gallons of oil that soon coated the water and washed upon the beaches. The real cost of the clean up operation even now cannot be determined; in fact, the long-range effects of the oil spill on the ecology of the San Francisco Bay and coastline will be unknown for many years.

I along with other Congressmen and local citizens investigated the San Francisco Bay collision. One major cause of collision was once again the lack of a bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communication aboard both vessels.

The radiotelephone bill would put an end to such costly neglect. It would insure that a radiotelephone be mandatory navigation equipment installed on certain vessels and a continuous listening watch maintained.

As such, in light of every committee and department report and from my own investigations, I believe this legislation is essential to reverse the rising trend toward increased vessel collision. Thus, a radiotelephone system should be imposed that will reduce the possibility of collision and chaos and increase marine safety on our inland waters.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we, the people of the United States, have been blessed in many ways by nature. We do not have earthquakes with the frequency or the resulting loss of lives as Chile or Turkey, or floods such as Pakistan, or famines such as India. Our catastrophes are, for the most part, the result of human error rather than acts of God.

The complicity of our economy, our technology, and our way of life, however, make us more susceptible to those types of catastrophes which are attributable to human error. Fortunately, we can reduce the risks we are confronted with whereas the rest of the world is at the mercy of nature. Safety is our solution. S. 699, is a bill to prevent loss of life and property on our navigable waters. It is the product of 4 years of work, not only by the committees of the House and Senate, but also the many interested agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Four years is a long time, especially when there is a need for legislation and that need grows and makes itself more apparent daily. Fortunately, the work has been done and not only do we have a bill to present to the House for its consideration, we have a good bill—a bill whose immense value may never be completely apparent because it is difficult to count the number of collisions which will be avoided because of this bill, or the lives, property damage, or suffering which will never become a stark reality because of this bill.

In closing, I merely want to say that S. 699 is a desperately needed bill to rectify a desperately dangerous situation, and I fully endorse it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 699, a bill which would require certain vessels to have radiotelephone capability to re-

ceive and transmit navigational information between vessels navigating on the inland waters of the United States.

The tragedies of recent years, involving vessels on the inland waters which have resulted in great loss of life as well as extreme property damage, demand such legislation. Some 14 years ago the passenger vessel *Andrea Doria* and the *Stockholm* collided off the coast of Long Island resulting in many deaths. Since that time we have seen the collisions of two tankers in New York harbor, and are well aware of the destructive fires in the Mississippi River resulting from collisions between oceangoing vessels and tow boats. In each of these cases there was no effective communication between the vessels involved.

Most recently in the San Francisco harbor the oil tanker *Oregon Standard* collided with the *Arizona Standard* with resulting massive pollution along the beaches and shoreline. I was part of a special investigating subcommittee which investigated the tragedy of February 8, 1971.

The two vessels which collided in the San Francisco Bay were equipped with common radio channels and both had in fact communicated with the harbor advisory station. However, one of the two vessels then either secured its radio or shifted to some other channel so that the other vessel was unable to communicate with her. Spillage of over half a million gallons of oil resulted. In this case as well as the aforementioned mishaps, it is reasonably certain that the failure to communicate was a major element.

The bill before us today has the support of the Secretary of Transportation, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Commerce. Each of these agencies is strongly aware of the need for effective safety measures in the vessels traveling our inland waters.

The specific purpose of the bill is to require for the exclusive use of the master or other persons in charge of the ship a continuous listening watch on a designated frequency. The bill would apply to all power-driven vessels of 300 gross tons or more, all passenger vessels of 100 gross tons or more, all towing vessels of 26 feet or more in length, and all dredges or similar vessels likely to obstruct navigation. The requirement would apply to the navigable waters of the United States inside the lines which mark the inland waters of the United States. The bill does not envision the replacement of existing radio facilities nor the presence of any additional personnel on board.

EXEMPTION PROVISION IN SPECIFIC INSTANCES

One of the strongest considerations calling for more lenient legislation in special instances is that certain types of vessels have admirable safety records. For example, tuna-fishing vessels, according to a survey by the American Tunaboat Association, have not been involved in any ship collision casualty on the navigable waters of the United States. Serious consideration has been given to the fact that these vessels are not likely to create the safety problems which S. 699 seeks to reduce.

Tuna-vessel owners and operators have good reason to be proud of their safety record. However, the committee has felt that matters such as these can best be dealt with administratively.

The intention of the bill is not to legislate strictly. The bill allows the Secretary to issue exemptions with respect to certain provisions of the act if he should consider that safety will not be adversely affected. He may also make exceptions in cases where a local communications system complies with the intent of legislation but does not conform in detail. In this regard, tuna vessels and other vessels with good safety records can make application to be exempted.

There are many shortcomings in the present sound-warning signals. The enactment of this bill could significantly reduce waterway accidents. The requirement of bridge-to-bridge radiotelephones is important and urgently needed to enhance safer navigation of vessels in U.S. waters.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to express my wholehearted support for passage of S. 699 as only the first in a series of steps which are necessary to protect the lives and property of those who not only crew America's vessels, but the thousands of residents along waterways who are imperiled daily. I am happy to see this bill come before the House. Since I, in January 1969, introduced a similar measure, H.R. 5189, after a series of potentially dangerous incidents on the Houston Ship Channel.

While Report No. 92-346 by Chairman GARMATZ covers in detail some of the disasters which have happened during the past several years on our waterways, such as the *Andrea Doria* collision, I would like to address myself to a situation which has possibly a much deadlier possibility than any of those mentioned—the situation where tens of thousands of persons live along a heavily traveled waterway upon which millions of pounds of dangerous and noxious products move daily, such as the Houston Ship Channel.

The north side of the Houston Ship Channel, at that time, lies within the eighth district of Texas, which I represent. Since the Texas Legislature redistricted the State in May, both sides of the channel, with its scores of refineries and petrochemical plants, will lie within the eighth district. So you can see that I have a particular concern about the Houston Ship Channel, and I have long had a deep interest in its safety.

At a public hearing in Houston on February 17, 1969, by the Army Corps of Engineers, Mr. Pat J. Neely, Jr., of the Houston pilots, testified that approximately 70 percent of all the dangerous and noxious chemicals which move in interstate commerce move on the Houston ship channel. Mr. Neely was referring to the total tons moved in interstate commerce, not the total number of the various compounds. Vessels carrying these chemicals move between heavily populated areas such as Galena Park, Channelview, and Baytown on the north side of the channel and Pasadena, Deer Park, and LaPorte on the south side. You can imagine what a disaster might occur should a collision between two vessels re-

lease chemicals, which, when mixed with the atmosphere, create a lethal blanket over these communities.

To further complicate matters and multiply the danger, there is the possibility that two vessels carrying different compounds might collide, and the mixing of the two chemicals possibly could set off an explosion and holocaust that would make the Texas City disaster of April 1947 sound like a firecracker. In a meeting 2 years ago with Commander Al Rose, the Coast Guard commander in the Port of Houston, I was told that individual barges carry many of these dangerous and noxious materials within separate holds, and this poses an even more dangerous situation should a collision occur. Rear Adm. Ross Bullard, commandant of the 8th Coast Guard District in New Orleans, has warned the Port Authority of Houston that the ship channel is literally a "floating wick."

While a mishap on the Houston Ship Channel in September 1969 certainly does not rank, as far as disasters are concerned, with those enumerated in Chairman GARMATZ' report, I would like to cite it as an example of what possibly could happen should vessels continue to use the antiquated system of whistles. At that time, the British freighter, the *Christiane*, collided with a tug on the Houston Ship Channel, spilling gasoline into the channel. At the subsequent Coast Guard inquiry, the captain and pilot of the freighter said it used whistle signals, but that the tug's pilot did not respond to the signals. The skipper of the tug reported he heard no whistle signals at all. If they had had bridge-to-bridge communication, it is possible that this collision might have been averted.

As I said earlier, passage of this measure will be only the first small step in such a safety program. President Nixon, in a message in 1970, urged approval of a waterway safety program. One section of his message called for enactment of the legislation we are discussing today. Another would have required a radar surveillance system on the Houston Ship Channel, among other waterways, to make it easier to monitor ship movements. It would resemble the air traffic reporting systems now in use at airports. Congress, however, has not seen fit to approve appropriations for this program.

Not only is there an ever-present danger to persons living along the waterways from fire and explosion, but collisions of tankers carrying petroleum products are a danger to the environment, as report No. 92-346 points out. And, it seems to me that the total aggregate of oil spilled upon our waters from unnoticed and unreported spills may be a far greater damage to the environment than the large ones, such as the spill in the Santa Barbara Channel and the Chevron spill in the Gulf of Mexico. For instance, Texas officials estimate that oil companies spilled 25,480 barrels of oil into public waters during 1964, most of it coming from barges. This means that 1,070,160 gallons of oil polluted Texas waters compared with the 700,000 gallons at Santa Barbara and the 850,000 gallons Chevron spilled in the gulf.

At the public hearing on the Houston

ship channel in 1969, many officials recommended deepening the channel to accommodate the deeper draft vessels, and the widening of the channel to improve safety. But there is just so much that can be done in this respect. It cannot be widened at points such as the Baytown Tunnel and the Washburn Tunnel, and certainly danger would continue to lurk at these points. Passage of this measure will be a major step in protecting the lives, health, and property of hundreds of thousands of persons who live and work in the vicinity of our major ports.

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide a positive means whereby the operators of approaching vessels can communicate their intentions to one another through voice radio, located convenient to the operator's navigation station. To effectively accomplish this, there is need for a specific frequency or frequencies dedicated to the exchange of navigational information, on navigable waters of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating;

(2) "power-driven vessel" means any vessel propelled by machinery; and

(3) "towing vessel" means any commercial vessel engaged in towing another vessel astern, alongside, or by pushing ahead.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in section 7 of this Act—

(1) every power-driven vessel of three hundred gross tons and upward while navigating;

(2) every vessel of one hundred gross tons and upward carrying one or more passengers for hire while navigating;

(3) every towing vessel of twenty-six feet or over in length while navigating; and

(4) every dredge and floating plant engaged in or near a channel or fairway in operations likely to restrict or affect navigation of other vessels—

shall have a radiotelephone capable of operation from its navigational bridge or, in the case of a dredge, from its main control station and capable of transmitting and receiving on the frequency or frequencies within the 156-162 Mega-Hertz band using the classes of emissions designated by the Federal Communications Commissions, after consultation with other cognizant agencies, for the exchange of navigational information.

(b) The radiotelephone required by subsection (a) shall be carried on board the described vessels, dredges, and floating plants upon the navigable waters of the United States inside the lines established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of February 19, 1895 (28 Stat. 672) as amended.

SEC. 5. The radiotelephone required by this Act is for the exclusive use of the master or person in charge of the vessel, or the person designated by the master or person in charge to pilot or direct the movement of the vessel, who shall maintain a listening watch on the designated frequency. Nothing contained herein shall be interpreted as precluding the use of portable radiotelephone equipment to satisfy the requirements of this Act.

SEC. 6. Whenever radiotelephone capability is required by this Act, a vessel's radiotelephone equipment shall be maintained in effective operating condition. If the radiotelephone equipment carried aboard a vessel ceases to operate, the master shall exercise due diligence to restore it or cause it to be restored to effective operating condition at the earliest practicable time. The failure of a vessel's radiotelephone equipment shall not, in itself, constitute a violation of this Act, nor shall it obligate the master of any vessel to moor or anchor his vessel; however, the loss of radiotelephone capability shall be given consideration in the navigation of the vessel.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may, if he considers that marine navigational safety will not be adversely affected or where a local communication system fully complies with the intent of this concept but does not conform in detail, issue exemptions from any provisions of this Act, on such terms and conditions as he considers appropriate.

SEC. 8. (a) The Federal Communications Commission shall, after consultation with other cognizant agencies, prescribe regulations necessary to specify operating and technical conditions and characteristics including frequencies, emission, and power of radiotelephone equipment required under this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall, subject to the concurrence of the Federal Communications Commission, prescribe regulations for the enforcement of this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) Whoever, being the master or person in charge of a vessel subject to this Act, fails to enforce or comply with this Act or the regulation, hereunder; or

Whoever, being designated by the master or person in charge of a vessel subject to this Act to pilot or direct the movement of the vessel, fails to enforce or comply with this Act or the regulations hereunder—

Is liable to a civil penalty of not more than \$500 to be assessed by the Secretary.

(b) Every vessel navigating in violation of this Act or the regulations hereunder is liable to a civil penalty of not more than \$500 to be assessed by the Secretary for which the vessel may be proceeded against in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction.

(c) Any penalty assessed under this section may be remitted or mitigated by the Secretary upon such terms as he may deem proper.

SEC. 10. This Act shall become effective May 1, 1971, or six months after the promulgation of regulations which would implement its provisions, whichever is later.

Mr. CLARK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to be proposed, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. Boggs) having assumed the chair, Mr. REES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 699) to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 549, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MOTORBUS WIDTH LIMITS ON THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. 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. 4354) to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to increase such limitations for motorbuses. 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. 4354, with Mr. REES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI).

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I appear before this distinguished body in support of H.R. 4354 as reported by the Committee on Public Works.

As indicated in the committee report, this is a simple bill which amends title 23 of the United States Code to permit the operation of buses on the Interstate System up to a width of 102 inches. This is an increase of 6 inches over the present limit of 96 inches.

This 102-inch bus is now in use all over the country on traffic lanes narrower than those on the Interstate System. They are essential to the mass transit development of our major cities and for alleviating urban congestion. My own city of Chicago has hundreds of these buses, as does the D.C. Transit Co. here in Washington.

It is completely unrealistic to keep these buses off the Interstate System in the urban areas when the Interstate System is there with a much safer de-

sign, and available for keeping these buses off the crowded residential streets and major arteries.

How are we ever going to make progress in developing the best transit use possible if we do not give the transit user the benefit of the most efficient and comfortable vehicle which we can provide.

The same applies to the intercity buses and their use on the Interstate System. The 102-inch intercity buses have been used in Canada, on the New York Thruway, and on the Interstate System in most of those States covered by the grandfather clause in the 1956 Highway Act.

With the reduction in rail passenger service to many areas of the country which has recently been taking place, there is a much greater need for the greatest flexibility, comfort, and convenience possible for the bus-traveling public of this Nation.

The American Association of State Highway Officials has approved the 102-inch width on the Interstate System.

The Federal Highway Administration has testified that the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety reports indicate that there is no class of accidents in which 102-inch buses seem more susceptible than other width buses.

Despite all of these items, there are those who oppose this bill on the grounds of safety, and that in some devious manner that this bill has something to do with trucks.

The bill as introduced has been amended in the committee to provide that the wider buses could only be operated on 12-foot lanes, and only after extensive safety studies are conducted by the Department of Transportation. It even gives a veto power to the Secretary of Transportation if the safety studies prove that the intent of this bill cannot be safely accomplished.

With respect to allegations concerning trucks, I would emphasize to the Committee that the bill before you, H.R. 4354, contains absolutely no reference to trucks in any form whatsoever, and any attempt to relate it to trucks is pure fantasy.

I reiterate, ladies and gentlemen, that this is a simple bill that is needed to increase the efficiency of the Nation's transportation system at no cost to the taxpayer other than those required for simple safety studies and rulemaking procedures.

If you close your ears to the rhetoric and the misrepresentations that have been circulated concerning this bill and consider it on its own merits, you can only reach one conclusion and that is that this bill is absolutely necessary for the good of the transportation system of America.

I urge the passage of this legislation and I hope it is by an extremely wide margin.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is permissive legislation. It is not mandatory. I ask your support of the legislation.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the minority, I wish to express my strong support for H.R. 4354. I agree with Chairman

BLATNIK that this is sound legislation. In our deliberations in committee, the relative adverse impacts were balanced against the undoubted advantages to be derived from increasing the widths of buses, and the latter were found to far outweigh the former. I should like to mention to you some of the principal factors which influenced our decision:

First. This is permissive legislation only. It does not compel any State to permit wider buses to operate on its highways. It simply authorizes States to permit them when, as and if they deem the operation of such buses to be prudent, proper, and safe.

As a matter of fact, 23 States already permit the operation of 102-inch buses on the Interstate System. Undoubtedly, more will do so if this legislation is approved. But the fact remains that they will not be required to authorize such use even if this bill does become the law.

I am well aware that certain Members feel that, if left to their own devices, the so-called trucking interests would ramrod authorizing legislation through in the various States. Personally, I have more confidence in State legislatures than that. I assure you the legislature in my home State of Michigan can and does make up its own mind on the issues that come before it—just as honestly and independently as the Congress of the United States does.

Second. The increased limitation authorized in H.R. 4354 applies only to traffic lanes on the Interstate System which are at least 12 feet wide. Lanes of that width are clearly adequate to carry such traffic. In fact, 12-foot lanes on the interstate, all of which have at least two lanes in each direction, are probably the safest roadways in the Nation upon which such vehicles could operate.

That is why I feel the fears which have been raised over the problem of air turbulence are overstated. Air turbulence is admittedly a serious factor when large and small vehicles pass one another on narrow gage, two-lane roads, particularly for vehicles traveling in opposite directions. But on four-lane Interstate roads, where oncoming traffic is usually separated by median strips, this problem is minimized, although not totally eliminated.

In this regard, it would seem to me that if we applied the same kind of ingenuity in vehicle design as we have done on aircraft, the air turbulence problem could be further reduced as a menace, even on those highways which do not measure up to Interstate standards.

Third. The increased width authorization would apply to buses only. The current 96-inch width limitations applicable to trucks would still apply.

The principal opponent of this legislation, Mr. SCHWENDEL, has conceded the good faith of the sponsors of H.R. 4354 in this regard. He has, however, raised the specter of the 102-inch bus authorization constituting a foot in the door for those who wish to increase width and weight limitations for trucks. I strenuously disagree. On behalf of the minority, I want to state that this is not our intention. We are dealing here solely with

buses. Our aim is narrow and limited. It is our belief that unless we measurably improve the comfort and convenience of intercity buses, we cannot reasonably expect to attract more passengers to this form of transportation. Personally, I put wider body buses in the same category as those wider body jet airplanes which we hear so much about. The integration of each into our transportation network will afford passengers in both realms a hitherto undreamed-of standard of comfort.

Parentetically, it may be that increased seating width is a necessity rather than a luxury these days. Statistics show that Americans are growing taller and bigger with each passing generation. Generally speaking, we are larger and bigger boned than our parents and our children are larger and bigger boned than us. The authorization of increased seating widths recognizes and seeks to accommodate to this physical fact of American life.

Fourth. At the present time, some 22,000 buses, 102 inches wide, are already operating on streets and highways around the Nation. The District of Columbia, for example, has 300 such buses on its city street system. Anyone who has ridden on these vehicles can attest to the improvement that widened seats afford.

Let us face it, only by making bus travel more attractive can we expect to convince the driving public to abandon their cars in favor of public transportation. And only if we succeed in doing this, can we expect to relieve the escalating congestion of our highways.

Buses are the most flexible mode of public transportation we have. But they can only reach their potential as people carriers if we build into them features which match the comfort and convenience of private automobiles. This bill is a step in that direction.

Fifth. In addition to the foregoing, under the provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act, the Federal Government has provided financial assistance to communities to purchase 2,481 transit buses. Of this number, 1,761 will be 102 inches wide. Some of the latter are already operating on the Interstate System in those States which permit it on either regular routes or in charter service. In view of this, it would be inconsistent for us to refuse to approve in this measure what we sanction and encourage through subsidization in other legislation.

In this connection, I should like to read to you a letter I have received from Mr. E. W. Knox, general manager of the Department of Street Railways of the City of Detroit:

DEPARTMENT OF STREET RAILWAYS,
Detroit, Mich., July 8, 1971.

HON. JACK H. McDONALD,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDONALD: The Department of Street Railways very earnestly supports H.R. 4354 commonly termed the "Big Bus Bill". This Bill increases the width of buses on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches.

The DSR is a municipally owned system operating 1,100 buses in its active fleet. All

buses are 102 inches wide for the following reasons:

1. Aisle width of DSR buses is 26 inches. A six inch reduction would narrow the aisle width to 20 inches which is totally inadequate for the comfort of standees in our inner city operation. There would also be considerable delay and the slowing up of vital schedules due to inefficient egress of the passengers.

2. A conglomerate of 96 inch wide and 102 inch wide buses in DSR's operation would entail a tremendous cost to the Department and would result in inefficiency in that flexibility of operation would be sacrificed.

3. A 102 inch wide bus is considered safer from a standpoint of more stable braking due to the wider width. DSR buses are required to stop within 28 feet at 20 MPH. This is easily accomplished with a standee load. In many instances, DSR buses exceed this standard without loss of control. DSR buses have sufficient brake capacity to meet any legal standard.

4. Suspension members in a 102 inch wide bus are wider and contribute to the safety of the bus by virtue of better stability. Better stability is accompanied by better steering. A 102 inch wide bus, in this regard, can well be considered a safer bus.

It is for reasons of increased safety, comfort and flexibility of operations that the DSR is strongly in favor of H.R. 4354.

As you are aware, 102 inch buses have been permitted in Michigan for a number of years on all highways except those designated as the Interstate System and it is respectfully requested that you give your favorable consideration and support to H.R. 4354 which will eliminate the present inconsistency and permit transit companies to standardize fleets and operate more safely, efficiently, and economically.

Very truly yours,

E. W. KNOX,
General Manager.

Sixth. Mr. Knox's letter brings me to a further point which I wish to emphasize—safety. I yield to no one in my interest in and commitment to the safety of the American driving public. In fact, I have recently cosponsored a bill, introduced by my colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. HARSHA, which would vastly expand the highway safety program in this country. Also joining as cosponsors of this bipartisan bill was the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Mr. BLATNIK, as well as the majority of other members of the committee from both sides of the aisle.

We on the Public Works Committee are safety minded and safety conscious. Insofar as safety considerations are concerned in H.R. 4354, I believe adequate safeguards are built into this legislation. The increased widths authorized for buses will not go into effect until after the Secretary of Transportation has completed studies, including engineering and testing analyses, to determine all safety effects. Following completion of such studies, such regulations as he deems necessary to protect the traveling public will be promulgated.

As our report makes clear, our overall intention is to confer "a veto power to the Secretary of Transportation if in fact he does find and reports to Congress that the wider buses will be unsafe and cannot be made safe by promulgation of safety regulations." Personally, I do not believe the Secretary will have to exercise his veto power. But incorpora-

tion of such authority in this bill should convince even the most concerned of opponents that safety considerations have not been slighted; that safety was and remains uppermost in our minds.

Seventh. Finally, authorization of increased widths will make possible safety improvements in the buses themselves. Even those who, like myself, have only an elementary knowledge of the laws of physics, know that by increasing the width of a vehicle you make it a more stable operating platform. You also make it possible to make improvements in suspension and braking systems. And last but not least, you make possible handsome dividends in comfort to the traveling public.

You have probably seen those commercials on TV sponsored by the airlines relating to increased seat widths. Clearly, much of the competition between airline companies today is focusing on promises of increased passenger comfort through the wider seats currently being installed on competing passenger aircraft. As I see it, similar benefits should not be denied to the generally less affluent public who travel by bus.

In conclusion, I believe H.R. 4354 is sound legislation. All points, pro and con, were carefully considered in committee. All interests, and most importantly, the safety of the traveling public, are protected.

I sincerely hope that the House, in its wisdom, will approve this measure.

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, buses are so vitally important to the future of the country that there is a sense of urgency to this legislation.

There are almost 90 million automobiles in the country today, and every day sees a net increase of about 6,500. Our streets and highways are becoming hopelessly clogged with automobiles, many of them carrying only the driver. These cars are polluting our air. When discarded—and approximately 6,000,000 are every year—they befoul the landscape. As former Secretary of Transportation Boyd once said, we must do something to break up this great love affair of the American people for their automobiles.

Mr. Chairman, the logical, practical, and vital answer is the bus, both local and over-the-road types.

Our Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Francis C. Turner, put it about as clearly as possible when he said in a speech last March:

For most of our cities—large, medium-sized and small—only buses can do the job.

And Mr. Turner went on to add:

In order to get people out of their cars and on to the buses, they must be given some real incentives.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is one of those incentives and, let me stress, has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with any other mode of transportation or any other kind of vehicle. It would affect only buses using the Interstate Highway System.

This bill will remove the shackles on the width of bus seats, which must be widened to keep up with a population that is simply growing bigger than 15 years ago when the current width limit was imposed. Every bus carries the equivalent of 12 carloads of people. In other words, a bus removes 12 cars from the streets and highways. If the bus operators can make their buses more comfortable, they stand a chance of getting at least some of those people out of their cars. The Department of Transportation is graphically demonstrating this by sponsoring exclusive bus lane experiments in three cities, New York, Washington, and Seattle. During the morning and evening rush hours, highway lanes leading into and out of the cities are reserved for the sole use of buses. Most of the buses being used are modern new transit-type buses of the width this legislation would permit. They are proving that the public—given a comfortable, safe, and reliable service—will leave their cars in their driveways and take the bus. Secretary of Transportation Volpe commented on the success of these projects just last month, stating:

The fast, clean, comfortable service now provided on exclusive busways has resulted not only in a savings of time for the commuter, but also has reduced traffic congestion, increased safety and rehabilitated a lot of once-frayed tempers.

In addition, all the buses in New York City are already 102 inches wide and have been running for some 20 years with no problems attributable to that width. The intercity operators believe they can also win more riders with the more comfortable and safer bus that H.R. 4354 would allow them to offer to the public.

Mr. Chairman, the bus is the transportation mode of the real public. Nearly 400 million Americans took intercity bus trips last year, or more than double the number who flew the domestic airlines. The bus is the vehicle of all the people—servicemen, youths, older persons with little to spend, all races. These people, and the entire public, deserve and should have the comfort and additional safety that this bill would give them.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a follow-on to the remarks which were made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), I think it would be helpful for the Members now on the floor to refer back to the enactment of the Highway Act of 1970 wherein we incorporated the highway-related mass transportation systems, with preferential lanes, as one of the sections of that bill.

I believe it is obvious that there is going to be an increasing need for a new design of the buses for this particular mode of our total transportation is in order.

Having discussed this matter with the Secretary of Transportation and people in the Federal Highway Administration, it is my view that they, in cooperation with our safety engineers, the manufacturers of buses want to move in the

direction of cleaner, more comfortable and safer buses. Also, I have asked the Department of Transportation to maximize and intensify the study of aerodynamics and the "wind blast" problems associated with heavy motor vehicles.

There, of course, were some reservations presented to the committee as they related to this legislation, a part of which came from the administration.

But I think it would be helpful if I were to read to the membership section 3 of the legislation at this time, because it tends to incorporate some of the suggested changes to cover reservations the administration had expressed during testimony before the committee.

Section 3 reads as follows:

Sec. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year which begins after the date the Secretary of Transportation has completed the necessary safety studies (including engineering and testing analyses) concerning the effects of such amendment and has promulgated such safety regulations as he deems necessary, or on July 1, 1973, whichever date first occurs unless, prior to such effective date, the Secretary reports to Congress that as a result of such studies he has determined that the operation of motor buses having a width in excess of 96 inches but not in excess of 102 inches upon twelve foot wide traffic lanes of the Interstate System will be unsafe and cannot be made safe by promulgation of safety regulations.

I, too, had some concern. However, the inclusion of this particular section tended to sway my thinking in the direction of support for this legislation.

To the Members from California, I do believe I have a responsibility to convey to you what the situation is in our own native State.

We are one of the 23 States that actually have the wider buses that are now in operation. The suburban and urban areas of California have the limitation set at 104 inches, not the 102 inches that is under consideration in this particular bill.

Finally, for those of you from California, I would like to read the communities that are now being served by the 102-inch transit buses and where they are actually in operation: Alameda, Culver City, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Montebello, Oakland, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Monica.

I thought this might be helpful as you give consideration to your position on this particular piece of legislation. I recommend passage of the bill before us.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works, but I want to try to tell you what I understand this bill to be, and if, when I explain it to you as I understand it in its simplest form, I am in error, then I would like to have someone clarify my thinking, if I am wrong, and where I might be wrong.

As I understand this proposal, it does nothing in the world except on the part of the Federal Government say to the States in the instance of interstate highways which traverse their States, that if

you want to, where there are 12-foot traffic lanes, you may, if you choose, allow buses of a width of 102 inches to travel.

It is my understanding that it does nothing more than that.

Now, how can you justify this? I am told that these 102-inch width buses are the safest ever built. I am told that there are 22,000 buses already in service in the United States which are 102 inches wide, and that these 22,000 buses constitute 40 percent of all the buses in use in the United States. In addition to this, if we pass this legislation, they would not immediately go into use in the States where they choose to allow their use because it is incumbent upon the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Frank Turner, and the Department of Transportation, to make a determination before July 1, 1973, that the utilization of these buses—not trucks—just passenger-carrying, for-hire buses—will constitute no hazard to safety in any way. If they make a determination prior to that time that there will be a hazard then they can and will veto the use of these buses anywhere that this bill provides that they be allowed where the States choose to allow them.

Now, there is not much wrong with that in my personal opinion. First of all, Frank Turner is, I think, without a peer in Government service as far as the knowledge of our highways are concerned, and the safety on those highways.

For those of you who are interested in safety let me say that I have seen statistics which show that each time you put one of these buses in service you take 11 passenger cars off of the highway. So what does that do to overall safety? And if safety cannot be provided on our interstate highways where on earth can it be provided, because they are the safest highways we have.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill ought to be passed.

I just want to know, Mr. Chairman, if there is anybody here who says that I have misinterpreted this bill?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that I believe the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is eminently correct in the statements he has made. The fact that this bill merely permits it in those States if they should so choose to permit these buses to be used on their State highways, then that State will have the right to determine that.

The fact that there are some 22,000 buses of this width already is absolutely correct. The total figure of buses in this kind of operation is about 90,000—some, so that figure is almost 25 percent of all of the buses in the country today.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The figure the gentleman is using includes inner-city buses?

Mr. HOWARD. That is right. We are just excluding schoolbuses which naturally would not be utilized and would not want to be utilized that way.

And, of course, the provision that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) referred to that the Department of Transportation must, under this legislation, make a survey as to any problems which may come up as to safety or such things as that, and that they will have the right to veto the operation of this legislation, should something insurmountable come up, is correct.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this legislation deserves our affirmative consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) has again expired.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to come before this body and oppose colleagues with whom you have worked for 16 years constructively on legislation to build a better America. I am especially proud of the 74 days that I worked with my colleagues in bringing out the interstate system and dozens—yes, hundreds of other bills that have come out of our committee.

But, I am convinced beyond a question of a doubt that we are wrong in acting on this bill today—and it is based upon much study and analysis by myself and much research, far beyond anything that has come before the committee.

I submit that the committee has not had enough time to consider this. There were many people who wanted to be heard on this, but who could not be heard because there was not enough time.

Now my interest is in safety as has been stated by many of you here—and I believe them—my interest is also in economy and I think this is uneconomical because a wider bus means a heavier bus—by 13,000 pounds according to the testimony of the bus people themselves—on the plans that they have in their family of buses.

Now I want to tell you that I speak for a lot of people and among them are the drivers of the buses. I know we had testimony before the committee and somebody from the union saying such and such, but I have gone to the drivers themselves and universally the drivers know that a bigger bus and a wider bus is going to be harder to manage.

Recently I was in Chicago at that great bus terminal there and I am told it is the greatest bus terminal in the world. I spent about an hour and one-half there looking it over, and I said to the people in charge, "Suppose we were to widen these buses by 6 inches," and this man said, "Man, you would not be able to get them in or get them out. We would have to rebuild this whole thing."

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to finish my statement and I will yield after awhile.

Mr. CLARK. This is with reference to the size in Chicago, where they already are 102 inches.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the Greyhound Bus Depot where the buses are, I am told, 96-inch buses.

Now, I speak also for the 80 million, or as somebody now suggested, 90 million drivers on the highways—automobile owners. We know on the average that it would be at least one passenger, so that would be 160 million.

Now, I have had some attention nationally since this came up, that I have been leading the fight both on trucks and buses. But I do not have any letters from anywhere from automobile drivers saying that they favor this bill, but there are hundreds of them, I suppose they reach into the thousands, saying—We are with you, good luck.

Now, the prestigious AAA organization speaks well for the automobile owners and they do not have anywhere near the number or amount of membership that they ought to have for the service that they do for the country. But they came before this committee, and they are completely and utterly against it.

Now, there is another reason I am concerned. The administration is opposed to this bill. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is opposed and the National Transportation Safety Board is opposed. Somebody mentioned Mr. Turner in glowing words and I can add to my comment about Mr. Turner because I recognize him as a great pioneer and a great authority, but Mr. Turner is not for this bill.

In an appearance before the committee, and I have forgotten the date, but in the early part of the hearings he said among other things:

In our previous testimony, safety was our primary consideration in our review of the proposal. It is still our primary concern. Based on the extent of our analysis to date with regard to the potential benefits and safety hazards which would result from the proposed increased bus width, the Department cannot support enactment of H.R. 4354 at this time.

Later after hearings he addressed a letter to Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I have a copy of the letter. Among other things he said:

The Department has concluded that the kind of evidence available to us now is not fully adequate to provide a reliable basis for a definitive finding on the relative safety of 102-inch buses as compared to 96-inch or narrower buses. Accordingly, our position on width remains unchanged.

So here are people who work in this field. Here is a man who, as has been said on this side of the aisle, and we admit on our side, is a great authority in the field of road legislation.

I want to call attention to the effect of blast, of air turbulence. We know it is there. If you want to be convinced, get caught on an interstate highway with a panel truck some night. Park it 6 feet off the lane and just see what happens as you sit in that panel truck. Observe how it rocks when a bus or truck comes by, and it may be as far away as 18 feet. It will still cause that panel truck to waver 3 or 4 inches.

Studies have been made of this subject. One of the reasons that Mr. Turner

cannot endorse this proposal is that he knows that studies of the blast effect and what to do about it will take time.

So there is this problem and many other problems. I say to you that it is senseless to pass a bill until we know all the facts with respect to the blast effect alone. How serious can that be? I can tell you that a constituent of mine was driving a very substantial trailer behind a car, and as a truck passed him on an interstate highway where there were two lanes, a 24-foot highway, it blew this whole operation, blasted it off the highway, and a life was lost.

This is piecemeal legislation. You cannot distinguish, friends, between a wider bus and a wider truck, regardless of what these people say. I know they mean it when they say that this does not relate to truck legislation, but I believe it will lead to a truck bill. Then what will you do if we have passed this bill? I say it is precedent-making, and we had better not make that precedent again until we know, and we need the whole picture. We need to study the question of the user taxes.

I have a substitute that I will offer at the proper time which is a proposition to have a presidential study to study the questions I have mentioned and many more and to bring back a report. Then we can legislate from a base of knowledge, sound research, thorough research, and we will not be guessing. That will be in the public interest.

I want to call attention to the fact that there are inaccuracies. I pointed that out in the report, and that is in the record. If you base your vote on that committee report, you are basing it on a report that is quite inaccurate and inadequate.

The first error deals with the statement made on page 3 of the report. The report states practically all the cities of the country presently permit 102-inch buses to operate on their streets and highways. This statement gives the impression that cities in this country are practically unanimous on this 102-inch-bus question. The facts in this respect are spelled out on page 339 of the hearings held on the legislation in 1969. Mr. Gunther was testifying. Mr. Gunther is the executive secretary of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, so he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Gunther said: "There are 14,500 cities that belong to the National League of Cities through State affiliates." That would be less than half of the cities I would include—and he said, "There are about 1,500 bus systems in our Nation and 94 cities are listed here."

That, I said, was a pretty small percentage. The percentage of the total is very small. The 22,000 buses which are 102 inches wide constitute 7 percent of the total number of buses.

This shows there are areas of mistakes.

Let us go on to what I call the third point. This relates to the number of 102-inch buses in service. The majority report states there are approximately 22,000 of the 102-inch-wide buses in operation. I am sure this is correct, but the false impression is of the number of

102-inch buses now in use as related to the total number of buses now in use.

Motor Truck Facts, published by the American Manufacturers' Association, states there are 364,340 motorbuses of all types which were registered in the United States in 1969. This means less than 7 percent of the buses in the United States are 102 inches in width—a much smaller quantity than the majority report would imply.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, of these buses in the United States, is it not a fact that 237,000 of them are school-buses that are not engaged in commercial and business-type operations?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think so.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So when we get this figure down to the commercial operation of buses, we actually have about 25 percent of the commercial buses in operation that are 102-inch buses.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman is correct. I am glad he made that point. But the buses are still on the highways, and those buses are 96-inch buses. We have a firm in my district that builds those buses. This is for safety reasons. They are continually trying to do what they can make those buses more safe.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, of the number of buses of over 100 inches that are operating at this time, how many of them are operating within the cities and municipalities of the country rather than on the Interstate Highway System?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There are 94 communities or cities that allow 102-inch buses. Not all the buses in those communities are 102 inches.

Mr. MIZELL. I think it would be safe to say the majority of the buses of 102 inches at this time are operating within the municipalities of this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman made a point of trying to discredit the committee report by quoting a colloquy he had in the committee hearing with Mr. John Gunther, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, I think it ought to be made clear that the testimony of Mr. Gunther was not to any measure at variance with the committee conclusion in its report. Does the gentleman recall Mr. Gunther, on page 319 of those hearings, making the statement that these wider buses are currently operating in most major cities of the Nation?

Is that not exactly what the committee said?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Gunther said that, but the figures I quoted are accurate also. They have been checked and doublechecked. According to his own statement, Mr. Gunther said there are 15,000 city buses.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman criticized Mr. Gunther, but does not the gentleman concede that Mr. Gunther in his executive position ought to know? Does not the gentleman recall Mr. Gunther gave testimony in favor of this bill and said it would be helpful to the cities of the Nation?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. He did, but I quoted that just to establish the point of error. That cannot be questioned. I never said Mr. Gunther was opposed to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor the argument or carry it on unduly.

I want to say that I am not against improving the opportunities to move men and goods on the highways. My record is pretty clear on this.

But I am interested in protecting the public interests. One of the public interests is safety. We have not explored all the areas that relate to this question. Unless and until we do I believe we ought not enact this kind of legislation.

The economics of this is bad, because increased width means increased size. On page 119 of the committee hearings is the statement of what the Greyhound Bus Co. has in its plans for a family of buses: Increase length to 40, width to 102, overall height to 12 feet, weight to 42,000 from 28,733.

Well, that is setting a bad precedent. I believe this is the first step toward a truck bill. This is serious business.

I am glad to note so many people who are arguing for this bill are making the point that this is not a truck bill. What will they do? How could they oppose a truck bill if one follows now? I plead with Members to not consider seriously enacting this unless we can amend it. I will have a substitute bill to present at the proper time.

Another error relates to the statement in the report that "Yet, in these cities the newly constructed Interstate System is not available to them under current law." Again, I quote from the 1969 hearings on this same legislation. At page 9, Mr. Charles A. Webb, president, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, testified:

In about 25 of these States, operations of 102-inch-wide local and suburban buses were permitted prior to July 1, 1956, which means such operations are permitted today on local and suburban segments of the Interstate System. In the remaining 15 States, local and suburban bus operators must confine their modern 102-inch-wide buses to routes which do not embrace any part of the Interstate System.

At page 4, the report states:

An excellent example of this situation is right in the Nation's Capital where the seven bridges crossing the Potomac River from Virginia, four are on the Interstate System, and therefore, cannot be used by 102 inch buses. The three remaining bridges all have lane widths less than 12 feet, but are available for the 102 inch buses. Yet, within Washington, D.C., the bus system contains over 300 buses of 102 inch width which operate legally on the city street system.

The report bemoans the fact that 102 inch buses can operate in the District of Columbia, but cannot cross the interstate bridges. The fact is there is no need for D.C. Transit buses to cross these bridges because D.C. Transit has no operating

authority or routes requiring them to cross the Potomac, except for one short route between Bethesda and the CIA. In fact, it is interesting to note that D.C. Transit has only 173 buses which are 102 inches wide. That is out of a total fleet of 1,167 vehicles, the majority of which are only 95 inches wide. The report claims D.C. Transit has over 300 buses, 102 inches wide, however, I have been assured by D.C. Transit officials that they have only 173 buses that are 102 inches wide.

Still another fallacy in the majority report stems from the statement:

The clear facts that the 102 inch bus is in widespread use with an excellent safety record on narrow lanes with lesser safety characteristics than the Interstate System has convinced the Committee that the 96 inch restriction on the Interstate System should be removed.

When viewed from the perspective of the fact that "widespread use" means less than 7 percent of all buses, the safety record may not be as impressive as it appears at first blush. The National Safety Council publication, Accident Facts, 1970, indicates that for the year 1968-69, the accident rate for buses were as follows:

Accidents per million vehicle-miles	
City	56.45
Suburban	31.71
Intercity	6.34

While it is impossible to tell what percent of the buses involved in these accidents were 102 inches wide, it is quite clear that the city buses do experience a much higher accident rate—hardly what should be termed "an excellent safety record." In addition, since the safety record of 102-inch buses is based mainly on city usage, some of the other safety problems, particularly those of the "blast effect" have not been fully evaluated. The "blast effect" would not be significant under most city traffic conditions.

Also, at page 4, the report states:

The other part of the bus operation—intercity long haul buses—presents still another phase of the transportation system which must be realized to its peak efficiency. This fact is accentuated by the recent developments in the railroad industry which have completely removed passenger service to many of our cities and so curtailed others as to create hardships on the total mobility of the American people.

It seems clear to me that the major portion of the urban traffic congestion results from intracity traffic and not intercity traffic. Encouraging people to ride intercity buses will do little to solve our urban-intercity traffic problems. In recent years, the number of intercity passengers carried by bus has steadily declined. The 1970 World Almanac cites the following figures:

1966	169,323,447
1967	166,285,070
1968	160,692,862

So the argument that "recent developments in the railroad industry" necessitate increased intercity bus service hardly squares with the fact bus ridership has been declining drastically during the period passenger trains were being dropped at an alarming rate. The

bus owners themselves admit that their buses travel, on the average, half empty. It is for that reason, I suggested to the bus owners that they can get additional seating space by removing one row of "unused" seats.

Another point which needs clarification is that of the size and weight of the new wider buses. While the present bill clearly deals only with an increase in the width of buses, it should be noted the new "family" of Greyhound buses would be 5 feet longer, 2 feet higher, and 13,267 pounds heavier than present buses. These increases are within the present size and weight limitations, and no changes in the law are necessary to accommodate them. It seems readily apparent to me that a bus 13,267 pounds heavier is going to cause more wear and tear on our highways. Thus, contrary to the statement contained in the report, there will be substantial costs to the Government and thus to the taxpayers beyond the cost of the studies mentioned in the report.

Finally, it seems to me that there are a sufficient number of inaccuracies in the majority report as to raise serious questions about the conclusions drawn by it in favor of the bill. Conclusions based on such questionable facts, certainly should not be given much weight.

I include the following complete statement on this problem:

SIZE AND WEIGHT LEGISLATION: STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGLER

I. BACKGROUND

A. Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956

In 1956, the Congress first considered the subject of vehicle weights and dimensions. The subject was broached in the consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 which established a vast new highway system spanning the country known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Federal-State ratio of contribution was to be 90-10.

The magnitude of the Federal contribution gave support to the imposition of standards for vehicle users designed to protect the useful life of this enormous investment and to enhance the safety of the motorists who travel on our highways. Before this time, the matter of regulation had been primarily regarded as a State concern. Naturally, the standards varied quite widely from State to State, ranging, for example, from 18,000 to 24,000 pounds for single axles—from 28,650 to 44,000 pounds for tandem axle maximums.

Ten years earlier, the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO), concerned with the same problem of promoting the maximum useful life of the nation's highways, established certain standards to that end. This group of professional highway officials from the various States set forth the following standards:

1. Maximum weights: (a) single axle—18,000 lbs. (b) Tandem axle—32,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—73,280 lbs. (as determined by AASHO formula based on maximum allowed length within the states.)

2. Maximum height: 12½ feet.

3. Maximum width: 96 inches.

4. Maximum length: (a) single unit trucks—35 ft. (b) Buses with 2 axles—35 ft. (c) Buses with 3 axles—35 ft. (d) Truck-trailer semi-trailers—50 ft. (e) Other combinations—60 ft.

Although in 1956 some thought that these standards were out of date and somewhat restrictive, still it was felt that they were reliable enough to be incorporated into the Federal Aid Highway Act. As passed, the

1956 legislation adopted the following legal limits and made them binding upon all Interstate mileage, with certain exceptions for States then having more liberal size and weight standards:

1. Maximum weight; (a) single axle—18,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—32,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—73,280 lbs.

2. Maximum height: 12½ feet.

3. Maximum length: no limit.

4. Maximum width: 96 inches.

The states protected by the "grandfather clause" exception contained in Section 108(J) of the 1956 Act are: Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, and Rhode Island.

All the time of the bill's passage, a commitment was also made to undertake extensive research to determine the standards necessary to ensure maximum useful life of the new Interstate System. The commitment was embodied in Section 108(K) of the Act which reads:

Test To Determine Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights

"The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned, or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several states, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal Aid Highway Systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

In 1956, AASHO already had in the planning stage, a series of tests which were designed to elicit much the same information as that mandated by the Act. With some modifications to meet the requirements of Section 108(K), 836 sections of test pavements were built late in 1956 near Ottawa, Illinois. Beginning in 1958 and spanning a two-year period, a nearly continuous series of tests of fully-loaded trucks was conducted over these sections of pavement. The purpose was to gather information bearing on the relationship between pavement types and bridge construction, and vehicle weight limits and axle loadings. The resulting data was to be a critical factor in setting the maximum desirable weights of motor vehicles allowed on the Interstate System.

After several delays, the data from the tests was made available by the Secretary of Commerce and printed as House Document No. 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session.

The maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles recommended on the basis of the Ottawa tests were the following:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—34,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—(to be determined by the formula).

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

Where W is the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L is the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N is the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. maximum height: 13½ feet.

3. maximum width: 102 inches.

4. maximum length: (a) single unit truck—40 feet. (b) single unit bus—40 feet. (c) semi-trailer—40 feet. (d) truck-trailer semi-trailer—55 feet. (e) all other combinations—65 feet.

II. ACTION IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

A. Senate

In November of 1967, Senator Warren Magnuson, and others, introduced a bill, S. 2658,

to increase the maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles operating on the Interstate System. This bill provided for the following limitations:

1. Maximum weight: (a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—36,000 lbs. (c) gross weight—computed by formula:

$$W=500\left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1}+12N+40\right)$$

Where W equals the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L equals the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N equals the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. Maximum length—no limitation.

3. Maximum width—102 inches exclusive of tire bulge and safety devices such as mirrors.

Four days of hearings were held before the Senate Public Works Committee in February and March of 1968. The bill was reported out of committee after it was amended to include the following weight limitations:

Single axle—20,000 lbs. Tandem axle—34,000 lbs. Gross weight—(computed by formula).

$$W=500\left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

The bill was then considered by the Senate under suspension of the rules, and passed by a voice vote with only seven Senators on the Floor.

B. House action

Similar legislation, H.R. 14474, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Kluczynski of Illinois and eight others. During the general hearings on the Federal Aid Highways Act of 1968, this bill was considered together with S. 2658. The hearings were held in February, May and June of 1968. On July 3, 1968, the House Public Works Committee favorably reported the bill, S. 2658, as amended, to the House.

Subsequently, a rule was obtained from the Rules Committee and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar, Number 669. The bill, however, was never called up for action and died at the end of the session.

C. Position of Department of Transportation

Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, testified before the Senate Public Works Committee that the Department of Transportation was opposed to S. 2658 as introduced. He stated, however, that the Department recognized the inadequacies of the existing size and weight limitations. Mr. Bridwell offered the following substitute bill on behalf of the Department:

[Attachment C]

A bill To provide for more uniform standards for the weights and dimensions and the safety and performance of vehicles using the Federal-aid systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That,

Section 127, of title 23 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 127. Vehicle weight and dimension limitations, safety and performance standards

"(a) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for expenditure upon the Federal-aid systems shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which any Federal-aid system may lawfully be used by a vehicle or vehicle combination with:

(1) weight in excess of twenty thousand pounds including tolerances carried on any one axle, or with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-four thousand pounds including tolerances, or with an overall width

in excess of one hundred and two inches excluding tire bulge due to loads and safety devices approved by the Secretary, or with an overall height in excess of thirteen feet, six inches, or with an overall gross weight including tolerances on a group of two or more consecutive axles in excess of that derived by application of the following formula:

$$W=500\left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

Where W represents overall gross weight on any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest 500 pounds; L represents distance between centers of the extreme axles of any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest foot; and N represents number of axles in the group under consideration; or

(2) the corresponding weights and dimensions permitted for vehicles or vehicle combinations using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on January 1, 1968, whichever is the greater.

"(b) Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall lapse. Subsection (a) of this section does not deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of vehicle or vehicle combination that could be lawfully operated within such State on January 1, 1968, or the operation within an urban area as defined in section 101(a) of this title of any transit-type bus meeting the requirements of section 4483(c) of title 26, United States Code, that could be lawfully operated within such area while engaged in scheduled bus service on January 1, 1968.

"(c) (1) In the interest of safety and the efficient utilization of the Federal-aid highway system the Secretary, after consultation with the States and such other public and private organizations as he deems appropriate and no later than two years following the enactment of this Act, shall develop and publish in the Federal Register reasonable and practicable performance standards providing objective criteria applicable to vehicles and vehicle combinations having more than two axles or an overall gross weight in excess of 14,000 pounds, which shall prescribe:

(A) minimum performance standards specifying a ratio of gross weight of a vehicle or vehicle combination to the net engine horsepower available for movement of the vehicle or vehicle combination;

(B) minimum performance standards for the braking system of a vehicle or vehicle combination; and

(C) minimum performance standards for the strength and operation of the linkage and coupling systems between the components of a vehicle combination.

(2) The Secretary shall determine the effective date of any standard prescribed under this subsection, which date shall be not less than one nor more than two years after the beginning of the fiscal year next following its publication in the Federal Register unless the Secretary finds, for good cause shown, that a later date is in the public interest and publishes his reasons for such findings. The Secretary may revise, amend or revoke any standard prescribed under this subsection by notice published in the Federal Register, but the effective date of any revision or amendment shall not be less than one nor more than two years after the beginning of the fiscal year next following its publication in the Federal Register, unless the Secretary finds, for good cause shown, that a later date is in the public interest and publishes his reasons for such finding.

(3) After the effective date of any standard prescribed under this subsection, 10 per centum of funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for expenditure upon the Federal-aid systems shall be with-

held from apportionment to any State within the boundaries of which any segment of any system may lawfully be used by vehicles in violation of that standard. No withholding from the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to such State shall be made pursuant to the preceding sentence where a reduction in apportionment under section 402(c) of this title is applied to that State for the same fiscal year. Where he determines it to be in the public interest the Secretary may suspend, for such periods as he deems necessary, the application of this subsection to any State. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to this subsection shall lapse.

(4) Nothing in this section shall diminish any authority conferred upon the Secretary or the Federal Highway Administrator pursuant to any other act.

SEC. 2. Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'single axle' means an assembly of two or more wheels, whose centers are in one transverse vertical plane or may be included between two parallel transverse vertical planes forty inches apart extending across the full width of the vehicle.

"The term 'tandem-axle' means any two or more consecutive axles whose centers are more than forty inches but not more than ninety-six inches apart and are individually attached to and/or articulated from a common attachment to the vehicle including a connecting mechanism designed to equalize the load between axles.

"The term 'overall gross weight' means the weight of a vehicle or vehicle combination without load plus the weight of any load thereon.

"The term 'vehicle' means a mechanical device intended primarily for highway transportation of any person or property therein or upon, or by which such device may be drawn upon a highway, except devices moved by human power or used exclusively upon stationary rails or tracks.

"The term 'vehicle combination' means a truck-tractor and semitrailer either with or without a trailer, or a truck with one or more trailers."

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by revising the caption of section 127 to read as follows:

"Vehicle weight and dimension limitations, safety and performance standards."

It would appear from the printed hearings that the Department of Transportation officials did not testify directly before the House Public Works Committee on this legislation. The only evidence of the Department's position with respect to S. 2658, as passed by the Senate is contained in the answers to a series of questions submitted to the Department by Congressman William Cramer of Florida. The Department's responses appear at pages 164-166 of the printed hearings, and appear to have been in line with the contents of the substitute amendment above which was submitted by Mr. Bridwell in the Senate.

D. Campaign

During the Presidential Campaign of 1968, the question of increasing the vehicle weight and dimension limitations became a national issue. Eventually, both major candidates issued statements on the subject. President Richard M. Nixon observed during the 1968 campaign, that:

"This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.

"I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.

"As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered, I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interests of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce."

Former Vice-President Humphrey also indicated his opposition to the legislation during the campaign.

III. ACTION IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

A. House of Representatives

In June of 1969, Representatives John Kluczynski and Robert Denney introduced legislation essentially the same as that which was reported out of the House Public Works Committee in amended form in 1968. The bill was H.R. 11870. The only change was the addition of a length limitation not contained in S. 2658. The following limits are provided in the Kluczynski-Denney bill:

1. Maximum weight—(a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—34,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—as computed by the formula

$$W=500\left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

2. Maximum height: no change from present limits.

3. Maximum width: 102 inches.

4. Maximum length: 70 feet.

The Subcommittee also had under consideration H.R. 11619, which would have permitted an increase in the width of buses operated on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches. The bill was introduced by Congressman Frank Clark of Pennsylvania.

Eleven days of hearings were held on these two bills during July, August, and September of 1969. In December, the Subcommittee reported the bill back to the full Public Works Committee without recommendation. The full Committee took no further action on either bill. As a result, both bills died at the end of the 91st Congress.

B. Position of the Department of Transportation

Mr. Francis C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, testified before the Committee with respect to H.R. 11870 and H.R. 11619. He stated that the Department of Transportation could not support the legislation unless the following changes were made in the bill:

1. That the effective date of the legislation be delayed three years to allow enactment of appropriate safety regulations governing the larger vehicles. He specifically mentioned regulations concerning: brake system performance, tires, weight-horsepower ratios, and track width.

2. That the provision in H.R. 11870 permitting two consecutive sets of tandem axles to carry a gross load of 68,000 pounds, notwithstanding other restrictions in the bill, should be eliminated.

3. That the term "tandem axle weight" be fully defined.

4. That the exception to width limitations for safety devices be modified to include "officially approved" safety devices.

5. That the exception to width limitations for "tire bulge" be eliminated.

6. That the length limitation be 65 feet instead of 70 feet.

7. That the protection of the "grandfather clause" be gradually eliminated.

8. That the size and weight limitations of Section 127, Title 23 U.S.C., be extended to all Federal Aid Highway Systems, and not just the Interstate System as currently provided.

C. Senate action

The Senate took no action respecting vehicle size and weight limitations during the 91st Congress.

IV. ACTION IN THE 92D CONGRESS

A. House action

On March 16, the Chairman of the House Public Works Committee announced that the Roads Subcommittee would conduct hearings on March 30th with respect to H.R. 4354. This bill provides for an increase in the permissible width of buses on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches. As one would suspect, the shortness of the notice of the hearings prevented many interested groups from testifying on this legislation. One interested witness, the American Automobile Association did not receive notice of the hearings until March 22nd. The short notice worked a particular hardship on groups such as the American Association of State Highway Officials, because their internal procedures require them to contact individual states before they can testify on a bill.

Because of the opposition of the Department of Transportation to the bill, the Subcommittee delayed action on it for at least thirty days. The Department's position is more fully discussed in a following section. The bill is thus presently pending before the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

B. Position of Department of Transportation

Mr. Francis C. Turner appeared before the Subcommittee to present the position of the Department of Transportation. In his prepared statement he said,

"Based on the extent of our analysis to date with regard to the potential benefits and safety hazards which would result from the proposed increased bus width, the Department cannot support enactment of H.R. 4354 at this time. We will attempt to arrive at a definitive conclusion as to the actual advantages or disadvantages in a reasonable period of time and advise this Committee as to our final overall recommendation."

In an initial response to questioning by Congressman Harsha as to the time necessary for the Department to formulate its position, Mr. Turner stated that "... it would take us at least three months to try to put that together in the form that we would be confident of and want to send to the Committee." Responding to further questioning by Congressman Harsha and Congressman Kluczynski, Mr. Turner agreed to attempt to develop the Department's position within thirty days.

C. Senate action

No size and weight legislation has been introduced in the Senate as of this date.

V. ISSUES

The question of changing the limitations on size and weight is extremely complex, and at times, extremely emotional in nature. I will attempt to discuss some of the major issues involved, hopefully in a relatively unemotional manner.

A. Accident data

For a number of reasons there simply are no accident statistics which are sufficiently accurate to analyze this complex question of the effect of increased size and weight on highway safety. To begin, the accident forms utilized in the various states do not distinguish between various sizes and classes of trucks and buses involved in accidents. For example, they do not distinguish between 96 inch buses and 102 inch buses (which, of course, are permitted to operate in some states on primary and secondary roads). Even if the report forms did distinguish between the two sizes of buses, the data still would not be adequate for purposes of this legislation. This is due to the fact that by far the majority of the 102 inch buses now in operation are operated within city limits. They have as a result, a much higher exposure to the possibility of accidents. At the same

time, they are not exposed to identical hazards, and they don't expose other drivers to the same hazards, as would be the case on more rural highways. That is to say, areas where the problems of air turbulence are more pronounced.

Thus, we are severely lacking in sound data on what should be one of the first and most important factors in considering this legislation.

B. Air turbulence

The problem of the air turbulence experienced when passed or being passed by a large bus or truck is a problem well known by every motorist. Unfortunately, the Department of Transportation has just recently recognized the problem as one of sufficient seriousness to warrant study and investigation. It is my understanding that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has just recently let the first contract for research into this problem. Thus, once again, we are without adequate scientific data to properly evaluate one of the critical problems related to this legislation.

It should be noted that the problem of air turbulence was the subject of an extensive article in the May, 1969 issue of Popular Mechanics. In an article written by E. D. Fales, Jr., the problems of "blast" and "suction" associated with the passing of large vehicles is fully discussed. During the course of this year's hearings, Congressman Don Clausen requested that the Department of Transportation check with the Federal Aviation Administration officials to see if some of the principles of aerodynamics which they utilize daily couldn't be applied to the problem of air turbulence as related to motor vehicles. It was certainly a good point, and one I hope the Department will pursue in a serious manner.

Mr. Turner attempted to belittle the problem because of the relatively small change in the overall size of the vehicle, and thus presumably the small increase in the air turbulence problem. This is after Mr. Turner had testified that: "Frankly, we do not know exactly how to put it (referring to research on air turbulence) together in order to really measure quantitatively the impact on safety."

Thus, we have the Federal Highway Administrator recognizing the problem of air turbulence, then stating that they don't know how to properly research the question, but that even so, the additional six inches wouldn't substantially increase the problem.

This is very difficult logic for me to follow. It would seem to me that once we have recognized a problem such as air turbulence, we should fully research the question before we make changes in vehicle size which are likely to complicate the problem. Research might reveal for example, that the proposed extra six inches could be utilized to reduce air turbulence through the application of aerodynamic design principles.

Testimony of Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, Deputy Federal Highway Administrator, before Senate Roads Subcommittee, May 14, 1971, on Truck Induced Aerodynamic Forces

"In June of 1970, the FHWA Office of Research initiated a study to explore the effect of truck blast (truck induced aerodynamic forces) on passenger automobiles. To date, the research has shown that the truck blast effect is significant to safety. The hazard occurs when the automobile is passing or is being passed by trucks in the same direction, and there is a small speed difference between the two vehicles.

"The research will be extended to include other vehicles, such as campers and "mini-buses," full size buses and some highway structures. Methods of minimizing the hazardous blast effect will be studied.

"The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has also been directed by the

Secretary to conduct areodynamic testing of 102-inch wide buses as rapidly as possible."

C. Braking capacity

One of the arguments utilized by proponents of the bill is that the additional space will permit better braking systems. They state that the new wider buses will have braking systems which are considerably more effective. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration regulations for new buses and trucks require them to stop within 245 feet at 60 miles per hour.

By comparison automobiles are required to stop within 216 feet from a speed of 60 miles per hour.

The danger of mixing in the same stream of traffic, vehicles with such widely varying braking ability should be apparent to all. The National Transportation Safety Board in its recent report on the tragic multiple-vehicle accident which occurred on the New Jersey Turnpike, November 29, 1969, (Report No. NTSB-HAR-71-3) recognized this problem and recommended that:

"3. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set a high priority on establishing performance requirements for new buses, trucks, trailers, and combinations in regard to: (1) improved braking capabilities with balanced skid resistance, reduced "fade", and shorter stopping with maximum load; (2) the use of energy-absorbing underdrive and override barriers to reduce passenger-car impact decelerations through controlled yielding; and (3) minimum limits on stability factors for loaded vehicles. (Stability factor is defined as one-half the tread width between centers of outside tire footprints, divided by the height of the center of gravity of a loaded vehicle.)

"4. The Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, Federal Highway Administration, consider the promulgation of regulations to require improved braking capabilities of regulated vehicles, and inclusion of a numerical statement of the stability factor (value) on the identification plate of all tank trailers which transport hazardous materials, in implementing Recommendation 3, above."

In a recent address, Dr. William Haddon, Jr., President, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, spoke of similar problems regarding braking capacity. Dr. Haddon is the former Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau. In an address to the Society of Automotive Engineers in January of this year, Dr. Haddon stated:

"A second noteworthy problem in relation to highway losses involving trucks and buses involves the extent to which their designers and manufacturers provide adequate braking ability. Simply stated, all vehicles in the dense traffic streams typical of many present roads must be able to break at essentially the same rate, lest in emergencies the slower braking vehicles literally sweep the faster before them with results well known to students of the daily press. This is not a requirement that logic places only on the members of one class of vehicles, such as passenger cars—where the at present huge discrepancies in maximum braking rates are also a serious problem (9) for the same and other reasons. It is also not a problem for vehicles only in a particular state of load. It is a logical, necessary performance requirement for all vehicles, especially including the heaviest trucks under their fullest loadings. Moreover, the braking capacity must approach closely at least that of the fastest braking vehicles now on the road since the alternative of worsening, for intervehicular compatibility, the latter's rates would be expected to yield increased losses in their own highway use.

"There is no present adequate Federal standard for truck braking rates. And, the Uniform Vehicle Code suggested for states has only a weak requirement for stopping distance (10), and that in a test at only twenty miles per hour. Actual braking per-

formance of heavy trucks is commonly two to three times worse than that of passenger cars. (12) (13) In many emergencies, regardless of the skill of their drivers, this guarantees intervehicular collisions, with property damage, injury, and/or death the result—a problem also presented by automobiles with inadequate brakes. In illustration, consider reports of the multivehicular holocaust, November 29, 1969, on the New Jersey Turnpike, in which among other factors one after another huge truck was unable to stop in a short enough distance and plowed into the vehicles and people ahead. Nationwide increases in traffic densities; the remaining lifetimes of present heavy vehicles whose maximum braking ability is incompatible with those of other, intermixed, and usually more vulnerable vehicles; and the indefinite continuation of present brake performance policies lead me to believe that increasing numbers of such disasters will occur."

The contractor's report of work recently completed for the National Highway Safety Bureau by the TRW Systems Group, dealing with the kinds of degradation which occur in the principal brake system design types manufactured during the years 1964-1969 for use on American-made automobiles and light-weight trucks, includes the following conclusion:

Current road tests of stopping distance from a speed of 20 MPH, as implemented in the various states, achieved results which are non-uniform to the point that the results indicate this type of test is relatively ineffectual as a means of detecting brake degradation. Such tests cannot predict 60 MPH performance. (11)

D. Vehicle power

The question of variations in the relative amount of power available to propel vehicles of varying size and weight is directly related to the previous discussion on braking ability. There are extreme differences in the relative power of buses, trucks, and automobiles. This, too, is rather apparent to the motorist stuck behind a big truck on a steep slope. The same applies to buses, if to a somewhat lesser degree. The various agencies of the Department of Transportation are in the process of prescribing certain minimum requirements in this respect. Here again, we are still doing research on a question vitally related to the issues involved in the pending legislation.

E. Pollution

Buses are one of the most serious polluters of our environment in two respects, air and noise. One doesn't spend much time behind, or anywhere near, a bus without being made rather pointedly aware of the extent of the air pollution created by the bus. The same is true of noise, but this is probably more true with respect to pedestrians than motorists.

In this regard, the proponents of the bill hinted that the increase in width would speed development of their turbine engine which does not pollute the air. If this is in fact the case, the proposed legislation should be amended to permit only those wider buses which utilize turbine engines!

F. Automobile versus bus safety

One of the major points used by proponents of the legislation is the increased safety of passengers. They point out the fact that on the larger buses, the passenger seats will be well above the point of impact for the majority of accidents. That's fine for the bus passenger, but what about the auto driver and auto passengers who are still located at the point of impact? In 1969, 977 billion inter-city passenger miles were ridden in automobiles as compared to 26 billion passenger miles in buses. Naturally, I'm not opposed to protecting the bus passenger from injury. However, in view of the relative amounts of travel by the two modes, the case for increased bus passenger safety at the ex-

pense of auto passenger safety will have to be very compelling. With 86.4% of all travel in the United States in 1969 being achieved through the use of the automobile, we clearly must give the auto the benefit of the doubt in resolving any safety questions as between the two modes of transportation. It is also important to be aware of the fact that in 1968, 104,702,000 motor vehicles of all types were registered in the United States. Of that total figure, approximately 21,400 were inter-city buses.

This all goes once again to the question of mixing in the same stream of traffic vehicles with widely varying power performance, braking capacity, and ability to survive a collision without serious damage.

G. Actual width

The width limitations contained in the 1956 Act included an exception for safety devices and tire bulge. As has been indicated earlier, the term tire bulge is now obsolete and should be deleted from the statute. The safety device exception is not obsolete. It does need to be revised so that the exception covers only those safety devices approved by the Department of Transportation. This exception has been abused by some vehicle operators.

The question of the safety device exception is directly related to the question of increased width limitations. The present width limitation is 96 inches. It certainly was a shock to me to find that the large mirrors on each side of buses effectively extends that width limitation to as much as 114 inches. By their own testimony, officials of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners indicated mirrors could protrude as much as 9 inches on each side. I personally measured some bus mirrors which protruded 12 inches. That would make the total width 120 inches. In either case, it certainly doesn't leave much room to spare, even on a twelve foot traffic lane. The problem is magnified when you have two vehicles this size passing one another.

Proponents of the bill argue that the mirrors are designed to break away in case they strike another vehicle or a fixed object along the highway. That is not a satisfactory answer to the problem. No driver is going to drive anywhere near the point that his mirror might hit another vehicle. In the normal course of driving he is going to leave sufficient space so that the mirrors will clear the adjacent vehicles. This places him 9-12 inches closer to the other lane on a multiple lane highway, or to the shoulder on a two lane highway.

Another problem in this area is that of "off tracking". This refers to the portion of a vehicle which swings outside the normal line of the vehicle due to the fact the wheels are mounted some distance from the front and rear of the vehicle. We have all witnessed the problem of "off tracking" when a bus attempts to turn a corner, especially in a multi lane intersection. The additional six inches in width and the additional five feet in length obviously further aggravate the problem.

Testifying before the House Public Works Committee on the question of highway safety, Dr. Robert Brenner, then acting director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, responded as follows to this question:

SCHWENGL. "And I would like to ask, have you done any research or are you planning any research on the effects of increasing the width of the trucks on the highway?"

DR. BRENNER. "We have work in progress at the present time in the general problem area of stability of trucks, truck-trailer combinations, double bottoms, semis, the whole problem of truck-trailer stability. And insofar as the width of the vehicle, wheel base in relation to the height as well as the mass distribution, are certainly central to stability studies and we will be working in the general area."

"As to the specifics of what the extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am not aware of any works specifically in that regard."

This statement was made in 1969, and to the best of my knowledge it still reflects the current status of this research within the Department. With this in mind, it is inconceivable that the Department could take any stand, pro or con, with respect to this legislation to increase the width of buses. At least not if they check with their own safety experts, and not just with the highway builders.

H. Driver rear vision

With both trucks and buses there is a rather extensive "blind spot" to the rear of the vehicle. In this area, the driver is unable to see any other vehicle. The rear view mirrors simply do not cover this area, and any motorist caught in that blind spot can be in for serious trouble. I have estimated that for an average truck-trailer combination 65 feet long, this blind spot includes about 346.7 cubic feet. The total for buses would be somewhat less because the driver does have some vision out the rear of the bus, and because the bus isn't as long.

To increase the width of the bus by six inches, and to increase its length by five feet obviously will increase the number of cubic feet contained in the "blind spot". Again, the Department of Transportation has recognized the problem and is working on it. Several possibilities exist for solving the problem. One is a series of overhead mirrors. Another is electronic equipment utilizing some form of television. It is foolish to increase the scope of this problem by increasing the amount of blind space, when we are just beginning to study solutions to the problem.

A related problem is the fact these large vehicles also block the forward vision of the vehicles behind them. They make it extremely difficult to see directional and warning signs in time to take proper action. The bus owners indicate the new bus will be safe because the bus driver will be in a higher position and then better able to see problems in the road ahead. Again, I ask, but what about the automobile driver who can't see the accident ahead because of the big bus in front of him? Incidentally, the new bus is also two feet higher, further compounding the problem.

I. Economic effect

While the economic impact of increasing the size of buses is not as great as the impact of the increases in size and weight contained in H.R. 11870, it is certainly a factor to be considered. Indeed, the new bus will be approximately 13,267 pounds heavier than the older models. However, since this is within the present weight limitations, no change in the law is required. The increased wear and tear on the highways will be clearly present.

The major economic effect of wider buses relates to the increased highway costs which may result from widening various highway structures to accommodate them. Conceivably, the traffic lanes of our Interstate System will have to be widened beyond their present twelve feet to accommodate the larger buses.

My basis for the foregoing statement lies in the fact that the present lane widths of twelve feet were the result of studies conducted in the late 1940's and early 1950's using vehicles 96 inches wide. Measurements were taken to determine the normal path for the 96 inch vehicles under various conditions. After allowances were made for the "waiver patterns" which were developed, it was determined that the traffic lanes should be twelve feet wide. It seems logical that similar tests using 102 inch vehicles would show a need for still wider traffic lanes. The cost of such a change in the Interstate System alone would be phenomenal!

There has been a good deal of speculation as to the intent of the Congress with respect to lane widths when the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted. It seems to me that the comments of Senator Gore with respect to an amendment offered by Senator Kerr offers some clarification of at least the Senate intent on this question. Senator Kerr's amendment, contained a limitation on maximum width to 96 inches. The amendment was agreed to; Senator Gore's remarks follow:

Mr. GORE: "The committee felt that with the vast investment the people are to make in this magnificent Interstate System of highways, somewhere, somehow, we should call a halt to the ever-increasing weights, to the ever-increasing widths, to the ever-increasing lengths of vehicles traveling the highways.

"Therefore, the Senate Committee approved by unanimous vote inclusion of the AASHO code for maximums, provided the States themselves do not have maximums in excess, in which event they would be permitted to participate in the 90 percent funds without reducing to these maximums.

"Now let us come to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Kerr) to the committee amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma pointed out that there was no uniformity in width, and the record shows that that is so. But I did not think the provisions voted by the House were sufficient. The Senator from Oklahoma originally submitted his amendment to have it comply exactly with the provision voted by the House, which applies only to axle weights—18,000 pounds in the case of a single axle and 32,000 pounds in the case of tandem axles.

"According to the testimony before the Senate committee, the most important factor, and the one causing the greatest damage to the highways, is the axle weight. The width causes great hazards in traffic. I insisted that we provide a limitation on width. It happens that there is more uniformity as regards width than as regards any other dimension or specification. At the present time, 46 States have a maximum width of 8 feet, and two States have a maximum width in excess of that. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to this committee amendment provides a maximum width of 8 feet for 46 States, and allows the maximum of the two States in excess of that to remain."

"I shall be glad to reply. As I see it, the most important thing to protect the investment of the people in the roads, that is, to keep the roadbeds and surfaces from being crushed by excess weight, is the control of the axle weights. The most important thing in preserving bridge structures is control of overall weights. The most important thing in preserving safety of traffic is control of the width of the vehicles. The Kerr amendment applies to all three."

J. Tires

One phase of the "safer bus" argument used by proponents of the bill is to the effect that the new buses will have wider tires. They argue that wider tires means more tread contact with the highway surface, and thus better braking ability. Safety experts have advised me that increased tread width will not increase braking effectiveness under normal traffic conditions. It improves only the braking ability on curves.

These experts further advise me that the crucial element here is the chemical composition of the tires, and not the width. To really effectively increase traction, the chemical composition of the tires must be changed to give a "softer" tire. This would, of course, result in a much shorter tire life.

It would be interesting to know if the bus owners are willing to use these "softer" tires in order to really improve the braking ability of their buses. I'm inclined to think they are not willing to do so inasmuch as they are

fighting the Department of Transportation efforts to establish tougher standards for retread tires used on buses. The American Transit Association and the National Association of Motor Bus Owners have joined in a lawsuit challenging the validity of the Department of Transportation's new regulations on regrooved tires. The regulations require that there be a 3/32 inch of under-tread below the grooves of the regrooved tire. The bus owners claim this would reduce tire life by 15%. They claim they can safely utilize the thinner tire on intra-city operations. It must be noted, however, that most city transit systems are supplementing their income with extensive charter operations. Assuming the thinner tire can be used safely on intra-city operations, there can be no assurance that the thinner tires will not be used on intra-city buses utilized for charter operations on the open highway.

K. Bumpers

The need for more adequate energy absorbing systems in the case of collisions between large vehicles such as trucks and buses, and automobiles is readily apparent. As noted earlier, the bus driver and bus passengers may be "well above the point of impact", however, the auto driver and his passengers located right at the point of impact. There is an urgent need for bumper systems designed to absorb amounts of energy sufficient to minimize the damage to the persons and property involved. Also, there is a great need for standardization of bumper heights for all vehicles. These improvements in bumpers should be made before we increase the width, length, and weight of buses.

L. Seat widths

One of the major arguments made in favor of the wider bus is the fact a portion of the increased width would be used to widen the passenger seats. Bus owners indicate they would add 1 to 1½ inches to each seat in the wider buses. They claim the additional comfort which would be afforded to passengers is vitally needed to attract more passengers. They, of course, point to the government's efforts to encourage more use of mass transportation facilities such as buses.

This question of seat widths is one which needs a good deal of very close scrutiny. It is especially necessary because of the extent to which the bus owners rely on the need for wider seats to justify the wider bus. Mr. Charles Webb, President of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners testified that passenger seats on inter-city buses is 17 inches. The seat model displayed by the bus owners representing present seats during the hearings measured 33½ inches from the inside of one arm rest to the inside of the other arm rest. This would allow 16¾ inches for each passenger. The model representing the proposed wider seats measured 36½ inches or 18¼ inches per passenger. With these figures in mind, it is interesting to learn that the coach seats in most of United Airliner's planes vary from 16½ to 16¾ inches in width! Seats on the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company are 18¼ inches wide.

In view of the foregoing indication that present bus seats are wider than many air coach seats, it is interesting to note that in 1968, the airlines compiled 113,910,636,000 revenue-passenger miles whereas the bus operators compiled only 24,500,000,000 revenue-passenger miles. Clearly, the nation's travelers spent a good deal more time in the narrower air coach seats. There has apparently been no great outcry from this group of travelers with respect to seat width.

If the regulatory agency for the buses, the Interstate Commerce Commission, follows the example of the airline's regulatory agency, bus owners may not gain much by installing wider seats. The Civil Aeronautics Board (C.A.B. has recently ruled that the airlines

must charge 8.5% more for wider seats. For example, United Airlines has removed one row of seats in its coach sections on some planes. This "five across" seating results in seat width varying from 18.99 inches to 19.74 inches. These wider seats would be covered by the surcharge order of the C.A.B.

An extension of the wider seat argument is equally invalid. This argument is to the effect that wider seats will attract more passengers to bus transportation and thus alleviate urban traffic congestion. This argument conveniently overlooks the fact that most bus seats on present intra city-commuter buses are narrower than 17 inches, even though many cities allow 102 inch wide buses. The explanation is simply that the bus companies use the extra bus width to provide more room in the aisle for passengers required to stand up. So it is clear that increased bus width *does not* contribute to a reduction in urban traffic congestion.

If bus companies are sincerely interested in attracting more passengers they could do better to start by cleaning up their dirty bus depots!

M. Coercion of the States

Still another consideration with which we must deal is that of the relative roles of the Federal and State governments in regulation of vehicle weights and dimensions. This Congressman realizes that the action we take with respect to this legislation will have effects more far-reaching than those which simply concern the Interstate System of this nation. In this respect we should look once again to the mandate of the 1956 legislation. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed a study of the appropriate vehicle weight and size limitations with respect to all Federal Aid Highways. The AASHO studies and the recommendations resulting therefrom, have been directed solely to the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, the Interstate System has been built to the highest standards of any highway system in our Nation. The greater problem arises from the fact that our Interstate System does not lead from one vacuum to another, but, in fact, leads from one city to another via the ABC, or primary and secondary road systems. The Federal government has an investment of 50% in the cost of constructing these systems. Granted, this amount may be considerably less than the 90% of construction costs which we have invested in the Interstate System, but there is no logical argument why the Federal government should not protect its investment merely because it is "only 50% of the total cost."

The larger buses which would be permitted on the Interstate System under the legislation now before the Public Works Committee are not going to load and unload in the middle of that system. They must, of necessity, use the primary and secondary systems in their movement from one point to another. Section 109 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which includes standards for all Federal Aid Systems, specifies that the Secretary of Transportation may not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects unless they provide a facility "(1) that will meet the existing and probable future traffic needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance." AASHO stated in testimony in 1969 that they believe the standards adopted as maximums should apply to *all* systems. It is clear that passage of this legislation by the Congress would serve as leverage to force the various States to increase their size limitations on the primary and secondary systems so as to equal that of the Interstate System. And, of course, there would be pressure to extend the width increase to other vehicles, namely trucks! This is despite the clear fact that our primary and secondary systems are not up to the same standards as

our Interstate System. It is one thing to say that this legislation is merely "permissive" and doesn't force the States to do anything. To adopt this philosophy is to be something more than naive.

VI. AMENDMENTS

In the event that H.R. 4354 does receive favorable action by the committee, there are several amendments which should certainly receive careful consideration.

First, the use of the larger vehicles, if approved, should be limited to those highways having a traffic lane not less than twelve feet in width. Further, this restriction should be extended to the entire Federal Aid Highway System in an effort to secure uniform standards, and to protect the safety of motorists on our primary and secondary roads. This, as you will recall, was one of the conditions specified last year by the Department of Transportation. It also has the support of AASHO.

Another amendment suggested by Mr. Turner in his testimony in 1969 deals with the question of excluding "safety devices" and "tire bulge" from the width limitation. Mr. Turner asked that the "tire bulge" exclusion be eliminated in as much as it was no longer needed. He stated during the 1969 hearings: "This tire bulge provision originated many years ago when vehicles were being converted from solid to high pressure pneumatic tires of today. The necessity for this exception no longer exists." I concur with Mr. Turner's suggestion. Likewise, I agree that safety devices excluded from the width limitation should be limited to those which have received the approval of the Department of Transportation. Thus, the words "officially approved" should be added immediately preceding the words "safety devices". This amendment was added by the committee.

It would seem to me that this is the appropriate time to put an absolute limit on bus length, even though that is apparently not an issue with the bus owners. Both the Department of Transportation and AASHO have recommended the forty foot length limit for buses. I strongly urge the committee to include such a length limit in the event favorable action on this legislation is contemplated.

During the 1969 hearings, Mr. Turner asked for a delay in the effective date of any change in size or weight limits. I urge the Committee to adopt his suggestion. The effective date should allow adequate time for the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to enact new regulations appropriate to any changes made. It should also allow adequate time for them to complete action on new safety regulations now in process which deal with braking systems, stopping distance, weight-horsepower requirements, and other problems.

Another amendment which should be considered is that of the "grandfather clause". In the event a width limitation of 102 inches is approved, only one state would be effectively protected under the 1956 "grandfather clause". That clause should now be eliminated insofar as width is concerned.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusion that must be drawn from the foregoing discussion is the fact that we are woefully lacking in solid information with respect to the effect of this legislation on highway safety. I have repeatedly called for studies to develop authoritative answers to the questions which have been raised. In this Congress as well as the 91st Congress, I have introduced legislation calling for a Presidential Commission to study all of the aspects of this legislation, from an economic standpoint as well as from a safety standpoint. The Commission would be composed of people broadly representative of the public, as well as the special interest groups affected by the proposed legislation. My bill,

H.R. 453, would direct the Commission to examine, among other things, the following questions:

(1) What share of highway construction and maintenance costs is allocable to each class of highway users?

(2) What would be the effect on the costs of the Federal-aid highway systems (both original costs and recurring costs) of permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways?

(3) What overall economic benefits would accrue from permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways, and which sectors of the economy would receive these benefits?

(4) How should the costs referred to in paragraph (2) be allocated on the basis of the economic benefits referred to in paragraph (3)?

(5) What would be the effect of permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways on all aspects of highway safety?

It seems to me that these are fair and reasonable questions. They are certainly questions any reasonable Member of Congress would want satisfactorily answered before he voted in favor of this legislation. If the truck and bus owners are really sincere they would get behind my legislation and work for its early enactment. If the facts are as represented by proponents of the legislation, a favorable report by an unbiased commission would in fact, speed passage of the legislation.

Presumably, if the Commission recommended legislation raising highway user taxes for trucks and buses, the proponents of the size and weight legislation would support that legislation with equal vigor.

With respect to the size and weight legislation presently under consideration. H.R. 4354, there are many factors which mitigate against its present enactment. Among the most significant is the opposition of the National Transportation Safety Board and the Department of Transportation to its enactment. The Board is a completely autonomous board which has the authority to investigate, make final cause determination, and report the facts and circumstances of major surface transportation accidents; and make recommendations for the purpose of preventing accidents and promoting safety in transportation. The Board also conducts special transportation safety studies, examines the adequacy of transportation safety standards, and determines compliance with these standards.

When an agency which has as broad a mandate as this Board has, and which obviously has the necessary experts to carry out the mandate, opposes a piece of legislation on safety grounds it is difficult for me to see how any Member of Congress could seriously consider voting for the legislation.

The Department of Transportation is also charged with responsibility for traffic safety, primarily through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The Administration is under the capable leadership of Douglas Toms. Secretary Volpe and Mr. Toms are to be commended for recognizing the safety problems inherent in the big bus bill, and for urging that it not be enacted. While the opposition of the Department isn't as broad as I would have liked to see, I'm certainly glad to have the Department on my side.

The positions of the Department and the Board follow as Appendix I and II, respectively.

It is incredible that the Public Works Committee would report the bill favorably in view of this strong opposition.

By so acting, the Committee has shown a callous disregard for the safety of the motoring public. The Committee in effect has voted in favor of special interest groups, the bus owners, and against the general public. It seems to me that it would be extremely difficult for a Member to justify to his constituents a vote in favor of this special interest legislation.

[Appendix I]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1971.

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: On March 30, 1971, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Roads on H.R. 4354, a bill: "To amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to increase such limitations for motor buses." Requests were made at that time by the Subcommittee for certain information to be supplied for the hearing record.

The information requested has been compiled and is enclosed herewith. In addition, I have enclosed for your information a copy of a letter that Secretary Volpe has sent to Representative Schwengel answering a number of questions which he has asked the Department to answer relating to the same subject matter.

Since the hearing held on March 30, at which I appeared on behalf of the Department, we have, in collaboration with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and other interested elements of the Department, reviewed all available data concerning the safety aspects of wider buses. As part of the review, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety has made an analysis of accident data involving 102 inch and other width buses. In addition, we have some very preliminary information from a study of the potential aerodynamic disturbance produced by wide vehicles, but this work did not involve specific tests with buses.

The Department has concluded that the kind of evidence available to us now is not fully adequate to provide a reliable basis for a definitive finding on the relative safety of 102 inch buses as compared with 96 inch or narrower buses. Accordingly, our position on H.R. 4354 remains unchanged.

The Department, however, has initiated studies to examine specifically the potential effects of wider buses on other vehicles in passing maneuvers and under various wind conditions. The aerodynamic or "blast" effects of large buses have not been adequately examined in our judgment and these must be determined as set forth below before a final judgment can be made on the potential effects of these large vehicles on highway safety. We intend to expedite these studies and related tests and will make the results available at the earliest possible date. We also believe that certain design features of 102 inch buses might have to be altered to assure operating safety equal to that of 96 inch vehicles. These include specifically braking capability and lateral stability, factors which will also be examined in the studies we are undertaking.

If the Committee concludes, based on the testimony and evidence presented to it, that legislation authorizing wider buses should be acted upon during this session, the Department urges that the use of wide buses on the Interstate highways be contingent on an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Transportation that these buses can be operated at least as safely as buses of 96 inches in width or less. The Secretary's firm view is that he would not under any circumstances make such a finding before completion of the studies referred to earlier on the relative

safety of the wider buses. We would be pleased to provide the Committee with an appropriate amendment to accomplish this objective.

Finally, we continue to recommend the technical amendments to H.R. 4354 to which I referred in my testimony on that bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this letter to the Committee.

If we can supply any further information to the Committee on this subject, we will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS C. TURNER.

[Appendix II]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD'S
POSITION ON H.R. 4354

H.R. 4354 is identical to H.R. 11691, 91st Congress. At that time we noted the absence of reliable data with respect to the safety effect of larger buses, both on the Interstate System and on the roads of lesser characteristics. The situation remains unchanged and, therefore, we continue to oppose the enactment of such legislation.

Some hazards of larger buses arise directly from the increased width itself, while others arise from other bus design features made possible by the increased width. Some of the hazards apply only to bus occupants, while others apply to everyone who uses highways.

Proponents of H.R. 4354 claim some features of improved safety by the increased width, but it is not clear what the performance effect of these improvements may be, nor is there any requirement in H.R. 4354 that any such improvements actually be made. Two types of 102-inch wide intercity buses are now being operated; in only one type are substantial safety-improving changes claimed.

While recognizing the economic benefit of H.R. 4354, which would substantially increase the express package capacity of intercity buses, we address ourselves to those aspects of the bill which relate to safety. Changes in the pattern of bus operation on Interstate and other highways which might come about with an increased capability for express package service and which might affect highway casualties have not been evaluated, to our knowledge. Until in-depth studies of casualty results are made, or until it is clear in some detail which changes in bus safety performance would be brought about by regulation in the very near future, it would not be reasonable or prudent to accept any degree of increased hazard. We believe that legislation permitting wider buses should be deferred until the Department of Transportation has developed regulations and standards for larger and heavier buses.

Research is lacking in determining the relative safety of wider buses with respect to:

1. Comparison of buses of different widths through past accident statistics, using an adequate statistical base and separating non-comparative factors; and
2. Implementation of a carefully designed and controlled experiment involving selected bus designs, drivers, and routes.

The approach of determining what types of accidents could occur which would not otherwise happen, and making a comparison of off-setting improvements, is mentioned on page 42 of the "Review of Safety and Economic Aspects of Increased Vehicle Sizes and Weights" issued by the Federal Highway Administration, September, 1969.

Although a number of representations of possible safety improvements for wider buses have been advanced, it is not clear that all of the hazards of the wider buses have as yet been identified and evaluated.

Among the identifiable questions of hazards or safety improvements are the following:

a. Frequency of excursions into other lanes will increase with wider buses under present driver capabilities and highway configurations. This question involves vehicle steering stability and driver steering behavior.

b. Possible improved braking by all models of buses and, if so, by how much, and in what braking performance characteristics.

c. Possible reduced tire loadings on wider buses resulting in increased or decreased traction.

d. Higher floors of wider buses inhibiting passenger escape from windows when bus is standing upright, or producing injuries due to longer drop to the ground.

e. Increased width of bus inhibiting window escape when bus is lying on its side with windows above.

f. Changed visibility of road ahead for other vehicles due to 6-inch wider bus and concomitant 2-foot increase in bus height.

g. Increased influence of wind blast in passing other vehicles in opposite directions which might affect safety margins of some vehicles.

h. Wider buses may facilitate installation of occupant crash protection.

i. Potential for passenger injuries may be reduced by higher seated position above other vehicles or increased by higher impact velocity when bus overturns.

j. Increased bus width may improve measured overturn stability when accompanied by increased floor height and what effects will be upon each bus model.

k. Raised floor height and increased proportion of weight represented by express capacity may cause the bus to become top-heavy when passengers are carried with empty luggage and express compartments.

In summary, these questions of hazards or safety improvements derive in part from existing bus safety recommendations of the Safety Board and in part from observations of 102-inch width buses and descriptive literature. We believe that the assessment of most of these questions need not await the occurrence of accidents, as some proponents claim, but may be accomplished by scientific testing or analysis of available engineering information. Until the results of such analysis and reviews are known, and safety standards developed therefrom, we would oppose the passage of H.R. 4354.

OSCAR M. LAUREL,

Member.

FRANCIS H. McADAMS,

Member.

LOUIS M. THAYER,

Member.

MINORITY POSITION CONCERNING H.R. 4354

Under existing law, the States can and do permit larger buses to operate on the Federal-Aid primary and secondary road systems than are allowed to operate on the Interstate Highway System. H.R. 4354 is permissive legislation that would authorize each State to permit the use of 102-inch buses on the Interstate System within its boundaries; however, no State would be required to increase its present limitations.

As the Interstate System was designed to accommodate the wider bus and has a much lower accident and fatality rate than the Federal-Aid and secondary road systems, we believe that the use of wider buses on a safer roadway would offer benefits to the passenger and to the general public which would outweigh any possible safety hazard which so far has not been proven to exist.

However, we do concur in general with the views of the majority of the National Transportation Safety Board as to the possible approaches to evaluating and judging the comparative safety of the wider buses. We support the enactment of H.R. 4354 at this time providing it is amended to delay its effective date until such time as the Secretary of Transportation completes the necessary

studies and promulgates such safety regulations as might be required.

JOHN H. REED,
Chairman.
ISABEL A. BURGESS,
Member.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I should like to point out a fact once again to make it very clear concerning this legislation. It seems that much of the opposition to this legislation comes through the use of the scare tactic that this is in part a forerunner of a large truck bill or that this is an attempt to revive a truck bill that was defeated in the Public Works Committee last year.

Mr. Chairman, I was, am now, and intend to be in the future absolutely opposed to any legislation that would permit wider, heavier, longer trucks on our Interstate System. I voted along with the gentleman from Iowa last year in the committee to help kill the truck bill. If I had any idea at all or any indication that this legislation before us had anything even remotely to do with resurrecting a truck bill I would not be here supporting this legislation; I would be here opposing it.

The gentleman from Iowa who was just in the well claimed that there were errors in our committee report on this legislation. I would point out that his statements are not that accurate. He quoted Mr. Gunther, who stated that there were not very many cities, or that it was a small percentage of the cities in the country, that had these wider buses.

The gentleman, I am sure, is well aware that we are talking about the large cities of the United States, which have transit systems. The gentleman from Texas accurately pointed out that Mr. Gunther himself is in favor of this bill. He says the bill is needed and he says that these wider buses are currently operating in most major cities of the Nation.

The gentleman from Iowa did not point out another part of Mr. Gunther's testimony. I should like to quote that:

What we are endeavoring to do with buses is, as you know, Mr. Chairman, the cities are very concerned about developing an urban transportation system. And the way we have it now is that many of the wider buses that can operate downtown and carry passengers, can't take them out to the outlying places where the jobs have moved.

So this is why we thought we should not object to this increase.

One of the reasons why we feel this is good legislation is we realize with the urban and suburban sprawl today many of the people who live in the cities and who do not own automobiles find that the buses they have taken around the cities are not permitted to be used now to take them to the outlying areas where their jobs are. This will insure that these people have the means and the ability to get to work in the future. I think it is rather important.

Another statement that was made by the gentleman from Iowa had to do with

the number of buses that we have in the United States and how many of these are wide buses. We have said that over 20 percent of these buses, 22,000 of them in the United States today, are 102 inches wide. We said that is over 20 percent of all the buses being used for this kind of transportation. The gentleman from Iowa pointed out in an accurate figure that the total number of buses in this country is 364,000. What was not mentioned in that figure is that 237,000 of these 364,000 are schoolbuses which use small rural roads and do not need to use the Interstate System. So this does not jibe with the kind of figures that we are talking about, namely, 22,000 out of 90,000 or so buses that are already in operation.

The gentleman from Iowa also stated in his remarks made earlier that the administration is opposed to this legislation. Well, the administration cannot be opposed to this legislation, since they requested that in the legislation we adopt several of their amendments. Every single amendment they sent down was accepted by the committee and is in this legislation. Mr. Turner is, in fact, in favor of the legislation.

One big point that has been made here regards the AAA. I did not get a letter from the AAA opposing this legislation, but I saw one of the letters which went to one of our colleagues from one of the New England States saying that the AAA, at the time they wrote this letter, was opposed to the legislation, and it added one sentence, which was that they were concerned about the safety aspects of it.

Well, as you all know, in this legislation, showing our concern for safety, we do have a provision which requires the Department of Transportation to make a survey concerning all of the safety aspects of this legislation. It goes even further and says if these safety requirements cannot be met or if there is a problem which arises, it gives the Secretary of Transportation veto power over the operation. The only objection I heard from the AAA about this legislation has been taken care of in this bill.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to observe that the Member from Iowa to whom my good friend alludes appears to be confused, as always.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who look at the transportation problems in this country I am sure are all aware of what we must do in the United States. We must do everything that we can with our responsibility in Congress to get our people out of automobiles and into mass transportation facilities. We cannot go on trying to build highways bigger and longer and wider in order to meet the increasing need of automobiles. The bus is the most flexible means of mass transportation in the United States today. Buses can go anywhere that roads can go. They are not tied down to the use of rails, as trains are, or airports like airplanes are, or docks as ships are. They can go anywhere

that a road can go. This legislation permits buses which we have now, 102-inch-wide buses, such as we have in New York City—and 100 percent of them are that width—it permits them to use the Interstate System, and this will take an average of 12 automobiles off the road for every bus that is put on the road.

Now let us talk about pollution. Air pollution is something that we are all concerned about. It is estimated that one bus pollutes about five times as much as one automobile. So, if we eliminate 12 automobiles by the use of one bus, we have cut air pollution in this case by more than half. That could justify passing this legislation all by itself.

There is also an additional provision in here for people who are concerned about the width and about how close a car may come to a bus on the Interstate System.

No matter where the Interstate System is, this provides that wherever there is a lane that is less than 12 feet wide, these buses will not be permitted on it. So, we will find, in comparing the distance and space between two passing buses, that there is more room and will be more room with two buses passing each other on the Interstate System than we have now when two Fords pass each other on any of the other roads in our country.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a safety bill. It is a much needed bill, and has nothing to do with trucks. I certainly would oppose such legislation that would add heavier, wider, and longer trucks on our Interstate System.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Does the gentleman know the maximum width of trucks using the highways today as compared to the maximum width of buses?

Mr. HOWARD. On the Interstate System I believe there is a width maximum of 96 inches. Buses are 102 inches in our cities and on many of our country roads and, certainly, the trucks are using these roads also which is a much more dangerous situation in our Interstate System.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Buses are wider than trucks?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; I would say they are. Trucks are certainly much heavier. People are concerned about the width and length of buses and trucks especially in turning, turning corners and such. When we are talking about trucks, we are talking about trucks which may be 40, 50, 60 or 70 feet long. However, buses have a maximum length of 40 feet.

We were also concerned about what these heavier vehicles would do to the roads. The average weight of a long-distance truck is over 60,000 pounds while the average weight of a bus is about 40,000 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is excellent legislation. I believe it is needed. I believe it will help people to get out of automobiles and use the mass transit system and that it will help people who do not own automobiles to get to their jobs, especially out in the suburbs, and be able to hold their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the House will uphold the position of the committee and will act favorably upon this bill.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will not the passage of this bill also be a step toward uniformity with regard to the rights of operators in the several States on the interstate highways, in view of the fact that a substantial number of States already, by virtue of the grandfather clause in the 1956 act, have the right to have 102-inch-wide buses operating on the highways?

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Oklahoma has brought up a very valid point and I am glad that he has done so. Yes; it will certainly help our coordination of travel throughout the country. Several States were grandfathered in under the Highway Act and since this is permissive legislation, other States will have the right to be covered. Several States have already passed legislation saying that they will permit this use if the Federal Government will release the restrictions it put in back in the fifties. If this is done, we will have a much more uniform mode of mass transportation in this country.

I thank the gentleman for bringing up that point.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to suggest to the gentleman that he might be wrong by implying that the administration supports this bill.

According to a letter which appears on page 29 of the committee report, addressed to Mr. KLUCZYNSKI—and this is after the hearings—the following is stated:

The Department has concluded that the kind of evidence available to us now is not fully adequate to provide a reliable basis for a definitive finding on the relative safety of 102-inch buses as compared with 96-inch or narrow buses. Accordingly, our position on H.R. 4354 remains unchanged.

I talked to them because there was a rumor around this morning. I called Mr. Turner and asked him if he had changed his position and he said, "No." I called Mr. Volpe and I said, "Is this still the administration's position?" And he said, "Yes."

Mr. HOWARD. I am glad the gentleman brought that up because that is precisely why we have given the Department the right to have a period of 18 months during which to conduct surveys and studies on this safety question and have given them the veto power, should they find it is not safe. I believe the gentleman has indicated his support for the inclusion of this provision in the legislation.

I would just say to the gentleman from Iowa that I did not say the administration has verbally supported this bill. I said that the gentleman from Iowa said that the administration opposed the bill, and in that in-

stance I still say that the gentleman was completely inaccurate.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield briefly on this point?

Mr. HOWARD. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MIZELL. Would not the gentleman agree, though, that we might be much wiser permitting the study to be completed before we start in enacting legislation that could prove to be hazardous in the future?

Mr. HOWARD. I believe that we would not, because I can see in my own area, which is one of the most densely populated States in the United States, the difficulties that we have with the lives that are lost because of the fantastic number of automobiles that are competing for the same spot on the highway in trying to get to work, and in getting from work home, going from suburban areas of Newark over to New York or into Trenton. I would rather see the action start now so that we will be able to have the study completed, and then with the completion of the study, if everything is all right, we will be ready to implement the program, rather than having a study again at that time. And when you consider how many thousands of studies we have going on now, to then at that point begin to work on some legislation which would surely delay it another year or another 2 or 3 years, depending on where we were on the particular calendar of that Congress, I feel that we should proceed with the safeguards that we have provided, and through this we will save time and save lives, and an awful lot of legislation to do it in this way.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the comment just made by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), implying that the administration has taken a position adverse to this bill, let us refer to that precise letter from which the gentleman from Iowa quoted, appearing on page 29 of the committee report.

Here is what the administration has recommended. It says:

If the Committee concludes, based on the testimony and evidence presented to it, that legislation authorizing wider buses should be acted upon during this session, the Department urges that the use of wide buses on the Interstate highways be contingent on an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Transportation that these buses can be operated at least as safely as buses of 96 inches in width or less.

And that is exactly what we have incorporated in this bill.

Mr. HOWARD. Exactly.

Mr. WRIGHT. Therefore have not we put in there precisely what we requested by the Department of Transportation?

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank my distinguished friend

and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD), for yielding to me, and I commend the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to page 3 of the report, where it says:

It should be further pointed out that as of January 1, 1971, UMTA (DOT) has provided financial assistance for the purchase of 2,481 buses of which 1,761 are 102" in width.

So, if the administration is opposed to this, they are certainly not acting like it, if they are buying 102-inch-wide buses. They bought some 1,761 of these buses, and many of these are running on the streets, and not on the Interstate Highway System, because, in fact, most of them will be running on noninterstate highways. So, I think, if the Department of Transportation really was against this bill they should stop buying such wide buses.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Illinois is so correct—so correct that I was just going to mention that, if the gentleman had not done so—because we have a contract whereby the Department of Transportation is purchasing some 2,481 buses, 1,761 of which—or two-thirds—are 102 inches wide, yet here we are in the same Congress having on the books legislation passed years ago that will not permit the widest buses possible to use the widest roadways we have. This legislation will help take care of that.

So, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY), for his observation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), and a member of the committee.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to add to this particular colloquy the fact that I had made reference to section 3, which the gentleman has talked about, in my previous remarks. The reason we incorporated section 3 into the legislation was to take care of the disagreements such as we are concerned with at this point.

Mr. HOWARD. I wish to thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, just by way of information, what do buses need 6 inches more in width for?

Mr. HOWARD. The buses are already there; this is not a bus-widening bill. What this legislation will do will permit the wide buses to be used which are not now permitted to be used at the present time due to the legislation which we passed some 20 years ago, saying that they can have these buses, and they can use them in the cities and in other certain areas, but they may not use them on the Interstate System.

So that this will permit the flexibility for that busine so that it will be able to carry people from one large city to another. At present it is very difficult to make them use the out-of-the-way roads,

most of which are narrow roads, and are therefore more dangerous, rather than giving them the flexibility to adopt schedules to meet the needs of the people.

Mr. WHITE. What are they being used for now? The question arises, why do they need the additional 6 inches?

Mr. HOWARD. Well, they are using them now, and they are using of course mainly the 96-inch-wide buses on the interstate highways. But because of the law as it now stands it puts them in a bind on being able to schedule their business to certain places.

If people want to charter a bus to go into New York City, that is one thing, but if they want to charter a bus to go from New York City to Washington, D.C., and use part of the interstate highway, then they cannot do so; they are required to use the more narrow highways, and they are too wide for this.

This then decreases their capability to be flexible enough to meet the needs of the people and it means too that our bus riders are going to be able to achieve their schedules.

Mr. WHITE. My question is "Why do buses need 6 inches more if we do not need and cannot take 102-inch-wide buses?"

Mr. HOWARD. The thing is that the 96-inch-wide buses do not need more.

This has to do with flexibility now. But we have a great number of buses now 102 inches wide in every part of the cities and among other places which are banned from these routes so we are not going to see renovations made in 96-inch-wide buses where they are going to put them in factories and make them 102 inches wide for a little more comfort.

What we are doing is including the 102-inch-wide buses in the Interstate System with the provision that all lanes must be at least 12 feet wide.

Mr. WHITE. If 96 inches is adequate, why can't they use 96-inch-wide buses on all roads in the future?

Mr. HOWARD. The 96-inch-wide buses are not adequate. That is the problem. If we had enough 96-inch-wide buses to handle all the traffic that is going through these cities, we would not need this legislation.

We want bus service to take care of a lot of people who in increasing numbers are trying to get from the suburbs into the city to work and the many city people who do not own an automobile and many of the poorer people who have a job out in the suburbs so they will be able to make use of all these facilities.

Mr. WHITE. What will the 6 inches more do?

Mr. HOWARD. There are more of them. There are buses that cannot be utilized on this kind of service.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I can help my friend and colleague from Texas in this regard.

The whole purpose of the bill is to try to make it a little more attractive for the public to use mass transportation modes rather than driving their own cars. We are trying to reduce the flow of traffic

and the fumes and the noise of automobile traffic. Every time we can encourage a bus load of people to ride that bus instead of driving their own cars, we have eliminated 12 cars and taken them off the road.

The idea of wider buses is to make them more comfortable and give a little more seat room for the passenger and give him a little more elbow room.

If this plan should succeed so as to make it more attractive for more people to ride the mass transit facility such as these buses, then we will have achieved part of the objective of solving this problem that all the big cities are confronted with.

If my colleague would yield further, I think I can give one salient illustration. Right here in Washington in the metropolitan area, there are seven bridges that cross the Potomac River over into Virginia. Four of those bridges are on the Interstate System. The irony of it is that the only system in the Nation that is limited to 96 inches is the Interstate System which is presumably the safest system that we have. It has the widest lanes and it is a system with multiple lanes. The irony of the situation is that right here in the city of Washington on the narrower streets that afford less safe passage, we have some 290 buses which are 102 inches wide daily plying the streets of Washington, but it is not possible for a commuter to ride one of these wider and somewhat more comfortable buses over from Virginia because the company that provides the service coming into Washington is inhibited by the rule which says that you cannot have that size bus on an Interstate System.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. In response to the gentleman from Texas, I stand as one of those who has not made up his mind and I am trying to determine where that extra 6 inches will go. Will it go into the aisle? Are you going to give 1½ inches to the passenger? We have to weigh the comfort of the passenger as opposed to the safety of those driving on the highway. I have driven on the highway and I have tried to pass buses. There is an element of risk in passing a bus. This is what we have to consider for the American public.

Mr. HOWARD. To respond to the gentleman, the additional width would be 6 inches, 4 inches of which would be in the seating width for the passengers, and one inch added to each of the two sides. I would be glad to supply additional information on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen that people will not use buses and will not ride trains unless forced to do so as commuters or unless they are provided with adequate, fast, clean transportation such as we see in the Metroliner running between here and New York. People use that mass transportation facility. It is hard to get a ticket on that train now.

We feel we can do the same thing, even more flexibly, with adequate, dependable, clean service provided by the

buses of this country, and I believe the vehicle by which we can do that is this legislation.

I yield back the remainder of my time. Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully invite the attention of the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I wish to direct my remarks to them and invite their responses. I am not going to discuss the merits of this bill because I am obviously not a member of the committee and did not hear the testimony. I do not pretend to have any expertise on this subject. But I do a lot of traveling on the highways, particularly on the interstate highways. The fact is that I travel Interstate 95 and Interstate 85 very frequently. Recently I have been amazed at the increasing number of collisions and accidents that occur on these important interstate highways. There is bumper-to-bumper traffic almost from Washington to Richmond, and particularly coming back up from Richmond to Washington on Sunday nights. Frequently we are stopped on that interstate highway and are held up and delayed for lengthy periods of time.

In recent days I have adopted the habit of leaving I-95 this side of Richmond and going over to U.S. 1 to get out of these jams caused by some truck, bus, or car colliding with another vehicle and jamming up the traffic.

In all the discussion of width and weight of vehicles using the highways, I am surprised if the committee has not considered the advisability of permitting the use of wider wreckers that use the highways intermittently when they are called out to remove another vehicle that has been involved in a collision. I have not been lobbied on either side of this bill. No one has discussed it with me. But I have talked with people who are involved in the operation of wrecker service, emergency vehicles, and I am informed that it is very difficult for a wrecker to remove a tractor-trailer—for example, to get it off the highway—or a bus that has been involved in a wreck with a 96-inch wrecker.

In all of the study—and we have been hearing this subject discussed for several years—is it possible the committee has not given any consideration to the advisability of separate legislation permitting the use of wider and heavier wreckers for intermittent use on the highways in removing buses and tractor-trailers that are involved in collisions?

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say we have not discussed this matter before the committee. This is one of many things that needs study and consideration. The gentleman has a very valid point. In connection with that, we do not have any report on the accidents or what causes the accidents or what to do about them. The matter has not been discussed at all on the floor here, and it is a matter that needs a great deal more consideration.

The gentleman raises a very valid point. The answer is we did not discuss this before the committee.

Mr. JONAS. I can testify out of my own experience that it is not infrequent to have a bus piled up in a side ditch on the Interstate Highway System or a tractor-trailer turned over on one of the highways. I am informed by people who are more knowledgeable in this field than I am that it is exceedingly difficult to remove one of these heavy vehicles with a light wrecker.

I would ask my friend, the gentleman from Illinois if he would look with favor on legislation designed to permit the use of heavier wreckers in these limited cases?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina has raised a point, and we will consider it the next time we have a committee meeting.

I understand the gentleman's question, and we will take it up the next time we have a committee meeting.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to this House the 102-inch buses are on the highway now, and I raise the question of the advisability of those sizes. That is the reason why I think we ought to have a study for the future. The 102-inch buses we have now are grandfathered in.

Very much has been said about taking automobiles off the highways. With the present limitations and the present bus systems we can take a great many more cars off the highway because they are only being used up to 51.10 percent of their capacity at the present time, according to the owners and operators of the buses themselves.

Mr. JONAS. If I may finish, I did not want to discuss the merits of this bill. I think they have been thoroughly discussed.

May I have a commitment from this side of the aisle to join the gentleman from Illinois in giving consideration to this proposal at the next meeting?

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman will receive the cooperation of the minority in this matter.

Mr. JONAS. I have no interest in it other than bringing this to the attention of the committee, because I think it is an important point that needs the attention of the committee.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, we will take it up at the next committee meeting. I assure the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK).

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support H.R. 4354, which is before this body today.

As the original author of this bill and a similar bill last year, I am most interested in its passage.

There has been much confusion surrounding this bill, including completely unfounded criticism of the bill itself, the

circumstances under which the bill has been handled, and the inference that there is something devious in this bill that will in some way be used as an instrument toward the reopening of the truck sizes and weights controversy.

Nothing could be further from the truth and I consider these statements as a personal affront to myself, a flagrant disservice to the Committee on Public Works, and as a definitely detrimental effect to the image of the activities of the Congress in the eyes of the American public.

When I introduced this bill last year it was about as simple a bill as could be introduced. It was a bill which merely allowed the operation of buses of 102 inches in width to operate on the Interstate System. Nothing more, nothing less. As you know, the current limit imposed by the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act is 96 inches.

Since the passage of that act, considerable testing of vehicle sizes and weights has been undertaken, such that the American Association of State Highway Officials has adopted 102 inches as the maximum permissible width on the Interstate System. These are the officials with the designated authority and responsibility for building and operating the Nation's highways. It is only the Federal law that restricts the width to 96 inches and that only on the Interstate System.

I would like to emphasize that the question of width of buses is the only thing that this bill addresses itself to and that within this proposed increase in width all the other requirements such as length, height, and weight remains unchanged. Buses will still have to conform to all of these standards as they are now in existence.

I would further like to emphasize to the members as has already been done by my colleagues that these 102-inch buses are now in use in large quantities by most large cities in the country on narrower lanes, and on highways which are much less safe than is the Interstate System.

It just seems to me as the most ridiculous state of events imaginable to have poured billions of dollars into the greatest highway system in the world and then turn around and prohibit its use by vehicles which we allow to operate on our lesser highways.

At that point in time when other forms of transportation are having the most difficulties it is the responsibility of those charged with the welfare of this country to make available the most flexible and efficient system of mobility possible. This bill is dedicated toward that goal.

As I said earlier, the bill as originally introduced merely allowed an additional 6 inches of width for buses on the Interstate System. To allow for the concern of those who raised the question of safety, although I still feel that it is a phantom issue, the committee amended the bill to allow for operation on 12-foot lanes only and to allow the Secretary of Transportation time to make the required safety studies.

The 102-inch buses are already in existence and can be put into service im-

mediately. Furthermore, the bus industry, if it is allowed to use the Interstate System as proposed, can begin to make these buses move more efficiently even than at present and still remain within the stated limits.

This bill provides maximum mobility for the American people at no capital cost. I strongly urge your favorable action.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that this legislation which is pending before this body today in no manner, size, shape or form has anything to do with trucks. I repeat this bill has nothing to do with trucks. I make this statement at the outset to lay to rest once and for all the charges made that this is in some manner connected with trucks. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works I can assure you that this is not true. H.R. 4354 allows an increase in width of buses used on the Interstate System from 96 to 102 inches. This is all this bill does.

This is permissive legislation. It will still require action by the States by enabling legislation to implement it if they so desire to do this. It further directs extensive studies to be made of any further safety features of the operation of buses. These studies will be made by the Department of Transportation. They have until July 1, 1973, to do this before this bill would go into effect. If at any time between the passage of this legislation and July 1, 1973, the Secretary of Transportation reports to Congress that this increase in width in buses will be unsafe and cannot be made safe then the law will not go into effect.

This gives the Secretary of Transportation who is in charge of all our national transportation a total veto power of the legislation.

Let me point out that the track record of safety in buses is quite clear. Buses with widths of 102 inches have been able to operate on the Interstate System since 1956 in nine States of this Union under the grandfather clause of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. In 29 other States buses can be used which are wider in width than 96 inches. This is 38 of our 50 States. We are talking about over 22,000 buses in this category currently in use. May I add that the Department of Transportation through UMPTA has purchased over 1,700 buses which are 102 inches in width to use in their urban mass transit program. The situation is actually ridiculous. The record is clear. The bus width we are talking about is being used in all portions of our Nation today and every day. It provides greater comfort and convenience to passengers. We in the Public Works Committee in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 authorized the use of high speed express lanes to move passengers in and out of our urban and suburban areas safely and efficiently. We did this for three reasons: first, to reduce air pollution; second, to reduce noise pollution; and third, to eliminate traffic congestion in our urban areas. This in-

crease in width of buses will make these buses more comfortable and hopefully will induce more and more of our auto driving people to turn to the buses. What we are doing today is recommending legislation for your approval which will provide a more efficient, effective form of mass transportation, will help our environment and resolve the congestion problems of our urban centers.

This is good legislation. It is legislation that will do a job which should be done if we are to face up to the problems we now face in the major transportation areas of all sections of our Nation and I strongly urge its passage.

May I close by commending the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), the floor manager of the bill, for his fine handling of this legislation as well as the minority floor manager, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD), and my other colleagues on the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) for the record they established on the floor today in support of this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This bill continues to respect, does it not, the police power of the State to enforce proper safety regulations on all vehicles that operate within its borders, including those that travel the Interstate System?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I believe we just need to get this in its rightful perspective. There is one purpose and one purpose only for the bill your Public Works Committee brings before you.

There exists today throughout the United States, and particularly in our metropolitan areas, a very urgent demand to do whatever this Nation can do to assist in developing facilities of mass transportation to get as many of the individual automobiles as possible off the road. This is an uphill battle. I cannot tell you that the passage of this bill will solve that problem. I am sure it will not alone solve the problem. But I think it is a significant step in the direction we are all trying to take, making it more attractive for the average commuter to take mass transportation instead of taking his own car. That is the entire purpose of this bill.

The gentleman from Iowa suggests that another study, still another study, should be made by some presidential commission. Let us review the history of this legislation.

The irony of it is that the safest roads in the United States, the Interstate System, those with the widest lanes and

those with multiple lanes and those with divided highways, are the only lanes in the Nation in which the Federal Government ever has restricted the width of vehicles. In all other areas, whether it be city streets, country roads, or any other primary and secondary highways, we have historically left that determination up to the respective States.

Why did we make this kind of a limitation—an arbitrary 96-inch width—applicable to the Interstate System? We did this because in 1956 when the Congress passed the Interstate Highway Act it was thought that there might possibly be some effect on safety arising from the width or the length or the weight or the size of vehicles. We admitted at the time, those of us who drafted that law, that we did not know what the proper limit should be, so we just arbitrarily established a limit of 96 inches for width. In that very same piece of legislation in 1956, we directed the Bureau of Public Roads to conduct a thoroughgoing study as to the safety factors relative to the Interstate System and then to report to us with recommendations as to what the permanent restrictions, if any, ought to be. We were acting in the dark and we admitted we were acting in the dark. But we created a study by competent authority, the Bureau of Public Roads, and they reported to us. What did that study recommend? That the maximum allowable width be increased from 96 inches to 102 inches. That is exactly what is encompassed in this bill.

Let it be clear that this bill does not have anything to do with trucks. There has been a lot of smokescreen scattered about to the effect that this was a big truck bill, and the subject of massive lobbying efforts.

I am just one member of the Committee on Public Works.

I do not care how you vote on this bill. Vote it up or down. If you do not want it, do not vote for it. But, for heaven's sake, do not be deceived and do not be misled by anybody who comes in here and impugns the integrity of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and tries to tell you that this bill is here today because the Public Works Committee has been subjected to some lobbying efforts, because that is a damnable falsehood. It is not true.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to restrain my remarks in such a way that it will be proper in the House. I do think it is altogether wrong for any Member of this body to wrap himself in the garb of sanctimonious self-righteousness and to attack and impugn the integrity of any committee of this House.

I can well understand that any Member of this House might conscientiously disagree with the Committee on Public Works, but I ask you simply to bear in mind what we are seeking to accomplish here. We are trying to make it easier for people to use mass transportation.

We speak a lot and hear a lot spoken in this Chamber about the need for mass transit, particularly in big cities. I am for all of the subways that can be built that will help to move people efficiently and relieve some of the congestion that

exists on the streets. I am for any other useful mode of mass transit that can be achieved, whether it be overhead or underground or otherwise. But let us be realistic about it. There is not but one way that the average citizen can afford in most metropolitan areas that will move him flexibly within a city and between cities, and that way is by bus. Passenger trains are falling by the wayside, as all of us know. If we are serious about this business of encouraging mass transportation, then I say we should vote for this bill. It does not widen buses; it simply permits the wider buses to get on the wider roads.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have been reading section 3 of H.R. 4354, and let me ask a question to be crystal clear that I understand what section 3 provides.

I will paraphrase it in my own words, and if the gentleman would answer yes or no, I would be grateful.

Section 3 provides that if the Secretary of Transportation, prior to July 1, 1973, conducts an investigation or safety study and as a result of that study determines that the operation of motor buses having a width in excess of 96 inches but not in excess of 102 inches upon 12-foot-width traffic lanes of the Interstate system will be unsafe and cannot be made safe by promulgation of safety regulations, his finding does, in effect, veto the use of any buses over 96 inches wide on the Interstate system?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Michigan is exactly correct. We do confer upon the Secretary of Transportation in this bill, in the section to which the gentleman has referred, the power to stop the bill and prevent its being effectuated into law if he finds as a result of this study that it would decrease safety.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if that study is conducted and if that study shows that buses over 96 inches wide on a 12-foot-width traffic lane of the Interstate system will be unsafe and cannot be safe by promulgation of safety regulations, what does he do with that report? Where does he send it? What gives it authority?

Mr. WRIGHT. He, being the agent named in the bill as the administering authority of the bill, has the power to negate the application of the legislation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Just the mere existence of that report with his signature on it coming to that conclusion?

Mr. WRIGHT. Precisely so.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. On that very point, suppose that some of these studies are so complicated that he cannot find that answer—and one of the things that we worry about is that if the Secretary finds it impossible to do an adequate study on

all of the factors that deal with safety—then the bill automatically goes into force? Is that right or wrong?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that it does not automatically go into force and effect everywhere. It would depend upon each State. We have only a permissive bill. All we are doing is to allow the States, if they want to do it, to permit the buses that already exist and are now operating on the more narrow roads to operate on safer roads, the Interstate System.

I am sure that the gentleman is aware of the fact that the safest roads in the United States are the interstate highways. It has been demonstrated statistically that the fatalities on the Interstate System, measured in millions of passenger miles traveled, is only about one-half that on the other road-street network of the Nation. The irony of this is that we have permitted the use of 102-inch buses—if it is a safety hazard, and the Bureau of Public Roads concluded that it was not—on the narrower roads, but we have prohibited the use of these 102-inch buses on the wider and safer roads throughout the country.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman is correct. As to the question that was asked whether or not the answer could not be found by July 1, 1973, we have in the report a letter from the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Turner, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), concerning this, and, in the opinion of Mr. Turner, he states that it is his opinion that such studies will require approximately 18 months to complete.

Of course, we have got almost 2 years between now and the terminal date, and it will cost approximately \$250,000 or \$300,000 in the estimation of Mr. Turner, and he said to us it would not be a very complicated problem for them to go into. He has been give almost 6 months longer than the time he himself estimates would be necessary to complete the studies.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, before I do anything else, let me ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and in one case to soften my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. All the committee is trying to do is make it easier and more attractive for people to use mass transit, the cheapest and most generally available form of mass transit that exists today in the United States.

We think it would be helpful to get a few of the cars off of the interstate highways, and permit these buses of no more than 102 inches in width to be used only on the widest lanes, the 12-foot lanes on the multiple-lane highways, if the States want to put them there.

So, vote the bill up or down. It has been studied. It was subjected to lengthy hearings by the Committee on Public Works in the 90th Congress, and was subjected to lengthy hearings again last year, and again we have held hearings this year. So vote the bill up or down, I suggest to my colleagues, but do not create a Presidential commission. It already has an additional study built into it. And the Secretary of Transportation, if for any reason he finds that it will be unsafe or will be less safe than what we have today, he can veto it.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Members support this bill which the Committee on Public Works has studied carefully and by a preponderant majority has recommended to you favorably.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending bill because, coming as I do from a heavily populated urban district, I know firsthand the value of fast, convenient, safe, and comfortable bus service.

Under the able leadership of Secretary Volpe, the Department of Transportation chose a major artery in my district for its first demonstration project of setting aside certain lanes of highway for exclusive use by buses during rush hours. It is proving to be an unqualified success, having nationwide significance in that it shows that people need, and will use, buses.

Secretary Volpe stated just last month:

In our concentration on the need to move numbers of people instead of numbers of vehicles, the use of exclusive busways has proved an effective method of dealing with rush hour, urban traffic congestion.

The same could be said for interstate bus service.

But faced with the competition of a plush automobile with commodious seating, the intercity bus companies—privately owned, by the way, and subsidy-free—are unable, literally, to expand to accommodate ever-bigger passengers.

This bill today would give them, and the public, the wider seats they need to attract people out of their cars. The crowded freeways and streets in the eastern corridor are stark testimony to the need for greater use of buses.

The traveling public deserves the relief this bill would afford them, and the bill deserves passage today and speedy enactment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the unanswered questions that have been raised regarding the safety of wider buses should be sufficient to prevent the passage of H.R. 4354. A more extensive study of the effects of a wider bus is needed. Safety is of highest priority and these buses must be proven safe before this measure should even be given consideration.

The current law allows for a 96-inch-wide bus. The 6 inch increase proposed by this bill, brings the width to 102 inches. Even if the buses would travel only in 12 foot lanes of the interstate system, the side margins become extremely narrow. The figure of 102 inches does not include the side mirrors that protrude as much as 9 inches. This leaves an extremely narrow margin on each

side, providing the buses ride in the center of the lane. Any slight swerve could have disastrous results if two buses were to pass each other.

The proposed change involves quite a few factors. An increase in the width of the bus will automatically enlarge the "blind spot." Not only will the total rear visibility of the bus driver be reduced, but the vehicle behind the bus will have reduced visibility. Imagine what it will be like to drive behind one of these monster vehicles.

The problem of bus widths also ties in with that of truck size. If buses are made wider, trucks will be next to seek an increased width. The plea for wider buses is a strategy for wider and longer trucks.

Additional size also means additional weight. This will cause additional wear and tear on the highways, thus leading to increased costs for upkeep.

The larger buses will also complicate the problem of air turbulence. Drivers already know the wind blasts felt when passing or being passed by a large vehicle. The problem of braking systems also becomes important when the weight and size of the vehicle is increased. Vehicles together in traffic must be able to stop at approximately the same rate, otherwise, the slower braking vehicles will collide with those able to brake faster. The possibility of such collisions calls for more adequate energy absorbing systems. Although bus passengers may be safe in a collision with a car, passengers in a car would be right at the point of impact. At this time, there is a lack of standardization of bumper heights. Improvements in bumpers are needed before buses are increased in size. There has simply not been enough done to provide for a safe intermix of automobiles and larger vehicles on the Nation's highways.

All the problems caused by the wider and larger vehicles have not been identified and studied. It is essential that every safety precaution is considered before this bill can be passed. As long as there is doubt as to the safety of a wider bus, Congress cannot and must not jeopardize human lives by allowing such vehicles to travel on our interstate system.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to explain my vote on H.R. 4354, the bill to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate System. After listening to the debate, and analyzing the bill, I concluded that this bill should be recommended to the Committee on Public Works for the purpose of removing certain defects in the bill.

During the course of the debate, it was not clearly shown that widening buses from 96 to 102 inches on the Interstate System would be entirely safe. The bill, in section 3 does provide that the amendments made by the act would take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year after the date the Secretary of Transportation has completed the necessary safety studies, including engineering and testing analyses, concerning the effects of the widening and has promul-

gated such safety regulations as he determines necessary, or on July 1, 1973, whichever would occur first unless prior to this effective date, the Secretary reports to Congress that as a result of such studies he has determined that the operation of motor buses having a width in excess of 96 inches but not in excess of 102 inches upon 12-foot-wide traffic lanes of the Interstate System will be unsafe and cannot be made safe by promulgation of safety regulations.

This demonstrates, apparently, the committee had some question as to the safety of the widening of motor buses and delegated discretion to the Secretary of Transportation to make a study, and to promulgate regulations or to veto this act of Congress.

In the first place, as there is a question about the safety of widening buses, the proper legislative procedure would be for the Secretary of Transportation to be empowered to make the safety studies and then report to Congress his findings as a basis for the passage of enabling legislation.

The second defect of the bill is that I am not aware of legislation whereby in affect the power to veto an act of Congress is delegated to a non-elected official, the Secretary of Transportation. This is an unwarranted delegation of power. These defects could have been rectified by further hearings and legislation by the Public Works Committee.

However, in the absence of a recommitment to the Public Works Committee, with some reservation and as an act of faith in the integrity of the Secretary of Transportation, and the various State, I would then support the passage of this measure. The saving factor of this legislation, though I think the procedure is improper, would be the safety studies and regulations by the Secretary of Transportation, and the necessity for each State under laws or regulations promulgated by the State Authority to set widths of buses on the Interstate System within the respective State.

I do think the U.S. Congress is capable of better procedure than demonstrated by this bill.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated in my supplemental views, which will be inserted in the RECORD following these remarks, I feel we should adopt the study which will be offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENDEL). It is my understanding that this may be subject to a point of order. If it is, I will vote to recommit this bill to committee. I think the people of this country are concerned about the effect of bigger and bigger vehicles on the quality of our environment. The SST affair should have made this crystal clear. The widespread acceptance by the public of smaller passenger cars echoes this growing sentiment. Not only the impact on the quality of our environment, but considerations of cost and safety convince me that this legislation should be subject to further study.

My supplemental views follow:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND ON H.R. 4354

I concur with the additional views of Honorable Wilmer D. Mizell, and I also concur,

in part, with the minority views of Honorable Fred Schwengel. I commend Congressman Schwengel for his leadership in protecting the public interest against efforts to increase the dimensions and weights of trucks and buses without any definitive studies as to the safety and cost factors involved. As one who joined his successful efforts in 1969 to accomplish this end, I am mindful of the fact that the problem of bus widths cannot realistically be separated from the truck size issue.

During the Committee's consideration of H.R. 4354, I was successful in requiring that the making of a safety study relative to buses be an absolute condition of this legislation, but, unfortunately, the study, which was limited to buses, leaves the larger issues involving trucks and related cost factors unresolved. In the Committee, Congressman Schwengel offered an amendment to H.R. 4354, which would have provided for the establishment of a Presidential commission to make a comprehensive study of the effects of increasing dimensions and weights of all vehicles operating upon the Federal-aid highway systems, including all related safety and cost aspects. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated.

In my opinion, if the House passes this bill to authorize increased widths of buses, it should insist that the study provided for in the bill be enlarged to include all matters relating to increased dimensions and weights of both trucks and buses with particular emphasis upon the safety and cost factors.

JAMES C. CLEVELAND.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my support for the efforts being made today to provide for a further, more comprehensive study of the issue of wider buses on the Nation's Interstate Highway System.

Serious questions regarding this wider bus standard—which increases the acceptable width from 96 to 102 inches—have been raised by the Department of Transportation and its National Transportation Safety Board.

These questions, in my estimation, have not been satisfactorily answered or properly explored. That is why I believe we need a Presidential commission to study all of these safety aspects, and to reach definitive conclusions on which we can act in a more enlightened and responsible way.

This Commission, which would be composed of public representatives as well as special interest groups affected by the new standard, could provide us with a balanced and thorough review of the situation. It could answer the questions that need to be answered.

At this stage, when there are 301 miles of interstate highway yet to be completed in my State of North Carolina, and 10,569 miles still unfinished across the Nation, I believe we have ample time and sufficient reason to proceed with due caution in this matter, and to gather all the relevant facts.

There is no reason at all for us to rush into this matter, especially when it could possibly prove dangerous to the safety of our motoring public. If the study proves otherwise, we are still no worse off for having undertaken an extensive review.

The creation of such a commission would provide us with a reasonable opportunity to act in the public good, and it is this course of action I urge my colleagues to adopt.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the first word and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Apportionment of funds shall not be denied to any State for allowing the operation of motor buses upon the Interstate System within such State with a width not in excess of one hundred and two inches plus additional width necessary for officially approved safety devices; or with the maximum width permitted for motor buses using the Interstate System within such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is greater. As used in this subsection, the term 'motor buses' means motor vehicles with motive power, except trailers, designed for carrying more than ten persons."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall not be applicable to any segment of the Interstate System, the traffic lanes of the main traveled way of which are less than twelve feet wide.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year which begins after the date the Secretary of Transportation has completed the necessary safety studies (including engineering and testing analyses) concerning the effects of such amendment and has promulgated such safety regulations as he deems necessary, or on July 1, 1973, whichever date first occurs unless, prior to such effective date, the Secretary reports to Congress that as a result of such studies he has determined that the operation of motor buses having a width in excess of 96 inches but not in excess of 102 inches upon twelve foot wide traffic lanes of the Interstate System will be unsafe and cannot be made safe by promulgation of safety regulations.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWENDEL

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWENDEL: Strike out section 3 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect two years after enactment of this Act, unless the Commission established by Title II of this Act reports to the Congress prior to such date that use of 102 inch buses would be unsafe.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. There is hereby established a Commission on Highway Safety and Expense (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Commission").

Sec. 202. The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of all effects on highway safety and the expense of constructing, reconstructing, repairing, and maintaining highways resulting from any changes in the size and weight limitations established by section 127 of title 23, United States Code. Such investigation and study shall include, but not be limited to, a specific examination of the following:

(1) What share of highway construction and maintenance costs is allocable to each class of highway users?

(2) What would be the effect if H.R. 11870, 91st Congress, as introduced, were enacted into law on the shares referred to in paragraph (1)?

(3) What would be the effect if H.R. 11870, 91st Congress, as introduced, were enacted into law on the costs of the Federal-aid highway systems (both original costs and recurring costs)?

(4) What overall economic benefits would accrue from H.R. 11870, 91st Congress, as introduced, if such bill were enacted into law and which sectors of the economy would receive these benefits?

(5) How should the costs referred to in paragraph (3) be allocated on the basis of the economic benefits referred to in paragraph (4)?

(6) What would be the effect if H.R. 11870, 91st Congress, as introduced, were enacted into law on all aspects of highway safety? Specifically, can 102 inch wide buses be safely operated on our Nation's highways?

Sec. 203. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 16 members appointed by the President, one of whom he shall appoint as Chairman, and shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Two members shall be Members of the House of Representatives one from the majority political party, and one from the minority political party. Two members shall be Members of the Senate, one from the majority political party, and one from the minority political party. One member shall represent the American Trucking Association, one the American Automobile Association, one the American Association of State Highway Officials, one the American Society of Professional Engineers, one the American Association of County Engineers, one the National Safety Council, one the National Association of Motor Bus Owners, National Highway Traffic Administration, and three members shall represent the general public.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

Sec. 204. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive \$100 for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional compensation on account of their service on the Commission.

(c) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Sec. 205. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) The staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

Sec. 206. (a) The Commission may for the purpose of carrying out this title hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission may deem advisable. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) (1) The Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter which the Commission is empowered to investigate by section 202 of this title. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States.

(2) If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contempt, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a District Court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts.

(4) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

Sec. 207. (a) The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this title. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall, in carrying out this title, utilize the existing test and other facilities of the departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, to the fullest extent possible.

Sec. 208. Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act the Commission shall submit a report of the results of the investigation and study required by this title to each House of Congress, and to the President, together with its recommendations, including specific recommendations with respect to each matter referred to in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 202 of this title.

Sec. 209. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its final report pursuant to section 208.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members know what this amendment is so I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) rise?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I

make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the pending legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would.

Mr. Chairman, I have given consideration to this question and since the bill itself does deal with safety and this amendment deals with safety and, in effect, it seeks in certain sections the same objectives that the bill does, that is to give an adequate study, and this substitute does of course extend the study, but I think it deals more adequately with the total problem which I think should be the interest of the Congress and of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. REES). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill under consideration amends section 127 of title 23, United States Code, to permit buses with a width of up to 102 inches to operate on the Interstate Highway System. While section 127 of the existing law sets weight and width limitations which are applicable to all vehicles using the Interstate System, the bill applies only to motor buses. The Secretary of Transportation is directed to study the safety of the proposed width change and report thereon.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. SCHWENGEL, would establish a Presidential Commission on Highway Safety and Expense to study all the effects on highway safety and cost resulting from any changes in the size and weight limitations established by section 127. The scope of the amendment is thus far broader than the bill. One of the specific examinations which the Commission would be directed to make includes cost allocations between different types of interstate highway users, a matter certainly beyond the purview of the pending bill.

The amendment falls under the general rule that a specific subject may not be amended by a general provision. The Chair has examined numerous precedents which illustrate this proposition. In the 84th Congress, for example, an amendment providing for Federal assistance for school construction generally was ruled out as not germane to a bill providing for construction of schools in impacted areas—July 7, 1956, RECORD, page 12025. And in that same Congress, where the Committee of the Whole had under consideration a bill authorizing a commission to investigate abridgement of civil rights, amendments to enlarge the scope of the investigation to authorize the commission to study and collect information concerning other rights and going to matters not carried in the bill was ruled out as not germane—July 20, 1956, RECORD, page 13728.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed? If not,

the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. REES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having and under consideration the bill—H.R. 4354—to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate system, in order to increase such limitations for motor buses, pursuant to House Resolution 546, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHWENGEL moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4354, to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. 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 178, nays 213, answered "present" 2, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—178

Abourezk	Brademas	Cleveland
Andrews,	Brasco	Collier
N. Dak.	Bray	Colmer
Archer	Brotzman	Conable
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Conte
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Coughlin
Aspin	Burke, Fla.	Culver
Badillo	Burlison, Mo.	Daniel, Va.
Bell	Burton	Danielson
Bennett	Camp	Davis, Wis.
Bevill	Carter	Dellums
Biester	Celler	Dennis
Bingham	Chappell	Derwinski
Boland	Clancy	Devine

Dickinson	Jonas	Rooney, N.Y.
Dow	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Duncan	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
du Pont	Keith	Ruppe
Dwyer	King	Ruth
Erlenborn	Koch	Ryan
Eshleman	Kyl	Sarbanes
Findley	Landgrebe	Satterfield
Fish	Lennon	Saylor
Flowers	Lent	Scherie
Foley	Link	Schmitz
Forsythe	McClory	Schneebell
Fountain	McCollister	Schwengel
Fraser	McDade	Sebelius
Frelinghuysen	McEwen	Shipley
Frey	McFall	Shoup
Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,	Shriver
Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Fuqua	Mann	Snyder
Galifianakis	Mathis, Ga.	Springer
Gaydos	Mazzoli	Stafford
Gibbons	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Mikva	Stubblefield
Grasso	Miller, Ohio	Sullivan
Green, Pa.	Mills, Md.	Taylor
Griffiths	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Gross	Minshall	Thomson, Wis.
Gubser	Mizell	Thone
Gude	Montgomery	Tiernan
Hagan	Moorhead	Vanik
Haley	Morse	Vigorito
Hall	Mosher	Ware
Hamilton	Moss	Whalley
Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi	White
Harsha	Obey	Whitten
Hastings	O'Hara	Widnall
Hechler, W. Va.	Pike	Williams
Henderson	Pirnie	Wilson, Bob
Hillis	Preyer, N.C.	Wilson,
Hogan	Railsback	Poff
Horton	Randall	Charles H.
Hunt	Rarick	Wydler
Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.	Wyllie
Ichord	Reid, N.Y.	Yates
Jacobs	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
Jarman	Rogers	Zablocki
Johnson, Pa.		

NAYS—213

Abbutt	Dent	Leggett
Abernethy	Diggs	Lloyd
Abzug	Dingell	Long, Md.
Addabbo	Dorn	McClure
Alexander	Downing	McCormack
Anderson,	Drinan	McDonald,
Calif.	Dulski	Mich.
Anderson,	Eckhardt	McKevitt
Tenn.	Edmondson	McKinney
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, Ala.	McMillan
Annunzio	Edwards, Calif.	Madden
Arends	Eilberg	Mahon
Aspinall	Esch	Mailliard
Baring	Evans, Colo.	Martin
Begich	Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.
Belcher	Fascell	Matsunaga
Bergland	Fisher	Meeds
Betts	Flood	Metcalfe
Biaggi	Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Calif.
Blackburn	Ford,	Mills, Ark.
Blatnik	William D.	Minish
Boggs	Frenzel	Mollohan
Bolling	Gallagher	Monagan
Bow	Garmatz	Morgan
Brinkley	Gettys	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Gialmo	Murphy, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Goldwater	Myers
Broyhill, Va.	Gonzalez	Natcher
Buchanan	Gray	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Burleson, Tex.	Griffin	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hammer-	O'Neill
Byron	schmidt	Passman
Cabell	Hanley	Patman
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Patten
Carney	Harrington	Pelly
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Perkins
Cederberg	Hathaway	Pettis
Chamberlain	Hays	Peysner
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
Clausen,	Helstoski	Poage
Don H.	Hicks, Mass.	Podell
Clawson, Del	Hicks, Wash.	Powell
Clay	Hollifield	Price, Ill.
Collins, Ill.	Howard	Price, Tex.
Collins, Tex.	Hull	Pryor, Ark.
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Purcell
Cotter	Jones, N.C.	Quire
Daniels, N.J.	Karh	Quillen
Danielson	Kazen	Rangel
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Rees
Davis, S.C.	Kluczyński	Reuss
Delaney	Landrum	Rhodes
Dellenback	Latta	Riegle
Denholm		

Roberts	Slack	Udall
Robinson, Va.	Smith, Calif.	Ullman
Rodino	Spence	Vander Jagt
Roe	Stanton,	Veysey
Roncalio	J. William	Waggonner
Rostenkowski	Stanton,	Walde
Roush	James V.	Wampler
Roussetot	Steed	Watts
Roy	Steele	Whalen
Roybal	Steiger, Ariz.	Whitehurst
Runnels	Stephens	Wiggins
St Germain	Stokes	Winn
Sandman	Stratton	Wright
Scheuer	Stuckey	Wyatt
Scott	Talcott	Wyman
Sikes	Teague, Calif.	Young, Tex.
Sisk	Teague, Tex.	Zwach
Skubitz	Thompson, N.J.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Grover Wolf

NOT VOTING—40

Adams	Hanna	Mayne
Anderson, Ill.	Hawkins	Melcher
Baker	Hébert	Mitchell
Barrett	Hosmer	Pepper
Blanton	Hungate	Seiberling
Brooks	Kee	Smith, N.Y.
Caffery	Kemp	Staggers
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Symington
Crane	Kyros	Terry
de la Garza	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Lujan	Yatron
Dowdy	McCloskey	Zion
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	
Flynt	McKay	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Zion for, with Mr. Adams against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Kemp for, with Mr. Barrett against.
Mr. Melcher for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Crane for, with Mr. Brooks against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Kee with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Terry.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Kyros with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. BRASCO and Mr. HAGAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DIGGS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill—H.R. 4354—just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY,
JULY 22

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?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY SAFETY
REGULATIONS

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a report entitled, "Caution: Riding in a Bus May Be Hazardous to Your Health," which appears in the RECORD of July 15, 1971, I discussed the adequacy and enforcement of Federal highway safety regulations. A substantial portion of that report discussed State noncompliance with all or portions of 16 separate Federal standards relating to highway safety.

I pointed out, too, that although substantial segments of State highway safety programs do not meet the minimum standards outlined under title 23 of the United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation has not used his authority to withhold from any individual State a portion of that State's Federal aid highway fund allocation to achieve compliance.

Safety regulations which exist on paper but are not enforced are totally meaningless. They contribute absolutely nothing to the preservation of life on our Nation's highways.

In a news release issued March 2, 1971, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reported on the status of State compliance with the existing 16 highway safety program standards and noted that 19 States have not demonstrated acceptable progress in complying with one or more of the standards. And although the news release makes mention of the DOT authority to withhold

highway funds to implement approved programs of highway safety, that authority is merely given lip service.

For that reason, I have sent a letter to Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats asking that the General Accounting Office determine whether the Department of Transportation is fulfilling its obligation to use the teeth it has been given by Congress to put the bite on safety-delinquent States.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD my letter to the Comptroller General and a copy of the NHTSA news release on State compliance with Federal safety standards.

NEWS RELEASE OF DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe has sent letters to the Nation's Governors telling them how their States rank and compare with all other States in their compliance with 16 Highway Safety Program Standards.

Under the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the States are responsible for carrying out highway safety programs to implement Federal Standards developed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and issued by the Secretary of Transportation.

In issuing a report card to the States, Secretary Volpe said:

"Ideally, all States should be fully implementing the highway safety standards. . . . In my continuing review of the status of highway safety around the country, I find some advances and, unhappily, some retrogression.

"As a former governor, I am of course fully appreciative of the problems in enacting your legislative programs and implementing and financing them. But the attack on highway deaths and accidents must be pressed without pause. With nearly all legislative bodies now in session, it is most timely that as a first step, you seek passage of the traffic safety laws your State needs and put them into effect as soon as possible."

The letters also included a list for each State of specific legislative and administrative steps which it has not taken. The rating grade takes into consideration the State's announced plans as well as its current program level.

The National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, appointed by the President, recommended that Secretary Volpe send the letters to the Governors.

The Secretary sent the Governors a chart showing a fundamental grading system ranging from A to D. This grading system

was developed so that each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico could readily compare its progress or lack of progress with the record of other States in relation to each of the Federal Standards.

The letter code indicates:

(A)—The State is currently fully implementing the requirements of the Standards.

(B)—The State's program, when implemented, will conform substantially to the requirements of the Standards.

(C)—The program when implemented will demonstrate acceptable progress toward implementation of the elements of the Standards.

(D)—The program does not demonstrate acceptable progress toward implementation of elements of the Standards.

The 16 Highway Safety Program Standards issued by the Secretary of Transportation include: Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection; Motor Vehicle Registration; Motorcycle Safety; Driver Education; Driver Licensing; Codes and Laws; Traffic Courts; Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety; Identification and Surveillance of Accident Locations; Traffic Records; Emergency Medical Services; Highway Design, Construction, and Maintenance; Traffic Lighting and Control Devices; Pedestrian Safety; Police Traffic Services, and Debris Hazard Control and Cleanup.

The States ranked in the top 10 in compliance are New York, Virginia, California, Louisiana, South Carolina, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, and Washington. Out of a total of 832 possible grades, there were 29 A's, 775 B's and C's, and 28 D's. Almost 94 percent of the grades were in the B and C category.

Acting Traffic Safety Administrator Douglas Toms said effective State highway safety programs will help achieve the goal of reducing highway crashes and resulting casualties.

"We are faced with 150 highway deaths a day in this country—a dismal toll. But we are making progress. Highway fatalities in 1970 totaled 55,300, but significantly, there were 1,100 fewer deaths than in 1969," Toms said.

"We are charged by law to look at the total State program and its effectiveness. Therefore, in reviewing the programs and working with the States from a technical point of view, we are together improving the quality and effectiveness of the program."

Failure to implement an approved program could result in the loss of Federal funds available for grants to the States and local communities under the Highway Safety Act of 1966. It could also lead to loss of 10 percent of the State's Federal-aid highway construction funds.

[A—Fully implementing; B—Substantial conformance; C—Demonstrates acceptable progress; D—Does not demonstrate acceptable progress]

State	P&A	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316
Alabama	OK	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	B	D	C	B	D	D	C	C	C
Alaska	OK	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	C	C	B	D	D	B	C	B
Arizona	OK	C	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	D	D	B	C	C
Arkansas	OK	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	A	C	B	C	C	B	C	C	B
California	OK	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	A	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	B
Colorado	OK	B	B	A	B	C	B	C	B	B	B	C	C	B	B	C	C
Connecticut	OK	D	B	C	B	C	B	A	B	B	B	C	C	B	B	C	C
Delaware	OK	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	C	B	B	C	C	C	B	C
Florida	OK	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	B
Georgia	OK	C	B	C	C	D	C	C	A	C	B	B	D	C	C	C	C
Hawaii	OK	B	B	B	C	B	B	A	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	C
Idaho	OK	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	B	D	B	C	C	C	C	B	C
Illinois	OK	D	B	D	B	C	B	A	B	D	B	C	C	C	C	C	B
Indiana	OK	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	C	C	B	C	C	C	C	B	C
Iowa	OK	D	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	D	B	C	C	C	C	C	C
Kansas	OK	C	B	A	C	C	B	C	B	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
Kentucky	OK	D	B	D	B	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	B
Louisiana	OK	C	B	A	C	B	B	C	A	C	C	B	C	D	C	C	B
Maine	OK	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	C	C
Maryland	OK	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
Massachusetts	OK	C	B	B	C	B	C	A	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	C
Michigan	OK	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
Minnesota	OK	C	B	B	B	C	B	C	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	C
Mississippi	OK	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	B
Missouri	OK	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	C	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C

[A—Fully implementing; B—Substantial conformance; C—Demonstrates acceptable progress; D—Does not demonstrate acceptable progress]—Continued

State	P&A	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316
Montana	OK	C	B	B	C	C	B	C	C	B	C	B	B	B	C	C	C
Nebraska	OK	B	B	C	B	B	B	C	A	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	B
Nevada	OK	C	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	B
New Hampshire	OK	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
New Jersey	OK	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
New Mexico	OK	B	B	B	B	C	C	B	C	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	C
New York	OK	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C
North Carolina	OK	B	B	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
North Dakota	OK	D	B	B	C	C	B	C	A	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	C
Ohio	OK	D	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C
Oklahoma	OK	C	C	D	B	C	B	B	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	B	B
Oregon	OK	D	B	C	C	C	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
Pennsylvania	OK	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	A	C	C	B	B	C	B	B	C
Rhode Island	OK	B	B	A	C	B	B	A	A	C	C	B	B	C	B	C	C
South Carolina	OK	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	A	B	C	B	C	C	C	B	C
South Dakota	OK	B	B	B	C	B	C	B	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	C	C
Tennessee	OK	C	B	C	C	B	C	C	B	D	B	C	C	D	B	C	C
Texas	OK	C	B	B	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	B
Utah	OK	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	B	C	C
Vermont	OK	A	B	B	C	C	C	B	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	B
Virginia	OK	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	C	C
Washington	OK	D	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C
West Virginia	OK	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	C
Wisconsin	OK	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	C
Wyoming	OK	B	C	B	C	B	B	B	C	C	C	B	C	C	C	C	C
District of Columbia	OK	B	C	A	B	B	B	B	A	B	C	B	B	C	B	D	C
Puerto Rico	OK	B	B	B	C	C	B	A	B	C	B	B	C	C	B	B	C

Note: 309-312* FHWA responsibility.
313-314

JULY 19, 1971.

HON. ELMER B. STAATS,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: On July 15, 1970, an unregistered interstate tour bus traveling west on rainswept U.S. Route 22 near Allentown, Pennsylvania, skidded and plunged 50 feet down an embankment, killing seven children and injuring the driver and 51 children and adults.

In brief, the bus carried more passengers than it could seat; at least two of its tires were bald or near-bald; its driver had accumulated at least eight prior driving violations; although the crash site was also the site of about forty accidents within as many months, it had not been identified in a Federal-state inventory of hazardous highway sectors; the bus tacograph was inoperative; the tour did not have ICC authorization, etc.

In the interim since that tragic accident, my office has reviewed safety regulations, as they apply to interstate and intrastate bus operations. While, in my judgment, such regulations are woefully inadequate in many respects, it is apparent that the Secretary of Transportation through authority vested in him under Title 23, U.S.C., could require individual states to make substantially greater strides in adopting Federally-proposed minimum standards for motor vehicle safety. Not only is he prohibited from apportioning funds for highway safety programs to any state whose highway safety program has not been approved by the Secretary, but also he is required to withhold ten per cent of Federal aid highway funds from any state not implementing an approved highway safety program.

Since Title 23 represents "minimum standards" for safety proposed for voluntary adoption by the states, it seems obvious that any individual state's highway safety program submitted for review and approval by the Secretary of Transportation should at least entail compliance with those minimum standards. Legislative history of the Act, however, reflects an intent of Congress to withhold funds only if reasonable efforts to achieve compliance are not being made.

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you review the Secretary of Transportation's failure to withhold any Federal aid highway funds from any state, despite the fact that a number of states require no motor vehicle inspections, or that 16-year-old drivers are permitted to drive buses in some states, etc. Clearly, practices such as these reflect a low level of concern for highway safety—and a

level which ought to be raised by forceful Federal action, if not by concerned voluntary action on the part of the individual states.

Your attention to this most serious matter will be sincerely appreciated.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED B. ROONEY,
Member of Congress.

(P.S.—For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a news release of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration dated March 2, 1971, which indicates that nineteen states are not making acceptable progress in compliance with one or more of sixteen Highway Safety Program Standards. Ten states are not making acceptable progress to establish periodic motor vehicle inspections, for example.)

A BILL TO CLARIFY THE RIGHTS OF STATES TO ENACT BUY-AMERICAN STATUTES

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which in effect would clarify the right of States to enact buy-American statutes.

The Federal Government has had a Buy-American Act since 1934. Twenty-one other States and territories also gave preference to domestic goods in their purchasing practices.

In a decision of the California Supreme Court, the California Buy-American Act was declared unconstitutional because it was an "encroachment upon the Federal Government's exclusive power over foreign affairs, and constituted an undue interference with the United States' conduct of foreign relations." This decision has the effect of making all State buy-American acts and regulations unenforceable.

Discontinuance of State buy-American practices has aggravated the Nation's No. 1 problem of creating new jobs and reducing unemployment. Many domestic industries are severely handicapped without the volume of State business.

The number of jobs affected is in the hundreds of thousands.

Foreign purchases are not cheap in the long run. One dollar spent for domestic goods generates 36 cents in taxes. The purchase of foreign-produced material generates no tax revenue from the production process.

Studies show that money spent domestically stimulates the economy by more than 15 times. Foreign purchases depress the domestic economy. Any purported savings in the purchase of foreign goods will be lost many times in its effect upon the domestic economy, as well as in loss of tax revenue.

The discontinuance of longstanding State buy-American practices has brought about expansion of foreign imports, but without a corresponding increase in domestically produced exports. This will further complicate the balance-of-payments problem faced by the United States today.

Federal action is needed now to allow State legislatures to continue their longstanding buy-American practices.

As I pointed out in a recent speech before the convention of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, in Miami Beach, Fla., the Secretary of Commerce has been quoted as saying the United States this year may face its first trade deficit in 75 years. He went on to say we are losing our competitive advantage in terms of price, productivity, and technology.

It is well known that the Japanese are eroding our competitive position in electronics; the Germans and others are undercutting our automobile industry. And many other industries where we are subject to foreign competition are in trouble.

It seems to me that the time has come for all in Government, management, and labor to renew our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to this country and all it stands for in terms of buy American. Yes, I would, of course, apply this principle to "ship American."

It may be that we cannot accomplish the full task through the legislative proc-

ess. But the bill I have introduced today will certainly help in that direction.

THE NATIONAL POWER GRID BILL

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing on behalf of myself, Congressman JAMES ABOUREZK of South Dakota, and Congressman HERMAN BADILLO of New York, a bill to establish a national power grid and a series of regional bulk power supply agencies. Senator LEE METCALF of Montana will be introducing an identical measure in the Senate.

This bill is the result of our growing concern over what we see as a crisis in the supply of electric power.

The day has passed when the Nation's electrical utilities alone can assure every American an adequate and reliable supply of electricity. The Federal Power Commission reports that there have been 13 blackouts and brownouts of more than 100 megawatts during May and June, with the worst yet to come. And the situation is not improving. Demand for electric power is expected to quadruple in the next three decades. Yet, the utilities are struggling under the current demand and have had little success in implementing plans to meet this future projection. Part of the reason for this is the legitimate controversy surrounding the environmental impact of the utilities' proposed generation and transmission facilities. Electric utilities account for a major share of air pollution from the burning of fossil fuels, and waste heat from powerplants is reportedly causing an increasing amount of harm to marine, animal and plant life.

The utilities response to the environmental challenge has been wholly inadequate. Instead of accelerating research for environmental protection they have simply allowed the situation to deteriorate into a crisis using the threat of a blackout as blackmail in trying to force acceptance of their plans.

The bill that we introduce today would establish a National Grid Corporation, financed by tax exempt bonds. This corporation would be responsible for the bulk supply of electric power. It could generate power either by contracting with existing utilities or by constructing and operating its own large scale plants. The corporation would move this power throughout the country using a "grid" system of extra high voltage transmission lines.

In each of the regions of the United States there would be established by the bill a "Regional Bulk Power Supply Corporation." These corporations would be largely independent of the National Corporation. Direction would be by a three-man board, one member representing private power companies, one representing public power companies and one representing consumers. They would market the National Grid's power to the utilities in the region but would not be in the business of distribution. Rather, they would sell their power through a series of

transmission lines to the utilities in the region, private and public, who would then market the power to the consumer.

The need for this legislation is compelling. Only with a national grid system can we assure all Americans an adequate and reliable supply of electric power. And because electric power is a vital necessity in this age of increasing mechanization, it is the responsibility of Government to insure its availability.

An example of how the national grid could accomplish this, consider the acute power shortage which struck New York City in 1969. Basin Electric Power Cooperative in North Dakota, along with the Bureau of Reclamation and Missouri Basin System wired Consolidated Edison in New York to say that they would supply all of the power New York needed. The city remained dim, however, because there was no way to transmit the power from North Dakota to New York. Had a national grid existed, this power would have been readily available to the energy-starved area. There are operating advantages for a national grid as well. It has been estimated that we would need 20 percent less generation capacity to meet our needs if we were to establish a national grid. Utilities could take advantage of seasonal and time variations in their peak loads. While people in California are still asleep and using little power, the excess capacity could be used in meeting the heavy demand of the Northern States. In the same way, power could go to the South during the summer in their season of peak demand.

Perhaps the most important reason for this public corporation, however, is for environmental protection, a matter so important to us that we must not limit ourselves to what is economically feasible. We do not expect this corporation to make money. Its profits will be in the form of clean air and water, and in the reliable supply of low cost energy to the American consumer. This is obviously an unfair demand to make on a private utility, whose reason for existence is to turn a profit. While obviously no power system can exist without environmental cost, there are promising technologies, such as underground transmission which could eliminate many of the environmentalists' objections. That is why, as part of our requirement that the corporation be in the vanguard of environmental protection, we have made a major commitment to research and development.

The electric power industry is one in which there are very great "economies of scale." Only a system of the size we envision can take full advantage of these economies, while insuring reliability. Further the system of the grid will eliminate the burden utilities now have of maintaining reserves to compensate for equipment breakdown and other emergencies. The resulting operating efficiencies could produce a cost/saving factor of one-third which would be passed on to the consumer.

In introducing this bill, we are offering to enter into a partnership with private industry to do a job which neither of us can do alone. The Government, in meeting its public policy to protect the

environment and insure a reliable supply of electricity, will assist in generation and transmission. The corporation will not take over the facilities of the utility industry, nor will it compel them to buy the grid's power. It will simply offer them a choice which we believe will become increasingly attractive as costs rise and concern for the environment grows. The compulsion involved is human and economic rather than legal. We have reached the stage in this country where a reliable supply of electric power, available to every consumer at low cost, and produced without degrading the environment is an absolute necessity. The electric utility industry cannot insure this; the national grid system can.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I wish to include the statements of Senator METCALF, Congressman ABOUREZK, and Congressman BADILLO presented this morning at a joint press conference announcing the introduction of the national power grid bill. I also include a copy of the legislation.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEE METCALF

The National Power Grid bill has been a long time coming.

Gifford Pinchot, while governor of Pennsylvania decades ago, outlined the concept.

Twenty years ago Commissioner of Reclamation Michael Straus proposed a western power grid.

Four years ago former Assistant Secretary of Interior Ken Holm and his associates proposed, in Study 190, a grid covering half of the United States.

More recently, former Secretary of Interior Hickel spoke of Departmental plans for a national power grid. But no proposal has as yet been put before the Congress.

The bill being put before both houses of Congress today will, we hope, at last focus Congressional, executive branch and national attention on a problem that has for too long been put aside.

I regard introduction of a bill such as this as an initial pleading. We need to have all segments of the power industry and environmental and consumer groups examine it closely, criticize or applaud, and help the Congress develop through the hearing procedure an act that will provide a transmission system that will move power where it is needed and diminish the demand for construction of additional generation facilities.

The sponsors come from Eastern and Western States. I commend the House members who have taken a leading role in developing the bill. It belongs on the agenda of priority items to be considered by the Congress.

STRAIGHTENING OUT THE POWER MESS

(Statement by JAMES ABOUREZK)

The United States today faces an energy crisis. Demands for energy are spiralling at a rate that requires doubling of our power output every decade.

The United States today faces a pollution crisis. That crisis is the direct result of production and utilization of ever greater amounts of energy.

Unless ways are found to produce and use energy while limiting pollution, we will face a grim dilemma. We will either have to stop the energy growth which underpins our economy, or we will have to stop breathing.

The purpose of the National Power Grid Act which Senator Metcalf, Congressman Tiernan, Congressman Badillo, and I are introducing today is to help side step that dilemma as far as electrical energy is concerned.

As degradation of our environment increases so do the ranks of those who argue that we must call a halt to our economic growth. They contend that a nation which has 6% of the people of the world, but consumes 35% of total world energy output, is a nation that is going to choke on the poisonous residue of the energy it consumes. If population and energy consumption continue to spiral upward forever, they may be right.

But, whatever the merits of this long run doomsday argument, we must not forget what slowing or stopping our energy growth will mean. It will halt the dynamism of our economy. It will bring an end to an historical trend of tremendous value—a trend toward freeing the human mind by releasing our hands from the time consuming drudgery of physical production. And in a nation where growth remains a powerful individual motivation, a policy of non-growth will require governmental controls on a scale which I believe would fundamentally alter our democratic system.

A no-growth policy is neither attainable nor desirable in the immediate future. Our demands for energy, particularly electrical energy, are going to increase for some time. Given this fact, it is vitally important that we take steps to insure that the energy we need is available, and available at an acceptable environmental price.

In the field of electrical energy those steps have not been taken. During the past 3 years we have experienced 400 serious power failures affecting 25 million people. Despite the massive Northeast power blackout of 1965, we continue to stumble along with a fragmented transmission system, inadequate generation facilities, and primitive pollution control techniques which guarantee that we will get the least possible power, delivered in the least reliable way at an unacceptably high monetary and environmental price.

The situation is absurd, but we are asked to accept it for the sake of free enterprise. We are asked to make this acceptance even though each of us knows that when his electric bill reaches ridiculous new heights, and his service hits new lows, he can only grin and bear it. The truth is that free enterprise electrical style means freedom for fragmented power companies to seek profits, but does not include freedom for the consumer. If you don't believe it try telling your power company that you don't like their prices or their service and are going to take your business elsewhere.

The fact is that pluralism in the power field means small, expensive, dirty power plants—a crazy quilt of unreliable transmission systems cutting across the countryside—and high prices to the consumer.

The purpose of the National Power Grid Act which I join in introducing today is to call a halt to this costly foolishness.

The basic thrust of this bill is not new. Years ago a distinguished former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Leland Olds, advanced what he called the "giant power concept". His plan anticipated our bill by proposing to develop economics of scale—while at the same time maintaining a pluralistic, electrical distribution and marketing system. In order to meet these twin objectives, Olds suggested that generation and transmission should be separated from distribution. He foresaw separate generation and transmission organizations providing cheap, clean, bulk electric power to local utilities which would then distribute and market that power as they do today. Essentially, that is what we are proposing here this morning.

Briefly, the specifics of our bill are as follows. A National Grid Corporation would be established and would control generation of all electrical power as well as having responsibility for high voltage transmission connecting separate regional transmission sys-

tems—(grids). This corporation would be directed by a 3-man board appointed by the President, confirmed by Congress, and consisting of one consumer representative, one private power man, and one public power man. Several Regional Grid Corporations would also be established to distribute power to local entities within their region. They would be governed by men appointed by the National Corporation.

There are three basic advantages to the system we propose. It would help protect the environment; it would lower prices to the consumer; and it would not alter the pluralistic local distribution and marketing system that exists in the electrical power field today.

Environmental protection would be achieved in several ways. Large new plants usually have higher levels of anti-pollution technology than do small ones, and a few large plants create less pollution than many small ones no matter what the technological level. Our system would favor large generating plants over smaller ones.

Existing small utilities spend less than 1% of sales annually on anti-pollution research, a scandalously low figure. Our Corporation would be required to spend 2% per year and would be given 250 million dollars to start the job.

The existing hodge-podge of power sources and transmission lines results in new lines springing up with little regard to the beauty of the lands they must cross. Under a national system, lines would be larger and fewer, and their route would be planned with environmental factors a primary consideration.

Finally, by placing power generation and transmission under a national system guided by a corporation which would be bound by law to pay real attention to environmental factors, our corporation would help eliminate the economic incentive to environmental degradation that is too often the rule today.

The consumers' interest in more reliable, cheaper electricity would also be served by creation of a National Grid Corporation. Major economies of scale in production, much increased reliability in transmission, and the ability to move power from power rich areas to high priced, power starved areas like New England, would all help lower the cost of electricity in the home. Since our grid system would also tend to standardize the price paid by companies for their electricity, it would greatly ease the job of utility commissions trying to determine which companies are gouging the consumer and which are not.

Finally, I believe that these benefits can be achieved without materially affecting the pluralistic electrical marketing system we have today. Private power companies would purchase their power from their regional grid and distribute it as they do today. Rural Electric Cooperatives would do the same. Thus the only competition that means anything in the electrical field would be preserved.

So long as America needs, and demands, more and more electrical energy, the logic of providing that electricity in the most coordinated, cheapest, pollution-free manner is unassailable. Only those with padded profits to protect can argue that nationwide planning of electrical generating and transmission facilities is not desperately needed. The National Power Grid Act establishes the machinery needed to do that planning.

In a recent assessment of the Nation's energy problems, Secretary of the Interior Morton said that solution of those problems, "will demand . . . above all . . . a clear, consistent, long range national energy policy of the kind we have proposed . . . and a dynamic new organization to put it into effect."

Together with Senator Metcalf, Congressman Tiernan, and Congressman Badillo, I believe that the National Power Grid Act gives Secretary Morton the dynamic new organization he seeks. I hope that he will agree.

BADILLO URGES NATIONAL POWER GRID

WASHINGTON.—New York Congressman HERMAN BADILLO called today for the establishment of a national power grid, calling it the "cornerstone of any effort to achieve electric reliability while protecting our environment."

A national power grid, Badillo said, "would take the Northeast out from under the annual threat of massive blackouts by enabling the region to tap the power surpluses of the Far West."

Badillo, who represents New York's 21st Congressional district, comprising parts of the Bronx, Manhattan and Queens (including the area containing Consolidated Edison's controversial Astoria plant) made the remarks at a 9 a.m. news conference (2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.) at which the four co-authors of a new bill establishing a national power grid unveiled the details of their proposal.

In addition to Badillo, the bill's sponsors are Rhode Island Congressman Robert Tiernan, South Dakota Congressman James Abourezk, and Montana Senator Lee Metcalf. All are Democrats.

"By interconnecting all our major power systems," Badillo said, "we will create a spinning reserve available to take care of any emergency. For example, if Con Edison's facilities should be strained on a particularly hot summer day, surplus power from the West Coast, which is three hours behind New York time and would not have reached its peak load, could be pumped in."

Another important feature of the national power grid, he asserted, is its ability to relieve air pollution caused by overuse of fossil-fuel power plants.

"Should New York or any other large city be threatened by an atmospheric inversion that traps power plant exhausts in the air, the fossil-fuel plants releasing pollutants could be closed down temporarily and power could be imported from other sections of the country," Badillo noted.

A NATIONAL POWER GRID

(Statement of Congressman HERMAN BADILLO of New York)

The chairman of the Edison Electric Institute recently told the National Press Club in Washington:

"There is no nationwide or national power crisis. Reliability is not one of our industry's major problems."

Isn't that a relief?

If we can dispose of the problem that easily, it would seem there is nothing further to do than deal with the issue with which the Edison Electric Institute is most concerned: how to increase the rate of return on private utility companies' investments.

But there is a reliability problem and the utility industry knows it.

In 1965, the great Northeast blackout dramatically revealed the dangerous weakness in our power system. The failure of a single relay sparked a massive cascading blackout that spread over 30,000 square miles paralyzing six of our most populous and industrialized states. Thirty million people were left without power—some of them in the nation's largest city for as long as 13 hours.

This same catastrophe revealed how completely our social and economic system depends on a reliable source of power. Air traffic control systems throughout the Northeast failed and a major air tragedy was averted only because the night was clear and there was a full moon.

Most hospitals were without power and some 600,000 people were stranded for as long as seven hours in the New York City subway system.

Two years later, this lesson was underscored when a minor accident involving a temporary transmission line in Pennsylvania precipitated another cascading failure which

spread throughout 15,000 square miles of the mid-Atlantic region and deprived 13 million people of power at the height of the evening rush hour.

Since 1967, there have been countless lesser failures and harrowing near misses. In each of the past three summers the Northeast again hovered on the brink of utter disaster—a disaster which was averted only through the drastic curtailment of the use of electricity. And during the winters unseasonably cold weather again jeopardized the stability of our power system.

Yet, throughout this time, the power industry repeatedly came before the Congress and the American people with boasts of the reliability of its system. Today, the industry line is something like this: "Just keep the environmentalists under control, hold government supervision of our construction programs and rate structures to a minimum, let us build the plants we want as quickly as possible and you'll have no problem."

But that's not an answer.

In a way, the Edison Electric Institute is correct. There is no national power shortage. In fact, we have a national power surplus. The chairman of the Federal Power Commission told Congress little more than a year ago that we have a national power reserve—or surplus, if you will—of 27 per cent, compared to the 15 or 20 percent generally considered to be a normal safeguard against unexpected equipment failures or higher peak loads than anticipated.

The power crisis stems from our inability to move that power around the nation to the areas where it is needed most. And that inability is the direct result of the private utility industry's intransigence and the weakness of regulation by the FPC and the state regulatory agencies.

With power transmission technology what it is today, it is senseless to talk about solving the power crisis only through construction of new plants. As William E. Warne, a water resources and energy expert recently noted: "New York City simply cannot accommodate in its environs a multiplication of generating stations."

A far better answer, in my view, lies in establishment of a national power grid, owned and operated by a National Power Grid Corporation. This concept is embodied in legislation I am introducing in the House of Representatives today with Congressman Robert Tiernan of Rhode Island and Congressman James Abourezk of South Dakota. The Senate sponsor of this bill is Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, a recognized expert in the utility field and a leading consumer advocate.

By interconnecting all our major power systems as this bill provides, we will create a spinning reserve available to take care of any emergency, regardless of where it may be. For example, if Con Edison's facilities should be strained because of an unusually hot summer day, surplus power from the West Coast, which is three hours behind New York time and would not have reached its peak load, could be pumped in.

Another important feature of a national power grid is its unique ability to relieve air pollution caused by over-use of fossil-fuel power plants. Should New York suffer an atmospheric inversion that traps power plant exhausts in the air over the city, the fossil-fuel plants could be shut down and power imported from other sections of the country.

Estimates of the time it would take to construct a national power grid range from three years to five or six years, with cost figures running well under two billion dollars. We are spending more than three billion dollars a year on the space program so it would seem that taking this step as an investment in improving the quality of life on this planet would not represent any distortion in national priorities.

Establishment of a national power grid is by no means a total answer to our power problems. But it is a necessary step, a comprehensive move toward assuring the power reliability our nation requires for its economic and social health.

H.R. 9970

A bill to establish a national power grid system, for the purpose of assuring an adequate and reliable low-cost electric power supply consistent with the enhancement of environmental values and the preservation of competition in the electric power industry

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Power Grid Act".

TITLE I—NATIONAL POWER GRID AND REGIONAL BULK POWER DISTRIBUTION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "National Grid" means the National Power Grid Corporation, established by section 102.

(2) The term "national board" means the board of directors of the National Grid.

(3) The term "regional corporation" means a regional bulk power supply corporation established by the National Grid under section 103.

(4) The term "corporation" means the National Grid or any regional corporation.

(5) The term "regional board" means the board of directors of a regional corporation.

(6) The term "region" means a bulk power supply region established under section 103(a)(1).

(7) The term "electric utility" means any person or public agency whose functions include the sale of electric power.

SEC. 102. NATIONAL POWER GRID CORPORATION.

(a) There is created a body corporate by the name of the "National Power Grid Corporation" which shall establish and operate a national power grid system. The National Grid shall have a Board of Directors, which shall consist of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with section 202, and which shall direct the exercise of all of the functions of the National Grid.

(b) The National Grid shall establish and operate a national power grid system, consisting of large electric power generating facilities, and a system of very high voltage transmission lines which, to the extent practicable shall interconnect such generating facilities and the transmission systems of each regional corporation. Such system may be established by constructing generating facilities and transmission lines, or by acquisition of existing facilities and lines under section 105, or both.

(c)(1) The National Grid shall contract to sell electric power to regional corporations at rates which shall be uniform throughout the United States and which shall be set at the lowest possible level consistent with sound business principles and the environmental protection requirements of section 201, taking into account the charges necessary to pay the operating expenses of the National Grid (including depreciation) and to amortize the indebtedness of the National Grid.

(2) The National Grid shall provide base load, peaking, or other power to regional corporations to meet requirements of which the National Grid has at least seven years notice. Any notice of requirements under this paragraph shall be accompanied by an offer to contract for the required power.

(3) The National Grid is authorized to

purchase for resale by the National Grid surplus electric power generated by any electric utility on schedules and at rates agreed upon with such electric utility.

SEC. 103. REGIONAL BULK POWER SUPPLY CORPORATIONS.

(a) Subject to section 105(a)(2), the National Grid shall establish by regulation—

(1) a number of bulk power supply regions which in the aggregation shall comprise the entire United States, and

(2) a regional bulk power supply corporation in each such region.

(b) Each regional corporation shall have a Board of Directors which shall be composed of three members appointed by the national board with the approval of the President in accordance with section 202, and which shall direct the exercise of all of the powers of such regional corporation. A member of a regional board may be removed by the national board for cause (including failure to carry out any order of the national board issued under subsection (f)).

(c)(1)(A) A regional corporation shall be the exclusive marketing agency for the National Grid within the region for which such corporation was established. Any electric utility, publicly or privately owned, may enter into a contract for services with a regional corporation. A regional corporation shall sell electric power to any electric utility the needs of which it has adequate notice except in cases of failure of such utility to meet its financial obligations, on proof of fraudulent application, or because of willful failure of such utility to comply with wheeling orders under subparagraph (B) or other requirements of such regional corporation.

(B) A regional corporation may not enter into a contract for services with any electric utility unless such utility agrees to permit (at such times and to such extent as such corporation may order) the use of its excess transmission capacity for the purpose of wheeling power from facilities of such corporation or the National Grid to load centers of other electric utilities contracting to purchase electric power from such corporation.

(2) Any transmission lines of an agency the facilities of which are transferred to the corporation under section 105(a)(1) may be transferred by the National Grid to the regional corporation for the region in which such lines are located and shall be operated by such corporation. Each regional corporation shall obtain such transmission capacity, in addition to the capacity acquired under the preceding sentence, as may be necessary to sell electric power generated by the National Grid to each electric utility in the region, and to transmit to National Grid transmission lines such electric power as the National Grid may purchase from such utilities. A regional corporation may obtain such additional capacity (A) by lease of or contract for all or part of the capacity of existing transmission lines of electric utilities, (B) by modification of existing facilities of electric utilities, or (C) by construction of new transmission lines by such regional corporation. Any excess transmission capacity of a regional corporation may be made available to electric utilities on a contract carrier basis.

(d) Electric power marketed for the National Grid by the regional corporation shall be sold at a rate equal to the uniform rate established by the National Grid under section 102(c)(1), plus a transmission rate charged by such regional corporation. Such transmission rate shall be set at the lowest possible level consistent with sound business principles and the environmental protection requirements of section 201, taking into account the charges necessary to pay the operating expenses of the regional corporation (including depreciation) and to amortize the indebtedness of the regional corporation.

(e) A regional corporation shall have the authority to issue bonds in accordance with section 206, but such bonds shall not be guaranteed by the United States unless issued with the approval of the national board.

(f) Any electric utility aggrieved or adversely affected by any action of a regional corporation may obtain administrative review of such action by the national board. The national board may, on the basis of such review, order the regional board to take appropriate remedial action.

SEC. 104. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) The National Grid shall carry out a program of research and development in the area of electric power generation and transmission. In carrying out such program, the National Grid—

(1) may conduct research and development activities directly or through contracts with any person or public agency,

(2) shall to the extent practicable coordinate its program with programs of other public agencies, and

(3) shall develop priorities for carrying out such program.

I. developing priorities under paragraph (3), the National Grid shall give preference to environmental protection and land use research including, but not limited to, underground high voltage transmission technology, sulfur oxide control and other technology to improve the performance of fossil fuel plants, development and demonstration of utility corridors, development and demonstration of improved methods for disposing of waste heat, and development of alternative methods of electric power generation (including but not limited to thermonuclear fusion, magnetohydrodynamics, and fuel cells).

(b) (1) The National Grid shall expend at least 2 percent of its revenues in each fiscal year to carry out the program under this section.

(2) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Grid for each fiscal year to carry out the program under this section an amount equal to (A) \$250,000,000 less (B) the amount the National Grid is required to expend under paragraph (1) to carry out such program.

SEC. 105. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN EXISTING FEDERAL-OWNED FACILITIES.

(a) Effective 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) There are transferred to the National Grid all electric power generating and transmission facilities of the following agencies:

- (A) Bureau of Reclamation.
- (B) Army Corps of Engineers.
- (C) Southwestern Power Administration.
- (D) Southeastern Power Administration.
- (E) Bonneville Power Administration.
- (F) Alaska Power Administration.

(2) After amortization, hydroelectric power projects, together with associated Federal transmission facilities, which are transferred to the National Grid under this subsection shall provide financial assistance to water resource development, the reclamation fund, and the basin accounts, in accordance with the laws and procedures under which they were authorized.

(3) (A) The Tennessee Valley Authority shall be designated as the regional corporation for the region consisting of the area in which it operates on the date of such designation, and for such additional areas as the National Grid may designate by regulation. Such Authority shall retain and operate all of its transmission facilities, but all of its generating facilities shall be transferred to the National Grid.

(B) Payment of principal and interest on bonds of such Authority outstanding on such one hundred and eightieth day shall be guaranteed by the United States. The National Grid shall assume all liability with respect to such portion of the outstanding bonds as the President may determine, taking into ac-

count the proportion of the Authority's power revenues attributable to the facilities transferred to the National Grid under this paragraph.

(b) Title II of this Act shall not apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority unless expressly so provided.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO NATIONAL GRID AND TO REGIONAL CORPORATIONS

SEC. 201. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

(a) Each corporation shall be subject to Federal, State, and local environmental standards. For purposes of this subsection, the term "environmental standard" means a law or regulation prescribing a standard or limitation for the purpose of control or abatement of air or water pollution or for the purpose of some other aspect of environmental protection.

(b) (1) Prior to applying to any public agency for authority to construct any proposed facility, the corporation which proposes to construct such facility shall hold a public hearing, after adequate public notice, and shall allow interested persons to submit comments on such proposal.

(2) Each corporation shall treat all decisions regarding the siting and design of facilities as a significant aspect of land use planning in which all environmental, economic and technical issues with respect to a facility should be resolved in an integrated fashion. In the resolution of these possibly competing demands such corporation shall give all possible weight to the protection of the environment.

(c) This section shall apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SEC. 202. BOARDS OF DIRECTORS.

(a) Of the members appointed to the board of directors of any corporation, one member shall be representative of the interests of privately owned electric power companies, one member shall be representative of the interests of publicly or cooperatively owned electric utilities, and one member shall be representative of the interests of consumers. Not more than two members of any board may be members of the same political party. Not more than two members of the national board may reside on the same side of the 100th meridian.

(b) (1) Members of the board of directors of each corporation shall be appointed for terms of 6 years, except that the terms of office of the members of any such board first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act, shall expire as designated by the President (or the National Grid in the case of members of a board of a regional corporation) at the time of nomination, one at the end of the second year, one at the end of the fourth year, and one at the end of the sixth year, after such date. A successor to a member of a board shall be appointed in the same manner as the original member and shall have a term of office expiring six years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. No member may be appointed for all or part of more than two terms.

(2) The members of the national board first appointed shall be deemed the incorporators of the National Grid and the incorporation shall be held to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the national board.

(c) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy in a board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Vacancies in a board, so long as there shall be two members in office, shall not impair the powers of such board to execute its functions, and two of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of such board.

(d) The Chairman of each board shall be elected by the members thereof.

(e) Each of the members of the national board shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5313), to be paid by the National Grid. Each of the members of a regional corporations board shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315), to be paid by such corporation. No member of any such board shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business.

SEC. 203. OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF CORPORATIONS.

(a) The board of directors of a corporation may without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service—

(1) appoint a manager of the corporation who shall be compensated at the provided for level II of the Executive Schedule, and

(2) appoint such other officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as are necessary for the transaction of its business, fix their compensation (without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and general schedule pay rates), define their duties, and require bonds of such of them as such board may designate.

Any appointee of a board of directors may be removed in the discretion of such board.

(b) (1) For purposes of the Act of March 3, 1931 (Davis-Bacon Act; 40 U.S.C. 276a) each contract to which the corporation is a party shall be considered a contract to which the United States is a party.

(2) If work, which if let by contract would be subject to paragraph (1), is done directly by a corporation, the prevailing rate of wages shall be paid in the same manner as though such work had been let by contract.

(c) In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees for a corporation, and in the promotion of any such employees or officials, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. Any member of a board of directors who is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this subsection shall be removed from office by the President of the United States, and any appointee of a board of directors who is found by the board to be guilty of a violation of this subsection shall be removed from office by such board.

SEC. 204. CORPORATE POWERS GENERALLY.

(a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, a corporation shall have the same powers as a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation has under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 5 of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, and in addition—

(1) May make contracts to carry out its functions under this Act.

(2) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws.

(3) Shall have power to acquire real property for the construction of generating facilities, transmission lines, and other structures and projects.

(4) Shall have power in the name of the United States of America to exercise the right of eminent domain, in accordance with section 207.

(5) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically conferred in this Act upon such corporation.

(b) In order to enable a corporation to exercise the powers and duties vested in it by this Act—

(1) The exclusive use, possession, and control of all property to be acquired by such corporation in its own name or in the name of the United States of America, are en-

trusted to such corporation for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The President of the United States is authorized to provide for the transfer to such corporation of the use, possession, and control of such other real or personal property of the United States as he may from time to time deem necessary and proper for the purposes of such corporation as stated in this Act.

(c) Each corporation shall maintain its principal office at a place determined by it.

(d) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting "any corporation established under the National Power Grid Act;" after "Tennessee Valley Authority;".

(e) A corporation may contract with any person or public agency which it deems qualified, to design, prepare specifications and bidding documents, recommend the award of contracts or supervise the construction and installation of equipment and facilities of any required type anywhere in the United States. A corporation may contract with the Federal Power Commission to participate with the staff of such corporation in system planning and load forecasting.

SEC. 205. ACCOUNTS AND CONTRACTS.

(a) A corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of accounts. Each corporation shall determine its own system of administrative accounts and the forms and contents of its contracts and other business documents except as otherwise provided by law.

(b) Subject to the other provisions of this Act, a corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against such corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the accountable officer or employee of such corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the board of directors thereof shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(c) All purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except for personal services, made by a corporation, shall be made after advertising, in such manner and at such times sufficiently in advance of opening bids, as the board of directors thereof shall determine to be adequate to insure notice and opportunity for competition; except that advertisement shall not be required when, (1) an emergency requires immediate delivery of the supplies or performance of the services; or (2) repair parts, accessories, supplemental equipment, or services are required for supplies or services previously furnished or contracted for; or (3) the aggregate amount involved in any purchase of supplies or procurement of services does not exceed \$2,500; in which cases such purchases of supplies or procurement of services may be made in the open market in the manner common among businessmen. In comparing bids and in making awards a board of directors may consider such factors as relative quality and adaptability of supplies or services, the bidder's financial responsibility, skill, experience, record of integrity in dealing, ability to furnish repairs and maintenance services, the time of delivery or performance offered, and whether the bidder has complied with the specifications.

SEC. 206. BONDS FOR FINANCING POWER PROGRAMS.

(a) (1) Each corporation is authorized to issue and sell bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness (hereinafter collectively referred to as "bonds") to assist in financing its activities and to refund such bonds.

(2) The aggregate outstanding amount of bonds issued by the National Grid and by all regional corporations shall not exceed \$15,000,000,000 at any time. This paragraph shall not apply to bonds issued by a regional corporation and not guaranteed by the United States.

(b) Subject to section 103(e), payment of principal and interest on bonds issued by a corporation under this section shall be guaranteed by the United States. Proceeds realized by a corporation from issuance of such bonds and from power operations and the expenditure of such proceeds shall not be subject to apportionment under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665).

(c) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), bonds issued by a corporation under this section shall be negotiable instruments unless otherwise specified therein, shall be in such forms and denominations, shall be sold at such times and in such amounts, shall mature at such time or times not more than fifty years from their respective dates, shall be sold at such prices, shall bear such rates of interest, may be redeemable before maturity at the option of such corporation in such manner and at such times and redemption premiums, and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as such corporation may determine.

(2) At least fifteen days before selling each issue of bonds under this section (exclusive of any commitment shorter than one year) a corporation shall advise the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount, proposed date of sale, maturities, terms and conditions, and expected rates of interest of the proposed issue in the fullest detail possible and, if the Secretary shall so request, shall consult with him or his designee thereon, but the sale and issuance of such bonds shall not be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury except as to the time of issuance and the maximum rates of interest to be borne by the bonds. If the Secretary of the Treasury does not approve a proposed issue of bonds hereunder within seven working days following the date on which he is advised of the proposed sale, such corporation may issue to the Secretary interim obligations in the amount of the proposed issue, which the Secretary is directed to purchase. In case such corporation determines that a proposed issue of bonds under this section cannot be sold on reasonable terms, it may issue to the Secretary interim obligations which the Secretary is authorized to purchase. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, obligations issued by a corporation to the Secretary shall not exceed \$750,000,000 outstanding at any one time, shall mature on or before one year from date of issue, and shall bear interest equal to the average rate (rounded to the nearest one-eighth of a percent) on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with maturities from dates of issue of one year or less as of the close of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of such corporation. If agreement is not reached within eight months concerning the issuance of any bonds which the Secretary has failed to approve, such corporation may nevertheless proceed to sell such bonds on any date thereafter without approval by the Secretary in amount sufficient to retire the interim obligations issued to the Treasury and such interim obligations shall be retired from the proceeds of such bonds. For the purpose of any purchase of a corporation's obligations the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such corporation's obligations hereunder. A cor-

poration may sell its bonds by negotiation or on the basis of competitive bids, subject to the right, if reserved, to reject all bids; may designate trustees, registrars, and paying agents in connection with such bonds and the issuance thereof; may arrange for audits of its accounts and for reports concerning its financial condition and operations by certified public accounting firms (which audits and reports shall be in addition to those required by sections 105 and 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act) may, subject to any covenant contained in any bond contract, invest the proceeds of any bonds and other funds under its control which derive from or pertain to its power program in any securities approved for investment of national bank funds and deposit said proceeds and other funds, subject to withdrawal by check or otherwise, in any Federal Reserve Bank or bank having membership in the Federal Reserve System; and may perform such other Acts not prohibited by law as it deems necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of this section. Bonds issued by a corporation under this section shall contain a recital that they are issued pursuant to this section, and such recital shall be conclusive evidence of the regularity of the issuance and sale of such bonds and of their validity.

(b) Bonds issued by a corporation under this section shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of any officer or agency of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury or any other officer or agency have authority over or control of any such fiduciary, trust, or public funds, may at any time sell any of the bonds of a corporation acquired by them under this section.

(e) Bonds issued by a corporation under this section shall be exempt both as to principal and interest from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by any State or local taxing authority except estate, inheritance and gift taxes. Interest on such bonds shall not be included in gross income for purposes of any tax imposed by subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(f) This section shall apply to bonds of the Tennessee Valley Authority, only if such bonds are guaranteed by the United States, in accordance with section 103(e).

SEC. 207. CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS.

A corporation may cause proceedings to be instituted for the acquisition by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights-of-way, or of any transmission capacity or existing facilities referred to in section 103(C)(2)(A) or (B), which, in the opinion of such corporation, are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The proceedings shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the land, easement, right-of-way, or other interest, or any part thereof, is located, and such court shall have full jurisdiction to divest the complete title to the property sought to be acquired out of all persons or claimants and vest the same in the United States in fee simple, and to enter a decree quieting the title thereto in the United States of America. In any such eminent domain proceeding (including a proceeding in the District of Columbia) a corporation may file with the complaint or at any time before judgment a declaration of taking in the manner and with the consequences provided by the first section and sections 2 and 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain", approved February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421).

SEC. 208. REPORTS.

(a) Each corporation shall report to the President annually, and the President shall transmit the report to the Congress with such comment and recommendations as he deems appropriate.

(b) Each corporation shall file with the President and with the Congress, in December of each year, a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of such corporation covering the preceding fiscal year.

MASSIVE OUTBREAK OF VENEZUELAN EQUINE ENCEPHALOMYELITIS

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

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a massive outbreak of Venezuelan Equine Encephalomyelitis—VEE—is sweeping through the horse population in southern Texas.

VEE is an insect bone virus that is transmitted by mosquitoes and other insects from animal to animal. It also is transmittable to man, and victims now lie in south Texas hospitals. In horses and other equines, VEE takes the form of fever and depression in about half the cases. The other half, however, finds the virus invading the nervous system, with a resultant fatality. Most humans infected come down with a mild form of influenza. However, in a study of 17,000 people affected by the virus in Venezuela and Colombia from 1962-64, one-half of 1 percent suffered fatally as the disease invaded the nervous system.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement because there has been widespread speculation and rumor about the effect of this disease, what it is, and what it is not. Some press reports may have distorted it for many who are otherwise unfamiliar with VEE. Many Members of this and the other Body are highly concerned about just exactly what is being done to combat it. There is room for concern, and there is even cause to worry, for it appears that we have not been adequately prepared to deal with VEE when it crossed our borders, nor are we adequately combatting it today. Moreover, there is now a new threat, African swine fever, which has come into this hemisphere, and which is equally frightening in its consequences, since there is no known vaccine against it. Thus, the VEE epidemic may only be a fire drill for dealing with these new strains of disease which we are even less prepared to combat.

Perhaps the saddest thing about the present situation in Texas, is that it might have been confined to a limited area, or possibly avoided. I realize that this statement may smack slightly of "Monday morning quarterbacking," and perhaps it is. However, we in Congress often find ourselves in the position of reacting to events outside these halls, and if one critical statement regarding the way the present epidemic has been handled will help avoid a latter day plague of new diseases to these shores, then I am willing to take a closer look at the present situation. Accordingly, I

have scheduled hearings on this epidemic to begin at 2 p.m. Wednesday, July 28, before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains which I have the honor to chair. I am doing this because VEE is not a new disease. It first appeared in the Americas in Venezuela in 1936. It was not controlled. It remained there, and in 1943 appeared in Trinidad, where Army veterinarians diagnosed it among the mule population in that area. During the forties and fifties the disease continued to spread in South America, mainly into Colombia. In 1968, a particularly virulent strain appeared in Central America, and by 1970, it had appeared in Mexico. It is this strain which has now crossed the border and found its way into the United States.

This is not the only strain of VEE found in the United States. A strain has been found in Florida, which apparently confines its mild effect only to humans, for only two or three individuals have been hospitalized with it.

The strain in Texas is presently being combated as well, I believe, as can be: There is a quarantine on all horse shipments and mandatory vaccination programs are underway in Texas and the bordering States—New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

The vaccine being used is known as TC-83, a live serum developed for human use from the VEE strain that appeared in Trinidad in 1943. Although it is an experimental drug, it appears successful in combating VEE, even though it requires 14 days after inoculation for the serum to become effective. There are still some questions about the use of the drug which I am sure the subcommittee will want to go into.

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Air Force, has also initiated a massive spraying program in south Texas and Louisiana in an attempt to destroy mosquitoes which are serving as the prime carriers of the disease. Using Malathion and Dibrom, two insecticides judged safe by the Department, thousands of acres will be sprayed by the Air Force and private companies in an attempt to halt the spread of the disease. This follows an earlier attempt to set up a barrier around the extreme southern tip of Texas, which failed before it started, because of, among other things, bureaucratic hangups in getting approval from the Public Health Service to set up the barrier. By the time it was set up, it was too late and the disease was behind the barrier.

Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to say that most experts agree that the present attempts to halt the disease, including the mandatory vaccination program of the entire million-horse herd in Texas, and the massive spraying attempts, will fail.

I say this, because everyone might as well know the truth about VEE. It is going to be with us for a long time. It now appears that the only possible halt in the spread of the disease will have to come from an effective barrier being set up elsewhere than in Texas. The present thought is that the spread of VEE will only be limited to geography and climate

considerations. If it follows the same pattern it has followed in South America, it will cycle through rodents and mosquitos from season to season and haunt us for years to come.

Earlier I mentioned the necessity of looking at the VEE situation closely because of a new animal disease threat for which there is no known vaccine. That disease is African swine fever, which has now, within the last few months, been conclusively identified in Cuba. It is felt that it probably arrived there from Spain, and Africa, as a result of the Spanish Airline flights into Cuba. There are also flights from Cuba to the Dominican Republic and to Mexico. Cuba exports some pork to Mexico, and the subcommittee will want to explore with the administration what contingency plans are presently in effect to deal with this new disease, and what cooperative agreements are being sounded with the Mexican Government to avoid a repeat of the VEE situation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time at present to go into all aspects of the VEE situation, which raises far more questions than we may ever obtain answers for. I will merely share some of the questions for which the subcommittee will want to get answers, in the hope that we can obtain adequate answers and encourage appropriate safeguards toward slowing the spread of VEE and other diseases which threaten us.

For example, one of the main questions the subcommittee will want to look at is the long delay in getting other governments to attempt to set up effective barriers to VEE, particularly when the path of the disease northward could be identified as long as 20 years ago. Additionally, why was there no contingency plan or vaccination program put into effect in the United States when the new strain reached Mexico last year?

It is generally agreed by administration officials that, despite the mandatory vaccination program, not all horses will be vaccinated. What further plans does the administration have for trying to halt the disease? Are additional Federal efforts called for in States such as Florida, where it appears VEE may be moving toward?

Why was the original barrier placed at the Texas border delayed until it was too late?

How adequate is the supply of TC-83? When can the restrictions placed by the Federal Government on its use be lifted, particularly when these same restrictions apparently resulted in a delay in vaccination of American animals while futile vaccination of Mexican animals was being aided by departmental officials?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress how serious is this present situation, and how futile have been our attempts to deal with it effectively to date. It is an open feeling among many respected authorities outside the Government that we could have done a better job. It is our job to make sure these questions and others are answered, not to satisfy an idle curiosity and place unnecessary blame,

but to insure that the efforts made from this point on will be responsible to the true needs of the present situation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

WHITE HOUSE DOES HARD SELL ON OLD SOFT SHOE ROUTINE

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it will be lucidly recalled that the President, while wooing southern delegates and votes in 1968, firmly committed himself to helping with the problem of textile imports.

However, when the matter came before the Congress after the elections, the administration slithered from one foot to another in a posture of ambiguity as to its commitment, in a rendition of the old political soft shoe routine.

When it became apparent that the administration was either unable or unwilling to come to grips with the problem through negotiations with foreign export nations or by firm support of quota legislation in the Congress, the distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), opened the door for voluntary measures which, while far from the relief some might have wished, did give us something rather than empty promises and hallow rhetoric.

The White House, of course, was quite taken by surprise that a single individual, through brilliance and personal ability, was able to open the way for an agreement which the administration's bureaucratic legions had been unable to approach. It was at this time that the administration first evidenced its underestimation of and lack of appreciation for the high ability of Chairman MILLS.

Now it appears that Chairman MILLS has once again made a significant contribution toward alleviating another pressing import problem, shoes.

However, this time rather than admit it has had its chestnuts pulled from the fire, the White House has had a second string side hold a press conference to downplay the true role which Chairman MILLS played.

This is an old and wornout political ploy whereby one tries to take credit for something someone else has done.

The administration has become rather adept at this without realizing how transparent the tactic is. Thus, they have dropped the soft shoe routine for another chorus of "Waltz Me 'Round Again, Willie."

The trouble is that we have all danced to that music once too often and much prefer to sit this one out.

Therefore, I suggest a change in tunes which would be more appropriate to the successful work Chairman MILLS has done for American labor and industry in alleviating the shoe import problem.

A more appropriate verse would be:

"I got shoes,
You got shoes.

All Mills' children got shoes.
When Mills goes to the White House,
Going to put on those shoes.
Going to dance all over that House."

AMENDMENT TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to advise our colleagues that I will offer an amendment to the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1972, H.R. 9844 as reported, tomorrow.

The amendment I intend to offer will require the Secretary of the Navy to report to Congress by January 1, 1972, on the specific action being taken to find suitable alternatives to the firing operations and training on and about the island of Culebra, to report to Congress by June 30, 1972, on the feasibility and cost of constructing an artificial island as a possible alternative and to end all firing operations on or at Culebra as soon as possible but no later than January 1, 1975.

For some 13 years the residents of Culebra sought to end the Navy training and testing on their island. In January their efforts seemed successful when an agreement was concluded among the Secretary of the Navy, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the municipality of Culebra whereby the Navy agreed to investigate "both technological and geographical alternatives to the training done around Culebra." However, in the 7 months which have passed there has been no visible movement on the part of the Navy to take meaningful initiatives to seek possible alternatives and to begin preparations to withdraw from the island. This policy of foot dragging cannot be permitted to continue and a clear congressional mandate must be given to the Navy to undertake effective action to find and report on alternatives.

I present the text of my amendment herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, in order that our colleagues may be familiar with its language. I urge that every possible consideration be given to this amendment and that our colleagues will support it when offered tomorrow.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9844, AS REPORTED— OFFERED BY MR. BADILLO

Page 17, between lines 5 and 6 insert the following:

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of the Navy (hereafter referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall immediately undertake a study to determine suitable alternatives (including the use of an artificial island) to which may be transferred all firing and other training operations currently conducted on the island of Culebra and the cays within three nautical miles of such island. The Secretary shall submit a written report on such study to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than January 1, 1972.

(b) If as a result of the study undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section the Secretary determines that the most suitable alternative would be the use of an arti-

ficial island, he shall submit a written report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than June 30, 1972, setting forth the estimated cost of such an island and the time within which the island could be constructed.

(c) The Secretary shall terminate all firing operations on or at the island of Culebra and the cays within three nautical miles thereof at the earliest practicable date but not later than January 1, 1975.

And redesignate the succeeding sections in title II accordingly.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1971

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain proclamations and statements.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks upon this same subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 1971 Captive Nations Week. July 18 to 24 is the 13th observance of this highly important week. We, in the U.S. Congress, join with millions of our fellow Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and to work in every possible manner for the achievement of their eventual liberation from the bondage of Red totalitarianism and Sino-Soviet Russian colonialism. Their fixed objective of national independence and freedom is our objective, and each Captive Nations Week observance stresses this fundamental truth.

The remarkable feature of the annual Captive Nations Week is its steady growth and expansion from year to year. As countless of our fellow citizens come to learn the long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920, the more they are impressed by the significance and importance of the week. Following the leadership of several of our Presidents, our State Governors and our mayors also proclaim the week, urging our citizens to dedicate themselves anew to the study of all the captive nations.

Under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee of Washington, D.C., State and local committees have been formed in practically all large States and major cities to observe the annual week. Moreover, the week has attracted the attention of numerous foreign countries so that in the Republic of China, South Korea, the Philippines, West Germany, Turkey and elsewhere Captive Nations Week is being appropriately observed and free Asian parliaments are being asked to pass similar Captive Nations Week resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, there are already several concrete lessons that can be drawn from

these annual observances. I summarize them in this fashion:

First. By their consistent opposition to and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow, Peking, and the lesser lights in the Red empire have shown since 1959 their fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86-90;

Second. The growth and development of Captive Nations Week in this country and abroad have demonstrated the deepened understanding on the part of our people and others of the basic and fundamental importance of all the captive nations to our national security and that of the free world.

Third. Our concentrated support of all the captive nations, including necessarily the dozen in the Soviet Union itself, is one of our most powerful nonmilitary deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime, formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world;

Fourth. A broad area of detailed work still remains to be done in exposing the complete breadth and depth of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism so that once and for all the peoples of the world will know and never forget who the real imperialists and colonialists are, so that the full impact of world opinion will fall heavily on the two last remaining imperio-colonialist centers, namely and solely Moscow and Peking, and

Fifth. To open the full vista of this area and to prepare the ground for this vital work, a Special House Captive Nations Committee becomes more urgent, more necessary, more indispensable with the passing of every day. On this commemorative occasion, I again call upon the Rules Committee to at least vote on the measures which have been submitted to create this desperately needed committee. I again ask the members of that committee to begin with my own, House Resolution 293.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following material:

Captive Nations Week proclamation by President Richard M. Nixon.

Proclamations by: Gov. John J. McKeithen, of Louisiana; Gov. Louie B. Nunn, of Kentucky; Gov. Edgar D. Whitcomb, of Indiana; Gov. Robert B. Docking, of Kansas; Gov. Patrick J. Lucey, of Wisconsin; Mayor Willis D. Gradison, Jr., of Cincinnati; Mayor Orville L. Hubbard, of Dearborn; Mayor Moon Landrieu, of New Orleans; Mayor Richard H. Marriott of Sacramento, and a column entitled, "Captive Nations Give Lie to Detente," by Thomas A. Lane, major general, U.S. Army, retired.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1971

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

From its beginnings as a nation, the United States has maintained a commitment to the principles of national independence and human liberty. In keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose of our people to encourage the constructive changes which lead to the growth of human freedom. We understand and sympathize with the efforts of oppressed peoples everywhere to realize this inalienable right.

By a joint resolution approved on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1971 as Captive Nations Week. I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-sixth.

RICHARD NIXON.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, John J. McKeithen, Governor of the State of Louisiana, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18-24, 1971 as Captive Nations Week in Louisiana, and call upon the citizens of Louisiana to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come:

Whereas, in accordance with Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted by the 86th Congress, the President of the United States will proclaim the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, following the tradition established by all his predecessors over the last twelve years; and

Whereas, The observance of Captive Nations Week provides another tangible demonstration of the free world's support of the aspirations of the people of East-Central Europe to freedom; and

Whereas, Public observances of Captive Nations Week 1971 in the United States would encourage these people in continuing to persevere in their quest for greater freedom; and

Whereas, This observance will dramatize the quest for universal peace through freedom and will help promote the spiritual

unification of Europe and its eventual political reunification;

Now, Therefore, I, Louis B. Nunn, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby proclaim the period of July 18-24, 1971, as Captive Nations Week in Kentucky, and urge the citizens of this Commonwealth to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF INDIANA

To All To Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, White Ruthenia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim that the week of July 12-18, 1971, be designated Captive Nations Week in Indiana.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

To the people of Kansas, greetings:

Whereas, Captive Nations Week was inaugurated in 1959 by a Joint Resolution of the United States Congress; and

Whereas, each year, Captive Nations Week has provided a fitting opportunity for the American people to show their solidarity with their captive brethren in East and Central Europe; and

Whereas, twenty-six years ago, the war in Europe came to an end, but the hopes and expectations that came in the wake of the hard-won victory over the Nazi military machine have yet to be realized, and for the millions of people in Eastern Europe Nazi domination, as well as the USSR, Asia and Cuba have been replaced by Communist rule;

Now, therefore, I, Robert B. Docking, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18 through July 24, 1971, as Captive Nations Week in Kansas and urge all people of the free world to support the aspirations of the people of East-Central Europe, USSR, Asia and Cuba to freedom.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communism have led to the subjugation of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the enslavement of one billion people by the tyrannous forces of Commu-

nism is a cause of deep concern for the people of the United States of America and the free world; and

Whereas, the national security and well-being of the citizens of the United States is dependent on the continued desire for liberty and justice on the part of the peoples of these captive nations; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the people of the captive nations the support of the people of the State of Wisconsin for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Wisconsin, as do all the people of the United States, want for the people of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs;

Now, therefore, I, Patrick J. Lucey, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby designate the week of July 18-24, 1971, as Captive Nations Week in Wisconsin and call upon the people of this state to join with others in observing this week which has been set aside as a tribute to those enslaved nations and people around the world deprived of elementary freedoms and liberties.

I further encourage all citizens to demonstrate their interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by attending or participating in commemoration ceremonies at St. Therese's Parish Park on Sunday, July 18, 1971, at 4:00 p.m., in Kenosha, Wisconsin.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF CINCINNATI

Be it proclaimed:

Whereas, the imposing reality of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, in the U.S.S.R., in Asia and Cuba cannot be ignored if we value our own freedom; and

Whereas, the cardinal Soviet Russian objective has been to obtain Western acquiescence to the permanent captivity of twenty-seven nations; and

Whereas, it is of crucial importance for us to morally sustain the hope and faith of the captive peoples in their eventual freedom;

Now, therefore, I, Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Mayor of the City of Cincinnati, do hereby proclaim the period from July 18, 1971, to Thursday, July 24, 1971, as Captive Nations Week in Cincinnati.

PROCLAMATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 18-24, 1971

Whereas, the significance and heritage of the United States of America stems from its belief in the ideals of peace, freedom and self-determination; and

Whereas, the oppression of peoples in Eastern and Central Europe as epitomized in the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, hinders the growth of understanding between Communist and free nations; and

Whereas, many of the people of these captive nations look to the United States as the champion of freedom and for leadership in the struggle for their religious freedoms and individual liberties; now,

Therefore, as Mayor of Dearborn, I proclaim July 18-24, 1971, Captive Nations Week in Dearborn, and urge all citizens to observe this period by showing friendship and good will to people of all ethnic backgrounds, and remembering in prayer the citizens of the world who are denied freedom and the right of political self-determination.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Whereas, the subversive tactics of Totalitarian Imperialism has led to the direct and indirect subjugation of the national independence of Democratic nations after reaching across international frontiers to the very shores of America; and

Whereas, the United States possesses warm understanding and sympathy for the cause

of human rights recognizing personal dignity as a universal aspiration; and

Whereas, this city has been host for those who flee tyranny and still shelter thousands of exiles from many nations who hope to one day restore to their homeland that quality of human dignity granted by God that gives free men the right to pursue happiness, cultural, religious and economic independence according to their individual heritage; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support of just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Moon Landrieu, Mayor of the City of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the period of July 18-24, 1971, to be Captive Nations Week in New Orleans

CITY OF SACRAMENTO PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE MAYOR

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, there exists today more than a dozen nations whose people have seen their national and cultural integrity dissolved by oppressive rulers selected for them, not by them, but by the masters of the Kremlin, and

Whereas, it is vital to the security of free men everywhere that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the people of these Captive Nations be nurtured and strengthened by all honorable means, and

Whereas, there are in Sacramento many residents with close personal and family ties with the peoples of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Cossackia, Croatia, Czechia, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slobakia, and the Ukraine, who feel the heavy hand of Communist Dictatorships, hands of social justice and equality, but delivers the chains of bondage, and

Now, therefore, I, Richard H. Marriott, Mayor of the City of Sacramento, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18 through July 24, 1971, as CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK in Sacramento and urge all residents to observe the occasion by strengthening their understanding of the basic rights which make all men free.

Issued: This 1st day of July, 1971.

RICHARD H. MARRIOTT, Mayor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS GIVE LIE TO DETENTE

WASHINGTON.—This third week of July has been designated by Congress as "Captive Nations Week" to remind us of the nations still held in the bondage of communist imperialism. Because so many Americans hold a heritage from these Captive Nations, we as a nation should have a pressing interest in restoring their freedom.

When Congress first passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959 and President Eisenhower signed it into law, Premier Khrushchev was greatly disturbed. He knew that the subjugated peoples were the Achilles heel of Soviet power and he feared an American policy toward their liberation. As nothing was done to align U.S. policy with the congressional resolution, Soviet fears subsided. The American government would do nothing to support its brave talk.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University has been a leader of Captive Nations Week activities for twelve years. He has written extensively about the nature of Soviet power and about conditions in eastern Europe. In a new book entitled, "U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth", (Devin-Adair, \$6.50) Dr. Dobriansky reviews Captive Nations Week history and shows how American misconceptions

about the nature of Soviet power have served the interests of Russian imperialism.

Perhaps the first misconception is that there are 200 million Russians in the Soviet Union. Dr. Dobriansky points out that 125 million of the Soviet population are non-Russians, captives of Russian imperialism just as the Soviet peoples are captives of the communist party. Minority rule is the rule in the Russian imperium.

Then too, the name "Soviet Union" has to Americans connotations of voluntary union, as the American colonies united to form a more perfect union. As Dr. Dobriansky reminds us, the Soviet Union is a creation of Russian imperialism, using communist internationalism to aid its conquests. The other communist states are not equals in an international communist society; they are the wards of Moscow.

The Soviet Union is the world's greatest imperialism. In the free world, small nations have won their freedom and independence; but no such freedom can exist in the communist world. The Soviet Union and Red China lay heavy hands upon their vassal states, controlling their economic growth and political development to assure full subordination to the twin imperialisms. Dr. Dobriansky lists 24 nations from Armenia to Cuba which have been conquered by the Russian imperialism.

Instead of recognizing the weakness of these imperialisms, the yearning of the oppressed peoples for freedom and the great boon to world peace which their liberation would bring, the United States has sought peace by courting the imperialists and forsaking the Captive Nations. It has strengthened the dictators with trade and recognition even as it turned its back on the aspirations of the oppressed peoples. For 33 years, it has sought detente with the Soviet Union, always falling but always coming back to try again, incapable of facing the reality that the imperial appetite is not satisfied by throwing the children to the wolves.

The United States, as leader of the free world, has an obligation to focus international attention on the Russian and Red Chinese imperialisms, to condemn the medieval cruelty which is so offensive to modern ideas of human liberty and to assist the subject peoples to regain their freedom. It should use the United Nations as a forum for the peaceful dismantling of the Soviet imperialism.

It is a strange paralysis of reason and will which keeps the United States in a zombie-like stupor of seeking the goodwill of tyrants. Congressman Wm. G. Bray of Illinois, in the introduction to the Dobriansky book, likens the U.S. to Sweet Alice of ancient fame:

"Oh, don't you remember Sweet Alice, Ben Bolt,
Sweet Alice whose hair was so brown?
Who wept with delight when you gave her a smile,
And who trembled with fear at your frown?"

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), for taking this time today to call attention to his resolution for the creation of a special Select Committee on the Captive Nations. There are few Members of this House who have championed the cause of freedom for the 180 million people behind the Iron Curtain with such vigor and determination as our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. I know of his deep concern, his deep dedication and his sincere yearning for the

day when the captive nations can rejoin the family of free nations as free people.

I must say that the appeal which the gentleman has made today will fall on deaf ears in the State Department and the executive branch of Government.

We were all very pleased and thrilled when President Eisenhower signed the proclamation setting up the third week of July to be set aside as a week of fervent prayer and hope that the people of the captive nations would be able to regain their freedom, and that this proclamation shall remain in force until such time as, indeed, the captive nations have regained their freedom. It was a day of great pride in this Chamber. My colleague in the well was one of the prime movers in engineering that resolution through the Congress and making it possible for the President to sign it.

But we have watched, since the enactment of this resolution, a constant effort by the State Department to minimize its importance, to hold up the issuance of proclamations as long as possible and to make the proclamation as meaningless as possible, right on through to this year's captive nations proclamation. It is a pro forma proclamation and one that does not reflect the great hope and the great yearning and the great desire of the Congress of the United States when we passed the resolution in its original form.

Mr. Speaker, we see subtle discouragement all over the country of those who try to organize manifestations calling attention to that resolution. There is an effort by the State Department to minimize its meaning.

But in Chicago we have a mayor who believes in the captive nations resolution and who believes we ought to keep reminding the Soviets and the Peking imperialists that the conscience of the free world cannot rest until those people are free. We have Mayor Daley who personally cooperates every year in the Captive Nation's Week program. We had a parade, probably the largest parade in the country, last Saturday, an hour and a half long on State Street, with all of the ethnic groups participating. When these people passed the reviewing stand one could see the yearning for their brothers and sisters in the captive nations to be free.

Mr. Speaker, unless Congress asserts its own sense of responsibility and refuses to accept a negative recommendation by the State Department and takes the bull by the horns and passes this resolution of the House to establish a captive nations select committee, it will not be done.

If we are to wait for the people in the State Department to make that decision, that committee will never come to light.

These are the same people who urge President Nixon to make his mission to China in search of peace. I was very sorry to see the other day a statement made by the President, well-meaning as it was, and I do not question the honesty, the integrity and the sincerity of the President, well-meaning as his statement was, that we refrain from any speculation on his planned trip to China.

I must respectfully reject that suggestion. If Members of Congress had asked questions before President Roosevelt went to Yalta, there would not be a Captive Nations Week today. No one asked any questions because we were at war and we were told of the delicate negotiations. The result was that 180 million people were thrown into Communist bondage against their will.

We in the legislative branch of the Government have the right and responsibility as a coequal branch of government, to ask the executive branch and the Commander in Chief and the President: What promises did Mr. Kissinger make in Peking? What concessions have been made? What does all this mean? And where does Nationalist China fit into all of this? Where does the rest of our allies fit into this secret plan?

I am not at all persuaded by those who say that these are very delicate negotiations, and you should not make any waves you should not ask any questions. I believe it is the responsibility of the Committees of this House and the other body on Foreign Affairs to have complete hearings as to what this trip does mean. And I believe Dr. Kissinger should spell out what agreements were reached during his visit to China. Surely we do not want another Yalta in 1971 or 1972.

I applaud the President for his boldness and his initiative. I am pleased to see that an effort is being made to recapture for the United States its leadership in foreign affairs, but I believe that we have a responsibility, for if people had asked questions at the time that 180 million people were being thrown into Communist bondage, then my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) would not be in the well of the House today pleading for a Select Committee on the Captive Nations. We would not have to have a Captive Nations Week, and at least 180 million people who fought as gallantly in World War II on the altar of freedom would be enjoying the same degree of freedom we enjoy today.

So I congratulate the gentleman in the well. I think that, small group that we are, thank God there are Members in this Congress who refuse to be beguiled by an aura of coexistence with the Communist world.

There are those who are so beguiled by this prospect that today they are willing to sweep everything aside.

The gentleman quite properly stated the case: There are two imperial powers left in this world, the Soviet Union and Red China. It is ironic that this Nation is being beguiled to a point where even when our most vital national interests is at stake, we cannot get the American people to react and respond.

So I say that the gentleman is correct. This Captive Nations Committee ought to be formed. This Captive Nations Committee ought to start asking some questions: What does Mr. Brezhnev mean by the "Brezhnev Doctrine?" What does he mean by keeping these 180 million people in captivity? And what are the plans of the Soviet Union and, indeed, Red China, to bring about some sort of liberation for these people?

I cannot think of anything more important.

Yesterday we passed a resolution establishing a Select Committee on the Environment. It is a good committee, but I cannot understand why, with the prestige of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida who is one of the most beloved Members of this Congress and whose record in defense of human dignity is without blemish, why his clearly pointed admonitions cannot be heard by this Congress, and have it pass this resolution. I am beginning to think that maybe the time has come for my colleague to file a discharge petition for creation of his select committee.

I think we ought to lay it on the line—where do we stand on this? Which of the Members are going to stand up for what is right and what is good and raise their voices in defense of these helpless people behind the Iron Curtain? Which of our Members are going to be beguiled by the smokescreen of the State Department?

I think the time has come when Congress ought to assert its own responsibility and for that reason I join my colleague in his plea. The conscience of the free world cannot rest until these 180 million people behind the Iron Curtain rejoin the family of free nations.

I am so proud there are men like the gentleman in the well (Mr. FLOOD) who over all these years has refused to compromise his principles and his great belief and who has continued his great struggle. These poor people behind the Iron Curtain cannot struggle for their liberty. Thank God that there are men like FLOOD around who has the courage and the stamina and the dedication and determination to continue fighting until that great day comes when we can undo the wrong that was done to these people, and when we can look upon them as our free brothers. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) as always is very kind and very gracious. He has been my strong right arm in this project since its inception, since he has been here. He understands the problem because in his veins flows the proud blood of Polish ancestry. Who would know better—who would know better? He has been eloquent before—and the highest compliment I can pay to him today is—I could not have said that better myself—and that is praise from Caesar.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) for yielding. I am indeed pleased to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), in his effort today to once again call to the attention of the Congress of the United States, and all the people of this country, the fact that there are millions of people living in slavery under the tyranny and the guns of ruthless Communist imperialists and aggressive colonialists. It is important that this Nation which believes so intensely in

freedom, not forget for one moment—as, unfortunately, we are sometimes prone to do—those people in the Captive Nations who are denied these freedoms we so enjoy.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is to be highly complimented for his forthright and continuing efforts to keep this issue squarely before the Congress of the United States. The Rules Committee should be prevailed upon to bring the gentleman's resolution (House Resolution 293) to the Floor of the House so that the full body of this Congress can have the opportunity to either vote up or down on this vital legislation. The compelling reasons why the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives should act immediately on this resolution by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are as follows:

First, America has been the leader of the free world in demanding that the flame of freedom be kept alive. The responsibility for keeping that flame of freedom burning lies right here in the halls of the House of Representatives. This body has the authority to demand on a regular and continuing basis that these captive nations be set free now. "Freedom now" has been a popular slogan in many causes. Through establishing this Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the Congress would be announcing worldwide that we will not rest until freedom once again is available to all nations and people held in slavery under Communist tyranny and dictatorship. In addition to those American men known to be prisoners of war, and those who are reported missing in action, there are other American citizens who are held in captivity in these Communist slave states. On this basis alone, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is correct in insisting that the Congress face up to the immediate need for a special committee in this House which will work relentlessly until every single American citizen is freed from captivity, whether it be in the Red Empire of China, North Korea, North Vietnam, or the Soviet-dominated nations of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Cuba, and so many more.

Second, the U.S. Congress, after spending billions of dollars overseas to try to prevent Communist aggression, has a responsibility to those now living in slavery in captive nations to join in every way possible their efforts to be free. Thousands of these captives struggle every year to cross the borders into free nations and many die in the attempt. We cannot abandon these people in their heroic effort to gain freedom nor can we forget those whom they have left behind. We must give them hope.

Third, Congress can no longer afford the luxury of just talking about this problem without setting up the appropriate machinery to do something constructive. My fellow colleagues, let us stop talking and proceed to the action stage. The Special Committee on Captive Nations will have the ability to study the plight of these people and nations and recommend ways in which Congress, the executive branch, and the Nation can work to get something done to free them.

Again, I wish to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania for his dedication and steadfast persistence. We have put the Rules Committee on notice that we intend to keep going in this effort to establish a proper committee to probe and find ways that the United States can help captive nations and captive people regain their freedom.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is very kind and it is that kind of feeling and that kind of speaking that brings the creation of this committee for which we have worked for so many years very, very close.

I have been given reason to believe that perhaps we need only one more vote in the Committee on Rules. If there ever was a year—if there ever was an hour for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee in this Congress—this is the year and this is the hour. You can smell it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, July 18-24 has been designated Captive Nations Week—a time when we turn our attention to the plight of enslaved peoples throughout the world. Yet a sometimes-unfortunate drawback of such observances is that some people limit their concern within the few specified days, all too quickly forgetting that millions of people live in slavery 365 days a year.

Because our Nation has been free from devastating invasions, American life and culture has generally flourished during our nearly two centuries of existence. We have rarely had to rebuild our country; rather, we have had only to continue building. It is, therefore, easy to continually take for granted the freedoms and privileges we enjoy as Americans and lose sight of the cultural and political enslavement of people held captive by Communist and other forms of despotic rule.

We were reminded of this fact just 7 months ago when Polish workers took to the streets in Polish cities last December. They openly protested a government edict that had heaped an intolerable burden on their already low standard of living. These demonstrations ultimately led to First Secretary Gomulka's downfall and to the rescinding of the December price increase directive by the new regime of First Secretary Edward Gierk. This shakeup in Poland's Communist Party indicates that the voice and will of the people can prevail. Further, what is particularly encouraging, Mr. Speaker, is that these enslaved peoples were given renewed hope in these gains.

Communist domination of the East and Central European countries has been a reality for over two decades. Throughout this time in many of these countries human rights have been trampled upon and political repression has become a fact of life.

Developments such as those in Poland are another of the many examples of popular discontent with Communist-imposed rule. Their message is clear—the peoples of the captive nations vigorously opposes Communist tyranny.

Peace in the world can only be achieved when people everywhere are free from domination because a world half free and half slave remains a breeding ground for endless conflict. As long as natural

rights are denied or limited and justice is disregarded anywhere in the world, our own independence is in jeopardy.

Our concern, therefore, Mr. Speaker, must be for the future. It is in this vein of rededication to a just cause that we will give meaning to the observance of Captive Nations Week—not only this week but throughout the year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this year we mark the 12th anniversary of a testament to freedom first proclaimed by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This is the 12th annual observance of Captive Nations Week authorized by congressional resolution in 1959. That resolution empowered American Presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all Captive Nations of the world."

Observance of Captive Nations Week points up the dedication of Americans to the nurturing of freedom throughout the world.

There is a truth that no arms and no occupation can kill. The truth is that within the hearts of the enslaved peoples there burns a love of liberty which is a constant threat to their rulers—a yearning for freedom which will ultimately prevail. And this truth gives meaning to our Captive Nations Week observance.

I believe the United States should seek enforceable agreements with the Soviet Union aimed at avoiding a third world war.

But it would be the greatest hypocrisy to close our eyes to the wrongs that the Soviet Union has done to millions of human beings deprived of individual freedoms and national independence.

Americans must continue to make known their deep concern about the people of the Captive Nations and convey this message to the captive world.

Americans should continue to make known their refusal to accept the regimes imposed upon these unfortunate victims of tyranny.

Americans should continue to promote the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms which are the God-given rights of all people.

Americans must never accept the view that freedom is foreclosed for the now-enslaved peoples of the world. Consistent with our own national interests, America should constantly explore all avenues that might lead to a lessening of their plight.

Let us continue to inform the captive peoples of our full and uncompromising support for their unquenchable goal of national and individual freedom. Let them ever know that Americans are dedicated to the furtherance of freedom throughout the world.

Let us keep faith with the people of the captive nations.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this week in America we express again our concerns for the liberation of the Baltic Republics of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

The exploitation and subjugation of these countries by Communist tyranny is a denial of fundamental human rights.

The captive peoples deserve all the support and encouragement we can give to the restoration of their independence.

Hopefully, the recent overtures on the part of our President in his "Journey for Peace" may mark the beginning of a momentous time in history when men everywhere may enjoy their freedom—and when all the world may have peace.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, every year since 1959 we here in the Congress have expressed our indignation over the continued enslavement of millions of human beings under totalitarian regimes around the world. Again this year we speak out on behalf of these subjugated peoples during this, the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week. Of course, it is only fitting that the Congress of the leader of the free world, duly elected by the people, do so. It is a fulfillment of our moral obligation to humanity. And since we are living up to our responsibility, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to direct my remarks to some of the opinionmolders in our society—the news media and the intellectual community—who also have a responsibility to search for the truth and to enlighten the American people as to what is going on in the world around them.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted that certain of the opinionmakers in this country have been quick to point out what they term "oppression" and denial of freedoms here in the United States. They have been quick to label our Government racist and fascist. I have also noticed, as I am sure most of us here have, that there has been a concerted moral condemnation of the United States by some of our opinionmakers because of our military involvement in Southeast Asia, inasmuch as it has been a denial of self-determination of those people living in that part of the world, and inasmuch as we have been inhumane in our conduct of the war. These are, indeed, debatable points. What is not debatable, however, is the fact that millions of individuals are daily being deprived of those basic freedoms we enjoy and take for granted in this country. Yet I do not find editorial after editorial denouncing the Communist governments as being racist or fascist or abhorring their crimes against humanity. Where is the concerted moral condemnation of Soviet Russia, or of Red China for their blatant human rights violations and for their denials of self-determination for those peoples under their domination?

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk these last few days over the things to come as a result of President Nixon's attempts to normalize relations with Red China—talk of world peace, of the possibility of more internal liberalization policies on the part of the Red Chinese leaders. But, Mr. Speaker, our responsibility to the American people is to view the world as it is, not as we would like it to be. Was the cause of peace further advanced when the United States recognized the Soviet Union in 1933 and began trading with it? Has there been over the years any restoration of those freedoms taken by the Bolshevik leaders

from the Russian people, and from the Ukrainians, and the Estonians, and the Latvians, and the Lithuanians, and the Byelorussians, and the Czechoslovakians? No, Mr. Speaker, the cause of peace was not further advanced. The freedoms of these people have not been restored. What did happen was that the United States sold into bondage millions of human beings by bailing out economically and giving prestige to their tyrannical leaders.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we here in the Congress are fulfilling our moral obligation to humanity when we plead the cause of those oppressed people throughout the world. I would only hope that certain others in positions of responsibility in our society, similarly live up to their responsibilities, to utilize their freedoms of speech and of the press, and condemn those government, violating these same freedoms elsewhere and expose the Communist leaders for what they really are.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join those of my colleagues who are pausing to recognize the plight of persons behind the iron and bamboo curtains. Twelve years have passed since the designation of the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. While there have been many changes in international affairs since that time, the overwhelming desire of hundreds of millions of people for freedom and true national independence remains undaunted.

For some countries, such as Armenia, the record of Communist domination goes back over half a century, while in other nations the onset of a Communist dictatorship is fairly recent. But regardless of the length of the servitude, we should not assume that it need be a permanent condition. Nationalism is a very enduring quality as so many examples of history—including that of our own—clearly points out. The observance of Captive Nations Week is an excellent way for all Americans to show their understanding of this simple fact and to demonstrate that they have not forgotten the tragic situation of their brothers in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. It is particularly fitting that we hold this observance so soon after the anniversary of our own country's Declaration of Independence. It makes the Fourth of July doubly meaningful for all Americans.

We must dedicate ourselves to the task of fostering freedom for all peoples of all nations until the day comes when the need for the observance of Captive Nations Week has passed.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 Congress passed Public Law 86-90, establishing the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. I wish to join once again with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

The purpose of the observance is to remind those of us who enjoy freedom and national independence that many millions of people in the world are deprived of these blessings. The observance of Captive Nations Week is a public testimony to the fact that we in the United States have not forgotten these people and that we have not abandoned our traditional role as the champion of free-

dom and independence for all nations of the world.

My friends in the State of Arizona share our desire to see liberty restored to the gallant and long-suffering citizens of the captive nations. On Friday, July 23, many of them will join with the Honorable Jack Williams, Governor of Arizona, in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of the Captive Nations Week Manifesto of 1971:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1971

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year is designated as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of this year's Captive Nations Week comes just seven months after the start of a chain of momentous events in Poland. In December, 1970, Polish workers took to the streets of many of Poland's cities—in open protest against the Gomulka regime's edict that had placed an intolerable burden on their already low standard of living. The toll of these food riots, according to the regime's figures, was, 45 dead and 1,165 wounded.

The upheavals led to Gomulka's downfall, and, when fresh work stoppages broke out in January and February of this year, the new regime of Edward Gierek rescinded the December price-increase directive. A shakeup in Poland's Communist Party, which had come in the wake of the December developments, indicates that the last word on the changes in Poland has yet to come.

The Polish events have again brought into sharp focus the inability of communism to satisfy the spiritual and material needs and demands of the people.

Communists regimes, backed by Soviet military power, have ruled over the countries of East and Central Europe for over two decades. The balance sheet of their tenure in power offers undeniable grounds for an indictment for tyranny, insensitivity and incompetence. In East and Central Europe, the Communists have systematically trampled upon human rights, have brooked no opposition and have established themselves as the sole font of wisdom and power.

Yet, political repression notwithstanding, the Communist regimes have been unable to "compensate" for their use of harsh tactics and methods by providing the people a decent standard of living. In divided Europe, the gap in the quality of life between its western and eastern parts has been widening with each passing year. The Communists have thus given the people of East and Central Europe the short end of the stick in both key sectors: in politics and personal life, the watchword is oppression and denial of inalienable rights; in the standard of living, the increase has been negligible—especially compared to the gains registered by other nations over the corresponding period.

The developments in Poland are but the latest in a series of dramatic proofs of popular discontent against Communist rule. Over the past 15 years, we have witnessed the Poznan riots and Polish October in 1956, the tragic but heroic Hungarian Revolution, also in 1956, and the "Czechoslovak Spring" in 1968. There have been other less publicized demonstrations of true popular sentiment in all the captive countries.

The message is clear. The people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania oppose Communist tyranny. Their aspirations and objectives are the same as those of all freedom-loving people in the world:

the right to chart their own future; national sovereignty and self-determination; respect for and observance of their fundamental human rights; and a chance to rejoin, as free and equal partners, the family of nations.

We believe that a lasting peace in Europe, and the world, can come only after the captive nations have regained their freedom and national independence. As long as there are men and nations in bondage, the quest for a genuine relaxation of tensions is bound to prove fruitless. A world half slave, half free remains a breeding ground for endless conflict. A community of free nations, on the other hand, is the best guarantee for the advent of true international comity, closer cooperation, and a just peace.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania.

We further stress that the Communist regimes in East and Central Europe continue to flaunt the will of the people by denying them the right to free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, their support of the right to self-determination for all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations.

2. To raise, at international meetings and conferences, the issue of the denial of fundamental human rights to the peoples of East and Central Europe.

3. To reject any and all attempts by the USSR and the other Communist regimes to secure even a tacit recognition of the *status quo* in East and Central Europe, since such recognition would deal a staggering blow to the hopes of the captive peoples of regaining their freedom and independence.

4. To voice their opposition, on all appropriate occasions, to the methods of force and threats and intimidation used by the Communist regimes in their effort to continue holding East and Central Europe in bondage.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 18-24, their awareness of the importance of the fate of 100 million East and Central Europeans to mankind's long quest for world peace and justice.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

VASIL GERMENJI,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in 1959, by a joint resolution of Congress, our President was authorized to proclaim this third week in July as Captive Nations Week. The American people have yearly observed this time as a period of renewed affirmation of their belief in the individual's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It must remain our constant goal that all nations will someday enjoy that peace, prosperity, and freedom which the American people treasure.

While recognizing that there have been steps toward debate between the nations of Eastern Europe and the West, it would be a mistake to assume that these countries have achieved sufficient independence to allow their citizens the rights which we in the United States assume to be inviolable. We in Congress

join with millions of fellow Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and to work in every possible manner for the achievement of their eventual liberation.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this week the United States observes Captive Nations Week to pay tribute to the billions of people who live under the yoke of oppression yet retain the desire for freedom. This is a week of national concern for our fellow human beings who are less fortunate than ourselves—less able to choose their own way of life—and less free to enjoy the world in which they live.

This is a week set aside by Congress and proclaimed by the past four Presidents as Captive Nations Week. Ceremonies throughout the Nation express the sympathy and understanding which Americans have always shown for the oppressed peoples of the world.

It is particularly important for each of us to remember the reasons for this special week at a point in history when our Nation is so frustrated and weary because of a long and tragic war in Indochina. We must try to separate the policies which led to the mistakes of Vietnam from those policies which assure our continued involvement and leadership in international affairs and on behalf of world freedom. The people of Asia, Eastern Europe, Cuba, and those threatened by outside designs in areas such as the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa must not be ignored at this most urgent time.

We need to strengthen and expand our efforts to bring the message of freedom to those in captivity through Radio Free Europe and other means of communication and to turn the United Nations into a true moral force for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity of joining my colleagues here today in the House to commemorate the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Once again we have the chance to call to the attention of the world the plight of 100 million east and central Europeans in the hopes that it will bring them closer to the freedom they seek. They will continue to urge our Government to do all in its power to loosen the unwanted bonds that now tie them to the Soviet Union.

I feel close to the people of the captive nations, because I have come to know many of their friends and relatives who were able to escape from behind the Iron Curtain. My heart breaks with the stories they tell of those who remain behind. We speak of 100 million souls from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. What they seek are only the same objectives of all free men. These objectives, as outlined in the Captive Nations Week Manifesto of 1971, include the right to chart their own future, national sovereignty, and self-determination, respect for and observance of their fundamental human rights, and a chance to rejoin as free and equal partners the family of nations.

There is much talk of a European security conference. Such a meeting can

be worth while if it secures the self-determination of the captive nations. We cannot stand by and see these nations lost forever to the side of the free nations. We must show our solidarity in working toward their independence. The uprisings in Poland last year are a sign to us that the spirit of freedom is not dead in the captive nations. While this spark remains we must not let the economic problems of the Soviet Union assume a permanence of their domination over the captive nations.

As a member of the Advisory Committee of the National Captive Nations Committee, I will continue to speak out for the personal dignity, freedom, and independence of the captive nations. I will continue to hold dear the motto of the committee which is a quote by Goethe:

Yes! To this thought I hold with firm persistence; The last result of Wisdom stamps it True; He only earns his Freedom and Existence who daily conquers them anew!

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again we are gathered together solemnly in this Chamber to commemorate and to protest the enslavement of untold millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. We observe Captive Nations Week not in celebration, but in mourning for the past and present, and to express hope for the future.

Twelve years ago the Congress passed Public Law 86-90, establishing the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week. The late President Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to issue a Presidential proclamation to that effect.

One of the principal objectives of this observance, in part, is the education of the American people regarding the captive nations, especially those under the domination of the Soviet Union. With a greater understanding of the problem, the people are in a better position to recognize and appreciate the current status of these nations and their courageous people. It is also most appropriate that we who enjoy the blessings of liberty pause for a time to reflect on the elemental human rights which are denied to those in the captive nations. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press are so elemental to our way of life that we often fail to consider that oppressed peoples living under Communist tyranny have been brutally denied these basic human and political rights. This annual observance affords us an excellent opportunity to show our support for the right of all people to pursue their political, economic, and cultural development as they deem best.

It has often been said that the right of self-determination is the foundation on which all other rights rest. If self-determination is denied, no other right is secure. I know I speak for many in my own State of Illinois whose ancestral homeland is in one of the captive nations and who continue to pray that liberty will soon be restored to these gallant and long-suffering people. I know, too, that I speak for many Americans of all nationalities who share this same dream.

I am proud to join with the voices of the free world in rededicating ourselves

in the great cause of liberty for all peoples. Our words and deeds must continue so that we can soon realize a day of true world freedom. I have faith that 1 day the people of the captive nations will once again be masters of their own destiny.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Americans celebrated Independence Day, a holiday which emphasizes the rights and privileges which are integral to the life of our Nation. On that day we publicly extol the guarantees of individual freedom that protect each citizen throughout the year and remind ourselves of the crucial importance of the liberties which accompany our citizenship. Since 1959, another July observance, Captive Nations Week, has forcefully proclaimed that the rights to which Americans are accustomed are equally as meaningful to other peoples of the world. Captive Nations Week publicizes the plight of the subjugated peoples of eastern and central Europe who cannot dissent from their government, speak freely through their press or exercise their personal religious convictions. Yet these people are as fervently desirous of these freedoms as were the Americans who won them years ago.

The courageous people in Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the Ukraine, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia have long sought the inalienable human privileges that Americans cherish. Government oppression and tyranny have not weakened this resolve, shown most recently by the 1968 Czechoslovakian uprising and the Polish upheavals of last December. The relevance of Captive Nations Week lies in its dramatization of the continual rededication of the captive peoples who strive in the cause of independence and self-determination.

As we recall our own political and personal freedoms, we should also remember Captive Nations Week as a particularly appropriate time to make known again our compassion for the people of east and central Europe. We who live in a nation preserving individual rights can best identify with the motivations of the captive peoples struggling to provide a similar environment in their own countries. The aspiration for government of the people's choice remains unabated in those European nations and the American expression of sympathy and support for this goal should be restated with equal firmness.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill popularized the saying that—

Democracy is the worst system of government, except for all the others.

During this week, Captive Nations Week, all Americans—particularly those that condemn "the system"—should reflect upon the unfortunate status of those Eastern Europeans who do not enjoy the liberties that we in this democracy take for granted.

The peoples of Albania and Poland cannot march in the streets to protest government policy, for they do not enjoy freedom of assembly.

The citizens of Czechoslovakia and Lithuania cannot stand at a podium and denounce their Government and its

leaders, for they do not enjoy freedom of speech.

The newspapers in Hungary and Estonia cannot publish articles and write editorials that cast their leaders in a poor light, for they do not enjoy freedom of the press.

The Jews in the Ukraine cannot go to synagogue, for they do not enjoy freedom of religion.

Those who live in East Germany cannot travel and visit friends and relatives, for they do not enjoy the freedoms of unrestricted travel.

And when the United States celebrates her 200th year of these freedoms in 1976, the citizens of Bulgaria, Latvia, and Rumania will be unable to make a similar celebration, for they will not be enjoying any freedoms at all.

Mr. Speaker, when a people have been free for centuries, they begin to forget what it was like not to be free, and they grow careless with their liberties. As long as there are peoples who are not free, we must continuously fight for their freedom from oppression.

"No man is an island, entire unto himself," wrote John Donne centuries ago. The same can be said for countries. No country is alone. The lack of liberty in another country diminishes the liberty in our country. If we grow lax in our defense of justice and liberty for others, we will grow lax in defense of our own freedom. As Doremus Jessup discovered, it can happen here.

But it will not happen here, if during this week and all the other weeks of the year, we remember those who are under the vile yoke of communism, and renew our pledge to procure liberty and justice for all peoples in all lands.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the legacy of Montesquieu and Locke and Jefferson—the foundations of sovereignty and democracy are unknown or unavailable to much of the world's population—in Eastern Europe and Asia in particular.

While these great men articulated theories to which free men and to which we as a Nation are deeply indebted, the theory of independence is as old as man himself. Thomas Jefferson one said:

The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time.

If there is a single issue that today both divides the world and on which the peoples of the world have a unanimity of thought, it is the longing for independence.

The essence of our own Declaration of Independence was eloquently expressed a century ago by President Abraham Lincoln. It is the promise not only of liberty, "to the people of this country, but hope to the world—that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance."

This Nation is committed to a world of law and free choice. The peoples of the captive nations are exemplars of man's basic quest for freedom. And, on this 13th anniversary of the official observance of Captive Nations Week, I wish to salute the people of these nations who though repressed retain their dauntless spirit and devotion to liberty.

In my own State, the Captive Nations

Committee of New Jersey will mark the culmination of this anniversary with a motorcade through Newark on July 24. I join with the committee in reaffirming a commitment to human dignity and liberty and freedom for all the peoples who do not enjoy this right.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to commemorate the 13th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. This annual ceremony, in which we express our solidarity with the captive peoples throughout the world, was inaugurated in 1959 by a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress. Twelve years ago our late President, Dwight David Eisenhower, became the first Chief Executive to issue a Presidential proclamation authorizing the observance of Captive Nations Week during the third week in July.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that there is a need for us to mark the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week. Certainly it is a sad commentary on the state of mankind that, throughout modern history there have always been peoples forced to accept the rule of others against their will. Although Captive Nations Week first began little more than a decade ago, it could just as well have been initiated a generation, century, or even several thousand years earlier. While we have progressed economically and made technological advances never envisioned by those who came before us, regrettably, man has not demonstrated the same progress in his ability to coexist amicably with his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment the proud peoples of over 25 European and Asian nations are virtual prisoners in their own lands. They are subjected to tremendous oppression as their cruel overlords attempt to bend both minds and bodies to the conqueror's will. Yet, despite the ceaseless harassment, both mental and physical, which these captive peoples have been forced to endure, their pride and spirit have remained unbroken. Today, we salute the tremendous courage displayed by the native inhabitants of these captive nations, and assure them that they have not been forgotten or their struggles gone unnoticed.

Today, there are nations with the power to decimate large portions of the globe with but the push of a button. Never before has it been so imperative that the different peoples of this world learn to live with one another. Certainly, even under the most favorable conditions, this would be an immensely difficult task. The fact that there are presently 27 nations under the weight of foreign domination serves to complicate an already complex situation and places a major stumbling block across the path to world peace. This obstacle is far from insurmountable; indeed, the solution is both simple and obvious.

Mr. Speaker, these captive nations must be given their freedom and the chance to determine their own destinies. This is all they ask, and certainly they must have nothing else.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today we join our voices to those millions of Americans and friends in 17 free world countries who are commemorating Captive Nations Week.

We enjoy the freedom to speak and those other freedoms guaranteed to us by the struggles of our forefathers. Yet, I sometimes think we treat these freedoms all too casually and tend to forget that there are those peoples who still live in the darkness of tyranny.

We must not allow ourselves to become so engrossed in domestic problems that we fail to remember the plight of our brothers who suffer captivity behind the Red totalitarian curtain. The imposing reality of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, in the U.S.S.R. itself, Asia and Cuba cannot be ignored if we value our own national freedom. The cardinal Soviet Russian objective has persistently been to extract Western acquiescence to the permanent captivity of 27 nations in order that Moscow's penetrations in Southeast Asia, the Mideast, Africa, and Latin America may be effected with minimum resistance. Just to mention a few recent episodes, the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the mass incarceration of Jewish, Ukrainian, Russian, and other heroic dissidents in 1969, the recent cultural oppression of the Russian Jews, the scandalous Kudirka case in the United States and the ruthless crushing of the Polish workers' efforts to obtain a measure of freedom in 1970, and the reemphasis of the Brezhnev doctrine at the 24th CPSU Congress this spring—all indicate the crucial importance for us to morally sustain the hope and faith of the captive peoples in their eventual freedom and strategically, our preserved freedom, too.

No matter how desperately some wish to brush their reality under the rug, with softer references and distorting interpretations, these periodic lessons abound as to the blunt existence of the Captive Nations. The Captive Nations are the peoples imprisoned within the Communist-dominated states under the dictatorship of the Communist Parties, and their consummate experiences attest to the overall truth that both in theory and action communism is but a mythology shielding the worst form of totalitarianism and imperio colonialism in the history of mankind.

Among the numerous forces at work for freedom in the captive world, the most dominant is the indomitable force of nationalism. This natural force means national self-determination and independence, economic freedom and opportunity, cultural progress, and a respectful place in a peaceful community of independent nations. Expressed in many ways, this persistent force is rampant in the Soviet Union; it is manifested daily in central Europe; it permeates all of Asia; it is the basis for Cuban resistance and hope. As the record well shows, nationalism is the greatest insurmountable obstacle to Communist totalitarianism and Soviet Russian imperio colonialism.

Contrary to absurdities witnessed in some places of the free world, including the United States, the youth, the workers and the intellectuals in the captive world know what it means to be deprived of freedom. There is a steady stream of refugees risking everything to escape to freedom—from mainland China, from

Cuba, from East Germany, and everywhere that captive nations exist. With their grasp of the real and true values of human existence, the captives of Communist totalitarianism are today freedom's most trusted allies; tomorrow they shall be its sternest guardians.

The captive nations will play their role for world freedom in the 1970's. By participating in Captive Nations Week we let our enemies know that we will never acquiesce to any permanent captivity of the nations in Eurasia and Cuba and also our captive allies that we are determined to work for their freedom, which in essence means our national freedom as well.

Here in Washington we see many demonstrations and a great number of protesters carry signs urging that the United States "get out of Vietnam." Today, these demonstrators are strangely silent. I hear no voices raised on behalf of our captive brothers. Where are these demonstrators now?—and where are the signs which should say "Soviet Union; Get Out of the Captive Nations." Get out of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and all the other nations which were once free and whose people now suffer under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the opportunity to demonstrate our feelings toward these captive peoples. We should delay no longer in establishing a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. We can do no less for these peoples who have suffered so much and who look to America in hope.

The captive nations must not be forgotten and let us today renew our pledge that they will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the working men and women of America have always been in the forefront of the movement to free the captive nations. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent publication made available by the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I include this booklet, "Who Is the Imperialist?" at this point.

Following the booklet, I include two proclamations from the mayor of Buffalo, and the Erie county executive; the Latuiam Information Bulletin; and the speech of Dr. Walter Dushnyck delivered July 14, 1971, at the Buffalo Kiwanis club on the occasion of the observance of Captive Nation's Week.

The material follows:

WHO IS THE IMPERIALIST?

[Maps and charts not permitted in RECORD] "Imperialism" is a word often heard these days. At work, at meals, wherever people get together and talk about the sad state of the world, imperialism is blamed again and again.

If imperialism is causing so much of the world's trouble, then free men everywhere should know the facts.

What are the facts? What nations recklessly seek to extend their domination and control over a tense and nervous world?

Who is the Imperialist?

This booklet sets forth the record of Communist territorial expansion since 1939.

The Communist claims to these areas rest almost entirely on force.

Who is the Imperialist?

The facts are a matter of record. Let the record speak for itself.

IMPERIALISM—SOME DEFINITIONS

"... A depraved choice of national life, imposed by self-seeking interests which appeal to the lusts of quantitative acquisitiveness and of forceful domination..." (Hobson's Imperialism.)

"Imperialism is leading to annexation, to increased national oppression..." (Lenin's Imperialism.)

"... A predatory foreign policy." (Ushakov's Standard Dictionary of the Russian Language.)

"When we say that 'imperialism is ferocious', we mean that its nature will never change." (Mao-Tse-Tung, "Cast Away Illusions: Prepare for Struggle.")

"The policy, practice or advocacy of empire of a nation... by the acquirement of new territory or dependencies... by the extension of its rule over other races of mankind." (Webster's Third New International Dictionary Unabridged.)

SOVIET TERRITORIAL EXPANSION

1. Romanian provinces

These are the words of the Imperialist:

"Within four days... Soviet troops shall occupy the territory of Bessarabia and northern Bukovina... The Soviet Union insists..."

So read the Soviet ultimatum dispatched to the Romanian government in late June, 1940.

What could Romania do? She had to accede to Soviet demands made with secret advance notice to Hitler. The Red Army occupied Bessarabia and northern Bukovina; the two provinces were incorporated into the Soviet Union, on August 2, 1940.

The final Treaty of peace in 1947 with occupied Romania confirmed these boundaries.

What the U.S.S.R. Demanded and Got from Romania

19,446 square miles.

3,700,000 persons were compelled to give up their independence and become Soviet subjects.

These areas larger than all of Denmark, included Romania's second and third largest cities, Chisinau (Kishinev) and Cernauti (Chernovtsy).

The annexation of Bessarabia again made Russia a Danubian power in a position to dominate the commerce of the Danubian Basin.

2. Battle States

22,059 square miles.

6,030,000 freedom-loving people were forced to become subjects of the Soviet Union.

Late in 1939, the Soviet Union got secret advance approval from Nazi Germany to seize the Baltic States. They were absorbed into the U.S.S.R. after an "election" supervised by the Red Army.

The Soviet Union Made a Deal with Nazi Germany and Added the Baltic States to the U.S.S.R.

18,353 square miles; 25,400 square miles.

These countries, in total area, were twice as large as Scotland, Kaunas, Tallinn, Riga, once proud independent capitals, became provincial centers of Soviet power.

3. Germany: Northern East Prussia

One million people fled westward. Their homes and farms were taken over by families sent from the Soviet Union.

During World War II, the Red Army occupied northern East Prussia and annexed the area to Soviet Russia.

The U.S.S.R. Demanded and Got This Area of East Prussia and Gave Its German Cities Russian Names

Koenigsberg (population 275,000) is now called Kaliningrad.

5,418 square miles.

Tilsit (population 57,000) has been re-named Sovetsk.

Insterburg (population 39,000) became Chernyakhovsk.

Soviet Zone of Germany and East Berlin

East Berlin: 1.1 million pop.; 155 square miles.

Soviet Zone: 41,500 square miles; 16.1 million.

The USSR created a Puppet State in East Germany in violation of the wartime agreements that Germany would be treated as a unit. On September 6, 1948, Communist organizations with Soviet Zone police crashed into the Berlin Senate Building in East Berlin and drove out the members of the Berlin City assembly popularly elected under Four-Power supervision. The assembly had to reconvene in West Berlin. Since then, there has been no freely elected government in East Berlin.

In October 1949, Soviet puppet communists in East Berlin declared the Soviet Occupation zone of Germany to be the German Democratic Republic (the USSR formally recognized the GDR by treaty in 1955).

June 17, 1953, Soviet occupation troops brutally suppressed widespread strikes and riots in East Berlin and other East German cities and restored the power of the Ulbricht regime.

In 1961, to cut off the mass flight of refugees to the West, the East German regime erected the concrete and barbed wire Berlin Wall of Shame.

Twenty Soviet Divisions remain stationed in East Germany.

4. Eastern Czechoslovakia

What the U.S.S.R. Demanded and Got From Her Neighbor Czechoslovakia:

4,900 square miles.

Many of the 731,000 people in the area abandoned their homes and farms, fled to start life anew in other parts of Czechoslovakia.

This area, nearly equal in size to Alsace-Lorraine, was incorporated into the Ukrainian S.S.R.

In June 1945, Czechoslovakia's easternmost province, Ruthenia, was added to the Soviet Union. The area had never been part of Tsarist Russia. The annexation of Ruthenia and Eastern Poland gave the U.S.S.R. a highly strategic position west of the Carpathian mountain range providing ready military access to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, giving the U.S.S.R. for the first time a common frontier with both countries. It marked the first in a series of post-war Soviet assaults against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak nation.

Communists seized control of Czechoslovakia on February 25, 1948, with the Soviet Army poised on its border. Czechoslovakia became a Soviet satellite.

Soviet Occupation

When, in 1968, Czechoslovak Communists under Alexander Dubcek tried to establish "socialism with a human face," the country was occupied overnight August 20-21, 1968, by five of the Warsaw Pact powers—i.e., Soviet units with decorative detachments from Bulgaria, East Germany, Hungary and Poland.

Unable to find leaders willing to collaborate, the USSR subsequently forced the purge of "liberal" communists from the government and at all levels of the Communist Party and the "trade unions," and nullification of the political and economic reforms initiated by the Dubcek regime. The USSR imposed an agreement on the captive government permitting Soviet troops to be stationed in Czechoslovakia—which had been free of occupation since late 1945. In 1971 five Soviet Divisions and ten other Warsaw Pact Divisions were stationed in Czechoslovakia.

5. Eastern Poland

As a result of the agreement between the USSR and Nazi Germany in August 1939, Poland was invaded. Within a month, Hitler and Stalin divided the country between them. In 1941, Hitler attacked the USSR and forced the Russians out of their newly acquired Polish territory. But the Red Army reoccupied the area in 1944. Following the establishment of a Soviet-sponsored provisional Polish government, the Soviet Union annexed 70,000 square miles of Polish territory, establishing the Russo-Polish frontier with minor modifications, at the Curzon line.

A Nazi-Soviet Deal Led to This Grab From the Poles

70,000 square miles.

11,800,000 persons—a population exceeding that of the Netherlands—came under Moscow's control.

This piece of Poland is about equal in size to the combined areas of Austria and Hungary. Within its borders lie the important cities of Lwow (L'vov) and Wilno (Vil'nyus).

6. Finnish Provinces

The Soviet Union attacked Finland in November, 1939. In the armistice concluding the war, Finland lost more than 10% of its territory and population. This land included the Karelian Isthmus with Finland's second largest city, Viipuri (Vyborg), the shores of Lake Ladoga, a section of the Salla (Kuolajarvi) region, and a strip of Kalastaja-saarento (the Rybachiy Peninsula). Resuming the fighting in 1941, the Finns recovered these losses. But in a second armistice on September 19, 1944, Finland was compelled to yield to Russia, in addition to those parts previously ceded, the city of Petsamo (Pechenga) with its access to the Arctic Ocean and border with Norway. The USSR still holds these territories under the peace treaty of February 10, 1947.

What Finland Ceded the U.S.S.R.

18,000 square miles.

Most of 450,000 Finns in this area chose to resettle elsewhere in Finland.

7. Self-determination Soviet style

Poland, 1956

In June 1956 a wave of strikes and popular disorders swiftly spread in Poznan. The people demanded "bread and freedom." The USSR had to make limited concessions.

But with Soviet military units in a threatening deployment, the brakes were put on the Polish popular movement for more independence from Moscow.

Moscow settled for the leadership of Wladyslaw Gomulka—who although anti-Stalinist employed harsh measures against those who would have the country stray from the standard Communist pattern or from a "realistic" policy of submission to the Soviet Union.

Soviet garrisons and other troops on Warsaw Pact "maneuvers" in Poland remained a ready reminder of Soviet insistence on subservience.

In 1968 the Gomulka regime joined in suppressing Czechoslovak "liberalization," and took harsh measures against domestic "liberal" elements. When in 1970 the Warsaw regime was in turn faced with a wave of worker riots and strikes in the Baltic coastal towns protesting the regime's anti-labor economic policies, Polish police, troops, and tanks crushed the protests with hundreds of casualties. The Gomulka Government was replaced by another Moscow-approved regime—the Gierek regime.

Hungary, 1956

In 1956, catching fire from the popular unrest in Poland, Hungarians—students, workers, intellectuals, peasants, soldiers, Communists and non-Communists alike—rose en masse against Soviet oppression. Hungarian "freedom fighters" demanding democratic reforms and national independence for Hungary were brutally crushed by Soviet tanks

and troops which entered Hungary "in accord with the Warsaw Treaty." An estimated 200,000 Hungarians fled their homeland.

While Soviet First Deputy Premier Mikoyan was still negotiating with Prime Minister Nagy, Soviet units seized control of the country. The Soviets suppressed the legal Nagy government, which had taken up the popular demands, and installed the Kadar regime. Imre Nagy, Minister of Defense General Pal Maleter, Miklos Gimes a leading member of the intellectual Petofoi Circle and other prominent Communists and non-Communists who led the Hungarian Revolution, were arrested by Soviet troops.

On June 17, 1958, the anniversary of the East German workers' uprising, Moscow radio announced their executions. Thus, the "anti-colonialist protecting power"—the USSR—took its revenge on the people in the protectorate seeking self-determination.

In 1968 Kadar Hungary also joined the USSR in crushing the Czech bid for some democratization.

Brezhnev Doctrine

The "Brezhnev Doctrine" (the Soviets say "limited sovereignty") was the ideological justification for the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The 1970 USSR-Czechoslovak Treaty of Friendship imposed by the Soviet Union declares "the protection of socialist gains . . . is a common international duty of socialist countries."

This is a brazen formulation of what had long been de facto Soviet policy. In practice this notion of limited sovereignty among "socialist states" means that the sovereignty of other Warsaw Pact members is limited while that of the dominant USSR is unlimited.

Soviet policy is not to conclude non-aggression pacts with other "socialist states." The "Brezhnev Doctrine" justifies armed intervention by the Soviet Union against any "socialist" country should it undertake changes in the political, economic, or social policies of its government which Moscow interprets as a threat to the "socialist community."

SOVIET TERRITORIAL EXPANSION IN ASIA

In Asia, as in Europe, the Soviet Union extended the area of its control by swallowing up countries and parts of countries along its borders.

8. Outer Mongolia

Area: 604,090 square miles.

Population: 1,174,000.

Outer Mongolia (Mongolian People's Republic) was the first Soviet satellite. The puppet regime established by the Bolsheviks declared Outer Mongolia's independence from China in 1921. In 1936, Mao declared that with the victory of the Communists in China, the MPR "will automatically become a part of China." Communist China did recognize Outer Mongolia's independence in 1949, and signed a border treaty with the MPR in 1962. But in 1964 Mao declared: "The Soviet Union under the pretext of assuring the independence of Mongolia actually placed the country under its domination." (to Japanese Socialist Parliamentary delegation, July 10, 1964.)

"The great Soviet Union . . . remains our true, unselfish friend and reliable protector (from) the encroachment of imperialists . . . If the plans of the Chinese leaders were realized our people would share the fate of the Inner Mongolians . . . who are dealt with on the basis of great—Han chauvinism." (Ulan Bator Radio)—Sept. 10, 1964

Russia maintains troops in the MPR facing Communist China. The MPR regime relies upon the USSR for its defense against Communist China.

9. Tannu Tuva (Tuva Republic)

64,165 square miles.

65,000 people were Sovietized.

In October, 1944, the republic of Tannu Tuva was incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

10. Japanese possessions

Following Japan's defeat in World War II, the Kurile Islands and the southern half of the island of Sakhalin, Habomai and Shikotan were annexed and incorporated into the Soviet Union. The Red Army had occupied these territories after the Soviet Union's six-day token participation in the war against Japan.

"There are no and cannot be any legal or moral grounds for (Japanese) claims to the Kurile Island"—Pravda September 2, 1964.

AREAS OF JAPAN ANNEXED BY THE U.S.S.R. FOLLOWING JAPAN'S DEFEAT

Southern Sakhalin: 17,850 square miles. 433,000 people became subject to Soviet dictatorship. Many had to abandon homes.

These acquisitions, involving an area larger than Switzerland, substantially expanded Russia's Pacific coastline and brought important strategic areas under Soviet control.

COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM IN ASIA

With massive military assistance from the Soviet Union and Communist China, the North Korean and North Vietnam regimes have carried forward the expansionist tradition of communist imperialism. These auxiliary powers are committed to ambitions of territorial expansionism. Neither accepts the idea of staying within its own borders.

1. North Korea

46,814 square miles.

13.1 million North Koreans get no opportunity for self-determination.

In 1945, following their six-day war with Japan, the Russian occupiers of North Korea established a people's government composed of Russian-trained Communists.

The USSR resisted efforts to reunite Korea through free supervised elections. The USSR in 1948 blocked the UN from holding free elections in the North. In contrast to the Republic of Korea whose government was elected in the South under UN supervision, the USSR established the "Democratic People's Republic of Korea" in the North.

2. North Korean grab for South

On June 25, 1950, the Russian-imposed regime of North Korea, with large scale military aid from the USSR, tried to "blitz" the democratically constituted Republic of Korea (South Korea). The UN condemned the attack and ordered military sanctions, including a UN military force to resist the aggression. When the war took a bad turn for the North Koreans, Communist China sent massive formations of "volunteers" across the Yalu River into Korea.

After lengthy negotiations an armistice was reached on July 27, 1953. About 70% of the Chinese and North Korean prisoners refused to be repatriated preferring to stay in South Korea or go to Taiwan.

The North Korean regime persists in terrorism, subversion and border attacks against the Republic of Korea.

3. North Vietnam push for Indo-China

Since its establishment in 1954 under the Geneva Agreements, North Vietnam has never given up its goal to "unify" Vietnam and eventually all Indo-China under its control.

Toward this end, North Vietnam has maintained military forces and political cadres in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia to overthrow the established governments.

North Vietnam with an area of 63,360 square miles and population of 20 million is seeking to subjugate an area of 227,580 square miles with 26.8 million people.

SUBVERSION

1954—After signing the Geneva Agreements, Hanoi left thousands of its military and political cadres in South Vietnam to subvert the fledgling republican government.

1960—Falling in efforts to topple the South Vietnamese Government through subversion, Hanoi undertook armed struggles.

1962—After at least five years of armed hostilities against the Kingdom of Laos, Hanoi signed the Geneva accords which were to lead to a permanent settlement of that crisis. However, Hanoi withdrew only thirty-seven of the thousands of troops it had infiltrated into Laos.

INVASION

1965—Hanoi began to send regular North Vietnamese Army main force units into South Vietnam.

1966—Hanoi began to occupy and build base areas in Eastern Cambodia.

1966—Hanoi occupied the route areas—soon to be known as the "Ho Chi Minh Trail"—leading into the eastern part of the Laotian Panhandle.

1968—Communist forces use their Cambodian sanctuaries to launch Tet Offensive.

OCCUPATION

1971—North Vietnamese military forces in South Vietnam number over 100,000; those in Laos 70,000; those in Cambodia about 40,000.

In addition, North Vietnamese Communist political and administrative cadres in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos number at least 80,000.

CHINESE COMMUNIST TERRITORIAL EXPANSION SINCE 1950

1. Tibet takeover

In October 1950, Communist China occupied Tibet with 1.2 million people and an area about twice the size of Texas.

In May 1951, the Communist Chinese forced the Dalai Lama to sign an agreement legalizing "the peaceful liberation of Tibet," and making him a virtual figurehead.

In 1959, Communist China suppressed several Tibetan uprisings. The Dalai Lama and 20,000 Tibetans fled to India. The legal Tibetan Government was forced to flee. Tibet was shorn of its last shred of autonomy. A puppet administration was installed, and Tibet was incorporated into China.

2. Cartographical aggression

In 1954, the Communist Chinese published a textbook with a map of China showing large areas of the Soviet Union which "by right" allegedly belong to China. The map, purportedly that of China before the First Opium War (1839-1842), included as part of China: Burma, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, Malaya, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, the Maritime Provinces of the USSR in the north, parts of Kirghizia, Tadzhikistan, Kazakhstan up to Lake Balkhash, and Sakhalin.

In what Mao has labeled a "war on paper," the Chinese Communists disavow the maps from time to time, but the maps are neither corrected nor withdrawn.

3. Aggression against neighbors

Communist China directly and indirectly has sought to annex or establish hegemony over all neighboring territories it regards as historically Chinese and to exclude the influence of rival powers, whether Communist or non-Communist.

Communist China supported and joined in North Korean aggression into South Korea. In 1962, Red China in a large scale assault on India established control over strategic border areas, including the Aksai Chin Plateau thus securing a very important link between Sinkiang and Western Tibet.

Communist China for years has also supported communist and ethnic minority insurgents in northeastern Burma, northern, northeastern and southern Thailand, Malaysia, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia.

Since 1968, the Communist Chinese have been building a road network through Communist-controlled northwestern Laos that could extend the Yunnan (China) road net-

work significantly in the direction of North-east Thailand.

CHINESE VS. SOVIET IMPERIALISM

1. Mao claims Soviet territory

"The Soviet Union has an area of 22,000,000 square kilometers and its population is only 220 million. It is time to put an end to this allotment. . . . About 100 years ago, the area to the east of (Lake) Baikal became Russian territory, and then Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka, and since then other areas have been Soviet territory. We have not yet presented our account for this list."—Mao to Japanese Socialist Parliamentary Delegation, July 10, 1964.

2. Mao indicts Soviet imperialism

"There are too many places occupied by the Soviet Union. In accordance with the Yalta agreement, the Soviet Union, under the pretext of assuring the independence of Mongolia, actually placed the country under its domination. In 1954, when Khrushchev and Bulganin came to China, we took up this question, but they refused to talk to us. They (i.e. the Soviet Union) also appropriated part of Romania. Having cut off a portion of East Germany, they chased the local inhabitants into West Germany. They detached a part of Poland, annexed it to the Soviet Union, and gave a part of East Germany to Poland as compensation. The same thing took place in Finland. The Russians took everything they could."—Mao to Japanese Socialist Party Parliamentary Delegation July 10, 1964.

3. Peking versus Moscow

"Their (Soviet) evil hands will be cut off as relentlessly as were those of the Indian reactionaries when they invaded China." Saifudin, Chairman of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, Urumchi Radio, October 1, 1964.

"The present Soviet Government has gone farther than the old tsars." New China News Agency, October 8, 1969.

"The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has grown from revisionism into social imperialism. . . . The Soviet revisionist social imperialists, however, directly plunder and enslave the people of other countries by means of the state power they have usurped." New China News Agency, April 21, 1970.

"The 'Brezhnev Doctrine' is an outright doctrine of hegemony. . . . A socialist community is nothing but a synonym for a colonial empire with you (the USSR) as the metropolitan state." New China News Agency, April 21, 1970.

"They have stretched their arms out to Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America and sent their fleets to the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the Pacific and the Atlantic in their attempt to set up a vast Soviet revisionist empire spanning Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America."—New China News Agency, April 21, 1970.

"Social-imperialism greedily eyes Chinese Territory." New China News Agency, July 31, 1970.

"Social-imperialism will never abandon its expansionist ambitions." New China News Agency, July 31, 1970.

SOVIET VERSUS CHINESE IMPERIALISM

1. Soviets condemn Mao's territorial claims

"Mao Tse-tung . . . is not only claiming this or that part of Soviet territory, but is portraying his claims as part of some 'general territorial question'. We are faced with an openly expansionist program with far-reaching pretensions. . . . Maps showing various parts of the Soviet Union and other countries neighboring China as Chinese territory continue to be published in the People's Republic of China. . . ."

"By what right are the Chinese leaders claiming lands that do not belong to China? . . . Indeed, were not such a serious question involved, such historic arguments could not be called other than childish."

"Have those who question the inclusion in the Soviet Union of a territory of more than one and a half million square kilometers considered how these claims will be taken by the Soviet people who have lived and worked on this land for several generations?"—Pravda, September 2, 1964.

2. Soviet view of Maoist imperialism

"The Chinese leaders no longer even attempt to camouflage their expansionist aspirations."—Pravda, September 2, 1964.

"The appeals for so-called territorial justice can only be taken as a disguise for imperialist aggression. . . . Mao Tse-tung's . . . reasoning about the unequal division of territories is only a new edition of the theory of Lebensraum."—Radio Moscow, September 6, 1964.

"The danger that China presents today comes from the ideology and war-monger politics of Maoism, just as the danger that was formerly represented by Hitler's Germany and militarist Japan came from the ideology and politics of fascism."—Novosti commentator Georgiy Dadyants in Paris Le Monde, April 2, 1969.

"Peking's policy is primarily determined by the hegemonic ambitions of Mao Tse-tung and his supporters."—Moscow Novoye Vremya, June 27, 1969.

"They use popular slogans and so-called revolutionary methods for greater effect in order to attain their narrow nationalistic goals."—Moscow Radio, March 21, 1970.

"The Chinese leadership has openly shown its unwillingness to participate in any political activity aimed at terminating the Vietnam war. . . . The Peking leaders hope the bloody war in Vietnam will be carried on forever."—Moscow Radio, March 28, 1970.

"The Chinese leaders do not want to relax their policy toward Asia. . . . The expansionist policy of the Chinese leaders is a grim reality to the Asian peoples." Moscow Radio, January 8, 1971.

The general line of the PRC's foreign policy remains . . . to win a place for China as a world power capable of imposing its decisions, its will on other states.—Tass, April 21, 1971.

THE IMPERIALISTS CLASH

Sinkiang

"The authorities of the Soviet Union have . . . carried out large scale subversive activities against Sinkiang, enticed and coerced tens of thousands Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union . . . spread lies and slanders . . . distorting the history of Sinkiang in an attempt to undermine the unity of the Chinese peoples of various nationalities."—New China News Agency, April 28, 1964.

Have the Chinese been living there (in Sinkiang) from time immemorial? . . . The Sinkiang indigenous population differs sharply from the Chinese ethnically, linguistically . . . Chinese Emperors conquered them . . . and deprived them of their independence."—Khrushchev to Japanese Parliamentary Delegation, September 19, 1964.

For the past 20 years Peking has been colonizing Sinkiang with Han Chinese to secure its claim on the region by turning the indigenous populations into a minority.

CHINESE COMMUNIST TERRITORIAL EXPANSION SINCE 1950

Expansion of Communist power

The preceding pages reveal but one aspect of predatory Communist policy: territorial expansion. But this does not complete the Communist record.

The Soviet Union and Communist China also have directly or indirectly subjugated many more millions of people and many more square miles without changing a single boundary, Albania, Cuba, Bulgaria, Hungary, east Germany, Outer Mongolia, North Korea, North Vietnam, and the remaining parts of Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia

still lie outside formal Soviet or Communist Chinese borders. But they are no longer free or sovereign states; they are in the "socialist camp"—as Moscow and Peking label it. While they exercise varying degrees of autonomy, they have been reduced for the most part to the level of virtual satellites. The continued existence of their Communist regimes depends on support and protection by the USSR, Communist China, or both.

In country after country, the same methods were used: demonstrate, agitate, infiltrate, intimidate, deceive, subvert, and control.

In exceptional cases the Soviet Union gave up what it seized, e.g., the leased naval bases of Porkalla and Port Arthur, its share in the Chinese Eastern Railway and special air, commercial and mineral rights in Sinkiang. In 1946, it withdrew its military forces from northern Iran after stalling for six months in violation of its treaty commitments and after it had forced a crisis in the U.N. In 1955 after ten years of occupation and eight years of negotiation it finally agreed to withdraw its troops from Austria. Under a state treaty Austria was reestablished with an independent and democratic government. Here and there Communist China has made minor border adjustments with its neighbors.

But neither the Soviet Union or Communist China has ever granted independence to countries once under their control.

In practice neither the Russian nor Communist Chinese leadership regard their client states as having rights to self-determination or to more than token sovereignty.

Albania, like the other Balkan countries, after World War II, found itself saddled with a Stalinist regime. Unable to resolve differences with the post-Stalin leaders of the USSR, the Albanian regime put itself under the protection of Communist China, its sole supplier of essential economic aid.

In Bulgaria the Communist-run Fatherland Front seized total power and suppressed all opposition. Bulgaria remains the most subservient puppet of the Soviet Union in the Balkans.

Cuba—Castro took over January 1, 1959, and waited two years to declare that he was a convinced Marxist-Leninist but had concealed this in order to consolidate power. Castro has never held his promised elections. Moscow hastened to turn Cuba into a center of communist subversion of all Latin America, a base for training guerrilla fighters, and a Soviet missile base against the United States. Only the courage, firm, and prompt action by the late President John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev to take the nuclear missiles out of Cuba and end this grave danger of a global nuclear conflagration. Castro supported the Soviet 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia. "It was unavoidable," he declared. "It has absolutely no legality," but could be "explained" from "the political viewpoint." Havana Radio, August 24, 1968). Castro depends on the USSR to keep his economy afloat.

In Czechoslovakia, after World War II a "government of national unity" opened the way for Soviet-trained agents to occupy key cabinet posts. As soon as the Communists had an iron grip on the police, communications, armed forces, and other important sources of power, they overturned the freely-elected government. When, in 1968, the Czech Communist (Dubcek) regime went "liberal" the Soviet Union invaded.

Hungary—Over a three year period after World War II under the watchful eye of Russian troops, the democratically elected leaders of the Hungarian government were picked off and replaced by Communists. The non-Communist parties were atomized and forced into a Communist-controlled front. The clergy was subjected to steady persecution. When the Hungarian people, including Communists sought independence in 1956, they were crushed.

Poland continues to live under the Soviet

shadow. In 1948, it was forced by Moscow, as was Czechoslovakia, to refuse Marshall aid. Polish "liberalization" gained after 1956 was soon negated. The aftermath of 1970 popular unrest leaves Poland in the shadow of Soviet power. Poland has no foreign policy of its own.

Romania—Romania's Stalinist nationalist Communist regime occasionally exercises a limited measure of prudent independence in foreign policy, but remains in the grip of the USSR through the country's membership in the Warsaw Pact and COMECON (Council of Mutual Economic Assistance). The Romanians systematically avoid any move the Soviets might use as a pretext for invoking the "Brezhnev Doctrine".

The regime of the "Democratic Republic" in East Germany is totally dependent on the USSR for its existence.

China's Communists, who won power largely on their own, have set out on their own imperialist adventures in Southeast Asia, and are challenging and competing with the USSR in supporting subversion in Africa, Latin America, and parts of Asia. Communist Chinese imperialism is competing with Soviet imperialism for control of the Asian land mass.

In Outer Mongolia, in a 1945 "plebiscite," the people "voted" 483,291 to 0 to become "independent." This meant complete separation from China and direct subjugation to Soviet interests. The Outer Mongolian regime remains a faithful puppet of Moscow.

In North Korea the Soviet Union in 1948 established a puppet government and equipped the North Korean army which (in June, 1950) attacked the Republic of Korea. The regime depends on Moscow and Peking for political, military and economic support.

The North Vietnam regime remains dependent on Red China and Moscow. In Indochina North Vietnam carries on the tradition of imperialism rooted in Communist ideology.

HERE IS THE SOVIET AND COMMUNIST CHINESE RECORD AS OF 1970

	Area (square miles)	Population (before annexation)
Territories annexed:		
Romanian provinces.....	19,446	3,700,000
Estonia.....	18,353	1,122,000
Latvia.....	25,400	1,951,000
Lithuania.....	22,059	2,957,000
Northern East Prussia.....	5,418	1,187,000
Eastern Czechoslovakia.....	4,900	731,000
Eastern Poland.....	70,000	11,800,000
Finnish provinces.....	18,000	450,000
Tannu Tuva.....	64,165	65,000
Japanese possessions.....	17,850	433,000
Tibet.....	560,000	1,200,000
Total.....	825,591	25,596,000
Socialist camp dependencies:		
Albania.....	11,100	2,019,000
Bulgaria.....	42,845	8,370,000
Cuba.....	44,218	8,074,000
Czechoslovakia.....	49,370	14,362,000
Eastern Germany.....	41,500	16,100,000
East Berlin.....	155	1,100,000
Hungary.....	35,919	10,284,000
Poland.....	120,632	32,207,000
Romania.....	91,660	19,721,000
Outer Mongolia.....	604,090	1,174,000
North Korea.....	46,814	13,100,000
North Vietnam.....	63,360	20,000,000
Total.....	1,151,663	146,511,000
Total annexations and dependencies.....	1,977,154	172,107,000
Under attack:		
Cambodia.....	69,898	6,557,000
Laos.....	91,429	2,825,000
South Vietnam.....	66,263	17,404,000
Total.....	227,580	26,786,000
Grand total.....	2,204,834	198,893,000

While the Soviet Union, Communist China and their offspring have relentlessly pursued policies of swallowing country after country,

the free world has sought to implement the principles of self-determination and independence.

From World War II through 1970 sixty-eight former colonial or semi-colonial areas have exercised self-determination and become independent in the non-communist

world. They had been dependencies of Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain and the United States.

These new nations have adopted foreign policies which are of their own choosing and making.

The following page lists the 68 newly independent states (except Rhodesia) created through the principle of self-determination since the beginning of World War II. Their areas and population (with the latest available figures) are:

NEW INDEPENDENT NATIONS SINCE WORLD WAR II

Country	Area	Population	Year of Independence	Former Control	Country	Area	Population	Year of Independence	Former Control
Algeria	919,352	12,943,000	1962	French.	Malaysia	128,430	11,835,000	1957	British
Barbados	166	251,000	1966	British.	Maldives Is.	115	104,000	1965	Do.
Botswana	238,605	629,000	1966	Do.	Mali	478,640	4,900,000	1960	French.
Burma	261,721	26,389,000	1948	Do.	Malta	95	319,000	1964	British.
Burundi	10,744	3,406,000	1962	Belgian.	Mauritania	397,850	1,120,000	1960	French.
Cambodia	69,898	6,557,000	1949	French.	Mauritius	720,000	810,000	1968	British.
Cameroon	183,381	5,562,000	1960	Do.	Morocco	171,843	14,816,000	1956	French/Spanish.
Central African Republic	241,000	1,518,000	1960	Do.	Nauru	8	6,053	1968	Australian.
Ceylon	25,332	11,964,000	1948	British.	Niger	489,062	3,909,000	1960	French.
Chad	495,624	3,361,000	1960	French.	Nigeria	356,574	62,650,000	1960	British.
Congo (Brazzaville)	132,000	826,000	1960	Do.	Pakistan	365,432	109,520,000	1947	Do.
Congo (Kinshasa)	905,328	16,730,000	1960	Belgian.	Philippines	115,800	35,993,000	1946	American.
Cyprus	3,572	621,000	1960	British.	Rwanda	10,170	3,306,000	1962	Belgian.
Dahomey	44,685	2,571,000	1960	French.	Senegal	76,194	3,685,000	1960	French.
Equatorial Guinea	10,830	286,000	1968	Spanish.	Sierra Leone	27,625	2,475,000	1961	British.
Fiji	7,055	519,000	1970	British.	Singapore	27,225	2,004,000	1965	Do.
Gabon	103,000	480,000	1960	French.	Somalia	246,000	2,500,000	1960	Italian/British.
The Gambia	4,003	357,000	1965	British.	Southern Yemen	111,080	1,146,000	1967	British.
Ghana	92,100	8,376,000	1957	Do.	Sudan	967,275	14,979,000	1956	British/Egyptian.
Guinea	97,000	3,702,000	1958	French.	Swaziland	6,705	375,000	1968	British.
Guyana	83,000	710,000	1966	British.	Syria	71,228	5,738,000	1944	French.
Iceland	39,758	200,000	1944	Danish.	Tanzania	362,820	12,926,000	1961	British.
India	1,261,483	523,893,000	1947	British.	Togo	22,000	1,818,000	1960	French.
Indonesia	735,268	112,800,000	1949	Dutch.	Tonga	270	81,000	1970	British.
Israel	7,992	2,813,000	1948	British.	Trinidad and Tobago	1,980	1,010,000	1962	Do.
Ivory Coast	127,520	4,200,000	1960	French.	Tunisia	63,379	4,533,000	1956	French.
Jamaica	4,411	1,900,000	1962	British.	Uganda	93,981	8,133,000	1962	British.
Jordan	37,738	2,071,000	1946	Do.	Upper Volta	105,946	5,278,000	1962	French.
Kenya	225,100	10,209,000	1963	Do.	South Vietnam	66,263	17,414,000	1954	Do.
South Korea	38,012	30,400,000	1948	Japanese.	Western Samoa	1,097	137,000	1962	New Zealand.
Kuwait	6,178	555,000	1961	British.	Zambia	290,586	4,144,000	1964	British.
Laos	91,429	2,825,000	1949	French.	Total	13,223,124	1,153,452,053		
Lebanon	4,015	2,367,000	1943	Do.					
Lesotho (Basutoland)	11,716	1,000,000	1966	British.					
Libya	678,182	1,859,000	1951	Italian.					
Madagascar	228,000	6,643,000	1960	French.					
Malagasy	228,000	6,643,000	1960	French.					
Malawi	48,443	4,285,000	1964	British.					

The free world has granted independence to: 1,153,452,053 people and 13,223,124 square miles and the Soviet Union and Communist Chinese have subjugated 172,107,000 people and 1,977,254 square miles and are seeking more.

Who is the imperialist?

PROCLAMATION OF COUNTY OF ERIE

Whereas, Public law 86-90 was enacted 12 years ago in Congress. This law establishes Captive Nations Week, and in so doing, our representatives themselves also established that we, Americans, do not bow to despotism whether it comes from the Court of St. James or the Kremlin or Peking; and

Whereas, To-day Communist has erected a cruel barrier of barbed wire, minefields, man-hunters, bloodhounds and machine guns. It has reestablished colonialism behind an Iron Curtain, where civilized nations labor under the boot of tyranny. The same ruthless armed oppression has been used against the open resistance in Budapest or the peaceful attempt for changes in Prague. This political oppression and economic exploitation of the Captive Nations is committed in the name of a political system which has been proven to be obsolete and reactionary. Communism attempts to stabilize its system through the blood-shed and misery of others. Fomenting small wars throughout the world is an oft-used strategy; and

Whereas, The peoples of the Captive Nations look to us for sympathy, encouragement and help. We have witnessed that bridges cannot be built to these countries. The puppet governments of Moscow insist that any contact with the West and freedom be denied their people; and

Whereas, We should ensure that these puppet governments receive no economic help from the West. To this end, we should avoid buying any products of these countries because the hard currency so acquired by these

governments is used to subvert our own freedom. We must keep in mind that these goods we buy were denied our enslaved brothers.

Now, therefore, I, B. John Tutuska, County Executive of the County of Erie, do hereby proclaim the week of July 19-25, 1971, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the citizens of Erie County to support and observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROCLAMATION OF CITY OF BUFFALO

Whereas, the aggressive and overtly hostile policies of Russian and Chinese Communists have led to subjugation and enslavement of a large number of once free and independent nations; and

Whereas, ample proof exists that these unwilling captives are desiring liberty and independence from their captors and have proven, time and time again, their dissatisfaction with their fate; and

Whereas, the powerful deterrent these nations constitute with their passive as well as active resistance by checking and hampering the grandiose ambitions of the Communist imperialists has been recognized by many experts; and

Whereas, the United States is committed to defend freedom and peace with justice all over the world because by such stand the preservation of our own hard-won freedom is being guaranteed; and

Whereas, the freedom aspiring peoples of the Captive Nations know that the United States is the stronghold of human decency with a deep dedication toward helping others to achieve a sovereign life and is willing to aid others at a great cost to her as shown in Vietnam; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week, urging the citizens of our great country to observe

said week with appropriate prayers, activities and rallies and expressing their moral support for the just aspirations of captive peoples to attain a full measure of freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Frank A. Sedita, Mayor of the City of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim July 18-24, 1971 as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon the citizens of Buffalo to join with their fellow citizens in observing this week with appropriate prayers for the deliverances of the oppressed and subjugated nations the world over.

LATVIAN INFORMATION BULLETIN, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 1971

BALTIC GENOCIDE DAY REMEMBERED

Thirty years ago about fifteen thousand citizens of Latvia were arrested, without prior warning in the middle of the night, by armed agents of the Soviet secret police. They were loaded into previously assembled cattle cars to be deported to forced labor camps in northern Russia and Siberia. At the loading stations husbands were separated from wives and children, to be sent to different destinations. This happened June 13, 1941, just a year after the Baltic Republics had been forcibly occupied and absorbed into the Soviet Union. Tens of thousands of Lithuanians and Estonians met the same fate. During the first year of the Soviet occupation, preceding the Nazi invasion, altogether some 125,000 Balts were deported or executed by the Soviet secret police. After the return of the Red army by the end of the war, mass deportations on an even greater scale were carried out in 1945, and again in 1949 in the wake of compulsory collectivization of agriculture. Nevertheless, the Moscow occupants had to cope with guerilla warfare, particularly in Lithuania, which was put down only in 1952. Estimates of the Baltic population losses during Stalin's rule range around fifteen percent.

This June, the thirty-first anniversary of the Soviet military invasion of the Baltic Republic (while Russia was still an ally of Nazi Germany), and the thirtieth anniversary of the first mass deportations, were commemorated in the United States, and elsewhere in the free world, by Baltic descendants and their friends. In Washington, D.C., a Mass was held on Sunday, June 13, at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, sponsored by the Joint Baltic American Committee. The service was attended by Dr. Anatol Dinbergs and Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, the diplomatic representatives of Latvia and Lithuania.

Also, the U.S. Congress devoted attention to these tragic events. Nine Senators and thirty-one Representatives inserted their remarks in the Congressional Record of June. We present below a few selected addresses.

REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R.-Mich.): Mr. Speaker, representatives of more than a million Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians living in the United States joined Sunday in commemorating the 30th anniversary of the mass deportations of Baltic peoples to slave labor camps by the Russians in 1941. With the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a description of the church service at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception which marked this tragic event in world history. The account follows:

A church service commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the mass deportations of the Baltic peoples to slave-labor camps in Siberia was held on Sunday, June 13, at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in the Nation's Capital.

The celebrant of the special service was Rev. Father Kazimieras Pugevicius of Baltimore.

Spokesmen for the Joint Baltic Committee, representing the central organizations of Americans of Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian descent, explained that the brutal Soviet action, commencing on the night of June 13, 1941, left deep scars and bitter memories among the Baltic peoples on both sides of the iron curtain. Concentration camp victims were drawn from all social and age groups, the Joint Baltic Committee pointed out, and were packed into cattle cars going to Northern Russia and Siberia, where most perished under the inhuman conditions.

The vast scale of these and later deportations after the Second World War was emphasized by Gunars Meierovics, Dr. John B. Genys and Gerhard Buschmann, representing over a million Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians in the United States.

The Committee placed conservative estimates of human losses by Baltic people in Soviet concentration camps to be in excess of fifteen percent of the population.

The Baltic people expressed their alarm at current Soviet policies, which are totalitarian cultural genocide tactics, implemented in the name of russification. They hope that world opinion will be reminded by Sunday's ceremonies of the brutal attempts to stamp out the Baltic peoples' national identity and desire for self-determination. The resultant protests to the Soviet government might stem these policies.

The consensus was unanimous that the plight of the Baltic peoples today was very critical, in the context of colonialism vs. self-government. The Committee declares that the annexation of the Baltic nations into the Soviet Union is not recognized by our government and many other nations. This occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is a flagrant breach of all international treaties and agreements between the Soviet Union and the independent Baltic States governments! (C.R. 6-15-71)

Sen. Charles H. Percy (R.-Ill.): Mr. President, in mid-June 1940, the Soviet Union overran and seized the nations of Lithuania,

Latvia and Estonia. Proud peoples fell under the control of the Soviet Union. Today, 31 years later, this deplorable occupation continues. The peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have not regained their freedom.

No rational man would suggest that the Baltic States should be part of the Soviet Union. Theirs are independent peoples with important cultures and rich religious heritages. For 31 years, against all odds, they have struggled to maintain their customs and traditions. They have been held by force, but their spirit has not been conquered.

On this occasion I would remind my colleagues of the concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 416—which was agreed to by this body on October 22, 1966. In that resolution, which was also adopted by the House, the Senate urged that the United States should direct the attention of world opinion to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the Baltic peoples and to bring the force of world opinion to bear for the restoration of those rights.

Today we recall and reemphasize the provisions of that resolution so that all may know where the American people stand on this issue. (C.R. 6-15-71)

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D.-Maine): Mr. President, one of the tragedies of modern history was the invasion and subsequent fall of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on this day 31 years ago. The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. The sudden extinction of their national sovereignty and their brutal absorption into the Soviet Union was an injustice which still burns in the memory of thousands upon thousands of these dispossessed peoples.

Mr. President, we have in recent years been coming to the end of a period of widespread colonialism in the world. Yet we sometimes forget that these countries of the Baltic are still colonies. I pray that they might some day regain their independence and freedom, and that the peace-loving peoples of the area who have been scattered throughout the world can return—and find once again their national identity. (C.R. 6-16-71)

Rep. Martha W. Griffiths (D.-Mich.): Mr. Speaker, in June of 1940 the Soviet Union invaded the Baltic States and took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms. The Soviets have since been bent on the systematic destruction of the national identity of the Baltic peoples. Tens of thousands of innocent and helpless citizens have been deported to live in exile in the remote areas of Siberia. And yet, throughout all this physical terrorization the Baltic peoples have persistently retained their will to resist communism. The United States has never recognized the seizure and occupation of the Baltic States and has continuously restated this position.

On this anniversary of the destruction of the Baltic States, I wish to express my admiration for the courageous peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The unfortunate events whose anniversary we observe this month should remind us once again that the hopes and dreams of these peoples are also our own. They should remind us that we must continue to strive for a free and peaceful world in which all people will have the opportunity to live their lives as they choose. The denial of freedom to the Baltic people is intolerable and a blow to the rights of all mankind. (C.R. 6-16-71)

Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.): Mr. Speaker, today is Genocide Day, the 30th anniversary of the mass deportation of people from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to slave labor camps in Siberia and other sections of the Soviet Union. This terrible instance of Communist brutality occurred in 1941, shortly before National Socialist Germany's armed forces invaded Communist Russia, its erstwhile ally.

The three Baltic republics had enjoyed a

short-lived freedom, having secured their independence shortly after the end of World War I, only to lose it soon after the National Socialists and the Communists collaborated to trigger World War II. The territory of the three small countries was invaded first by Soviet troops and then by their Nazi counterparts.

Towards the end of World War II when Soviet troops reoccupied the Baltic States, the U.S.S.R. illegally incorporated these three nations into its structure, an action which our Government has never recognized. Since then, the Baltic people have suffered from the collectivization of their farms and the nationalization of their industries. They have suffered religious persecution and their children have been subject, through Communist educational institutions, to Communist brainwashing.

Hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Letts, and Lithuanians were shipped from their homelands like cattle, to be replaced by peoples from other parts of the Soviet Empire. This wholesale exchange of populations has radically altered the ethnic compositions of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, it is not pleasant to have to invite the House's attention to such an occasion as Genocide Day. Unfortunately, we must take note of it, so long as the Soviet Union continues to treat the Baltic peoples as colonials to be exploited, as chattels to be exported, and as inferior creatures to be exterminated. Genocide is wrong, no matter who practices it, no matter who the victims are, and regardless of whether they be many or few.

However, I direct the attention of the Members to the fact that throughout the free world the peoples of Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian origins maintained their traditional civic, cultural, and church organizations and continue their efforts on behalf of their enslaved compatriots held captive within the U.S.S.R. The legitimate spokesmen for the Baltic peoples are found in the free world rather than the Russian puppets in the three so-called Soviet Socialist Republics. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the perseverance of the Baltic people will triumph over communism and that freedom will ultimately be restored to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. (C.R. 6-14-71)

THE BALTIC CONQUEST

Such is the title of an editorial in the *New York Times* of June 21, 1971. We reprint the article in full:

The people of the Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—have been recalling a sad anniversary. It was in mid-June of 1940 that the Soviet Government of that time, headed by Stalin and Molotov, sent ultimata to these then independent nations, all of which had binding non-aggression pacts with the Soviet Union.

Each ultimatum demanded that the respective government be dissolved and replaced by one satisfactory to Moscow, and also that Soviet troops be immediately admitted to garrison the nation so addressed. Since each of the Baltic nations was small and weak and since the alternative to acceptance of the ultimatum was armed attack from the Soviet Union, the governments surrendered. A few weeks later "free elections" were held in each country to elect parliaments which "unanimously" requested entry into the Soviet Union.

An entire generation has grown to maturity since this aggression took place. National independence is still denied the Baltic states. Moscow has persistently endeavored to achieve Russification of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia by encouraging migration of Russians to the Baltic area and by trying to force domination of Russian language and Russian culture.

But there is still evidence—not least in the complaints of Moscow's gauleiters in these

small lands—that the desire for freedom along the Baltic persists even now, more than three decades after Stalin's shameless and brutal conquest.

LATVIA IN THE LIGHT OF THE LATEST SOVIET CENSUS

The Soviet Central Bureau of Statistics has now published more detailed reports of the results of the census conducted on January 15, 1970. The reports reflect population growth during the preceding decade, and provide figures concerning the ethnic composition of the Soviet population in general, and of the individual Republics in particular. It appears that of the total population of 241.7 million, only 129 million (53.2%) are Russians, while 112.7 million (46.8%) are non-Russians. Of the latter, most numerous are the peoples which inhabit the western

(European) and southern (Asian) frontiers of the USSR. Their territories were invaded and added to the Russian colonial empire in the course of modern history, up to World War II.

As for the Soviet-occupied Baltic Republics, their combined population has increased from 6,001,000 in 1959 to 6,848,000 by January 1970. The population increase in Latvia and Estonia, which are today the most industrialized regions of the USSR, is mainly due to the influx of Russians and other Soviet nationals, while in Lithuania the ethnic proportion of the population has changed little since 1959. The profound changes in the ethnic composition of Latvia's population since the war and Soviet invasion is illustrated by the following table, based on the Soviet census of 1970, and the last census of independent Latvia conducted in 1935.

POPULATION OF LATVIA AND ITS ETHNIC COMPOSITION (BETWEEN 1935 AND 1960)

Nationality	1935		1959		1970	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Latvians	1,473,000	77.0	1,298,000	62.0	1,342,000	56.8
Russians	207,000	10.6	556,000	26.6	705,000	29.8
Others	271,000	12.4	239,000	11.4	317,000	13.4
Total	1,951,000	100.0	2,093,300	100.0	2,364,000	100.0

The Soviet census shows that, while Latvians increased during the last decade by a mere 44,000 persons, the number of Russians in the same period increased by 149,000. Also, other Soviet nationalities, such as Byelorussians, Ukrainians, and others, increased by 78,000. This, of course, reflects a continuous flow of immigrants from the Soviet Union proper. Furthermore, the census rates the total number of Latvians within the USSR at 1,430,000. This means that 88,000 Latvians are dispersed in the USSR, outside the Republic of Latvia, as compared to 102,000 in 1959. In order to evaluate this decrease, it must be borne in mind that the census takers determine nationality in accordance with the testimony of the persons they interrogate. It is quite possible that some Latvians, permanently settled in eastern provinces of the Soviet realm, declared themselves to be Russians for reasons of expediency, particularly in cases of ethnically mixed marriages.

In the Republic of Latvia, 98.1% Latvian nationals listed their mother tongue to be Latvian, and only 45.3% claimed to be in full command of the Russian language. This is a remarkable indication of persisting nationalism, considering the fact that about 50% of Latvia's population is under 34 years of age, having no personal recollection of independent Latvia, and being compelled to learn Russian in schools. Other points of interest; 62% of Latvia's inhabitants now reside in towns, and only 38% live in rural areas. There are 200,000 more women than men in Latvia, this obviously being due to the ravages of the second World War.

According to the last census of independent Latvia, the number of ethnic Latvians in 1935 was 1,473,000, or 77% of the total population. Compared with the latest Soviet census, it appears that there are fewer people of Latvian nationality in Latvia today than there were 35 years ago, while the total population has increased by 413,000, mainly due to the immigration of Russians. Even though innumerable thousands of Latvian citizens perished during the war and the years of Nazi occupation, the decline in number of Latvian nationals since 1941 was primarily due to repeated mass deportations during the reign of Stalin.

Also, more than a hundred thousand Latvians managed to escape from renewed Soviet atrocities to Western Europe toward the end of the war. Most of them have subsequently emigrated overseas, primarily to the United States, Canada, Australia, and Eng-

land. While being loyal citizens of their adopted countries, they generally adhere to their native cultural traditions and continue to support efforts for the eventual liberation of their homeland.

At home, too, the majority of the Latvian people of all ages (except the Moscow controlled communists and their followers) resent the denial of their inherent right of self-determination. Persistent passive and active resistance of premeditated Russification causes the Kremlin and its communist agents in Latvia great concern.

YAKHIMOVICH AND RIPS RELEASED FROM RIGA MENTAL INSTITUTION

This Bulletin carried in its July, 1969, and January, 1970, issues stories about the ordeal of two Latvian citizens, Ivan Yakhimovich, and Ilya Rips.

Yakhimovich, 41, a Latvian citizen of Polish nationality, married and the father of three small children, was for ten years a member of the Communist Party in good standing. Though being a philologist by education, he chose in 1960 to assume chairmanship of a collective farm in the eastern part of Latvia. In 1964 *Komsomolskaja Pravda* (Young Communist Truth) published a laudatory article about him, calling him "hardworking, honest and fair, a man who worries more about his collective farm than he worries about himself."

But in 1968, having lost his idealistic belief in the infallibility of the Party of Lenin, he participated with other dissenters in denouncing the unfair trials of Soviet writers and intellectuals, oppression of minority nations, and the invasion of Czechoslovakia. As a result, he was stripped of his Kolkhoz chairmanship and expelled from the Party. But this did not make him change his views. In early 1969, Yakhimovich, anticipating his imminent arrest, published an open letter, dated March 24 and addressed to the peoples of the Soviet Union, denouncing violation of human rights and demanding freedom of speech. He concluded his appeal by saying: "The strong and mighty of this world are dominant only as long as we are on our knees. Let us arise!"

Yakhimovich was, as he anticipated, arrested on March 25, 1969, and was subsequently confined to a Riga mental hospital. According to the latest news, he was released in May of this year. But nothing is known about the present state of his mental and physical health, nor what happened to his family.

Ilya Rips, a gifted mathematics student of the Latvian University and the son of a Jewish physician, set fire to himself on April 13, 1969, at the Latvian Statue of Liberty in Riga. By this dramatic attempt at self-immolation he protested the denial of permission to Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel, and the rape of Czechoslovakia. The flames which enveloped his garments were, however, put out by a group of passing sailors, and a policeman delivered his burned and beaten body to a hospital, where he eventually recovered. He was thereafter placed in the same Riga mental institution where Yakhimovich had preceded him by a few weeks, though it is doubtful that the two ever met face to face. However, both were released about the same time two years later. It is of interest to note that Grisha Feigin, the bemedaled former Soviet army major of World War II, who this February was unexpectedly permitted to emigrate to Israel, also underwent examination of his mental health in the same institution.

The latest Soviet underground issue of *Chronicle of Current Events*, No. 18, carried a chilling story of a mental clinic by a Russian inmate, Vasily Chernyshov, after his arrest in March, 1970. The story tells of the application of mind distorting drugs to some "incurable" political prisoners locked up in "special" mental institutions.

MORE NEWS ABOUT LATVIAN JEWS

On May 27, four Latvian Jews were convicted at a closed trial in Riga. The court imposed prison sentences of one to three years. Soviet news agency *Tass* said the "criminal group" had been convicted for reprinting "anti-Soviet publications from Tel Aviv and duplicating other slanderous materials." The nature of the "slanderous" materials was not revealed by *Tass*. One of the convicted persons was Ruth Alexandrovich, a 23-year-old nurse. Her mother, Rivka Alexandrovich, who had been previously permitted to emigrate to Israel and was at the time of the trial in the United States, said that her daughter's fiance, Isai Averbukh, also of Riga, had been arrested just before the trial and sentenced to 15 days in jail for "hooliganism." The real reason for his confinement, obviously, was to prevent him from demonstrating against the unjust trial.

The *Jewish Week-American Examiner*, Washington, D.C., carried in its May 27 edition a story by Victor U. Blenstock of the testimony of a Riga-born Jew, Avraham Feld, on the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. Feld, who had managed to emigrate from Riga to Israel 18 months ago, was on a speaking tour in the United States. Before his departure from Latvia, Feld was arrested six times on various charges. Concerning Jews in the Baltic States, Blenstock's story has this to say:

"Feld . . . draws attention to the great difference in the situation of Jews in Russia proper and the Baltic states. In the latter—in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—he points out, there was rich and full Jewish life until the Russians overran the republics 30 years ago and made them part of the Soviet Union.

"The occupation and annexation put an end to the flourishing Jewish cultural and religious life there and Jews who wanted to live as Jews concluded that they could only do so if they emigrated. Proportionately, there has been less integration and absorption of Baltic Jews than of Russians.

"When the Russians occupied Riga, Feld said, there was a Jewish population there of 60,000. Today, there are about 35,000 including the thousands who moved into the capital from the provinces. The great majority of them—unlike the Jews in Soviet Russia who have been cut off from Jewish life since the Bolshevik Revolution—still are Yiddish-speaking, are versed in Yiddish culture and have some religious background, he said . . .

"The great majority of them want to leave," he asserted, "and that is probably

true of the Jews in all the Baltic states. They have more Yiddishkeit and more national feeling than the Jews in Russia."

According to *Jewish Week*, July 1:

More than 80 Jews who staged public hunger strikes in Moscow and Riga to protest denial of exit permits to Israel ended their demonstrations under the threat of arrest. One group of 33 Jews from Riga and Wilna staged their 48-hour strike in the Moscow Central Post Office, while 50 others engaged in a similar demonstration in Riga. The Riga and Wilna Jews sent a letter of protest to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which was presented to Secretary-General U Thant by Yosef Tekoah, Israel Ambassador to the UN.

The Soviet census of January, 1970, listed the number of Jews living in the Baltics by the end of 1969 as follows: 37,000 in Latvia; 24,000 in Lithuania; and 5,300 in Estonia.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN LATVIAN ASSOCIATION

The American Latvian Association in the United States assembled for its 20th annual congress on May 21-23 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The Association (founded in 1951 in Washington, D.C., by immigrants of Latvian descent, most of whom had entered the United States after the war on the basis of the Displaced Persons' Act of 1948) represents today about two hundred organizations of American Latvians from coast to coast. The Congress elected a new Board of Directors, most of whom had served in the preceding year. Uldis Grava was again elected president, and Gunars Melerovics, deputy president. Dr. Igvars J. Spilners, director of the Bureau of Information of the ALA, described the aims of the Association in a press release as follows:

"American Latvian Association, uniting about two hundred organizations in the United States, has the responsibility to promote welfare, good citizenship, education and cultural life of Americans of Latvian heritage. However, as long as Latvia is occupied by a foreign force, it has the additional responsibility to inform the world of the conditions in Latvia and, as much as possible, to give Latvians in their occupied homeland uncensored news on happenings, cultural life and ideas in the outside world, as well as in the Baltic."

The Congress received messages from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, Lawrence F. O'Brien, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee, and William G. Millikan, Governor of Michigan. Also, diplomatic representatives of Lithuania and Estonia, Mr. Joseph Kajeckas and Mr. Ernst Jaakson, sent their greetings. Gerald R. Ford, Representative of Michigan and minority leader of the U.S. House, addressed the assembly in person, as did Robert Boelens, Mayor of Grand Rapids, and Dr. Anatol Dinbergs, Charge d'Affaires of Latvia.

The congress authorized Dainis Rudzitis, the chairman, to send telegrams to President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, Secretary of State Rogers, and Assistant Secretary of State Hillebrand, expressing hope that continuous American moral support of the aspirations for self-determination of the Baltic peoples will precipitate their eventual liberation from the Soviet colonial yoke.

The Department of State conveyed the following reply on behalf of the President:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1971.

DEAR MR. RUDZITIS: President Nixon has asked me to thank you for your telegram expressing the views of the 20th Annual Congress of The American Latvian Association in the United States held recently in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The President deeply appreciates your loyal support and your dedication for the cause of freedom.

As you know the policy of the United States with respect to Latvia and the other

Baltic States supports the right of self-determination for their peoples and is in sympathy with their just aspirations for a free and independent national existence. Our attitude and actions have been consistent with this policy, as we have never recognized the forcible incorporation of these nations by the Soviet Union. You can rest assured that we will continue to adhere to this policy.

Sincerely,

(S) W. D. Blair, Jr.

WILLIAM D. BLAIR, JR.,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

Mr. DAINIS RUDZITIS,
President, Twentieth Annual Congress of the American Latvian Association, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Anatol Dinbergs, Charge d'Affaires of Latvia, concluded his brief address by emphasizing that history is basically a record of people and nations striving for freedom, justice and peace, in opposition to the horrid forces of imperialism. Such ideals guided the Latvian nation during its independent life, and they are not lost today under oppressive Soviet control. That is what disturbs the Moscow installed Latvian communists, as is evidenced by their constant complaints about prevailing "bourgeois-nationalism." For this they blame "malevolent" propaganda of the "ringleaders" of emigre organizations in the West, including the American Latvian Association.

To be singled out by the Communist functionaries in such a manner is in itself a sign of distinction and it also confirms that the Latvian Nation has not lost its identity and continues to strive for the restoration of its independence.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: OUR UNRECOGNIZED ALLIES AGAINST COMMUNISM

(Address by Walter Dushnyck, of New York, delivered on July 14, 1971, at the Kiwanis Club in Buffalo, N.Y., on the occasion of the observance of "Captive Nations Week")

Mr. Chairman, Friends of Captive Nations, Ladies and Gentlemen: At the outset of my talk I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for inviting me here and allowing me to share some thoughts and observations with you on the vital problem of the Captive Nations.

The observance of Captive Nations Week from July 18 to 24, 1971 is being held on the basis of a Joint Resolution of the U.S. Congress (Public Law 86-90), which became effective as the law of the land twelve years ago, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first Presidential Proclamation, calling on the American people to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The law further authorized the President of the United States "to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. . . ."

This law was very specific as to the meaning of the term "captive nations", when it stated:

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others. . . ."

Each year, Captive Nations Week has provided a suitable framework for the American people to demonstrate their solidarity with their brethren in Central and Eastern Europe, and in Asia, who are held in captivity by the Communist regimes. Nationwide observances, preceded by Captive Nations Week proclamations by the President

and by Governors and Mayors of many states and cities, offer Americans a renewed opportunity for manifesting their concern for the plight of the captive nations, deprived of their inalienable rights to freedom and human dignity by their Communist enslavers.

Captive Nations Week in 1971 is being observed amid a series of internal events and developments in America which distract the attention of the American people. With the war in Vietnam, American prisoners of war in North Vietnamese captivity, the disarmaments talks with the Soviet Union; the break-down of law and order in the United States, rampant inflation and the general loosening of the American patriotic stance—all this is not necessarily conducive to a spirited and enthusiastic support of the captive nations and their unending quest for freedom and national independence.

But the issue of the captive nations—whether our policy-makers recognize it or not—is closely connected with our national security and our power to survive as a sovereign nation and a leader of the free nations of the world.

THE SOVIET EMPIRE VS. THE UNITED STATES

In order to properly assess and appreciate the problem of the captive nations, we should not fail to learn the nature of the Soviet Russian empire, which is regarded by some of our liberal writers, professors and even some statesmen as a "federation" not unlike our own United States. They advance all sorts of "theories" to justify their belief that Russian Communism has mellowed to the point that true and sincere coexistence with the United States is just around the corner. They further claim that the era of complete sovereignty is a thing of the past. Therefore, they urge, we should not prod the Soviet Union about its captive nations, because that would mean "interference" in the internal affairs of a sovereign country.

The Soviet Union is not a federative union, as it claims to be. Its growth and development came about through ruthless conquests and aggressions against smaller and weaker neighbors, which had been subjected to a brutal process of Russification and Sovietization. Contrary to the accepted popular view, the USSR is not a homogeneous nation, but a conglomeration of an impressive number of alien nations and peoples which are kept by force under Soviet Russian control and domination.

Out of some 235,000,000 people in the Soviet Union today, more than half are non-Russian. In 1920, after the Soviet regime was firmly established, the Kremlin re-conquered such non-Russian nations as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan although it had previously recognized the independence of these countries. Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia and Poland had escaped the Soviet Russian imperialistic claws, but not for long. In 1940 the three Baltic States were forcibly incorporated into the USSR, and after World War II the Kremlin succeeded in imposing its totalitarian rule on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, and, for a while, Yugoslavia. Moscow annexed Northern East Prussia to the USSR, and gave Russian names to such German historic cities as Koeningsberg (Kaliningrad), Tilsit (Sovetsk) and Insternburg (Chernyakhovsk). It also grabbed a few provinces of Finland—Vyborg, the shores of Lake Ladoga, the Salla and Kalastaja-Saarento regions.

In Asia the Soviet Union imposed communist rule on Outer Mongolia, Tannu Tuva, the former Japanese possessions of Southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles Islands, North Korea, North Vietnam and Tibet. Red China was originally controlled by Moscow, but lately Mao Tse-tung has been asserting himself as a "leader of world communism", and has opposed the Kremlin leaders. In our own Western Hemisphere, Moscow was its springboard in Castro's Cuba.

Thus, without counting the original captive nations which Moscow conquered in 1920, the Soviet Union has annexed, since 1945 a total of 1,977,154 square miles of foreign territories with 172,107,000 alien people. Under attack now are South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

In short, this is the record of Soviet Russian aggression and expansion. But the Soviet leaders, who frequently assail "American imperialism and aggression," have the gall to pride themselves on their "liberal policy" toward other nations. On June 20, 1967 Pravda of Moscow, reported a statement of Alexei Kosygin, Soviet Prime Minister, made on the 50th anniversary of the Soviet takeover in Russia, in which he said: "In the fifty years of its existence, the Soviet Union has respected all other nations, great as well as small. Every nation is entitled to establish an independent national state of its own . . ."

In December, 1965, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, speaking on his resolution in the United Nations, stated:

"No state has the right to intervene directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal and external affairs of any other state. Consequently, armed intervention and all forms of interference of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements are condemned . . ."

These declarations of Kosygin and Gromyko were obviously false, for it did not deter the Soviet government from sending the Red Army to invade and occupy its "socialist" satellite, Czechoslovakia, in August 1968, just as it had done during the uprisings in Hungary in 1956.

Furthermore, the grim record of the Soviet Union proves that it has constantly broken its treaties, agreements and protocols, all of which are merely means to achieve its imperialistic objectives. More than 130 years ago, a famous French aristocrat, Adolphe de Custine, a trained political observer and one graced with a broad knowledge of political and cultural developments, went on a visit to Russia. Anticipating many modern intellectuals—Koestler, Gide, Silone—de Custine went to Russia as to a "promised land." He toured the country and talked to the Czar and his court nobles. In order to impress him, the Russians treated him to pageantry, military parades and religious ceremonies. But he returned to France at the end of 1839 wholly disillusioned, saying that he was duped by the "god that failed." And he stated:

" . . . They (Russians) mean to seize by armed force the countries accessible to them; and thence to oppress the rest of the world by terror . . ."

This gifted French observer ably assessed the essence of Russian politics. General Walter Bedell Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow and former CIA Director, who wrote a preface to de Custine's book in 1951, stated that the parallels between de Custine's Russia and the present Soviet Union are both vivid and ominous: the merciless despotism, fear of the secret police, the political prisons, the purges, "confessions," censorship and slavery, the rewriting of history and, above all, the same appetite and urge for world conquest.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—A POWERFUL DETERRENT TO WORLD CONQUEST

The presence of the captive nations in the USSR and its peripheral empire constitute a powerful deterrent to Soviet plans of world conquest. The Kremlin leaders are greatly annoyed and irritated because the U.S. Congress enacted the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in 1959. The Resolution has been denounced and vilified by the Soviet leaders, in the press and over the radio, as a "cold war" instrument and "subversion" of the "peaceful Soviet paradise."

Yet, at the same time the Kremlin leaders incessantly propagate "wars of national liberation," which are primarily directed against the U.S. and its allies. The newly-emerging independent nations of Africa and Asia, and indeed, the countries of Latin America, are under perpetual barrage of Soviet propaganda, aimed at converting these peoples to the Soviet viewpoint and its political philosophy. Propaganda is followed by concrete Soviet deeds of support: weapons and other military equipment necessary for guerrilla fighters. Most of the so-called "wars of national liberation" are inspired ideologically and sustained militarily by the arms of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

THE FLIGHT OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

In enacting the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" twelve years ago, the U.S. Congress was far-seeing in defining the meaning and significance of the captive nations. It knew that the great masses of discontented people inside the Soviet Union may well undermine the power and strength of the Communist empire. We all know that during the German-Soviet war in 1941 hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops went over to the German side; the civilian population of Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic States, the Caucasus, and elsewhere welcomed the German armies not as conquerors, but as liberators, because so powerful was the hatred of Soviet Russian domination under Stalin that even Nazi Germany looked to those captive peoples as a benevolent messenger of salvation. It was only when the Nazis began their stupid, senseless and inhuman barbarities that these same peoples turned against the new dictatorship.

The Kremlin leaders know well that in any major confrontation with the United States and/or Red China, the USSR will be exposed to the assault of freedom forces from abroad. They know that they cannot commit their multi-national armies in any major war with the West, because these armies will be undermined by mass defections and desertions to the side of the enemy of the Soviet Union.

That this will be the case is borne out by a great mass of evidence at hand.

(1) Opposition of Intellectuals: In the first place, the Soviet Union is plagued with a number of unbridgeable weaknesses. There is a growing unrest and rebellion of intellectuals, both in Russia proper, and in the non-Russian republics. We all heard of such names as Sinyavsky, Daniel, Amalrik, Gri-gorenko, Sakharov, Solhenitsyn who, in their underground writings, had assailed Soviet tyranny and have demanded more personal freedom and less police control.

(2) In Ukraine, this anti-Communist opposition has a mass character, because unlike their Russian opponents, the Ukrainians fight against the Russification of the Ukrainian language and culture, as well as against the oppressive yoke of the Communist Party, which, in the case of Ukraine and other non-Russian republics, is a party imposed by Moscow. In the last 7-8 years some 300 Ukrainian intellectuals have been arrested, tried and sentenced in Ukraine. Most of these people were young people—in their mid-thirties, and all were the product of the Soviet system. Among the better known Ukrainian fighters for freedom are Vyacheslav Chornovil, Valentyn Moroz, Syvatoslav Karvansky, Ivan Kandyba, Ivan Dzyuba and others. Some of them were arrested for reading the books on Ukrainian history, published outside Ukraine; others, for disseminating copies of Pope John XXIII's encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, and the address of the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which he delivered during the unveiling in Washington, D.C. of the statue in honor of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko in June, 1964.

(3) The same repressions against restive non-Russian peoples are conducted in Lith-

uania, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, and the Caucasus;

(4) We are witnessing the systematic defections from behind the Iron Curtain: Svetlana Allilugena, ballerina Alice Markova, Soviet top-ranking nuclear scientist Nnaotole Fedoseyev, writer Anatole Kuznetsov; only a few days ago some 15 Polish tourists tried to escape from Yugoslavia to Italy; we have weekly defections of Hungarians and Czechs to Austria and Germany. All this indicates most convincingly the restlessness of the captive people in the Soviet communist empire and their desire to live in freedom.

LACK OF WESTERN RESPONSE

It is almost unbelievable that the Western world, which prides itself on upholding the general principles of freedom and emancipation should continue to be so oblivious to the plight and suffering of these "unpeoples" (the captive nations) of the Russian communist empire.

In the past, both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations adhered to the principle of containing the spread of Communism. In subsequent years, however, this policy has gradually become watered down into one of "bridge building" to Eastern Europe. Today President Nixon is advocating a dubious policy of "negotiation rather than confrontation."

The erosion of our belief in universal freedom was not a bit affected by the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the challenging "Brezhnev Doctrine," which had serious, adverse effects upon Yugoslavia and West Germany, not to mention the captive nations inside the Soviet Russian empire. This deteriorating Western policy with respect to the Soviet bloc was accompanied by the U.S.-Soviet non-proliferation treaty in 1969, the continuous SALT talks with the USSR, and the Soviet-German Agreement of 1970. From the viewpoint of the Kremlin, the Soviet leaders see no reason why they cannot call a European Security Conference which would eventually approve and sanction the much-desired status quo, and thus assure the permanent division of Europe.

But perhaps the best assessment of Western policy was made by East West Digest of London in its issue of October, 1970, which said editorially:

" . . . The West's foreign policy is still one of futile optimism geared to reconciliation and trusting such men as Brezhnev and Kosygin who have a record of incorrigible treachery. It is based on a totally false assessment of Soviet intentions and ruthlessness both at home (in the field of repression) and abroad (in the area of subversive imperialism) . . . Both the British and American governments are basically disinterested in the fate of the captive nations. Their members turn a blind eye to reports of re-Stalinization, repression, slave labor camps and putting dissident intellectuals into lunatic asylums . . ."

"Western leaders want to enjoy the friendship of both the rulers of communist states and at the same time of the peoples who endure living under such totalitarian regimes. They pursue the fatuous illusion of being all things to all men. They solemnly maintain the contemptible theory that tyranny and freedom are reconcilable and that people denied liberty will happily continue to agree to being denied the freedom that Western politicians themselves enjoy . . ."

It is recalled that immediately after the end of World War II hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist refugees were forcibly repatriated to Central and Eastern Europe in an operation known by its code name as "Operation Keehaul." Unlike the Pentagon Papers, this secret document was never made public, perhaps some important lessons could be drawn from it that could benefit those

who are still confused about the true nature of Soviet Russian imperialism.

It would be proper at this gathering to recite two cases of how the free world is still uninformed or naive as far as the captive nations are concerned.

THE CASE OF LITHUANIAN SIMAS KUDIRKA

In November, 1970 a young Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, tried to defect to the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*. He was already on the U.S. ship, but the Soviet guards who came from a nearby Soviet ship, dragged him back, beat him up, while the American captain and seamen watched idly. He was denied the right of political asylum and was handed over to the Soviet police. He believed in what he heard over our "Voice of America," and thought that there was no difference between our professed pronouncements on freedom and our practical policy of "non-confrontation." True, a "confrontation" was avoided at the sacrifice of a human being who sought freedom and was denied it. Also, at the sacrifice of a great amount of American moral and political prestige.

PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU'S POLITICAL CAPER

Another case of Western myopia or stupidity was the political caper of Prime Minister Pierre E. Trudeau of Canada. Two months ago he went to the Soviet Union, where he signed a "friendship protocol" to assert his independence from American influence. Mr. Trudeau has repeatedly warned about American influence, expressed persistent hostility to NATO and has allegedly a firm trust in the Soviet Union's veracity. While touring Ukraine, he made some observations which created a furor among some 600,000 Canadians of Ukrainian descent (the fourth largest ethnic group in Canada). He said that Ukrainians coming to Canada "found themselves living in a political structure of the same basic design as that of the Soviet Union!" The irony is that the Ukrainians who came to Canada did so primarily to escape the oppressive "political structure" of the Soviet Union.

Before going to Moscow, Prime Minister Trudeau had been asked by members of the Parliament representing strong Ukrainian settlements in Canada to raise the question of persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals by Soviet authorities. Upon his return to Canada, the Prime Minister stated that he did not find any evidence of persecution in Ukraine, and he added:

"My position in the Soviet Union or in Canada is that anyone who breaks the law to assert his nationalism does not get too much sympathy from me . . .

"I didn't particularly feel like bringing up any cases which would have caused Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Kossygin to say: 'Well, you know, why did you put in jail certain leaders of the Front of the Liberation of Quebec? After all, they think they are only fighting for the independence of Quebec. Our people say they are fighting for the independence of the Ukraine. Why should you put your revolutionaries in jail and we shouldn't put ours?'"

This ridiculous comparison of the province of Quebec and its French terrorist organization, the Liberation Front of Quebec, with the plight of the 46-million Ukrainian nation, forcibly deprived of its freedom and national independence, has rightfully provoked indignation throughout Canada not only on the part of the powerful Ukrainian ethnic group, but of other ethnic communities as well, including the English-speaking one.

A columnist in the *Toronto Telegram* wrote on June 3, 1971:

The captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain do not expect the democracies to wage a war for their liberation, but neither do they expect and certainly do not deserve, what amounts to cynical disregard of their

suffering by an elected representative of free men.

"Mr. Trudeau is the first leading politician of a democratic country who has displayed such a callous attitude.

"Other Western Prime Ministers or heads of state have visited Moscow to explore the possibilities of easing tensions of East-West armed coexistence, but none has done or said anything that could be construed as political and moral endorsement of Red fascism.

"For instance, the President of France, while concluding mutual consultation agreements in Moscow last year, said nothing the Soviet regime could exploit for its internal and external propaganda. American governments have been negotiating with Moscow for years without compromising the principle democratic countries stand for.

"Mr. Trudeau, however much he may now want to deny it, rendered the men in the Kremlin invaluable service by telling their helpless subjects that the Bolshevik dictatorship was not much different from the Canadian system of government and by alleging American military threat to our sovereignty . . ."

These two examples, the case of the Lithuanian defector, Simas Kudirka and Mr. Trudeau's political capers, indicate most vividly how the problem of the captive nations is not only misunderstood but also neglected by the free countries.

WHAT CAN WE DO TO HELP THE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

"Captive Nations Week" in 1971 affords a national forum for the discussion of issues affecting our national interest and security.

Therefore, as free citizens, we must support the policy of our government in resisting Communist aggression and communist attempts at world domination;

We must urge our government and the governments of all other free nations to prevail upon the United Nations to institute a U.N. committee to investigate Soviet Russian enslavement of the captive nations;

We must appeal to the U.S. Government to expand radio broadcasts to the captive nations via "Voice of America" and "Radio Liberty," which had been under attack by some of our liberal thinkers;

We must appeal to the U.S. Congress to create a Select Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, which would be dedicated to the study of the captive nations;

We must on all occasions, protest and denounce Communist persecution of the captive nations and the suppression of their national, religious and cultural freedoms.

In doing so, we will bring a moral support and encouragement to these hapless captive peoples who always looked to us as for guidance and moral assistance. We must not fall them, for in helping the captive nations we are helping ourselves as well.

Thank you.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House of Representatives once more observe Captive Nations Week, we must bear in mind the fact that over four-fifths of the present population of the United States was not even born when the Reds seized power in Russia back in 1917. This is not particularly surprising, but what will undoubtedly surprise many of my colleagues is that news that almost half of our present population has been born since the beginning of the cold war. Many millions of others who were alive in 1945 were too young to recall at firsthand what occurred a quarter of a century ago.

In light of these facts, we must review some of the happenings of the periods

that followed the two World Wars. The fact that they are history does not mean that they no longer concern us.

As a result of World War I, many new nations that had been parts of the German, Austrian, and Russian Empires became independent. Some of them remained free for a quarter of a century, but for others independence lasted for but a brief moment.

The Communists, who seized power from the provisional government of Kerensky, proved to be as imperialistic as the Romanoffs and others who had established and maintained the Russian Empire. The independence of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Urel, North Caucasia, and Ukraine was extinguished in 1920, while the Far Eastern Republic and Turkistan lost their freedom in 1922. Mongolia became a Communist satellite in 1924.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania lost their independence in 1940, not long after the Communists and their ideological bedfellows, the National Socialists, began World War II.

National Socialism was destroyed as a result of Germany's defeat in World War II, but communism became more powerful than ever. In Europe, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia went behind the Iron Curtain in 1946, Poland and Romania in 1947, Czechoslovakia in 1948, and Hungary and East Germany in 1949. In faroff Asia, North Korea became Communist in 1948, all of China except Taiwan in 1949, Tibet in 1951, and North Vietnam in 1954. The loss of China to communism was a devastating blow to the non-Communist world.

The last country to become part of international communism's ever widening sphere of influence was neither European nor Asiatic, but a New World nation located but a stone's throw from the United States. Cuba became a captive nation in 1960.

Lengthy as the list of captive nations has become, it would undoubtedly have become even longer had it not been for the United States. Greece and Turkey would probably have disappeared behind the Iron Curtain soon after World War II, had it not been for American assistance. South Korea is still free only because of a tremendous expenditure of American lives and material treasure. Only the most obtuse member of the surrender cult would argue that South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos would have remained outside the Communist orbit if America had not assumed the burden when France abandoned its former colonies.

Much as the overwhelming majority of Americans would like to see the captive nations regain their freedom, realism recognizes that the day of deliverance is yet in the future. A totalitarian structure that is built upon an atheistic contempt for God and an amoral disregard for man, contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. When these seeds will germinate no one can foretell, but history teaches us to hope rather than to despair.

In the meantime, let us keep the list of captive nations from growing.

Mr. Speaker, the captive nations in-

clude more than a billion victims of Communist aggression who have frequently given eloquent demonstrations of their yearnings for independence. As the leader of the non-Communist world, the United States must continue to inspire and encourage them in their desires for a restoration of their freedoms and a place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, this week as we commemorate Captive Nations Week, we must of necessity review the cause of the oppressed, captive peoples of communism in the light of President Nixon's announcement that he will be visiting Red China sometime within the next 10 months.

This is obviously a change, and another geographic area where change is supposedly working to the betterment of captive peoples is Poland. I will, therefore, concentrate my comments on these two areas.

It is my assumption that Mr. Kissinger traveled to Peking to work out the details and, in effect, complete the agreement under which President Nixon would travel to Peking. It is my further assumption that President Nixon will not consider traveling to Peking, nor could the Chinese Reds consider receiving him unless the war of aggression by the North Vietnamese against Laos and Cambodia, as well as South Vietnam has been ended.

Therefore, President Nixon certainly will not travel to Peking unless there is, in full actuality, a cease-fire in all of Indochina, return of all POW's, and release of all U.S. citizens held by the Red Chinese before he sets foot in Peking.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, in commemorating and acknowledging the spirit of Captive Nations Week, we must keep in mind the brutal Red Chinese occupation of Tibet, their military aggression against India, and their involvement in guerrilla warfare in Burma, Thailand, Malaysia and, of course, their military aggressions against U.N. forces in Korea.

The Red Chinese have also been involved in subversive acts in Kenya, Singapore, Indonesia, and other lands. They have invested heavily in factions of the Palestinian guerrilla forces, and they certainly cannot be described as a friendly, peace-loving, or democratic regime. The people of mainland China are captives of communism.

Now let me review the so-called change in Poland. This feeling of change is based upon the events beginning December 20, 1970, when the structure of power in Poland changed at the top. The First Secretary of the Polish Workers' Unity—Communist—Party, Wladyslaw Gomulka, was replaced by Edward Gierek.

It is rather remarkable to see that some people in the West are trying to read in these shifts in the guard in Gomulka's rule some significance of "liberalization" and "nationalism." It is even fashionable to conclude that these changes signify the "splintering" of Communist unity and that the change-over reduces significantly the amount of guidance and control exercised by Moscow over Eastern Europe.

This wishful thinking is not backed up with very much substance. In fact, the

comments many are making about the Gierek regime duplicate exactly the false hopes which many had when Gomulka took over.

In 1956 Gomulka was released from house arrest and became the supreme boss of Poland in October. Just as in the present circumstances, sympathetic commentators in the West were quick to praise this development as a sign of the liberalization of Communist rule in Poland. Some even read this as a shift to "nationalism" and to a brand of communism "independent from Moscow."

Let me give you some examples. On October 22, 1956, the New York Times proclaimed Gomulka "a national hero of Poland." A week later Newsweek magazine developed this theme further praising "Gomulka as a hero of millions of Poles," and as "an exponent of national communism." Newsweek even said that Gomulka "may eclipse Tito in the drive to shake the Kremlin's chains." According to Newsweek, this development "would mean eventual loss to Russia of its East European empire—biggest prize of World War II." In the same week, Time magazine concluded its evaluation with a statement that "it is conceivable that Gomulka can lead the 'liberals' to a decisive break with Russia."

This initial enthusiasm of the Gomulka regime in Poland gradually faded away when events proved that there was no real justification for such exaggerated hopes and expectations. Communist control over Poland not only did not dissipate but, with the passing of years, continued to solidify its basic framework. By 1968 the same Gomulka, who was expected to "shake the Kremlin's chains," was eagerly helping his Moscow partners to crush the liberalization effort in Czechoslovakia in a common invasion by the forces of the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, and East Germany.

Gomulka lasted 14 years until December 1970 when, after the bloody workers' riots, he was replaced by Gierek and again the West found a new hero.

There is no more justification for rejoicing in 1971 than there was in 1956. Gierek, like Gomulka, is a man who ruthlessly fought his way up through party ranks and has no extensive education or experience. However, the New York Times recently concluded that the new shift in Poland is a switch to a "technocratic management" style of operation, and that the new Gierek regime creates the impression of "sincere independence." The phrases may be different but the thought is a repetition of the same error. On October 21, 1956, the New York Times was just as sure that Gomulka would provide the type of leadership for "a different road to socialism." The Times quoted Gomulka as saying:

There is more than one road to Socialism. There is a Soviet way, there is a Yugoslav way, and there are other ways.

The Times never spelled out what those "other ways" were. On the next day, October 22, the Times further quoted Gomulka as saying to a delegation of Polish students that—

Polish troops would never fire on their brothers or on the workers.

The integrity of that promise was shattered 14 years later in December 1970, when Gomulka's security forces fired at the Polish workers on the streets of Gdansk, and Szczecin with numerous people killed and wounded. This was the end of Gomulka and his group, including President and Marshal Marian Spychalski, Secretaries of the Central Committee Zenon Kliszko and Boleslaw Jaszczuk, and others.

The new group headed by Edward Gierek is by no means any better than the one it replaced. It would be even possible to reason that the Gomulka group should be considered more representative of the grassroots of Polish "nationalist" communism—if there can be such a concept of "nationalism" in the dogmatic internationalistic Communist ideology.

Gomulka himself spent his lifetime in Poland with only 2 years in Moscow in 1934 to 1936, when, in between two jail sentences in Poland, he was sent by the party to the International Leninist School. He was fortunate to be in jail in Poland in 1937 when, by Stalin's order, all leading Communist functionaries of Poland were called to Moscow for consultations. Not a one survived the purge. Gomulka remained in a Polish jail until the outbreak of World War II and then worked in the underground under the German occupation.

By contrast, Edward Gierek spent all his adult life in France and Belgium with only 4 years in Poland in 1934 to 1938 where he was deported from France for helping to organize the first sitdown strike in French history. During World War II Gierek was active in the underground movement in Belgium as a member of the Belgian Communist Party. Only in 1948, or 3 years after the end of World War II, did Gierek come back to Poland where he was born 35 years before his homecoming.

There are many reasons to believe that the Gierek rule will be much less Polish oriented and much more internationalist and cooperative with the international purposes of the Communist Party and of Moscow than the predecessor Gomulka regime.

The sympathies and enthusiasm of the political experts who welcome the new spirit of managerial technocratic leadership in Poland seems to be completely misplaced and unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, the infamous Brezhnev doctrine applied to the Eastern European satellites of the Soviet Union dramatizes the determination of the dictators of the Kremlin to maintain their tyrannical hold on the peoples of Eastern Europe who are without exception anti-Communist. It is also necessary for us to take note of the activities of the U.S.S.R. in the Middle East, where they not only threaten the State of Israel but, in effect, are slowly asserting greater control over the radical Arab governments. The newest developments in Sudan are evidence of this.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week assumes greater importance today than at any time in the 12 years since President Dwight D. Eisenhower

signed into law the week which we observe in the cause of world freedom.

Another great American President, Abraham Lincoln, eloquently emphasized:

This government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free.

Mr. Speaker, the world cannot endure half slave and half free. Communism is a totally false philosophy. It is based on terror, it attempts to advance by outright aggression or subversion, and it has an ideology that is incompatible with the natural desire of all men to be free and to be served by governments truly reflecting their national history and traditions.

At this point, I wish to place into the RECORD the following resolutions:

Proclamation of the State of Connecticut by the Honorable Thomas J. Meskill, Governor.

Proclamation of the State of Delaware by the Honorable Russell W. Peterson, Governor.

Proclamation of the city of Lansing by the Honorable Gerald W. Graves, mayor.

Proclamation of the city of Mobile by the Honorable Robert B. Doyle, Jr., mayor.

Proclamation of the city of Baltimore by the Honorable Thomas J. D'Alessandro, III, mayor.

Proclamation of the city of Newport News by the Honorable J. W. Hornsby, Jr., mayor.

Proclamation of the city of Hartford by the Honorable George A. Athanson, mayor.

Proclamation of Metropolitan Dade County by the Honorable Stephen P. Clark, mayor.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I enclose:

An excerpt from the book, "Religion Can Conquer Communism," by O. K. Armstrong and M. Moore Armstrong.

The program of the Captive Nations Week Committee of New York for Captive Nations Week.

A press release of the Captive Nations Week Committee of New York on the sermon of Msgr. John Balrick at St. Patrick's.

An article in the Ukrainian Catholic Daily.

A letter from the Bishop of St. Nicholas in Chicago to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

A news release from the National Captive Nations Committee.

A Captive Nations Week appeal by the Women for Freedom, Inc.

The material follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, June 25, 1971.

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for inviting me to participate in the observance of "Captive Nations Week" by declaring July 18-24, 1971 as an official period of observance in Connecticut.

I will be happy to issue the official statement you request and enclose a copy for your information.

Again, thank you for writing to me on this important subject.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. MESKILL,
Governor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18-24, 1971

During the month of July we are vividly reminded of our nation's declaration of independence. Therefore, it is fitting that we remember those peoples and nations still held captive by foreign powers.

Since World War II, much of Eastern and Central Europe has been dominated by Soviet Russia. Today, communist regimes are attempting to superimpose themselves on governments in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

American men have long defended life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for their fellow countrymen and have continuously defended these same principles for other peoples on foreign soil.

In these days of stress at home and abroad, I call your attention to "Captive Nations Week" in the expectation that every Connecticut citizen will voice his support for a just and lasting peace for all self-determined peoples throughout the world.

THOMAS J. MESKILL,
Governor.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Dover, June 25, 1971.

MESSRS. DANIEL J. FLOOD, AND
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
National Captive Nations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Governor Peterson has asked me to send you the enclosed statement urging the observance of "Captive Nations Week."

He has also given his permission for you to use the statement for news release or in any manner that would aid in the observance.

Sincerely,

JERRY SAPIENZA,
Press Secretary.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR RUSSELL W. PETERSON
IN OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS
WEEK

One of the grim realities of today's world is the existence of captive nations in Eastern Europe, Asia and other parts of the world. Nations such as Hungary, Czechoslovakia, as well as many others, have shown their preference for national independence, a preference which has been ruthlessly disregarded.

With our cherished heritage of freedom and independence, we have a special obligation to offer every possible moral support to these captive nations in order to help them to maintain hope and faith in their eventual destiny as free nations.

Accordingly, as Governor of the State of Delaware, I designate the week of July 18-24, 1971, as Captive Nations Week in Delaware, and urge residents of the First State to consider the plight of those nations who do not enjoy the freedoms which we enjoy and to join in expressions of encouragement and support for their aspirations.

CITY OF LANSING,
Lansing, Mich., June 18, 1971.

MR. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
MR. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
National Captive Nations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Per your request of June 14, 1971, please find enclosed my Proclamation declaring the week of July 18-24, 1971, as "Captive Nations Week in Lansing".

Sincerely,

GERALD W. GRAVES,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Whereas: Since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of

the United States and of all the free people of the world; and

Whereas: The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Tibet, North Vietnam and others; and

Whereas: It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas: The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas: It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States are with them, their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Gerald W. Graves, Mayor of the City of Lansing, by the power vested in me, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18-24, 1971, as "Captive Nations Week in Lansing" and invite the people of our City to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge all citizens to remember those who are held in the captive nations of the world.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF MOBILE

Whereas, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that I, Robert B. Doyle, Jr., Mayor of the City of Mobile, Alabama, do hereby declare that the week of July 18 through July 24, 1971, be designated as Captive Nations week in Mobile, and invite our citizens to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS J. D'ALESSANDRO III, DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JULY 18, 1971 AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" IN BALTIMORE

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Checho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia,

Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III, Mayor of the City of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18, 1971, as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore, and call upon the citizens of Baltimore to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Newport News, Va., June 23, 1971.

MR. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
MR. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
National Captive Nations Committee
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is copy of Proclamation written by me in connection with Captive Nations Week.

A copy of said Proclamation has been given to the news media for publicizing said event. Very truly yours,

J. W. HORNSBY, Jr.,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF CITY OF HARTFORD

Whereas, there are presently one billion humans under totalitarian Red rule; and

Whereas, it is crucially important for us to morally sustain the hope and faith of these captive peoples in their eventual freedoms; and

Whereas, the massive and imposing reality of the captive nations throughout the world cannot be ignored if we value our own national freedom; and

Whereas, on the basis of Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week Resolution passed by Congress in 1959, our people will again express their moral conscience toward the captive peoples in observances of Captive Nations Week, scheduled for July 18-26, 1971; captive peoples in observances of Captive Nations Week, scheduled for July 18-26, 1971;

Now, therefore, I, George A. Athanson, Mayor of the City of Hartford, do hereby endorse the aims of the Captive Nations Committee and urge all citizens to participate in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
HARTFORD, CONN., June 23, 1971.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
National Captive Nations Committee
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MESSRS. FLOOD AND DERWINSKI: I am happy to enclose a proclamation for "Captive Nations Week", July 18-26, 1971.

Best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. ATHANSON,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT NEWS, VA.

Whereas, the massive and imposing reality of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, in the USSR, Asia and Cuba cannot be ignored if we, as Americans, value our own national freedom; and

Whereas, there are approximately one billion human beings presently under totalitarian Red rule, with the threat of same being spread more and more throughout the world, including the United States; and

Whereas, it is of crucial importance for us, as Americans, to morally sustain the hope and faith of all captive peoples in their eventual freedom from Communistic domination.

Now, therefore, I, J. W. Hornsby, Jr., Mayor of the City of Newport News, by the authority vested in me, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18-24, 1971 as Captive Nations Week and urge that the people of Newport News express their moral conscience toward the captive people throughout the world in observance of this week.

PROCLAMATION OF DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Whereas: The massive and imposing reality of oppression imposed upon some one billion inhabitants of captive nations in Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia and Cuba cannot be ignored if we in America value our national freedom, and

Whereas: The cardinal Soviet Russian objective seeks to obtain Western acquiescence to the permanent enslavement of 27 nations so Moscow's penetrations in South Asia, the Mideast, Africa and Latin America can be pursued with the least difficulty, and

Whereas: Russian enslavement of Czechoslovakia in 1968, unrest of Polish workers and the scandalous Kudirka case in 1970, as well as re-expression of the Brezhnev doctrine at the 1971 24th Party Congress in Moscow, stress the necessity to morally sustain hope and faith of all enchained peoples in their eventual freedom, and

Whereas: The U.S. Congress, through Public Law 86-90, expresses moral consciousness on behalf of all captive peoples with observance of Captive Nations Week;

Now, therefore: be it resolved that I, Stephen P. Clark, Mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning Sunday, July 18, 1971, as Captive Nations Week.

In observance thereof: I call upon the people of Metropolitan Dade County to join with me in participating, wherever and whenever possible, in ceremonies designed to make no peace with oppression but rather to help us employ our freedom in the maintenance of justice and liberty among all men and nations everywhere.

LET'S HAVE AN ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT TO FREE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By O. K. Armstrong and M. Moore
Armstrong)

Believers of all religious faiths, let us unite! Let us join to overcome the godless force that would crush all religion and would build a completely atheist society. We have nothing to lose but the chains of persecutions, restrictions, and harassments that bind our fellow believers in all Marxist lands.

And what have we to gain?

We can gain a world rid of the most reactionary ideology of modern times. We can gain a world in which young people everywhere can plan their futures without enforced military service, and can enter freely into their chosen professions, their home-making, and their community life. We can gain a world cleansed of the knock on the door at night by the dread secret police; a world without the arrests, imprisonments,

and tortures of atheist Marxist rulers.

We can gain a world in which people everywhere and of all creeds may again rear their altars and light their fires of religious faith, unhindered and unafraid.

To accomplish this history-making task, we must add to our program of moral and spiritual pressure the weapons of direct political action.

Let us hasten to agree that this does not mean taking the churches and the church organizations which we cherish into "politics" or governmental affairs. It does mean that as individual believers we can join hands across denominational lines in this matter of universal concern. We can unite as believers in God and in the unalienable rights of His children of all races and kinds to influence our public servants to help accomplish the most important mission confronting us in this modern age:

It is to regain religious liberty for all people and roll back the tide of Marxist atheism.

If ever there was a common program worthy of ecumenical cooperation, surely this is it. If ever the clear call sounded for religious unity to accomplish a specific task, that clear call is sounding now. . . .

In this common effort of Catholics and Protestants, of Christians and Jews, of Muslims and Bahai, of Buddhists and others whose religious faith prompts concern for fellow men, there need be no sacrifice of cherished beliefs. There need be no surrender of principles or creeds, no giving up of hallowed practices of church, denomination, or fellowship.

All believers, each in his own way or in collective effort within his fellowship and group, may join the ranks of those who now stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord. . . .

Whatever the believer's faith, as he faces religion's greatest challenge for survival let him take heart by remembrance of a rugged follower of the Nazarene Teacher, the Apostle Paul. Persecuted, beaten, imprisoned, tormented by infirmities but never wavering in his belief in the ultimate triumph of a righteous cause, he wrote to his friends in the struggling fellowship in Rome:

If God be for us, who can be against us?

Believers of the world, let us unite in the crusade to roll back the ominous menace of atheistic communism. We have nothing to lose but the chains that bind our fellow believers, and a whole future to gain for humankind.

The above excerpt from the book, "Religion Can Conquer Communism," was reprinted with the permission of the authors.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(13th Annual Observance, Beginning July 18, 1971)

Nationality, Veteran, Patriotic, Church, Political and Civic groups plus individuals are invited to participate in the various Captive Nations Week activities.

PROGRAM—SUNDAY, JULY 18TH: MANHATTAN
9:00 a.m. Assemble at 59th Street & 5th Ave.

9:15 Fifth Avenue Parade—59th St. to 50th St.

10:00 Memorial Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral

11:00 Fifth Avenue Parade—50th St. to Central Park Mall (Band Shell near 72nd St.)

11:45 Ceremonies, honored speakers and folklore entertainment at Central Park Mall.

2:00 p.m. Peaceful demonstration at Soviet Mission to UN—67th St. & Lexington Ave.

BRING YOUR BANNERS AND FLAGS

Groups and individuals may participate in all or any part of the above program. For further information, please contact the Committee (below).

Judge Matthew Troy, Chairman.

Dr. Ivan Docheff, Exec. Vice Chrmn.
 Captive Nations Week Committee of New
 York, P.O. Box 1204, New York, NY 10017;
 Phone: 367-7266 or YU2-6505 Evenings.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK,
 COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK,
 New York, N.Y., July 16, 1971.

UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC PRIEST TO PREACH
 SERMON AT ST. PATRICK'S

This year, the observance of Captive Nations Week in New York City will begin with the Fifth Avenue Parade from 59th Street to St. Patrick Cathedral at 9:15 a.m. The Solemn Mass will be celebrated by Monsignor John Balkunas starting at 10:00 a.m., and the sermon at St. Patrick's Cathedral will be delivered by the Ukrainian priest, Father Provincional Patrik Paschak, OSBM of Astoria, N.Y.

Following the Liturgy, the participants will proceed in formation to Central Park's Bandshell for a rally. The rally will open with the Pledge of Allegiance by Col. Robert G. Goff, Commander of CWV, Queens Chapter, with opening address by Hon. Matthew J. Troy, and followed by remarks of Dr. Ivan Docheff, Chairman of American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., George Woloshin, Ukrainian-American student leader, and by the guest speaker. A program of folk songs and dances performed by various nationality groups will follow.

After the Rally in Central Park's Bandshell, the participants are going to march to Soviet Russia's Mission to the United Nations, 67th Street and Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. to picket in order to call the attention of our fellow Americans and the world to the real enemy of peace and to the main source of the international tension.

By supporting Captive Nations Week Observance we give hope to those in the Russian-Communist and other slavery aspiring for freedom and independence, and we help to preserve freedom in the United States of America.

We implore the News Media and Public to listen to us on July 18, 1971, as we want to preserve freedom here, and we want to restore it everywhere on the globe.

Thank you.

MICHAEL SPONTAK,
 Secretary.

[From the Ukrainian Catholic Daily, July 15, 1971]

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS SCORECARD: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18-24, 1971

(Remarks of Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, May 4, 1971—Conclusion)

(B) THE KUDIRKA CASE

Vibrant conscience expresses itself in many diverse ways, and one of the most important is ready access to political asylum. This has been a time-honored principle of our Republic and a prime reflector of the American conscience. An outrageous violation of this principle occurred in November 1971, when a Lithuanian sailor by the name of Simas Kudirka leaped to freedom from a Russian fishing trawler off Martha's Vineyard and was brutally returned by our Coast Guard. The disclosures in this case will indicate the lapse of conscience and political ineptitude described earlier, in this case a sample of the authorities involved.

It is unnecessary here to dwell on the eye-opening details of the case, for the published hearings are available to the public. From the politico-moral viewpoint, suffice it to say that, traditionally, the extension of political asylum under whatever circumstances, on land, sea or in the air, has been automatic. One of the conclusions arrived at by a congressional body with reference to an involved officer clearly shows the moral aspect of the scandalous case: "In other

words, he was saying: 'I've got it made. What do I care for any other human being.' If this attitude is typical of high officials in the Coast Guard, God help America."

But the additional fact is that this human being was defecting from Russia domination of his captive land, Lithuania. A politico-moral sensitivity to this circumstance could only be derived from proper training in terms of the captive nations approach. The testimony reveals how gravely derelict we are in this important respect. Consider this from a Coast Guard officer: "I didn't and I still don't feel there are any facts that the Russians go around killing people." This quote is accurate but the committee did also conclude, "A reading of the many communications on the Kudirka case points up the need not only for aggressive action but for a refresher course in basic English for both Coast Guard and State Department officers." However, aside from the English, it would probably flabbergast the officer to learn that over the past fifty years some 80 million lives have been sacrificed by the Russian totalitarians. The answers given by Admiral Ellis to Representative Derwinski's questions concerning education on the Soviet Union and Russian contempt for international law are enough to indicate the low state of our training."

(C) POLITICAL WARFARE ON THE U.S.
 TERRAIN

A careful documentation of this subject would have to cover enemy subversive preparations as far back as 1961, that is for overt operations in this form of bombings, propaganda, demonstrations and assassinations. Those of us who as far back as 1952 advocated the creation of a Freedom Academy for the study of Red political warfare can take pride in our vision of things to come. Some senatorial reactions to the bombing of the Senate in March 1971—such as "You wonder what motivates people to do a thing like this" or "The massive bombardment we are continuing year after year against the people of Indochina has its counterpart in the mounting destruction of humane values in our own land"—actually underscore the desperate need of this Academy, even for some naive Senators.

The relation of this dimension to the captive nations lies in the fact that the Russians, through proxy procedure, have established and are supporting training centers in these nations for this operation. For years Moscow has maintained simulated American towns in Ukraine for such training. Cuba has over forty such centers to receive young American renegades under cover of cutting sugar canes. The ouster of four Russian diplomats from Mexico in March, 1971, involved the training of Mexican traitors in North Korea. One would have to be blind, indeed, not to see Hanoi's long arm of supporters in most of the anti-war demonstrations here. In short, it is not just Communist Party participation in this operation to achieve defeat for the U.S. in Vietnam; the preparatory be blind, indeed, not to see Havana, Hanoi, Prague, Pyonyang and other proxy centers of captive lands.

(D) THE 24TH CPSU AND THE CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN USSR

While captive resources are increasingly exploited for the training of traitors in political warfare management in the U.S. and elsewhere, patriots and freedom-fighters in the captive nations seek ways and means to express their nation's desire for freedom and hope for eventual liberation. It should be emphasized that our traitors receive substantial support from our enemies, the patriots in and from the captive nations have not enjoyed equivalent assistance. Nonetheless, in the recent period, the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia, the outbreaks in Poland, the arrests of intellectuals in Ukraine,

the inter-republic frictions in Yugoslavia, and the mutual charges of imperialism and colonialism in Moscow and Peking also reflect the basic and imposing reality of the captive nations within the Red Empire itself. The cardinal objective of Moscow and its syndicate members has been and will continue to be the acquisition of Free World agreement to the permanent captivity of their dominated peoples, but the captive nations themselves will from time to time impress themselves on Free World attention, if not on its prudent and insurable aid.

Thus, as concern the pressure of invincible nationalism and the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in March-April of 1971, served up additional examples of the far-reaching ramifications and impact of the captive nations. The demands on the part of the Japanese, Belgian, Chilean and other delegations to the Congress for "independence of each party and noninterference in one another's affairs" may be viewed by some as expressions of nationalism, but there is little reason to count on them. Each of these parties would be for naught in their respective countries if there were no powerful Soviet Union. The same applies to the CP's in the Red Empire, as in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Ukraine and so forth.

What by far was more important was the string of slavish obeisances uttered by leaders of the non-Russian CP's in the USSR. Listen first to Brezhnev: "All the nations and nationalities of our country, above all the great Russian people, played their role in the formation, consideration and development of this mighty union of equal nations that have taken the road to socialism." No sooner was this myth propounded that the so-called Ukrainian quickly added, "The revolutionary energy, dedication, diligence and profound internationalism of the Russian people have quite legitimately won them the sincere respect of all the other peoples of our Socialist motherhood." Plainly, isn't Russian domination a paradise of priceless blessings? The Armenian Kochinyan put in his bit of praise for "the role of the culture of the Great Russian people." The Azerbaijani Aliyev piped in "the friendship and mutual assistance of Soviet peoples, headed by our elder brother, the great Russian people" and the Turkestanian Rashidov ranted about "the great striving of people of all nationalities to learn the Russian language . . ." as . . . "convincing evidence of the dedication of Soviet people to this union, of their love and respect for their elder brother." Oh, so sweet this Russification!

Underlying each of these spurious utterances, is of course, the fear of rampant nationalism in the USSR, which justifies the Amalrik question, "Will the Soviet Union Survive by 1984?" The Latvian Voss brought this into focus with his euphemisms about "Our whole Socialist reality brings up the people in the spirit of friendship and fraternity of the peoples of the USSR . . ." The Latvian rabble, already thrown on the dustbin of history maliciously libel the friendship and unity of the Soviet people. They spread untruthful statements that suppression of national minorities exists in the USSR . . . Only isolated politically immature people fall for the bait of such, nationalistic fables." Need more be said about the towering reality of the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself?

A NEW FOREIGN POLICY? PINGING RATHER THAN PONGING

The scope, ramifications, theoretic structural unity, and fundamentation of captive nations reality and mode of analysis should be perfectly clear by now. In present-day, confused America, these aspects and features deserve wide circulation for sober thought

and action. The forum provided by Captive Nations Week in the third week of July (the 1971 Week being July 18-24) should generate such constructive discussion. The President can lead in this with a more forceful proclamation. The Congress can pave new paths by creating a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. And our foreign policy toward the Soviet Union can be realistically reshaped to deal effectively with Moscow. Even the ping-pong diplomacy of the present, engendering evolving American-Red Chinese contacts and relations, necessitates careful consideration of the captive nations in the Red Chinese imperial complex.

Upon the issuance of the 617-page State Department report on the State of the World, Secretary of State Rogers declared, "My great hope is that the path we are taking can help create among Americans a new national unity and purpose in our foreign policy—a policy no longer haunted by the past, but committed freshly to the opportunities of the future. One cannot but strongly share this hope, and at the same time point to the captive nations approach as its best means of realization. The President's doubt about us ever having another war won't be justified without this approach. To secure peace with freedom means to ping rather than just pong. Opportunities for ping-pong are great with the captive nations."

THE ST. NICHOLAS DIOCESE,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1971.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, Alexandria, Va.

MY DEAR DR. DOBRIANSKY: Once again the voice of free nations throughout the world find a most appropriate occasion to unite their efforts in behalf of the greatest blessing mankind enjoys on earth—freedom.

The strength of our efforts, commemorated uniquely during July 18-24, 1971, Captive Nations Week, evokes the strongest response possible, that of moral reaction, to the fate of millions who are deprived of both civil and religious freedom. The tragic fate of these countless victims is a constant reminder that the peace and good will which are the goals of civilized nations remain still an elusive objective. The most sacred rights of man are contravened with impunity, and a physical and moral enslavement, incompatible with human dignity, is imposed even on entire nations. The ruthless force and devious guiles of atheistic communism, working contrary to the religious, cultural and economic aspirations of humanity, prolong such evil by attacking the very resources it seizes: the will of man, the creativity of the human spirit, and the hopes for an improved world.

The Ukrainian nation, one of the first victims of this ruthless persecution, nevertheless stands in the vanguard of all captive nations to contradict whatever ominous threats emanate from the Soviet Empire. The indomitable surge to freedom of Ukraine, together with that of other nations laboring under a similar yoke, proclaims that the human spirit is mightier than any force seeking to restrict it, and that aspirations toward freedom can never be permanently denied.

Atheistic communism has set itself in opposition to both God and man, seeking to establish itself as the absolute for all being and activity. Its downfall is already confirmed in this concentration of evil, and we re-new our confidence that history will record its demise along with previous dictatorships.

Our prayers this day are offered for continued strength of purpose, for universal peace and understanding, for the conversion of enemies, and for the enduring blessing of Almighty God upon humanity and the world He has created.

Very sincerely,
JAROSLAV GABRO,
Bishop of St. Nicholas in Chicago.

NATIONAL CAPTIVE
NATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1971.

THE CONFRONTATION OF NEGOTIATION

On the eve of the 1971 Captive Nations Week, the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington has appealed to the President and Congress for a strong expression of "the moral conscience of America toward the one-third of humanity still in the bondage of totalitarian Red tyranny." Proclaimed by the President and most Governors and Mayors of large cities, Captive Nations Week will be nationally observed on July 18-24. This will be the 13th Observance since Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86-90) in 1959.

Led by its Chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the committee stresses in its appeal to every Senator and Congressman, "No matter how engrossed we might become in impulsive domestic problems, both useful and trivial, the realities of the world we live in may prove to be explosive if we fail to regain our perspective." Charging that we have lost our perspective concerning "the captive nations in toto," Dr. Dobriansky states, "the imposing reality of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, in the USSR itself, Asia and Cuba cannot be ignored if we value our own national freedom." A *Congressional Record* reprint, titled "The Captive Nations Scorecard" and distributed widely by NCNC, points out that if some irresponsible notions on Vietnam were to succeed, more nations in southeast Asia would be added to the now long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920.

"In real terms, the issue today," says the Professor, "is not confrontation or negotiation, but the confrontation of negotiation." His current book *U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth* highlights the instrument of confetti diplomacy that Moscow and Peking are confronting us with. Behind this confetti, the NCNC statement declares, "The cardinal Soviet Russian objective has persistently been to extract Western acquiescence to the permanent captivity of 27 nations in order that Moscow's penetrations in South Asia, the Mideast, Africa and Latin America may be effected with minimum resistance."

The committee also announced today the election of Dr. Alton Ochsner, Jr. (M.D.) of Louisiana and Mr. Joseph Lesawyer of New Jersey as executive members of NCNC. For years Dr. Ochsner, who is chairman of the Americanism committee of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, has spearheaded the Captive Nations Week event in New Orleans. His dedication and selfless works for the cause of human freedom have won him national renown. Mr. Lesawyer is president of the Ukrainian National Association, an American fraternal that has supported the captive nations movement since 1959. The new member has frequently testified at national party conventions in behalf of the captive nations idea.

During Captive Nations Week, NCNC will emphasize (1) the largest captive nation of 700 million Chinese and the U.N. ineligibility of the unrepresentative Peking regime, (2) the need to expand Radios Free Europe and Liberty against Moscow's anti-American propaganda, (3) the Supplemental Statement of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel on U.S. insecurity in the 70's, and (4) the creation of a Select House Committee on the Captive Nations, "among other ends to symbolize our conscience toward the plight of one billion souls."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK APPEAL BY WOMEN

Women for Freedom and the undersigned women's organizations are appealing to all members of their sex to manifest concern for the millions upon millions of their sisters throughout the world who are still suffering from the burden of being females, and even more so for their religious, political, and social beliefs. These are the enslaved women

of the Captive Nations who yearn to express their womanhood through their love of God, family, and friends, but who are denied these basic freedoms by the Communist oppressors of their lands.

Therefore, we call specific attention to the 18th Captive Nations Week which is being observed this year July 18-24 throughout our nation and other free countries. It behooves all women who cherish freedom to participate actively in Captive Nations Week observances in their communities. But beyond this, concerned women should carry forward their commitment to their sisters in captivity through their community groups, organizations, churches, communications media and legislative representatives. In keeping with their love of human dignity, they should seek implementation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, and through their congressmen, they should work for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. At every opportunity they should strive to call attention to the denial of human rights to our sisters in captivity throughout the world.

For the millions of women who do not share with us the dignity of free and unfettered womanhood, we must offer hope, courage and commitment to help them escape the bondage which destroys them not only as women but as human beings.

This, then, would be a true women's liberation movement!

Women for Freedom, Inc., Byelorussian American Women's Association, Czechoslovak National Council of Women in Exile, Georgian National Alliance, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Ukrainian National Women's League of America.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in the 13th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we set aside this week each year to focus our attention on our 100 million captive brothers and sisters in Communist-dominated Eastern and Central Europe.

Early in this century many American immigrants were fortunate enough to have escaped Communist oppression in their native lands. Others were not so fortunate and were forced to remain behind. It is to these proud people we now offer our affection and our admiration.

Americans everywhere feel a deep compassion for their loved ones across the ocean. No Iron Curtain or Berlin Wall can sever family ties or dampen the human spirit. Indeed, such manifestations of Communist oppression as these only serve to rekindle the flames of freedom. That freedom-loving spirit lives in all the captive lands. It exists in the hearts of those oppressed as certain as faith and hope and the will to be free exist.

The freedom-loving people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia knew this feeling. Despite overwhelming odds and the prospect of much bloodshed, they fought valiantly but vainly to shed the yoke of totalitarianism. In the face of such courage, can we, as Americans, afford to let our moral consciences sleep? Can we afford to watch the flames of freedom smolder?

I sincerely believe the deprivation of liberty does not destroy the desire for it. That is the reason my colleagues and I can look to the day when the peoples of the captive nations will once again be free.

Therefore, let us officially manifest both to those governments that oppress,

and to oppressed peoples everywhere, our deep and enduring concern for the freedom of all nations. Let us reassert our willingness to support those who seek the cherished fruits of liberty.

We Americans extend our hands in friendship to the people of Eastern and Central Europe. We offer our prayers and words of encouragement to nourish and strengthen their spirit. We endorse, and will continue to boldly and firmly endorse, the proclamations designating Captive Nations Week until freedom, self-determination, and human dignity are a reality for all mankind.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, once again this week we observe Captive Nations Week. We set aside this week each year to reaffirm our commitment to freedom for all men, and to show that we do not forget the citizens of those countries which still suffer under Communist domination.

During the past year, we have seen many signs that these oppressed peoples have not given up their hope for freedom and self-determination. The unrest among Polish workers this past winter is a sign that the peoples of Eastern Europe do not support their Communist rulers. The continued resistance of Ukrainians and other nationalities to the Soviet Government's policy of forced Russification is proof that all is not well in the Soviet Union itself. And most spectacularly, the heroic protests of Soviet Jews have called the attention of the entire world to the inequities of Soviet nationality policy.

But these are only the most recent indications of the courage and dedication of these captive nations. The record of many years shows their unbroken determination to enjoy the blessings of peace and freedom.

Living in freedom, we often tend to forget that much of the world languishes under Communist domination. This week gives us a chance to show that we have not forgotten, to show our hope that these nations and the entire world may soon enjoy peace and liberty.

Let us hope for the day when there will no longer be a need for Captive Nations Week. But until that fortunate time arrives, let us rededicate ourselves to bringing to the captive peoples, and to all mankind, the chance to live in freedom.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the commemoration of the history of the gallant people living in Communist occupied Cuba, Europe, and Asia. A number of years ago Congress established the custom of setting aside a week in symbolic behalf of those people enslaved by tyranny.

Throughout this Communist occupation the people behind the Iron Curtain have been subjected to a determined effort to destroy their national heritage. Hundreds of thousands of them have been dragged from their lands by the Communists intent upon destroying the ethnic character of their populations. Not in their long and glorious histories have these people experienced such a barbarous annihilation as they have experienced during the years of Soviet Russian rule.

Yet in spite of the attempts of the Communists to suppress their national aspirations, these captive peoples continue to express their desire for freedom. Their continuous opposition and their attempts to revolt have demonstrated to the world that these people will always strive for freedom and for the right to determine their own destinies.

The people of the United States recognize the plight of the captive people and anticipate the day when they will be allowed to rule their homeland unrestricted by Communist tyranny. I join with them in praying for the day when the Communist overlords are finally expelled and the enslaved peoples will once again take their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues and all concerned Americans in the 13th annual observance of Captive Nations Week, July 18-24. We again give public notice that all people under the heel of oppressive governments, Communist and others, have the support and sympathy of the United States in their struggle against tyranny.

Since President Eisenhower began the observance in 1959, Captive Nations Week has served to demonstrate that the American people realize and are grateful for the responsibility of a free society. The liberties embodied in our Constitution must not be taken for granted. To insure their continued existence we must continue to work for the freedom of all nations. Our most important export is our free system which, more than any other single factor, will serve to crumble the walls of tyranny which encircle captive nations worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue our support for these millions of individuals in their struggle for self-determination. To protect our own precious freedom we must aid them toward choosing and directing their own forms of government.

Captive Nations Week should serve to remind all U.S. citizens that they must guard against any encroachment upon their liberty, and it should be a beacon to the subjects of repressive governments everywhere that the free citizens of America have not forgotten their plight and struggle. Mr. Speaker, I urge all patriotic Americans to join me and other Members of Congress in observing Captive Nations Week. It is a service in the interest of a free America and a free world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the deprivation of inalienable human rights by a totalitarian government is fortunately an unknown concept in the American experience. Yet in the satellite nations of the Soviet Union and Communist States of Asia, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—ideals which free men take for granted—are merely hollow phrases, flouted by tyrannical regimes. It is in recognition of this suppression of the freedom and independence of literally hundreds of millions of Europeans and Asiatics that we once again formally proclaim Captive Nations Week.

In July of 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a free world leader who

devoted his life to the opposition of tyranny of all kinds, joined with Congress to establish Captive Nations Week. The congressional resolution, noting the denial of national independence of 22 states because of direct or indirect aggression by the Soviet Union, has annually permitted us to focus unified national attention on the plight of those unfortunate people behind the Iron Curtain. Twelve years later, this resolution empowering American presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved in the captive nations of the world" must sadly still be in effect.

The continuing subjugation of civil liberties in the Communist controlled nations serves to illustrate the fundamental hypocrisy of Marxist doctrine. Karl Marx, depicting the downfall of capitalism in the Communist Manifesto, predicted that governmental dictatorship would wither away once the communistic proletariat structure had replaced the old capitalistic system. Yet rather than miraculously vanishing after the Bolshevik Revolution, the central political machine rapidly expanded to infringe on virtually every phase of life of the Russian citizenry. Within three decades the Stalinist colossus had overflowed its borders and brutally annexed the ten neighboring nations to the west.

Since these illegal invasions, every effort to counter Soviet hegemony in these lands has been viciously stamped out. The facts speak for themselves. In 1956 the Polish workers of Poznan were brutally suppressed when they rose up against the puppet dictatorship in Warsaw. That same year witnessed Russian tanks firing on Hungarians in the streets of Budapest. In Berlin the puppet Communist government was forced to construct a physical barrier to prevent mass flight to a free land. Three years ago, troops of the Soviet Union and four of her satellites invaded Czechoslovakia to thwart the burgeoning "liberal" policies of the Dubcek regime. The pronouncement of the Brezhnev doctrine, stating the intention of the Soviet Union to interfere with any Communist state in which forces hostile to socialism seek to infect the public mind with capitalistic ideals, expressly commits the Soviet Union to continued direct domination of all captive nations.

I join with my distinguished colleagues in urging all Americans to participate in Captive Nations Week by reevaluating our own rights and freedoms which are easily taken for granted in our prosperous and fortunate land. It is my prayer that the millions of people living in captivity may find strength in the expressions of sympathy and spirit of hope which reaches out to them through the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we once again observe Captive Nations Week with words of hope for the enslaved peoples of the world, and with faith that ultimately self-determination will be restored so that they can freely decide the form of government under which they choose to live.

On these occasions in the past, I have

urged that the House of Representatives give more than lipservice to its good intentions by enacting the resolution which would create a special committee on the captive nations. I have been co-sponsoring this resolution in repeated Congresses and it still is gathering dust in committee. Our words on the House floor today would be given more credence were we to insist that this resolution be brought to the whole House for a vote. Creation of the committee, in the words of the resolution, would provide a "continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for world peace with freedom and justice".

For the benefit of those who may not be familiar with this legislation, I wish to place it in the RECORD at this point, with my fervent hope that at long last it will receive the approval it so richly merits:

H. RES. 293

Whereas on the all-important issue of imperio-colonialism the posture of imperialist Moscow, as shown in part by the rape of Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev doctrine, has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the eleven anniversaries of Captive Nations Week have clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas, following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that, in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our time is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to shed popular light on this issue by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement

to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide, anti-American propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalitarian form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas, in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the twelve Presidential proclamations, it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for world peace with freedom and justice; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a nonpermanent committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1972.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and

fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

SEC. 6. The committee shall enjoy a non-standing status, performing its duties in the course of the Ninety-second Congress and subject to renewal only as determined by needs in the completion of its work and further purposes of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during this week commemorating Captive Nations Week, I wish to pay tribute to the courage and determination of the peoples of the captive nations for their continuing efforts to achieve their personal freedoms.

This week marks Captive Nations Week which was inaugurated in 1959 by a joint resolution of the Congress—Public Law 86-90—a time when we must once again solemnly reaffirm our commitment to the 100 million people in East Europe. Twelve years ago, the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to issue a Presidential proclamation to that effect.

We have seen a continuation of Communist domination of the countries in East Europe. Last year, however, there was open protest in Poland by workers against higher prices for food. These protests led to the downfall of Gomulka.

The goal of the Soviets at present is to maintain the status quo in the captive nations. The Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty for Eastern Europe is not acceptable to free men.

The United States needs to continue to use all the resources of diplomacy, morality, and world public opinion so that freedom is ultimately restored to the peoples of the captive nations.

We know that while the Communists can stamp out the flame of revolt, as we witnessed in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the spark of freedom continues to live in the hearts of the people living behind the Iron Curtain. We know that they await the day when they will rise up and throw off the yoke of tyranny.

We, therefore, observe Captive Nations Week in the hope that our concern in their welfare will hasten the day in which the peoples of these countries join the family of free nations.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to join my colleagues in the House in the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week.

The 86th Congress wisely set aside the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week and thus gave the American people an opportunity to reiterate their support for the universal principles of freedom and self-determination for all of mankind. It is my hope and belief that this annual observance serves to sustain the hopes of captive peoples throughout the world that freedom shall one day return to their lands.

It is saddening, indeed, that one of the tragic legacies of World War II is the continuing domination by the Soviet Union of the people of many European nations. The coldly calculating policy of Soviet colonialism and exploitation is forced upon the peoples of many lands through Communist tyranny and military force.

The specter of communism also has been forced upon hundreds of millions of

people in other nations throughout the world. In every instance, the Communist dictatorships seek to enslave the minds and hearts of their subject peoples through the device of totalitarian control. Individual liberties are denied and imprisonment or worse is the lot of those who dare to protest.

Communist imperialism has led to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, Slovakia, North Viet Nam, Cuba, and others.

Recent history makes it clear, however, that the peoples of these nations do not willingly accept Communist domination. The people of Poland, for example, have maintained a continuing struggle for their freedom against the Soviet-dominated government of Poland. The most recent example of their resistance came in December of 1970 when Polish workers demonstrated in the streets against the economic policies of the Gomulka regime and forced the government to substantially ease their plight. The peoples of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other nations have similarly demonstrated their disdain for their Communist oppressors.

We all hope that this observance of Captive Nations Week will strengthen the will of oppressed peoples throughout the world and encourage their Communist masters to restore freedom to these nations.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time when all Americans again join in recognizing the plight of those people who still live under captivity in totalitarian societies, I think it is important for us to reexamine some of those assumptions that were universally accepted by Americans at the end of World War II than they would seem to be today.

At that time, one of our primary objectives for going to war—as had been our primary objective in World War I—was to make the world safer for democracy. In Woodrow Wilson's phrase, "to make the world safer in the post world war era for all individuals in the enjoyment of their inalienable rights."

We have in recent times, however, heard an argument gaining force that the Soviets have some kind of a claim to enjoy a sphere of influence, and that sphere of influence, of course, involves holding many millions of people in subjugation. The American view, by contrast, was the basis for the Atlantic Charter, the Charter of the United Nations, and the other World War II declarations to which the Soviet Union was a party, and to which the Soviet Union has turned its back. Abraham Lincoln said better than a century ago that this Nation could not exist half slave and half free and before the century was out, it would be either all one or all the other. I think in our telescoped world of the 20th century, one might appropriately say that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. And it must be the con-

tinuing commitment of all of those people who cherish liberty to renew their dedication and their consecration to those ideals of liberty for which this Nation has gone to war in many times past.

The imposing reality that there are still people living in captive countries cannot be ignored. There are many that would like to wish it away. But the fact is that in 1968 Czechoslovakia saw a reassertion of Soviet Russian domination; in our country we had, at the end of 1970, the famous Kirdurka case—the Lithuanian sailor who sought asylum and was denied it—an incident which has placed a blemish on our moral conscience. The Polish unrest at the end of 1970 was also an indication of the pertinence and the relevancy of Captive Nations Week. In addition to that the reemphasis placed on the Brezhnev doctrine at the 24th Communist Party Congress last March and April was only another way of saying that Moscow is intent upon maintaining its control in Central Europe; in the U.S.S.R.; among the many non-Russian nations; in Asia; and in Cuba. In conclusion I would like to recite a quotation from the former House Speaker, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, who stated:

We must never for a moment forget the nations large and small which live under dictatorship. We must never forget the ideals of the people who yearn for freedom, and most of all we must never forget that it is freedom which is the truth they seek, and cannot be forgotten.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, each year Americans observe the date our Nation won its freedom in a war against tyranny nearly 200 years ago. The 4th of July has become quite an occasion for us. It is a national holiday. We take off work. We gather with friends and relatives for picnics and reunions. We listen to patriotic speeches, watch a parade of bands, and top the whole day off with a grand and glorious display of fireworks.

I admit I enjoy these festivities. I relish a 3-day holiday and the time I can spend relaxing with my family. Yet, I cannot help but feel the true feeling for the fourth has been lost. It has become something like a summertime Christmas, decorated with so much tinsel and other trimmings that we have buried the real observance of freedom. Our appreciation for what we have in this Nation has been dulled.

Fortunately, I get a reminder each year which makes me reflect on what it does mean to be an American. The reminder comes in the form of an invitation to participate in the annual observance of "Captive Nations Week." The Assembly of Captive European Nations never fails to point out there are hundreds of millions of people in Europe who look toward the United States as the symbol of liberty.

Like millions of Americans, I have a kinship with those people, the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania. The district I represent, the 20th District of Pennsylvania, has strong ties with these nations. We know the people there nurture a strong, fierce desire to be free. Quite possibly

their desire is greater than ours since we have basked in the light of liberty for nearly 200 years, while they are denied the right of all men and must fight continually to gain it against overwhelming odds. We have seen this desire burst into hot flame. It did in 1956 in Poland and Hungary; in 1968 in Czechoslovakia; and last December again in Poland. Their Communist captors, however, were quick and brutal in stifling the flames before they spread.

The embers of that fire cannot be permitted to be extinguished. That is why each year for the past 12 years the President of the United States has set aside the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week" and urged all Americans, regardless of nationality, to demonstrate a united support of freedom for those oppressed. This is the fuel which we, who enjoy freedom, must use to fan the flames which burn in nations shut off from the world by a curtain of captivity.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is an obligation, not a pleasure or privilege, to join with the Assembly of Captive European Nations in supporting the universal principles of freedom and self-determination for all mankind. We cannot afford to forget them. The world cannot afford to forget them.

WILL AMTRAK BECOME A SUCCESS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I re-introduced House Joint Resolution 613 to improve the national railroad passenger service and for other purposes, bringing the total number of cosponsors to 51. At this point I include a list of those cosponsors:

LIST OF COSPONSORS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 613

Andrews of North Dakota, Aspin, Baker, Bennett, Brademas, Brinkley, Carney, Collins, Conable, Conte, Diggs, Donohue, Dow, Dulski, Duncan, Fish, Grasso, Gubser, Halpern, Hansen of Washington, Harrington, Hicks, Hillis, Horton, Keating, Kemp.

King, Lent, Link, McCloskey, McClure, McKeivitt, McKinney, Minshall, Morse, O'Konski, Podell, Powell, Quillen, Reid of New York, Roe, Roush, Roybal, Schwengel, Seiberling, Smith of New York, J. William Stanton, Stratton, Terry, Ullman, Whitehurst.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, today, 23 of us cosigned the following letter which was mailed to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1971.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned, have noted the recent Amtrak decision to incorporate a Washington, D.C.-Cumberland-Clarksburg-Parkersburg route into the basic system. This follows a similar announcement to reinstate rail passenger service in Montana, also at no cost to the states involved.

We believe this comes at a most inopportune time, for it is certain to have an adverse psychological influence on any state

planning to vote on appropriations for section 403(c) funds for maintenance of rail passenger service.

We do not believe Amtrak should continue to add to the basic routes by following this seemingly arbitrary, capricious and piecemeal procedure.

We therefore call upon you as Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to initiate a full investigation into the selection process of new routes, and to request Amtrak to make a study as to ways to expand this system under existing or new legislation.

We firmly believe unless Amtrak deals with all parts of the Nation with fairness and equity, it cannot become a success.

Sincerely,

Les Aspin, Charles E. Bennett, Jack Brinkley, Silvio O. Conte, Ella Grasso, Seymour Halpern, Michael Harrington, Louise Day Hicks, Elwood Hillis, Frank Horton, Jack Kemp, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., James A. McClure, Joseph M. McDade, William E. Minshall, F. Bradford Morse, Alvin E. O'Konski, Carl D. Perkins, Walter E. Powell, J. Edward Rouse, Henry P. Smith, III, John H. Terry, Al Ullman.

Mr. Speaker, the States of Michigan, Ohio, and New York worked long and hard within the concept of section 403(c) to obtain a temporary route, in addition to the previously announced basic system, from New York City to Detroit by way of Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, and Chicago. It is probable that Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois will join in the agreement later.

Many meetings were held with transportation leaders in the various States, and I was fortunate to be on hand in Cleveland at the first, key, joint meeting. I then arranged a meeting for the Great Lakes group with Amtrak officials so we could determine firsthand how that temporary route could be obtained.

Amtrak officials laid down some strict requirements, not to mention the fact that New York, Ohio, and Michigan had to pledge to pick up two-thirds of the losses which could range from \$3 to \$5 million. The Governors and legislative leaders of the above States had to come out with definitive statements regarding the pledge, and legislation authorizing the funding was also a requirement.

After a tremendous extra effort by the States and after a lot of anxiety, Amtrak finally granted the temporary service. However, this is the way it should be, but I felt that two-thirds was too much for the States to bear and therefore my legislation reduces down the State contribution to one-third.

Nothing has been done in either the Senate or the House to ease the burden on the State contribution under section 403(c). But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, what do we read in the paper—Montana and West Virginia get temporary service with no pain or strain. This is arbitrary, capricious, and discriminatory. It is an insult to every State legislature in the country with the exception of those that benefit from preferential treatment.

For this reason, a number of us have cosigned a letter to Chairman STAGGERS requesting prompt hearings. We want the Amtrak officials called before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to explain this action. Without an equitable program, Amtrak is doomed to failure.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with a number of my colleagues in addition to the cosigners and cosponsors and we are all anxiously awaiting a full investigation into Amtrak policies. Should this not be forthcoming in the near future, I have promised my colleagues that I will take a special order for 1 hour at which time we will review in depth Amtrak decisions and discuss ways and means to end these discriminatory actions.

In view of this, I cannot predict what action will be taken by the legislatures of New York, Ohio, and Michigan in appropriating moneys to keep their agreement viable. Amtrak certainly gave the Great Lakes agreement an adverse psychological blow.

However, Mr. Speaker, we all want to see Amtrak become a success. I certainly hope the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will give them a chance.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S DENUNCIATION OF BLACK LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Vice President AGNEW this past weekend denouncing black leadership in America while heaping praise upon the leaders of African nations are typical Agnewisms—wedges planted deliberately in attempt to divide and conquer. His attack follows a very consistent and typical pattern. It was scarcely surprising to anyone who has read or heard his utterances on any segment of the public, branches and members of government, students, peace seekers, the press, and on and on, so long as they are those whose views are at variance with his. This apparently is the Vice President's way of fiddling while Rome burns; of telling the world it is marching out of step with him. His attack was new only in the fact his harangue from Spain is the first time in memory that any head of Government has gone abroad to attack citizens of the country he represents.

While the Vice President speaks of those "who have arrogated unto themselves the position of black leadership," it might be called to his attention that he has been often and most recently noted to be singularly out of step with pronouncements and action from the ultimate source of leadership from the White House, the President of the United States. The congressional black caucus and China are just two cases in point. In his meeting with the congressional black caucus, the President said:

I can understand why you are here. Black people have not received a fair shake in America. If I were you, I would be on the other side of the table pleading this case.

Apparently, the Vice President is unaware of this statement.

Further, Mr. AGNEW has not been noted, in the past in his own State as Governor, nor presently in his Vice Presidency, for his communication with black Americans. Although his statements are very difficult to follow with any degree

of logic, it is not hard to understand that times and the people have indeed passed him by. The Vice President also seems unaware that the matter of black leadership is not within his province to decide—just as white leadership and leadership of ethnic groups, student groups, peace groups, and so forth, are not. With regard to black leadership, blacks and people of good will, without regard to race, have decided this matter by elections and/or by their demonstrated support, whether in civil rights groups, the political arena, or any area of social concern.

It is regrettable that the Vice President was so intent on misuse of his meetings in Africa that he missed the significance of the venerable and dynamic leadership of Ethiopia, Kenya, and the Congo as it relates to the links between black Americans and Africans and the mutual issues of concern which bind us together.

Mr. AGNEW might well have pointed out determination of Kenyatta, of Kenya, to achieve self-determination for his people. He might have noted his commitment to attaining the fullest political representation and participation in the governmental processes for the people of Kenya. Black American leadership has the same goals.

In this century, Haile Selassie has no peer in symbolizing the will of his people to be free and not yield to colonial oppression.

In obvious contradictory statements, one notes the Vice President's remark that:

We in the United States make a mistake in attempting to expect immediate representative government in areas where there has been absolute chaos through "this importation of subversion from Communist countries."

Chaos by colonialism is the fact history establishes.

Leaders everywhere, Mr. AGNEW should have pointed out, should study the example of Mobutu in developing a strong economy and an effective government in a country which less than a decade ago was ravaged by colonialism and internal wars.

With appalling lack of perception and grasp, it appears not to have struck the Vice President that black Americans have been for centuries a part of a reputedly "representative government—by, for, and of the people"; that the demands of black citizens are then far overdue for the immediate representation and the proper voice in its own government which has been so long and arbitrarily denied.

Black Americans are proud of the work that Africans are doing within their own countries, but there are problems in which they seek and need the assistance of American Blacks and of the U.S. Government. This was a specific issue of discussion with the Vice President in the Congo—U.S. aid.

While the Vice President seems to attempt to distract attention from this issue, the Congressional Black Caucus in its presentation of recommendations to the White House and to congressional leadership of both parties, has pressed for proper attention to Africa through priority allocation of aid. The facts are U.S. aid to the Congo over a period of the

last decade exceeded \$400 million, an amount that represents more than the United States has given any other African nation. On the other hand, the United States has given assistance in the billions of dollars to help in the restoration of European countries and the development of Latin America and Asia. Again, while admiring the leadership of these African countries which need U.S. aid, the administration which Mr. AGNEW represented in his visits stands behind a sugar subsidy allocation to the wealthy white-minority ruled Republic of South Africa.

The Congressional Black Caucus has led the fight against that allocation. Surely, in reference to his pronouncements on black leadership, the Vice President must know that our efforts had the support of black leadership groups in general, that South Africa is the only country in the world where economic, social, and political discrimination is the proclaimed policy of the government, instituted and implemented by law in the world's most hideous form of racism—apartheid, that a sugar subsidy to South Africa gives sanction and support to these practices and policies.

Mr. AGNEW's trip was to enable him to familiarize himself with developments in the countries he visited; to talk with their leaders and to report to the President on his observations.

Black leadership will not be deposed nor its unity dispelled by the Vice President's attack. In cooperation with all black leadership, national and international; in cooperation with men of goodwill whatever race, color, or creed, we will continue to direct our efforts toward change in the harsh conditions under which all too many poor, black, and oppressed citizens of America and the world are forced to live.

The dedication of the Congressional Black Caucus is to help America finish its highest task—the liberation of its black and minority citizens. We will continue to do our problem solving within the framework of representative governmental processes and thus help this Nation to have its ultimate chance of fulfilling its commitment to one open society with liberty and justice for all.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman as the senior Member from the Democratic side of the aisle and of the Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives, and also as chairman of the black caucus for a most perceptive statement. Without attempting to be emotional or vitriolic he has responded to the slanderous statements that the Vice President leveled at black American leadership.

I feel the gentleman's statement will be helpful for all of those Members in the House of Representatives who are interested in accomplishing the goals that have created the necessity for the formation of the black caucus.

Again, under the leadership of the gentleman in the well, I think we will

begin to forge a more responsive group of Members willing to speak to the issues that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan raises.

Then perhaps some day we can begin to solve some of those issues.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman from Michigan for arranging time today so that we can join him with words on this most important subject.

Vice President AGNEW's remarks while en route to join the celebration of over 30 years of rule by General Franco, that black leaders in the United States could well learn a lesson from the black leaders of Ethiopia, Kenya, and the Congo countries from which he had just departed on his round-the-world tour, are but another indication of his continuing insensitivity to the goals and aspirations of the black people of this Nation. The man who stated 3 years ago that he did not need to tour a ghetto "because if you have seen one ghetto you have seen them all" has not grown in the office of Vice President to the extent that he is able to differentiate between the situation faced by the leadership of African nations and that which confronts black leadership here at home.

Perhaps, as Mr. STOKES so eloquently stated in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. AGNEW's difficulty stems from the fact that he is totally unaccustomed to seeing blacks in leadership positions because the Nixon administration has so miserably failed to appoint blacks to positions of responsibility in this Government. Having watched and listened to the Vice President for 2½ years, it is conceivable to me that he is so out of touch with the movement for social change here at home that he is genuinely unaware that the leadership qualities he so admires in the black leadership of Ethiopia, Kenya, and the Congo could be duplicated in our own Government if the Nixon administration was willing to provide American blacks with the same opportunities for responsible leadership which exist in the countries that Mr. AGNEW has visited.

Yet, although I can recognize as a fact the isolation of this administration from the concerns and needs of this Nation's black communities, I cannot for a moment condone or excuse the insensitivity which has produced this isolation and which leads to the type of remarks made by Mr. AGNEW during his flight. There is no excuse for the fact that Mr. AGNEW expects this Nation's black leadership to grovel in thanks for the few morsels which blacks have received from our bounteous affluence. There is no excuse for Mr. AGNEW's lack of appreciation for the courage of this Nation's black leadership in awakening this Nation's conscience to the need for fulfillment of the constitutional ideals on which this Nation was founded. The

price that black leadership, and all black citizens have had to pay for the recognition of fundamental rights in this society is too great for us to have patience with one who would disparage this contribution.

Our country's black leadership needs no defense from me; its record of achievement speaks for itself and equals, if not transcends in majesty, that of the African nations which Mr. AGNEW admires. In truth, the black leadership of this Nation deserves praise rather than scorn from Mr. AGNEW because it has fought for social justice and equality with nonviolent respect for human values and freedom that has not been shown by the society which oppresses them. The black leadership of Kenya and the Congo have been at least able, in recent years, to work in a context which is free of colonial suppression and Haile Selassie of Ethiopia has ruled proudly and independently for decades. Mr. AGNEW would be free to make a fair comparison between the black leadership of this Nation and that of Kenya, Ethiopia, and the Congo if instead of criticizing, he would turn his attention and efforts to removing the remaining obstacles from this society that preclude black leadership in this country from the responsibility and power which Mr. AGNEW admires in their African brothers.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman from California for his elaboration of this response.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for taking this time to respond to Mr. AGNEW's remarks. I, too, think it is important to consider that Mr. AGNEW was on his way to celebrate the anniversary of a dictatorship of over 30 years in Spain. We all know the history of that country since Mr. Franco has been in power there. However, I am not sure that we ought to be surprised as to what the Vice President said while there. He has been bad-mouthing people for quite some time now. If he were not in the high office of the Vice President of the United States, his remarks about everybody, including the black leaders of this country, would be taken as nothing more than the bad-mouthing of a redneck, if I might be permitted to compare him with a redneck. But the Vice President, because he holds this high office, does command the national press and the world press for what he says in derogation of other people. I think we ought to recognize it as that.

I am not saying that we ought to forgive him, but I do want to tell the gentleman that in South Dakota last year during the 1970 election campaign, when South Dakota, which had been a very strong Republican State for a long period of time and when things looked bad for the Democrats, the Republican strategy called for the visit of our Vice President to South Dakota. Of course, we all welcomed him to the State, as a very high official of this country. When he got there he engaged in the same kind of rhetoric, the vicious and pernicious mudslinging

stander that he almost always engages in. Almost instantaneously the tide of the campaign started to turn. As you know, the Democrats picked up and swept the State.

So I am not sure that you ought to entirely condemn and criticize him. It may be that the fortunes of black people might pick up if you allow him to continue with what he is doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman. That comment by the gentleman who just spoke certainly is food for thought for following that technique. I thank him for his contribution.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman in the well, the distinguished representative of the State of Michigan, a man who also serves as the very distinguished chairman of the congressional black caucus, for having taken this special order on this very important subject. I wish to associate myself entirely with the remarks that he has made in the well and commend him for having stated so very well and so succinctly the immense problem that comes about as a result of the kind of statements made by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Vice President's recent pronouncements from Madrid on the subject of black American leadership.

Vice President AGNEW has recently completed a tour of Africa which included Ethiopia, Kenya, and the Congo. This trip provided a unique opportunity for the Nixon-Agnew administration to show itself above the conflicts that embroil and sometimes embitter us at home. Black Africans have watched the progress of their brothers in America over the years. Young African children have studied the patient struggle of black Americans from emancipation to the present day. They have followed the fight for equality in education, housing, and jobs. They have been aware of the NAACP's gains in the courts in the area of enforcement of existing laws. They waited, with us, the many years before passage of a civil rights law by the Congress of the United States. And, with the rest of the world, they heralded the coming of nine, then 13, black legislators to the House of Representatives, culminating in the formation of the congressional black caucus.

If he were a statesman, a quality his office should evoke from him, Mr. AGNEW would have spoken in positive terms. He would have called upon the Africans' knowledge of American history and added to it. He would have spoken of the gains black Americans have made over the years, and pointed to the 1,860 black elected officials as tangible evidence of those gains. He would have demonstrated to the Africans he met that, in America too, black political maturity is becoming a reality.

But he did nothing of the sort, Mr. Speaker. Instead, and again, black

Americans have been slapped in the face by the Nixon-Agnew combine. Not a single gain was cited, and his remarks, instead of being those of a statesman, were those of a backroom politician intent upon hacking up his political adversaries. He referred to black leaders as—

Those in the U.S. who have arrogated unto themselves the position of black leaders, those who spend their time in querulous complaint and constant recriminations against the rest of society.

With typical shortsightedness he did not recognize that the same system that produced the so-called querulous and complaining black leaders produced him. No, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing of the statesman in Mr. AGNEW.

And yet, his "querulous complaint and recrimination" against black American leadership did not surprise me. He was frustrated. He had just left nations where the heads of state, the vice heads of state, all cabinet officers, all diplomats, and every other prominent official was black.

Considering the absence of black Americans in the Nixon-Agnew Cabinet, how could he have explained to them that they found no black men capable of running a government?

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman made a former statement for the RECORD on this subject for which I would like to commend him.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman in the well (Mr. DIGGS) and comment that it was a "good will" mission that Vice President AGNEW was sent to accomplish. It seems to me that he is not only failing to accomplish good will abroad—by attending and celebrating the victory of a fascist regime against the people of Spain 30 years ago for example—but he is certainly not creating good will at home. The good will at home means the good will of all the people. It seems to me that the Vice President of this administration, and the entire administration have failed to make a commitment to the majority numbers of the people in his country. It has failed not only the black people who organized this caucus in order to present their position, their demands for their legitimate share in the decisionmaking process and their demands for their share in the vast economic resources of this country, but many other people who have been denied and deprived the same rights: the young people, the women, the working people of this country. I think this is a moment in history when we require a commitment to the ideals that America is supposed to stand for—to the black people in their fight for the long-overdue right to participate in everything in America. America can become greater if it recognizes the rights of black people and others who have been deprived thus far.

It seems to me that a Vice President who acts in the manner that Vice President AGNEW has consistently acted, not only regarding blacks but regarding the

young who have protested this illegal and unconstitutional war which was based on deception and lies to the American people, is someone to whom we should not listen.

Contrast the reporting of the media regarding public opinion with the Vice President's malicious, unfair, and scandalous attack upon the black leadership of this country.

The black leadership has shown a tremendous capacity to move toward meeting the needs of the people. It has shown a significant, serious and mature leadership through the development of the black caucus. The development of the black movement by its leaders has become a movement of real political and social activity, seeking economic and social change. It is completely at variance with the inferences made by the Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I think a person who occupies the position of Vice President of the United States can ill afford to alienate segments of our population and significant segments of the people in our society.

I want to commend again the gentleman in the well (Mr. DIGGS), who is also chairman of the black caucus, for bringing this serious matter to the attention of the entire House.

This is a moment for us to say to a man who cannot speak for the interest of all the people of this country, but who will blindly attack the black leadership of this country, that that man is not entitled to continue to hold that office.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her contribution and for particularly underlining the implications of this matter at its broadest base, the substance of democratic pronouncements that we allude to often in this Chamber.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the general commendation of the gentleman in the well for his leadership not only on this issue but on many other issues. I had the great privilege of serving on one of the last outposts of this colonialism, the District of Columbia Committee, with the gentleman in the well. The leadership he has displayed is indicative of the kind of leadership he is displaying today with reference to what the Vice President is saying and doing.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately Czar Nicholas, Juan Peron, Marie Antoinette, and others are no longer here. Surely, in their former dominions the Vice President could have extended his ill will as he has done in those dominions within his general travels.

I think that his odious comparisons speak for themselves. I think that history will record both the place of the civil rights leaders in this country and the Vice President properly and I think that the civil rights leaders in this country can abide that history writing in easy conscience.

I merely want to say that the Vice President unfortunately not only does

nothing to promote good will in the world, but does nothing to cool exacerbated tempers and impatient desires in this country when he prates as unceremoniously as he did on this tour. So I hope that perhaps, if nothing else, in reading these various remarks of our colleagues it will make him aware that maybe he can spend a little more time listening and a little less time talking and he might hear some of the things that are going on in his very own country.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for his continuing association in trying to bring about true democracy not only in the area that he represents, but in the Congress of the United States as it affects this country.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I feel extremely proud to be a new Member of this Congress, and I feel equally as proud to serve under the gentleman in the well as chairman of the congressional black caucus, where a group of determined Congressmen are committing themselves to serving not only their districts, but the poor people throughout the United States. I am proud I am under your leadership because some of the things we articulate and some of the recommendations we have made have been heard by the President of the United States. That is why at this time it is particularly embarrassing to me as a member of a minority group to have a person who alleges to be my Vice President and the Vice President of all of the people of this country who goes to a foreign land and who insults those of us who are struggling to make this a better country.

It is repugnant to me to hear and to understand how anyone could possibly go to the country of Greece and ask for guidelines as to how a Greek Vice President should conduct himself.

It is this type of thing which seems to me is actually un-American. But because of the times we live in and because of the political decisions that have to be made, I think that the ultimate responsibility must fall upon the President of the United States. In fact, Mr. AGNEW was selected because it was part of a so-called southern strategy, and if this is so then I think the Executive has deviated from that strategy far enough in his contemplated visit to China, that he can also remove from his neck the heavy yoke of having a golf-playing comedian as a Vice President, who laughs at the struggles of the poor people in this country. I hope without regard to politics that in the best interests of all the people, such as those in the black caucus and the Members of this Congress, who are working toward having all of the people live together so that they can enjoy freedom and to have equitable rights to enjoy the wealth of this country, that perhaps we can no longer afford the luxury of selecting people for any type of leadership in the manner in which Mr. AGNEW was selected.

Mr. Speaker, I think it incumbent upon President Nixon to repudiate the odious and repugnant remarks made by Vice President AGNEW during the week of his visits with African heads of state.

I refer to the July 17 news conference during the course of which Mr. AGNEW delivered a broad indictment against black leaders in America, calling them querulous and saying they had much to learn from their African counterparts whom he met during his recent global tour.

During his tour he visited Emperor Haile Selassie in Ethiopia, President Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya, and General Joseph Mobutu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

He described the leadership of these African leaders as in "distinct contrast with many of those in the United States who have arrogated unto themselves the position of black leaders, those who spend their time in querulous complaint and constant recrimination against the rest of society."

The Vice President is quoted as saying:

I happen to believe that there are many, many black people in the United States who are tired of this constant complaining, and would like to see some constructive action from these people.

At one point in the press conference, Mr. AGNEW bitterly complained that black American leaders have displayed no recognition of any efforts that are made on their behalf by the administration. He also praised the African heads of State for being grateful for our foreign aid.

Obviously, Mr. AGNEW's remarks were spontaneous. He was merely thinking out loud.

Nevertheless, I think President Nixon has a responsibility to disassociate the Executive office from the implications of the Vice President's sudden outburst. It is unambiguously clear that the Vice President is not just irritated, but exceedingly angry at prominent civil rights leaders and black elected officials—especially the congressional black caucus. As a result, he has chosen to attack us by saying that the concerns we have voiced to the White House do not reflect the feelings of many, many black Americans. I think Mr. AGNEW is showing a total lack of sensitivity to minority groups who are still fighting to convert the constitutional guarantees of equality from an illusory promise to a veritable practice.

Mr. AGNEW's remarks also come at a bad time. Mr. Nixon is currently eggshell walking with China in an effort to promote peace abroad. It seems inappropriate that the President's alter ego should incite domestic discord by stomping and storm-trooping over our black leaders at home. At a time when the President is trying to unite the world, the Vice President should not be trying to divide the country.

Indeed, it is ironic that the very people to which Mr. AGNEW's remarks have an appealing ring—the conservative southerners—are the same people who have voiced opposition to the President's China initiative. Clearly, it is in the President's interest to disavow and disassociate himself with Mr. AGNEW's remarks and the audience to which they appeal.

Finally, I find it preposterous to ask black Americans who are fighting for rights guaranteed them by the Constitu-

tion to be "grateful" like black African leaders who are putting forth their finest diplomatic etiquette to get more foreign aid.

Ethiopia's Haile Selassie, as you know, hopes to continue getting increase in military assistance, development loans, and technical assistance. The Congo's Joseph Mobutu hopes to get the same increases plus increases in sales as well. And Kenya's Jomo Kenyatta, who is not getting anything other than technical assistance, is hoping to get more. Naturally these leaders are making overtures of "gratefulness" and going through the other necessities of diplomatic protocol.

What black Americans are fighting for, however, are not special privileges but rights—rights the administration has failed to press for. Instead of receiving administration support we have received some rather disappointing omens. Let us just take a look at the record of the Nixon administration.

In January, 1969, Mr. Nixon met with six black leaders and pledged to do more for blacks than any other President has ever done. He then declined to name a black to his Cabinet.

In April 1969, EEOC Chairman Clifford Alexander resigned because of a crippling lack of administration support in an effort to enforce the law on employment discrimination.

During that same month the administration also proposed a severe budget cut in the fair housing enforcement program.

In June 1969, the Nixon administration announced its opposition to extending the 1965 Voting Rights Act which had been so effective in registering blacks in the South.

In July 1969, the Nixon administration relaxed school desegregation guidelines.

In August 1969, the Nixon administration requested a delay in court-ordered desegregation in 30 Mississippi school districts, the first time in history the Justice Department had ever done so.

Between August and November 1969, the Nixon administration attempted to install Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., Chief Judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Haynsworth's record was one of foot-dragging in school desegregation and racial equality.

In February 1970, Leon Panetta, HEW's chief civil rights officer, was forced to resign. He charged that the administration policy in civil rights was fashioned by neither a moral nor a legal commitment to equality and enforcement of the law.

During that same month, Daniel Moynihan, the President's chief domestic adviser, proposed that—

The time may have come where the issue of race could benefit from a period of "benign neglect."

And the President announced he had consistently opposed in the past and would continue to oppose in the future busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance.

In March 1970, Senator EDWARD BROOKE, the only black Republican elected to a national office, charged that the Nixon administration has made a cold, calculated political decision to shun the

needs of blacks in favor of pursuing a southern strategy.

In April 1970, the Senate beat down an attempt by the Nixon administration to install G. Harrold Carswell to fill a vacancy in the Supreme Court. Carswell was a strict constructionist who used the law as a means of slowing down the progress of the poor and the black.

In May 1970, the Nixon administration sent FBI and Justice Department investigators to Jackson, Miss., to look into the mass murders of four black youths at Jackson State College by State police. None of the police responsible have been arrested.

In June 1970, Dr. James Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education was asked to resign because of his intent to end both de facto and de jure school segregation.

In October 1970, the Solicitor General Erwin Griswald argued for the Nixon administration before the Supreme Court against student busing in the schools in the Deep South.

In December 1970, James Farmer, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, resigned saying he could more effectively fight for minority rights outside than inside the Government.

Between January and June 1971, the Nixon administration opposed any requirement that Southern States seeking to alter their voting laws and voting district boundaries should have the burden of proof demonstrating that such changes were not to minimize the voting power of blacks.

In May 1971, the Civil Rights Commission reported that the 40 departments and agencies of the Nixon administration for which it made recommendations 7 months earlier had made little progress in their civil rights performances.

In June 1971, the Nixon administration took the position that it would oppose what it called forced integration of the suburbs but which to us would have meant equal access to all housing.

Now, in July, the Nixon administration opposes pending legislation which would give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to issue cease-and-desist orders.

With this kind of a record, it is foolish to suggest as Mr. AGNEW has, that blacks should be "grateful" for the accomplishments of the Nixon administration. It is equally irrational to expect blacks to go through all kinds of diplomatic etiquette to secure rights which are properly ours.

It is my hope that in future months we will be seeing less spontaneous outbursts from Mr. AGNEW and more concrete action from Mr. Nixon.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me, and I want to commend the gentleman for making it possible for us to express our opinions this afternoon under these special orders.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Vice President AGNEW for retaining his crown for the third consecutive year. There is no doubt that Mr. AGNEW's attack on black leaders last week while

traveling from Kenya to Spain assures him of retaining his championship as "buffoon of the year." Webster's dictionary defines buffoon as a person who tries to amuse by jokes and tricks—such as a clown. Admittedly, our Vice President is a clown but his tricks are no joking matter. Mr. AGNEW is traveling in foreign nations as the official representative of the President of the United States. His proclamations are rightfully construed as the official policy of our Government. Such a broad, general indictment of black leaders in this country by our Vice President, in my opinion, demands rebuttal.

It is truly amazing that Vice President AGNEW who has demonstrated his complete inability to properly assess white leadership—now purports to be an expert on black leadership. For a man who so totally lacks the qualities of leadership, it contradicts logic for him to suddenly become an authoritarian on qualitative leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in 1969, it was the "intellectual liberal" who had to endure the verbal attacks of our Vice President. In 1970, it was the "students" who pricked Mr. AGNEW's wrath. This year it is the black leaders of America. Vice President AGNEW has described black leaders as "complaining * * * carping and unconstructive." He further suggests that black leaders in America emulate the leadership of Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and Joseph Mobutu of the Congo. I hope the Vice President did not mean that if blacks in this country are to attain equality, justice, and first-class citizenship that it will be necessary to do what Kenyatta and Mobutu did to their white oppressors? Certainly, Mr. AGNEW who has criticized some black leaders for advocating the violent overthrow of our Government is not now siding with them? Mr. AGNEW of all people speaks of "carping and complaining." The record is clear—Mr. AGNEW and carping are synonymous. Perhaps, a little advice from black leaders might help AGNEW—take a close look at our type of government before praising authoritarian regimes—for does the Vice President want us to emulate nations such as Russia, Yugoslavia, or Spain—run by dictators—where a No. 2 man is expendable?

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, our Vice President is seriously ill. He has all the symptoms of an intellectual misfit. His recent tirade against black leadership is just part of a game played by him—called mental masturbation. Apparently, Mr. AGNEW is an intellectual sadist who experiences intellectual orgasms by attacking, humiliating, and kicking the oppressed.

He either reflects the official ideology of this administration or he does not. At any rate, it is time for President Nixon to set the record straight. I call on the President to either agree with this buffoon or to publicly repudiate him.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his constructive contribution.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has made a point that might slip the attention of those of us concerned with the matter. It is not simply a matter of the Vice President's repeated racial misstatements which have been made for many years now which is deeply disturbing, but it is the fact that he is the second in command of the administration now occupying office and that as such he speaks for the entire administration.

I think the gentleman from Missouri has very properly implied that this is a statement that the administration should be held responsible for, regardless of which single individual in that administration it emanated. I think we would make a serious mistake to separate the administration from the Vice President's remarks—any of them—but these remarks in particular.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the black caucus met with the President of the United States—and not with the Vice President. We submitted some 61 requests to the President after waiting 13 months for that meeting. Two months after that, we finally received a response. At no time did the Vice President make any comments about the nature of the meeting—or about the substantive proposals that were made—nor did he in any way indicate that he was receptive of what was going on.

Then from distant shores we have this attack, an innuendo, for there were no specific leaders names mentioned. As a matter of fact, he refused to divulge to the press who he had in mind. So this requires us to join with you and with the gentleman from Missouri to answer very unspecific charges against unnamed people.

As to the allegations of "carping," that will require black leadership to speak more directly and more effectively. We must press harder than ever to realize any reasonable success in achieving the goals that we hear so much about in this Chamber and which our people in the communities across this Nation have so little evidence of movement.

So I think these remarks, all of them, from our friends who are not in the caucus, as well as those who are members, should be instructive to the entire Congress. I feel, as you do, that perhaps a great deal more could come from a true working coalition of Members of good will in this Chamber to meet the real aspirations of the people that we so proudly represent here in the Congress.

Mr. DIGGS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I sent for a copy of the press briefing of the White House Monday and this question was raised with the Director of Communications, Mr. Ziegler. The response was that he had no comment, that the President had met with certain people, and they were trying to make progress. Apparently, the White House is attempting to disengage or disassociate itself from the statement made by the No. 2 man in our Government. And it is very difficult for me, along with you and others of like persuasion, to see how the administration can disassociate itself without doing it publicly and spe-

cifically, particularly when the No. 2 man was selected by the No. 1 man in the first place.

Mr. CONYERS. May I point out to the distinguished Member in the well that these remarks could have a very detrimental effect upon the relationship of the black caucus with the administration, which, of course, is already almost nonexistent.

Mr. DIGGS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank my distinguished fellow Member from Michigan, and commend him for taking this time to give us all an opportunity to express our views on the point at hand. Were it not for the affront that the statement of the Vice President gave to our countrymen, our friends, and our brothers, I must say that I would find some pleasure in a tendency on the part of members of the Republican Party, who have a strange inability to recognize merit abroad without giving affront at home. That is a tendency I would like to encourage in anyone whom I oppose politically. And I must agree with my distinguished friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that this is not only Mr. AGNEW's particular syndrome. As a matter of fact, almost the same thing is happening with Mr. Mitchell in England.

These men, when they find that congenial climate of the inquisition of the star chamber, seem to find themselves in a position of commending that which exists abroad and at the same time condemning those at home. I do not understand it.

I come from the southland. I know that there is no more abrasively hard atmosphere in which leadership can develop amongst the black community than there, and I know that that hard, abrasive climate has produced some of the finest representatives in my community. I feel that the tough school that the leaders of our black community come from has really produced the highest polish amongst leaders, as high a polish as anyone can find anywhere, and it is surprising to me that this cannot be recognized by persons in the other party.

I certainly do agree that this is not a single attitude of Mr. AGNEW. Mr. Mitchell, for instance, in England, was talking about the great virtues of summary justice. He seemed to think there was something great about the worst factors of England.

I think he is probably talking about the period of the bloody law, and Jeffreys of the Bloody Assizes, rather than the present developments in England. I wonder if he knows who he is talking about in Africa? Of course, there are great leaders there, but one who is so blind as not to see the great leaders here that spring from the same racial roots must be too blind to recognize those of merit in Africa.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the gentleman from Texas, one of the eminent members of the bar to be found in the Chamber. I would remind the gentleman that the man who heads the Justice Department is the one who gave the District of Columbia its no-knock provision and who is now suggesting it would be eminently fine legislation for the entire Nation. So at least he is being perfectly consistent at home and abroad.

Mr. ECKHARDT. That is certainly true. He also, as the gentleman recalls, was the prime sponsor of the sentence enhancement device, which is the first instance I know of in America in which a man might be tried in camera for an offense for which he was neither indicted nor charged. Now he must find it pleasant to be in those same halls that in medieval England would permit the same types of processes to result in the conviction of those men who laid the foundations of our Anglo-American justice. But I submit that he is looking to the wrong heroes. He should be thinking of some of those who fought tyranny in Parliament and who persisted until they laid the cornerstones of the system of justice we hold dear in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. First, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this most timely issue before the House and also I would like to state that the leadership which the gentleman has provided makes me proud to be a member of the black caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I say, Mr. AGNEW, take off those rose-colored glasses. When the black leadership talk about social, economic, and financial conditions of the black and the poor, it is very real.

One should not have to be told that there is a housing shortage and funds have been withheld and houses are not being built. It is evident that unemployment is at an alltime high. It is quite clear that there has been an increase in applications for employment compensation which has led to an increase in welfare rolls for lack of employment. Schools have not been built to provide much needed education facilities; particularly in the highly congested communities.

The need for adequate housing, full-time employment, and adequate education have all contributed to the increase of crime.

No, Mr. AGNEW, do not listen to the black leaders. Take the rose-colored glasses off and see the conditions of the black and the poor for yourself.

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

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, may I address an inquiry to the gentleman from Michigan?

In the account I have of the Agnew charges about the U.S. black leadership, the Vice President declared in effect that the black leadership in America did not accurately reflect the sentiments of ordinary black citizens. Does the gentleman in the well believe the Vice President was commenting about the black Congressmen here in the Chamber? Does the gentleman think when the Vice President spoke of black leaders that the Vice President was directing his thoughts at black Congressmen?

Mr. DIGGS. It is a little confusing as to exactly who the Vice President was talking about. He made particular reference to events of recent times. Some people may find in that some indication that it was being directed toward the black members of the House. However, the kind of response that was forthcoming from across the country from leaders of black organizations—Rev. Ralph Abernathy, and others—would indicate many blacks felt they fit the shoe the Vice President was using to kick us with.

Mr. DOW. The Vice President evidently intends to make it appear that he reflects the sentiments of ordinary black citizens. Does the gentleman think he reflects the sentiments of ordinary black citizens as well as the black Congressmen in the House of Representatives?

Mr. DIGGS. I am not aware that the Vice President has any communication with the black community in the State with which he is identified or anywhere else in the United States. So when we hear these kinds of references to black leadership in these vague terms without any more definition than his remarks offered, it is difficult to know to whom he was referring.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With reference to the question that has just been asked of the gentleman in the well, I should like to say it seems to me it would be rather difficult for the Vice President of the United States to have any real idea of what black people in America are thinking today, particularly with reference to their leadership. The Vice President of the United States serves in his capacity as Vice President in a Cabinet that does not have a single black man. It seems to me that an administration that has no contact with black people at the top level of Government would find it extremely difficult to be able to interpret what black people in America are thinking today.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. I completely concur with the response of our colleague from Ohio to the question of the gentleman from New York.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that the Vice President apparently was attempting not only to divide whites against blacks but also to divide black Americans against their leadership? His gratuitous comments about the quality of unspecified black leaders were clearly

provocative. I am sure we all resent it. We do not know about whom he was talking.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Diggs), as the rest of us, can only speculate as to whom he meant.

It would seem that this ill-timed statement serves perhaps another purpose because we would not have been in the well together today had the Vice President not made his remarks. He has, inadvertently perhaps, given us a very important opportunity to restate to our colleagues on the Hill and to the American people as well the nature and the dimension of the objectives of those of us who do constitute legitimate black leadership in this country, as to what we are about, why we are about it, and how dangerously little time we have to accomplish those goals we have set as our task.

Mr. DIGGS. Would the gentleman agree also that it would appear he is trying to divide black American leadership from black African leadership?

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman is correct.

There was a temptation on the part of some to inquire into the nature and the character of some of the governments that were visited by the Vice President of the United States. I can tell from the comments we have heard here that that temptation was resisted, because it would be very easy for us to begin to make invidious distinctions between African leadership and black leadership as well as between black leadership and its supporters and followers here in this country.

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

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

Mr. DOW. As the gentleman from Michigan knows, he and I have been associated in considerable efforts to eliminate the sugar quota for South Africa as a means of drawing the attention of that Government to the fact that so many of us in this country deplore the degrading and abysmal servitude in which the black Africans are compelled to live.

Now, I observed that the Vice President has been traveling in Africa. I wish the gentleman from Michigan would enlighten me on what measures or steps Vice President Agnew took while he was in Africa to lift the yoke from the black people in South Africa and in that part of the dark continent.

Mr. DIGGS. In view of what the Vice President has said and in view of his record, not only as Vice President, but before that when he was an official in Maryland, perhaps he would have felt more comfortable had South Africa been included on his trip because of the nature of the society there.

I am very glad the gentleman made reference to the South African sugar quota, because this is a matter which is now pending in the other body. It was just voted out of the Senate Finance Committee, and it carries the administration's proposal for continuing this subsidy to this racist-developed nation called the Republic of South Africa. When one considers that they have now reversed what they originally were try-

ing to do and when one considers that the quota for the Republic of South Africa now exceeds the entire quota for all of black Africa, then one begins to get some idea of the implications of that measure which is pending in the other body and behind which the administration continues to seek support. It would be interesting to see whether or not the Vice President will join in with the administration and other members of that party in seeking to promote that proposal which has such implications for U.S. policy on the African continent composed of over 300 million people.

Mr. DOW. I have only one other question to ask the gentleman. Again I go back to quotations from the press about the Vice President's comments. This is what it is reported he said:

I happen to believe there are many, many black people in the United States who are tired at this constant complaining and who would like to see some constructive action from these people.

I suppose he means the black leaders. I would like to ask the gentleman if he could cite some instances of constructive action on the part of the Vice President that we could point to as a good example which the black leaders might follow if they are to improve their leadership as he suggests.

Mr. DIGGS. Well, the gentleman raises a very cogent point. Of course, the Vice President has not set an example in generating harmonious race relations in the United States and he did not do so when he was an official of the State of Maryland. He appears to be continuing along this low road to the detriment of those people of good will like yourself who recognize that unless all of us share equitably in the opportunities and the results of this society that we are all going to be victims of something that our forefathers fought against many years ago.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Diggs) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers) as well as others for taking this time to comment on the Vice President's remarks on black leaders in America.

I do not know the total context in which the Vice President spoke, nor have I seen all of his remarks. But, frankly, what I have seen reported in the press suggests very clearly that the Vice President, if quoted accurately, has made statements that were unfair, unnecessary, and unconstructive.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is a time-honored rule that those in our diplomatic service and in our Government, that criticism of our country, of our people, is reserved for the United States. It is clearly not the role of a good will ambassador to criticize his country or his people while trying to serve and represent our country overseas.

I have met with several of the African leaders with whom the Vice President

conferred on this trip and I have considerable respect for them and the work they are doing in their countries. However, their problems and their responsibilities are vastly different from those of the black leaders in America, so different that virtually the only thing they have in common is the color of their skin, and that is never a basis for comparison. But the Vice President has chosen to make a comparison which in my view is reprehensible and a sorry reflection on the comprehension of his own country and what it stands for.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Reverend Abernathy, Roy Wilkins, George Wiley, Whitney Young, and the late Dr. Martin Luther King as well as Jesse Jackson and others in their continued efforts to secure economic, social, and political rights for all Americans; for black Americans and the rest of our citizens for which the fight has not been an easy one and is not yet won.

Unlike the leaders of black African nations, Reverend Abernathy, Jesse Jackson, Mr. Wilkins, and Mr. Wiley are not in positions of national authority. Yet they do have a national mandate in many respects. They are on the outside all too frequently and sometimes the society and the establishment goes out of its way to keep them there. What they must do and how they must do it is entirely different from the rulers of Ethiopia, the Congo, and Kenya. Much of the political and economic progress made by America is due to the leadership of black Americans dating back to the Revolutionary War. These men, as Americans, have spoken out for all men, have had a sense of feeling for humanity not only in our country but for the fate of mankind.

I deeply hope that these Americans will continue to speak out ever more vigorously for freedom and first-class citizenship, and for the rights of those that are denied in southern Africa. And against the terrible doctrines of the perversion of democracy and the inhumanity of slave labor conditions that pertain in the mines of South Africa, the denial of the basic freedoms and a decent education.

I think that sometimes as I recall Selma, Ala., back in the days of Martin Luther King, one cannot help but be convinced of his very deep conviction that he was concerned with the soul of America and the future of all America. And if we did not know our soul and could not find our own way there would not be much left for America and not much perhaps for the rest of the world.

So, I hope this kind of attack will not in any sense deter you in your efforts to secure that which is vital to all America, the opportunity of a free America concerned with all mankind.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague for yielding again.

I rise to commend and identify myself with the fine statement that has been made by the gentleman from New

York and to remind my colleague in the well that when we went to Selma, Ala., in 1965 with a congressional delegation at the request of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, the first to join with us was the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

It is not surprising then that we find them in the Chamber at this hour with us participating in this discussion, because their convictions have made them two of the finest gentlemen in this body, and two of the men who have set the kind of example that gives hope that perhaps we can turn the rhetoric of a constitutional democracy into some meaning for the 24 million black Americans who know precious little about it.

To be charitable, the best one can say of our Vice President and the administration which he so accurately personifies is that he continues to remain arrogantly insensitive to the fundamentals that ought to govern a democracy and to the pressing needs and aspirations of the American people. The great majority of American citizens acutely recognizes, even if the Vice President does not, that irrelevant criticism can never take the place of constructive leadership that should come from the White House.

The Vice President's latest, mindless outburst is capsuled, while enroute to totalitarian Spain, in an irresponsible attack on black leadership in the United States, partially grounded, we have been told, on Mr. AGNEW's annoyance at the disclosure of the Pentagon papers in the American press. To our lasting shame, SPIRO T. AGNEW continues to give vent to what are apparently his deep-grounded authoritarian leanings and convictions, coupled with an apparent desire to divide not only whites against blacks, but blacks against blacks.

Mr. AGNEW's ill-founded outburst represents the maneuverings of a demagog, searching for a scapegoat. We do have real, legitimate, and pressing problems that continue to undermine our sense of national purpose. These problems that the Vice President attempts to evade add up to a sum greater than their individual parts: the unendable Vietnam war, the eroding economic climate, and a continuing lack of real opportunity for all. Railing against youth or against the legitimate aspirations of black Americans will not erase these problems, much less solve them. The Vice President's approach to problem solving represents and is symptomatic of the approach of the entire Nixon administration.

Faced with crises in our national and international life, responsible leadership ought to unite and lead. Irresponsible, ill-equipped, uncreative politicians and those who either do not understand or believe in democracy and what should be the American way of life, choose the way of the demagog. That is the way that divides, the way that leads, if unchecked, to dictatorship, war, and irreversible destruction. Is this not the direction of SPIRO T. AGNEW? In these troubled times is he not seeking to mask unresponsiveness of an administration of which he is second in command?

It is true, as Mr. AGNEW asserts, that citizens young and old, black and white,

are complaining and carping. Rightfully so, because of an administration which has been and continues to be inept and aimless, an administration populated in high places by those who are so obviously lacking the vision and conviction necessary to further the best interests of the American people.

Mr. AGNEW's attack on black leadership would be ludicrous if it were not so tragic, if it were not so shallow and insensitive. In no other single area of American life is Mr. AGNEW's lack of knowledge and understanding more clearly demonstrated than when he comments on black Americans.

For every black American who has a decent job and a decent way of life there are scores of other black Americans who are sick and tired of waiting for a tomorrow that never comes. Black Americans are fighting and dying in Indochina in disproportionate numbers. Twice as many black Americans as compared to whites are jobless. The ratio of young black Americans who cannot find a job is frightening.

Mr. AGNEW is to be pitied. He does not realize and perhaps will never understand that it is the "complainers" and the "carpers" who are fulfilling the highest role of citizenship in a democratic society. It is these Americans who retain their faith in the potential of America. They know that in order to realize our potential we must end the war, we must uproot racism, we must eliminate unemployment and lack of opportunity.

The fact of the matter is that black leadership must press their claims for justice and opportunity harder than ever. Why? Because people honestly doubt whether this so-called democracy will ever have any real meaning for those who are sick and tired of waiting for a tomorrow that never comes.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President makes me feel so ashamed at times. His latest failures in terms of philosophy and statesmanship occurred in Madrid. The most objectionable was his coarse references to American leaders who happen to be black. He showed his contempt by making an odious comparison. The comparison was that American black leaders fell short of what he termed the "dedicated, enlightened" leadership displayed by several African heads of state who just happen to be the heads of authoritarian regimes. But, what is more repelling is to find that the Vice President when he thinks of American citizens, and in this case leaders, rather than comparing them with leaders qua leaders, without regard to race finds it necessary because they are black to compare them with other blacks. It would be as offensive to me were he to compare Americans of Greek extraction who happen to be leaders in our country with figures in the Greek junta. I thought that the Vice President was the Vice President of all the people of our country. Clearly, Vice President AGNEW does not think that way.

It came as no shock to find that Vice President AGNEW, after making his speech, went on to participate in the Franco dictatorship commemoration of their takeover of the democratic and duly elected Spanish Government. Such con-

duct does not add luster to the Office of the Vice Presidency.

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to read this past weekend that Vice President AGNEW took time out before celebrating the 35th anniversary of the Franco dictatorship in Spain to make some gratuitous remarks about America's black leaders.

I was not, however, surprised by the Vice President's ill-advised outburst because this is, sadly, what we have come to expect from him.

Mr. Speaker, the divisive rhetoric which has characterized Mr. AGNEW's tenure as Vice President has been a distinct disservice to the Nation and to the high office he holds.

Mr. AGNEW has repeatedly broken the administration's promise to work to "bring us together." By his criticism of the black men and women who have worked so tirelessly to win equal rights for all Americans, the Vice President has driven another wedge between black and white Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we as a nation cannot afford to be torn apart further. I call upon Mr. AGNEW to apologize to the black leaders of America, and moreover, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the administration to make good a commitment—which it has so far failed to do—toward the cause of human rights and dignity in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 3 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of Mr. DIGGS' special order today.

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE CREDIT UNION SHARE INSURANCE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would improve the share insurance law affecting credit unions.

Basically, the legislation requires the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to insure all federally chartered credit unions on either an outright or a provisional basis.

Under the share insurance legislation passed during the last Congress, Federal credit unions were required to apply for the insurance and those credit unions that were turned down in their insurance applications were given 1 year to obtain the insurance or else they would be forced into liquidation.

The legislation that I originally introduced to provide for share insurance for credit unions contained a provisional insurance feature. However, the legislation passed by the Senate did not provide

for provisional insurance and, because of the pending adjournment of the 91st Congress, it was necessary for the House to accept the Senate version. At that time, I stated that, if the legislation had problem areas, that I would offer amendments to correct them.

The legislation I am offering today corrects one of those problem areas. As of July 10 of this year, 949 Federal credit unions out of the nearly 12,000 Federal credit unions had applied for and been denied share insurance for a varied number of reasons. Granted, the number of credit unions that have been turned down is small in comparison to the overall number that have been granted, but I feel that Congress wants to keep as many credit unions in operation as possible. My legislation would accomplish that. It would require the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to either insure those rejected credit unions on a permanent basis, or on a provisional basis of not less than 1, nor more than 2 years. He would be required, under the provisional insurance plan to state the reasons why the permanent insurance was not granted and, if the credit union did not correct the discrepancies during the time period allowed, then it would have to liquidate at the end of that period.

Mr. Speaker, several hundred of the credit unions that have been denied insurance are of the so-called low-income category. These credit unions do an outstanding job, but they have been slow to develop their full potential because, by their very nature, they are dealing with low income people who do not have a great deal of money to put into savings and, as you might expect, there have been problems with delinquencies. But these credit unions have shown that they are one of the outstanding ways to help fight poverty and we should encourage their continuance in every possible way.

There is little chance, however, that these credit unions can survive without the share insurance, since denial of their applications has placed them under a cloud.

One of the provisions of the 1970 Share Insurance Act was to allow low income credit unions to accept deposits from businesses and individuals outside the credit union's so-called field of membership. Under this provision a low-income credit union, for instance, could accept deposits from a public utility which wanted to help people in a low-income area. Since the funds would be insured, there would be no potential loss to the depositor. These funds will enable the credit union to relend the money to its members. However, without the insurance, it will be impossible for these credit unions to attract large share deposits from outside sources. Its capital will have to come from people within the field of membership of a low-income credit union and, because these people have limited resources, it will mean that the growth of shares will be extremely slow.

Not all of the credit unions that have been denied share insurance are low income credit unions, nor are they small credit unions. Some credit unions have

been denied insurance because of supervisory problems, but the withholding of share insurance may actually make it more difficult for the credit unions to correct these problems and could conceivably cause a run on the credit unions.

By insuring all credit unions that have been denied insurance on a provisional basis, there would be little danger to the insurance fund established in the National Credit Union Administration. That fund already has more than \$6 million in premiums, and invests these funds in Government obligations. During the first 37 years of operations of the Federal credit unions, losses have been only a fraction of 1 percent and, based on these figures, the amount of money already collected in the share insurance fund by the National Credit Union Administration is enough to cover credit union losses for 74 years, based on past experience. It must also be pointed out that, if all of the uninsured Federal credit unions were given insurance and subsequently failed, there would still be many assets of these credit unions, particularly the loan portfolios, that could be used to offset losses. Thus, there appears to be little danger in providing this insurance, at least on a provisional basis, for those credit unions that have been previously turned down.

When the share insurance legislation was passed, it was pointed out that the legislation was designed to give credit unions the same type of protection provided banks and savings and loans. However, it now appears that credit unions are not getting equal treatment. When the Federal Deposit Insurance Act was passed in 1933, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation quickly insured all member banks of the Federal Reserve System by use of a temporary insurance fund. The Corporation also set out to insure non-member banks as quickly as possible and assisted those State, non-member banks that needed financial help.

There were approximately 1,000 State, nonmember banks that applied for insurance that were found to have assets insufficient to cover their liabilities to depositors and other credits. These banks were assisted in placing themselves in a position to qualify for insurance by a special department set up for that purpose within the FDIC. Correction was accomplished through the raising of local funds, through directors' guarantees, through purchase of local interest of paid assets and through investment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in capital obligations of those institutions. In short, the Government went out of its way to provide insurance for all of the banks.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was established, which also made certain that all federally chartered savings and loans were granted insurance. The FSLIC did look at insurance applications on a case-by-case basis, but officials of that organization have assured me that they did not find a single case where the initial insurance application was denied.

It must be pointed out that both the FDIC and the FSLIC were established at perhaps the most critical financial time

in this country's history and there was no guarantee that there would not be huge failures in our financial institutions that could wipe out both of these funds. If the Government was willing to take a chance on banks and savings and loans at the height of the depression, is it asking too much that we provide at least provisional insurance for credit unions that have established an outstanding record of service to little people.

Hopefully, this legislation will reach the floor shortly so that Members will have an opportunity to make certain that these worthwhile credit unions are not voted out of existence.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of the bill I introduced today follows:

H.R. 9961

A bill to provide temporary insurance for the member accounts of certain Federal credit unions, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Federal Credit Union Act is amended by striking out "reject" and inserting in lieu thereof "disapprove".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 201 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) In the case of any Federal credit union whose application for insurance is disapproved, the Administrator shall nonetheless issue to such Federal credit union a certificate of temporary insurance which shall be valid for a period of not less than one year nor more than two years, as determined by the Administrator at the time of issuance. The Administrator shall suspend or revoke the charter of any Federal credit union which has failed, upon the expiration of the period of its temporary insurance, to file an application for insurance which is approved by the Administrator in accordance with subsection (c). A Federal credit union which is temporarily insured under this subsection is an insured credit union under the provisions of this title for the period of such temporary insurance.

SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the first half of 1971 Free World shipping to North Vietnam has continued to show a decidedly downward trend. According to information made available to me by the Department of Defense this past June three ships flying the flag of the United Kingdom and one vessel under registry of the Somali Republic frequented North Vietnamese ports. These four arrivals brought the total for the first 6 months of this year to 29. This compares to the 37 Free World arrivals during the first half of 1970. The success of steps to reduce this traffic with the enemy is further borne out by the first half figures for 1968 and 1969 which were 78 and 60 arrivals respectively. This is solid progress and I commend the administration's perseverance to restrict the enemy's source of supply, for this, too, serves in the winding down of the war.

So long as American men are under fire in Vietnam, this problem deserves our very best efforts.

FREE WORLD FLAG SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM 1971

	United Kingdom	Somali	Total
January.....	3	1	4
February.....	5	1	6
March.....	3	2	5
April.....	5	1	6
May.....	4	1	4
June.....	3	1	4
Total.....	23	6	29

FREE WORLD FLAG SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM 1970

	United Kingdom	Somali	Kuwait	Total
January.....	2	1	1	4
February.....	5	1	1	6
March.....	3	1	1	4
April.....	7	2	1	9
May.....	6	3	1	9
June.....	3	2	1	5
Total.....	26	10	1	37

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 13th year that we have observed Captive Nations Week. Since its inception under the Eisenhower administration the third week in July has been set aside to pay tribute to and remember those 100 million individuals who live under Communist domination.

The list of captive nations is a long one—a list that should weigh heavily on the conscience of each and every Member of this body. As President Kennedy once said:

All of us . . . must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe men can choose, in peace and freedom how their countries can be governed.

It is interesting to note that no nation has ever adopted communism voluntarily. The oppression imposed on citizens behind the Iron Curtain has certainly not lessened nor is there a "better type of communism" available these days—as some would lead us to believe.

I am sure that those imprisoned under the thumb of the Soviet Union would be horrified to learn that there is a general feeling some even contemplate such a thought. These oppressed peoples are our greatest allies against communism, and we in the United States are one of the last vestiges of hope in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Each year, during this observance, much talk is bandied about, deep concern is expressed, and much tribute is paid to the many who suffer under Communist oppression.

However, it is rarely possible to take some kind of constructive action which will live on after the well-meaning words have long since died away.

With this in mind, I plan to introduce legislation which would indicate to at least one captive nation that we stand fully behind our promises.

In 1945 the Holy Crown of St. Stephen was entrusted to the U.S. Government for safekeeping until such time as Hun-

gary became free once again to function as a constitutional government established through free choice. The Holy Crown is a national treasure of immense historical and symbolic significance to Hungarians, and American-Hungarians who believe that governmental power is inherent in the Holy Crown itself.

In the course of recent diplomatic negotiations it has become apparent that a possibility exists that the Crown may be returned in an effort to promote American-Hungarian relations. My concurrent resolution expresses the sense of Congress that this not be done. We must not break our sacred trust and thereby indicate our lack of hope in Hungary's future. The Holy Crown of St. Stephen must be kept in trust in America, and we must uphold the belief of Hungarians everywhere that someday freedom and independence will return to Hungary, as well as to all other captive nations.

PROPOSED SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9388 IS AMBIGUOUS AND MISLEADING

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the other body adopted an amendment to the Atomic Energy Commission fund authorization bill, H.R. 9388. The amendment was added as a proviso to project 72-3-b on page 3, lines 9 and 10, that had authorized \$3,500,000 to acquire lands near Lyons, Kans., to establish an atomic waste depository.

The language of the amendment reads as follows:

"On page 3, line 10: After the figure '\$3,500,000' Strike out the period and insert: ', except that no funds shall be obligated or expended for the acquisition of a fee simple interest in land, or any other interest in land which exceeds three years from the date of enactment of this Act, until an advisory council appointed by the President of the United States reports to the Congress that construction and operation of such project can be carried out in a manner which assures the safety of the project, the protection of public health, and the preservation of the quality of the environment of the region.'

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the language is ambiguous and misleading, the amendment does not protect Kansas and its people from the dangers of premature burial of highly dangerous nuclear waste material.

I am sure that Governor Docking and his legal advisers will recognize the transparency of the ambiguous language. I am certain that Kansas scientific advisers to the Governor will understand that their concerns and admonitions have not been heeded. And I have little doubt that enactment of the authorization bill in its present form will trigger a suit by the State of Kansas against an agency of the Federal Government that will seek to enjoin land acquisition, whatever its form or length of tenure may be.

It is vitally important, in my opinion, that the people of Kansas not be deluded into believing that they are now pro-

tected from burial of deadly wastes until laboratory research has been carried out and safety assured.

First. This Senate amendment permits the AEC to acquire the land for up to a 3-year period. During that time the AEC can do what it pleases in the salt mine; there are absolutely no restrictions on the agency except its good sense, which it has not evidenced in any great quantity on this matter up to now.

Second. The conditional clause says when and if an advisory council—not authorized by law but referred to in the committee report—tells the Congress that construction and operation of the project and transportation of wastes to it can be done safely, the AEC can undertake permanent acquisition of the land.

In short, the amendment deals only with land acquisition and does not deter it; it simply limits the tenure of land control for a period of up to 3 years. If in the interim the advisory council gives a go-ahead, AEC can buy the land. Or, if at the end of 3 years, the advisory council has not said or done or determined anything, the AEC can still go ahead and acquire permanent possession of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to observe that Kansas has been badly served in this matter. It is an action that Kansans will not be permitted to forget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the conditional clause of the amendment, beginning with the word "until," would appear at first glance to be a restriction on permanent land acquisition, and indeed on construction and operation of the waste facility until either of two events take place:

a. Three years from date of enactment;

b. The advisory council finds during that 3-year period or at its expiration that the safety of the project is assured.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that if indeed the amendment truly and effectively is so provided, it would be a substantial step forward. It would not, of course, restrict the AEC from doing what the Governor does not want them to do—bury high level waste experimentally or otherwise in the salt bed. He wants that done through further research in the laboratory.

Careful analysis of the words of the amendment indicate that the restrictions are not there at all.

First. AEC's authority to acquire the land—for the 3-year period—does not restrict burial of high level wastes during that period. This is the heart of the objection by Kansas.

Second. In any event, no matter what eventuates, AEC is free to acquire the land at the end of 3 years.

Third. The authority of the advisory council does not estop AEC from beginning at least experimental burial of high level wastes tomorrow. Moreover, whenever the advisory council reports to Congress, next week, next month, next year; on that day AEC may acquire the land permanently and do what it will on it and in it.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider for a mo-

ment this advisory council and its competence, its function, and its authority. The bill itself does not require or direct the President to appoint such a council. It merely says "an advisory council appointed by the President." There is a more specific reference to such a body in the Joint Committee's report. Obviously designed to placate Governor Docking and Kansas and allay their concerns, the Joint Committee suggested that the Environmental Protection Agency, not the President, name a council, which it graciously suggested also would include representation from Kansas, to keep the Congress and the Executive informed on the project.

One might well ask: "informed about what?" What is the competence of this advisory council to determine whether technical and involved scientific facts have been proved? What authority would the council have except to, and I quote, "report to Congress." Suppose in its wisdom it "reported" that all is not well. How would that halt the project? Certainly, according to the language of the amendment, the construction and operation of the project could already have been undertaken, and also the transportation of the wastes.

Of course, the advisory council might learn, like the rest of us, that there had been a train wreck that spilled nuclear wastes and that an entire area someplace was being poisoned because retrieval of the spilled waste was difficult if not impossible. It could then "report" to Congress that the project is unsafe.

Or the advisory council, which obviously will be dominated and controlled by the AEC and the Executive, might in its wisdom determine 6 months from now that AEC's scientific analysis and research is convincing enough to assure the council's members that the project will be safe. Obviously, as soon as it makes such a report, the AEC is free to acquire the land permanently.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, where does Kansas, the Kansas Governor, his scientific advisers who first raised the serious health and environmental and safety issues—where do all these people stand in such circumstances? How will their voices be heard? How will their views become known? Most important, how can they stop the project if they believe it is still not safe to bury lethal wastes.

I simply cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why such strenuous efforts are being made to compel Kansas to do what its elected officials of State government say should not be done—now. What is the urgency of pressing forward until safety is really assured, unless of course safety really cannot be assured? How can we be so incredibly naive as to accept assurances that are simply not borne out by the words of the amendment?

I regret this hasty action which I consider ill advised and imprudent. I want the record to show that at least one Member made protest in behalf of his State and its people.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The first electronic computer was the numerical integrator and computer designed and built under the direction of J. Presper Echart and John Mauchly in Philadelphia, Pa. in 1946. It was housed in a room 30 by 50 feet, contained approximately 18,000 vacuum tubes and required 130 kilowatts per hour.

SUPPORTS EXTENSION OF FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM

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

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I submitted testimony in support of extending the foster grandparents program and it is my hope that the program will receive the funding it needs to continue.

With this in mind, I recently received a paper concerning the foster grandparent program, especially as it involves residents of Utah County.

The paper was submitted by Betty Mattson, a junior majoring in social work at Brigham Young University. I felt that her report was so informative that I asked her permission to submit it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it might be useful to all Members of Congress and therefore I include it at this point:

THE FOSTER GRANDPARENTS AGENCY (By Betty Mattson)

Upon entering one of the cheerfully decorated recreational rooms in the children's section of the Utah State Mental Hospital, visitors are immediately set upon by a group of lively, eager children. Some are quickly pulled off to a corner to view a valued treasure, while others are poked and jabbed excitedly in gestures of friendliness and curiosity. But through all the chaos one is impressed with the sweet serenity of an elderly woman, calmly sitting in a chair among all the confusion and darning a pile of socks.

The elderly woman is a foster grandmother and these are the initial impressions of our committee upon visiting the State Mental Hospital for the purpose of finding out who the foster grandparents are and what they do.

In Provo, Utah the Foster Grandparent Agency is a branch of the Community Action Program, being federally sponsored and funded through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Throughout the nation 4200 elderly people currently participate in this beneficial and rewarding program of self-help and fulfillment.

Created five years ago, the Foster Grandparent Program was instituted to serve a dual purpose:

(1) To give elderly, financially deprived citizens an opportunity to supplement their meager incomes, while offering invaluable public assistance in the capacity of "foster grandparents" to severely retarded, emotionally disturbed, delinquent children, and those with educational problems.

(2) It offers these same children an opportunity to receive affection, attention, and to develop a loving relationship with an older person, an experience often deprived this type of child by nature of his particular type of

problem. As a result, many have improved their physical skills, their intellectual understanding, and social readjustment.

Qualification for the job of a foster grandparent depend upon these factors:

1. Must be 60 years of age or older.
2. Must not make over \$1900 per year if living alone or \$2500 per couple.
3. Must be physically and emotionally able to work with children.
4. Must be interviewed and passed upon by the agency where the children are enrolled.
5. Must be considerate and understanding of children and have an active desire to help their individual growth and development.
6. Accept supervision as required.

In Utah County, foster grandparents serve children enrolled in Utah State Training School, the Utah State Mental Hospital, and the Provo and Nebo School Districts. Quite specifically, their duties are these:

1. They help wash the children and dress them.
2. They take the children for walks or rides in wheelchairs.
3. They listen to the children read.
4. They read to the children.
5. If the children can talk, they visit with them, talking about nature, looking at pictures, etc.
6. They help the children put puzzles together, build simple things with their hands.
7. They help the children take steps, learn how to pedal a bicycle, swing, etc.
8. They accompany the children on excursions, ride with them on the bus, take them to classroom training.
9. They help the children write and talk.
10. They help feed the children.
11. They take the children away from others if he is causing undue disturbances.
12. They sing with the children and play games with them.
13. They make candy, cookies, etc. with the children.
14. They sit with the children.
15. They love the children.

In essence then, they fulfill the roles of grandparents, especially to the two particular children whom they are assigned to. After each work shift they carefully fill out a report on each of their children, one-half being devoted to the problems they encountered during the four hour period, and the other to the progress they felt they made. The reports are used extensively by the professional worker in charge of the child's case.

But being a grandparent is much more than simply fulfilling the responsibilities of a job. It is loving and giving. As one grandmother whom we interviewed expressed it, "They call me Grandma, just like my own grandchildren." Those interviewed expressed their deep sense of satisfaction at seeing a child progress to the point of leaving the institution, but at the same time they felt a sense of loss at his departure.

On their own, the grandparents have started holding family home evenings once a week. The success of the program has already been manifest. The children clamor to be allowed a part in the program, and in the minutes of the meetings their names are carefully recorded each time they offer a prayer, give a scripture reading, etc.

When the grandparents were interviewed as a group, our committee was not only tremendously impressed with their high degree of personableness, friendliness, and obvious devotion to the children, but also with their apparent gratitude to the program for what it had given to them. When asked how the program had benefited them personally, they all answered enthusiastically and often interrupting each other in order to express strong feelings. They all seemed to feel that the Foster Grandparent Program helps them to stay young mentally and physically; it serves as a morale booster, and gives them an interest in life. They also felt it was an education in itself and had increased their toler-

ance tremendously. The grandparents were also in agreement in respect to the way the program helped them financially. Several had been unable to maintain themselves independently before they got the job, either because they were not eligible for social security or simply because they had lost their money in some way.

It was interesting to note that although the program provides for sick leave and vacation, few of the grandparents take advantage of these benefits voluntarily, preferring instead to spend their time working. Mr. Charles Deering, director of the program, referred to the grandparents as "old pioneer stock," "proud people" who "had to work and be independent." This same feeling was expressed by the grandparents themselves when several agreed that they would rather do volunteer work than just sit home, and the majority had been volunteer aides before they ever heard of Foster Grandparents.

Mr. Deering, himself, expressed strong feelings toward the program. He feels that it is a very successful program, in that it offers senior citizens morale and financial help while they are themselves offering invaluable help to the handicapped. He very strongly believes that the program is keeping these people out of rest homes and lengthening their lives. He cited an example of one elderly grandmother who underwent a serious operation and because of her obvious strong motivation for living, recovered and is back at work again. He emphasized his point by offering the information that no grandparent has ever quit voluntarily—only death and illness have taken them away, and there are 28 people on a waiting list, hoping to enter the program.

Our committee was tremendously impressed with the Foster Grandparent Program. It appears to be one of the most innovative and progressive programs of self-help in our country today. It is extremely disappointing to discover that in the next fiscal year the 10 million program is going to be cut back to 7 million, and that many of the grandparents from this area will be forced to return to welfare. It seems incongruous that our government would feel it necessary to cut back funds to a program where self-help is the key to success, and would instead allocate funds to the welfare programs, where these people will obviously be returning, a program where despondency and dependency are the only answers. Our committee urges the expansion of this program and we certainly support its creation and existence.

TWO BILLS WOULD BAN TELEPHONE HARASSMENT TO COLLECT NON-JUDGMENT DEBTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as another result of my investigation of deception and fraud in the sale of magazine subscriptions, which now has spanned some 30 months, I am introducing today two bills intended to deal directly with a serious consumer abuse associated not only with magazine sales but also with sales of a broad range of products and services.

The abuse to which I refer involves the use of the telephone to harass consumers for collection of debts which are unjustified, or are in dispute, often for very valid reasons.

Telephone harassment is a technique which over the years has been employed routinely by certain magazine subscrip-

tion sales companies to collect payments on high-priced, long-term contracts for magazines, which, just as routinely, were sold by deception or fraud.

My investigation of magazine sales methods revealed a distinct pattern of high pressure salesmen misrepresenting or concealing terms of a "package deal" for magazines, and then resorting to high-pressure collection tactics after subscribers discovered they had been deceived or gypped.

The consumer's natural defense against sales deception is to stop payment. The magazine sales agency, and many other businesses ranging from the "cornerstones" of the business community to the most disreputable, respond with collection pressures ranging from initial, mildly worded reminder notes to pseudo-legal documents and frequent phone calls which threaten law suits, bad credit reports, and attachment of wages. The magazine sales agencies which sell high-priced contracts on a budget payment plan invariably establish their own collection operation. They grind out ingenious dunning letters and harass delinquent subscribers with phone calls placed to their homes, or to relatives, neighbors, and employers.

Complaints received in my office have reported telephone threats of lawsuits, jail sentences, military demotion, deportation, loss of employment, garnishing of wages, public disclosure of bad credit and all manner of possible consequences.

The consumer who receives offensive or threatening dunning notices by mail has something concrete which he can display to convince authorities he is being harassed. And, if the harassment is based on deceptive or fraudulent sales practices, the sales or collection agency involved may have to answer to a State Bureau of consumer protection, the Federal Trade Commission, or the U.S. Postal Inspection Service.

But if the threats, intimidation and harassment are confined to abusive telephone calls, the consumer is virtually defenseless. He is prohibited by law from recording a telephone call without the caller's consent—even if the caller is abusive. If the recipient of abusive calls ignores the law and records the conversation anyway, the recording undoubtedly will have no value in a court proceeding, and could conceivably lead to legal action against the harassed consumer for having made the recording.

Some time ago, when telephone company officials were invited to my office to hear a recording of several harassing calls placed to one magazine subscriber, the telephone executives quickly suggested punitive action against the individual who made the recording. The company responsible for the abusive calls clearly was of lesser concern.

In my view, the time has come to turn the tide against the unscrupulous seller who will stop at almost nothing to collect a claimed debt, no matter what valid reason the consumer may have for non-payment. The answer, I believe, is to prohibit telephone calls for the purpose of collecting nonjudgment debts.

Because many thousands of these calls are being made daily, both interstate and

intrastate, I am dealing with the problem by introducing two separate bills. The first of these would prohibit collection by telephone in interstate commerce, by simply including the prohibition in the Federal Communications Act of 1934's existing prohibitions against obscene or threatening phone calls.

The second bill would broaden the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 by giving it additional jurisdiction over obscene, threatening, or harassing calls, including harassing calls to collect nonjudgment debts, between the several States and within each and every State.

I felt two separate bills were in order because the first, dealing with interstate telephone communications, is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to regulate. The second, broader bill, expectedly will give rise to charges of Federal interference in a matter which is the responsibility of the individual States.

I dispute that latter point of view, because every telephone instrument has the capability to carry the caller's voice, his words, his threats, his obscene utterances both intrastate or interstate at will. He needs do nothing more than dial a particular sequence of numbers to call a party across the street or across the country. Thus, if the individual telephone user has the ability to transmit his voice within a State or beyond, at will, to threaten or abuse the party called, then I am firmly convinced the responsible Federal agency must have the authority to protect the potential victim of the abusive call from the acts of the caller, whether the victim and caller be located within the same State, or are separated by one or more State boundary lines.

But my purpose today is not to fight the issue of jurisdiction. That, I am certain, will be debated fully when these measures are made subject of congressional hearings. I am concerned now only with stopping harassment by telephone to collect debts which have no legal substance. When telephone subscribers are afraid to answer their phones, because some high-pressure collector may be calling to renew his harassment, it is time the telephone subscriber is granted relief.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify the purpose of these measures, and to demonstrate how consumers are being harassed by telephone, I offer the following description of a typical situation, plus supplementary information regarding current Federal efforts in the continuing crack-down on magazine subscription sales abuses.

The phone rings—and you lift the receiver.

A voice at the other end asks, "Mrs. Smith, will you be home today? I represent the Acme Collection Service, and I have been instructed to serve a summons for your appearance in court to explain why you have not maintained regular payments on your contract for magazines. Unless you will mail a payment of \$13 today to bring your account up to date, I will have to drop by and serve these papers."

"But," protests Mrs. Smith, "we didn't order magazines. My husband told the salesman we did not want any magazines but he sent a contract and payment book, anyway."

"I'm sorry, Mrs. Smith," responds the voice on the telephone. "I know nothing about your dispute with the Bargain Magazine Co. But I have orders to collect the overdue payments on your account today or serve a summons for your court appearance. Now, will you mail the payment or shall I serve the summons?"

Frightened that she may be but a step away from a jail cell, Mrs. Smith reluctantly agrees to mail a \$13 payment for periodicals she did not order and receives a final admonition from the collection agency representative to "make all your monthly payments on time in the future to avoid further difficulties or embarrassment."

The names are fictitious, of course, but the situation is repeated thousands of times daily, often in far more forceful terms, in cities and towns across the country as high-pressure collection agents threaten, cajole, and intimidate consumers to make payments on sales agreements or contracts which may not be legally binding, or which may have been consummated as the result of deception, misrepresentation or fraud.

What our fictitious Mrs. Smith—who might have been a resident of Pennsylvania—wasn't told was that the collector was calling her on a WATS—Wide Area Telephone Service—line from a multi-state collection center located in a city in Tennessee, perhaps. Obviously, being hundreds of miles away, the collector had no intention of serving any legal papers on Mrs. Smith. His sole objective was to pressure Mrs. Smith to make a payment on a contract she was not legally obligated to pay.

A manager of one such collection agency volunteered information to my staff that he regularly used this technique to collect payments on magazine contracts. He later repeated his claims in a signed statement to a Bell Telephone representative who was investigating phone harassment at the direction of the Federal Communications Commission.

Both by telephone and through the mail, high-pressure collectors harass and threaten consumers to make payments on questionable or totally phony financial obligations day in and day out. And if you think you have nothing to worry about, just hope you are not placed in the position in which many consumers have found themselves after a joker entered their name and address on a mail-in order form for books, records, stereotapes or other merchandise and the unsuspecting consumer started receiving bills, payment demands, and threats of legal action from a computer that cannot read and will not listen to explanations.

On January 18 of this year, five subsidiaries of Cowles Communications, Inc., publisher of Look magazine, pleaded "no contest" to charges of postal fraud leveled by the U.S. attorney in Des Moines, Iowa, and paid fines totaling \$50,000 on 50 counts of fraud. The legal

proceedings were the end result of magazine sales abuses reported by the Easton, Pa., Express newspaper and investigated by my office and the U.S. postal inspectors.

In charges filed in the U.S. District Court in Des Moines, the Justice Department stated that the Cowles subsidiaries attempted to collect payment of magazine sales contracts which legal opinions had indicated were "legally unenforceable."

My own investigation of magazine sales methods clearly shows that most agencies selling long-term, budget payment plan contracts for three, four, five or more magazines use basically the same type of contract. Obviously, if the Cowles contract was "legally unenforceable," then the contracts of most other subscription agencies are likely to be "legally unenforceable," as well.

Thus, any consumer who feels he was deceived or defrauded by a tricky salesman may find it worth his while to consult an attorney, or complain to his State bureau of consumer protection, or the Federal Trade Commission, or, if use of the mail was involved, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service.

My investigation of magazine sales abuses, with the continued assistance of the Easton Express has been underway for 2½ years. To date, it has produced legal proceedings by the Federal Trade Commission involving 17 corporations, mail fraud charges by the U.S. Postal Service against five corporations, a Federal Communications Commission notice to every telephone company in the Nation that the consumer has a right not to be harassed by telephone for the collection of disputed debts, and Internal Revenue Service investigation of tax records of numerous magazine sales agencies. In addition, information and documents have been supplied to at least a half dozen States actively prosecuting magazine sales abuses, including Pennsylvania.

Several weeks ago, the Federal Trade Commission took its first of a series of expected actions against magazine sales companies which send traveling crews of "cash" salesmen from town to town. In that move, the FTC filed charges of deceptive practices against Publishers Continental Sales Corp., based in Michigan City, Ind. In the weeks ahead, I expect that at least a half dozen more companies which sell magazines door to door through traveling crews who often claim to be "students working their way through college" or representatives of such worthwhile Government or charitable programs as Headstart, Youth Corps, and Boys Town, will be named by the FTC in further legal proceedings.

In addition, my files on more than a dozen magazine sales corporations have been turned over to the U.S. postal inspectors, who are now actively engaged in investigation of magazine sales practices all across the country.

Deception and fraud in the sale of magazines is being stopped. But the magazine investigation has merely opened a Pandora's box of other consumer abuses which must be brought to a screeching halt.

Clearly, many of the worst abuses are occurring in the collection field, where no stone is left unturned in efforts to coerce the American consumer to pay claimed debts which may be unjustified, inflated, or subject to legal challenge for any of numerous reasons.

In the Justice Department's 50-count information against the Cowles subsidiaries, it was charged that as part of the defendant corporations' "scheme and artifice" to defraud, and for obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, the defendant corporations represented "that they would cause the customer unnecessary inconvenience, including loss of job, legal proceedings, attachment incurring court costs, legal fees, and public embarrassment through jeopardy of credit rating—whereas, the defendant corporations had no intention of garnishing wages or entering the transaction in a court of law, but used this as a scare tactic."

Because the scare technique is in widespread use by debt collectors, I am taking a first step today to stop harassment of consumers by telephone for collection of disputed debts by introducing two bills which would make it a criminal offense to harass any consumer by telephone for the collection of debts which have not been validated by legal process.

Both bills would make it illegal for any individual or organization to: "make a telephone call, solely to pressure, annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number, for the purpose of collecting any debt which has not been held in a valid judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction to be due and owing."

The bill also provides that any person who knowingly permits a telephone under his control to be used for harassment shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months.

The real clout of these bills is the additional impetus they give the Federal Communications Commission to "cut off telephone service" to any individual or organization engaged in telephone harassment to collect nonjudgment debts. The company or collection agency that resorts to telephoned threats of legal action, of public embarrassment of the consumer, of bad credit reports, or other comparable penalties will be sorely pressed to continue plaguing consumers if its telephones are removed.

Companies, such as a Baltimore-based magazine sales agency which regularly harasses subscribers by calling neighbors and employers to try to force payment of disputed magazine sales contracts, may be in line for a dose of their own medicine. In some instances they already are. That Baltimore company, for example, paid a substantial sum to settle one Washington, D.C., area subscriber's suit out of court, after harassing collection calls by the company to the woman's employer temporarily deprived her of a promotion opportunity. The same company has been the subject of dozens of telephone harassment complaints I have filed with the Federal Communications Commission over a period of many months. The company, Interna-

tional Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., has already received several warnings from its telephone company to mend its telephone collection methods. In addition, its sales methods are being investigated now by U.S. postal inspectors.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT HARASSMENT BY INTERSTATE TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION TO COLLECT NONJUDGMENT DEBTS

JUSTIFICATION

The major provision of the Communications Act of 1934 dealing with obscene or harassing telephone calls is Section 223 [47 U.S.C., Sec. 223] which reads as follows:

"Whoever: (1) in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign communication by means of telephone—

(A) makes any comment, request, suggestion or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy or indecent;

(B) makes a telephone call, whether or not conversation ensues without disclosing his identity and with intent to annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number;

(C) makes or causes the telephone of another repeatedly or continuously to ring, with intent to harass any person at the called number; or

(D) makes repeated telephone calls, during which conversation ensues, solely to harass any person at the called number; or
(2) knowingly permits any telephone under his control to be used for any purpose prohibited by this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

(1) With an increase in the use of interstate telephone service for collection of claimed debts, there has been a corresponding increase in the number of illegal practices used that may be in violation of applicable tariffs of the telephone companies and criminal statutes. Practices alleged include calls at odd hours of the day or night; repeated calls; calls to friends, neighbors, relatives, employers, and children; calls making a variety of threats; calls asserting falsely that credit ratings will be hurt; calls falsely stating that legal process is about to be served; calls demanding payments for amounts not owed; calls to places of employment; and calls misrepresenting the terms and conditions of existing or proposed contracts.

(2) Since Section 223 and the harassment subsection (D) apply only to telephone calls which are made solely to harass any person at the called number, it might be determined that harassment in conjunction with debt collection is not in violation of the statute.

Accordingly it is important that the provisions of this Act be amended by adding a new subsection (E) to prohibit annoying, abusive, threatening, or harassing calls for debt collection purposes where that debt has not been first secured by a valid judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

The text of the proposed legislation reads as follows:

A Bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telephone calls made to collect a non-judgment debt.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) (D) the following:

"(E) makes a telephone call, solely to pressure, annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number, for the purpose of collecting any debt which has not been held in a valid judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction to be due and owing; or"

A BILL TO PROHIBIT HARASSMENT BY INTRASTATE TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION FOR COLLECTION OF NON-JUDGMENT DEBTS, AND TO PROHIBIT OBSCENE OR HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS INTRASTATE

JUSTIFICATION

The major provision of the Communications Act of 1934 dealing with obscene or harassing telephone calls is Section 233 [47 U.S.C., sec. 223] which reads as follows:

"Whoever: (1) in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign communication by means of telephone—

(A) makes any comment, request, suggestion or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent;

(B) makes a telephone call, whether or not conversation ensues, without disclosing his identity and with intent to annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number;

(C) makes or causes the telephone of another repeatedly or continuously to ring, with intent to harass any person at the called number; or

(D) makes repeated telephone calls, during which conversation ensues solely to harass any person at the called number; or

(2) knowingly permits any telephone under his control to be used for any purpose prohibited by this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

With an increase in the use of the telephone service nationwide, for collection of claimed debts, there has been a corresponding increase in the number of illegal practices used that may be in violation of applicable tariffs of the telephone companies and criminal statutes. While some of these illegal practices involve calls in interstate commerce, the great bulk of calls are in intrastate commerce, and accordingly, it is only through regulation of these intrastate calls as well as interstate calls that Congress can attempt to regulate these illegal acts.

Since Section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 dealing with obscene and harassing telephone calls, applies only to interstate and foreign calls and the District of Columbia, it is important that Congress recognize the inseparability of the interstate and intrastate telephone systems and exercise its responsibility to control illegal acts throughout the entire nationwide telephone communication system.

The text of proposed legislation reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit harassing telephone calls made to collect a non-judgment debt, and to prohibit intrastate harassing or obscene telephone calls.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended—

(1) by striking out "in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign communication"

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) (D) the following:

"(E) makes a telephone call, solely to pressure, annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number, for the purpose of collecting any debt which has not been held in a valid judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction to be due and owing; or" and

(3) by striking out in the heading for such section "in the District of Columbia or in Interstate or Foreign Communications."

Sec. 2 (a) Section 2(a) of such act is amended by striking out "the provisions" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 223, the provisions."

(b) Section 2(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 301" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 223 and 301."

(c) Section 3(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "(other than section 223 thereof)."

TOWARD HELPING OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented the first in a series of statements concentrating on several problems of the elderly American. These statements are in support of eight bills I am currently circulating for cosponsorship that will help resolve some of the financial difficulties the senior citizen finds himself faced with upon retirement.

Today, I would like to concentrate on the three bills that would provide improved medicare services for the elderly. Health is one of the major concerns of the elderly. It is also one of their most significant cost items. Nearly seven out of every eight Americans over age 65 have a health problem that requires some sort of constant care, either with medicine and doctors visits or hospital and nursing home care. Public sources only cover roughly two-thirds of the cost of this care.

Medicare was intended to provide adequate medical care for the elderly in their greatest period of need and to prevent a complete loss of savings or income due to illness. In this respect, medicare has been less than hoped for.

For many over-65 Americans the principle expenditure is for drugs and patent medicines. There is no need to comment here on the disproportionately high cost of prescription drugs. I am sure each of us has had the occasion to criticize the high cost of a small vial of pills.

Nevertheless, these bills for pills that could run into hundreds or thousands of dollars yearly for an elderly American are not paid for under the medicare program. For many this comprises the major portion of their medical expenditures. Thus for elderly Americans in this category, medicare is a failure.

My bill, H.R. 9672, and others like it now pending in the Ways and Means Committee would help solve this problem by extending medicare benefits to cover the cost of prescription drugs. Safeguards are provided that would prevent profiteering from the sale of prescription drugs to medicare recipients. Also a minimum payment of \$1 per prescription is required by the beneficiary so that low-cost items are excluded.

Two other bills, H.R. 9151 and H.R. 4507 respectively, would provide for payment of optometrists' services and chiropractors' services under the medicare plan.

The aged American has great need of the services of both of these professional men. Failing eyesight and weakened muscle and bone structure figure prominently in the health problems of the over-65 American.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the criticism of chiropractors which is a holdover from past years when the prac-

tice of chiropractic medicine was filled with quacks. Perhaps today the problem is still there to a small degree. But there are many chiropractors who perform significant and important services for sick Americans and their presence is essential to the total health care system in the United States.

These three medicare reforms are by no means the only reforms that could be made. They are, however, important reforms that could be accomplished with a minimum of problems. I urge my colleagues to join me in reintroducing these bills next week. To recapitulate the three bills I discussed today will be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

MEDICARE REFORMS FOR THE ELDERLY

1. H.R. 9151—A bill to provide for payment of optometrists' services under medicare.
2. H.R. 9672—A bill to include prescription drugs under medicare.
3. H.R. 4507—A bill to include chiropractor services under medicare.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES— XVIII

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, anybody having any conscience at all must be shocked at the actions of the Justice Department in letting Frank Sharp off the hook. Other, smaller crooks have gotten far greater punishment than Sharp did. Other, smaller crooks were prosecuted with full vigor. Why then did the Justice Department make its shocking and odious deal with Sharp, a deal that enables Sharp to escape any prosecution even for violations of Texas law, thanks to a sweeping grant of immunity granted at the request of the Deputy Attorney General? Even now Texas officials are having to ask the Federal courts if they can prosecute Sharp. What a sorry pass this is.

The Justice Department made its deal with Sharp to keep from prosecuting him at all. If they had prosecuted him they would have had to uncover plain evidence that indicates their own Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson, was engaged in Sharp's schemes part and parcel.

I have cited many examples of questionable and probably illegal self-dealing loans that Sharp arranged between his various companies while Wilson was providing the man with legal advice. Wilson must have known about these deals, and he must have known they were shady at best and flatly illegal at worst.

Wilson might have chosen simply to ignore all that was going on around him, because he was making good money from Sharp's retainers, and because the same deals that Sharp and his pals were involved in gave Wilson a grand opportunity to enrich himself, just as Sharp and his other pals were enriching themselves.

Wilson was general counsel for National Bankers Life Insurance Co., a company that he helped Sharp take over. It was the common practice of officers and directors in that company to trade in large volumes of the company stock. Some of these deals were short-swung

transactions designed to bring quick profits to the insiders. Will Wilson was an insider, and under normal SEC practice, he would have registered his dealings in National Bankers Life stocks. Texas law on this point is not so explicit, and since it did not specifically require Wilson to register his inside trading, he never did report any of it. The distinguished ex-attorney general of Texas operated in the shady gray area of Texas law, and he knew it.

When Sharp was sentenced, his attorneys said that Sharp had been betrayed by his friends and partners. He relied on these people, the counselor said, and they betrayed him, much as Harding had been betrayed by his friends. Will Wilson was a friend of Sharp's. I wonder if Sharp believes that Wilson, like his other pals, betrayed him and enriched himself at Sharp's expense; I wonder if he believes that Wilson was one of those who "just took advantage" of Frank Sharp?

It is certain that Wilson owed a great deal to Frank Sharp. That debt surely is repaid, since Wilson's Justice Department has insured that the man will never face trial for his crimes. But Wilson was there right in the thick of Sharp's wheeling and dealing. If he was a wholly honest man in those dealings, he would be one of the very few in the Sharp entourage who was. I would be surprised if there was a single man on the inside of Sharp's companies who did not take advantage of the law, who did not wheel and deal, and who did not skirt the edges of the law whenever it proved necessary to find the next pot of gold. I would be surprised if Will Wilson was indeed not at the heart and center of the Sharp empire. I would be very surprised if Wilson was in fact wholly ignorant and not a party to a great many of Sharp's dishonest deals.

URGENT STEPS MUST BE TAKEN TO REFORM PROCEDURES AND ATTITUDES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT AGENTS

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the latest revelations concerning the June 7, 1971, raid on the home of Mr. Kenyon F. Ballew, of Silver Spring, Md., by a combined force of 28 Federal agents and county police make it clear that urgent steps must be taken by Secretary Connally to reform the procedures and attitudes of Treasury Department agents.

The Washington Daily News of July 19, 1971, reported that two Treasury Department supervisors sat in their car while inexperienced agents led the raid on Mr. Ballew's apartment so that they might have a little on-the-job training. One of the results of the on-the-job training is that Mr. Ballew remains in a hospital with a bullet apparently permanently lodged in his brain.

The Daily News also reports that during a second raid on the same night, led by an inexperienced Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division agent, a 10-year-old and two younger children were held

at shotgun point while the raiders ransacked their apartment.

The Washington Post of July 20, 1971, reported that the Treasury Department agents obtained the warrant to raid Mr. Ballew's apartment in search of illegal hand grenades "solely on the basis of information from a 17-year-old youth who had been arrested on housebreaking charges." No illegal hand grenades were found.

Meanwhile, Montgomery County Executive James Gleason calls the raid on Mr. Ballew's home "justifiable" and Secretary of the Treasury Connally makes no public comment.

The Washington Evening Star in an editorial on July 6, 1971, entitled "Gleason's Judgment," and the Washington Post on July 17, 1971, in an editorial entitled "Mr. Gleason on Raids," make it clear that the Montgomery County executive is in error and that the case, as the Washington Post put it, "is not closed."

Since this raid was conducted under Federal authority, I feel that Secretary Connally has a firm obligation to come forward with a full public report on all aspects of the raid. He also has a responsibility to take expeditious action to assure that no similar event occurs in the future.

For the information of my colleagues, I place the texts of the articles in the Washington Daily News and the Washington Post, as well as the texts of the editorials of the Washington Star and the Washington Post, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Daily News,
July 19, 1971]

T-MEN IN GUN RAID WERE ROOKIES: CONFIDENTIAL REPORT SAYS SUPERVISORS SAT OUTSIDE IN CAR DURING BALLEW RAID

(By Diane Bauer)

A confidential federal report on the Treasury agent and police raid in which a Quebec Terrace, Silver Spring resident was permanently crippled by a bullet, reveals that inexperienced G-men were picked to lead the raid to give them "on the job training."

A second raid the same night on another apartment where only three children were at home was also led by an inexperienced T-man, the report says. Neighbors have said that a 10-year-old and two younger children were held at shotgun point while the raiders ransacked the apartment.

Portions of the report, which has been circulated to higher-ups in the Justice Dept., Treasury Dept., Maryland U.S. Attorney's office, and Montgomery and Prince Georges County governments "for comment" were made available to the Washington Daily News.

BATTERING RAM

The 100-page report is still in the process of being revised before it will be considered ready for release to the public.

The secret Treasury document is the latest in a series of contradictory official statements brought to light by The News in the five weeks since the 28-man raid.

On June 7 Treasury agents, aided by Montgomery County and Prince Georges County police, some bearded and in scruffy clothing, forced their way with a battering ram into the apartment of Kenyon F. Ballew, 27, of 1014 Quebec Terrace at 8:30 p.m.

ANTIQUES

Mr. Ballew was critically injured with a bullet in the brain as he leaped from the bathtub and grabbed an antique cap and ball pistol to defend himself and his wife.

The agents, from the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division of the IRS division of the Treasury Dept., had a search warrant to look for illegal hand grenades but found only dummy grenades owned by Mr. Ballew since he was a child, and his antique gun collection.

The confidential report states that altho the warrant, based on information from an informer called "Burt" by the agents was obtained to search for illegal hand grenades, the informant told police that the souvenir grenades were actually dummies and that he did not believe that Mr. Ballew knew how to recapture them.

Marcus Davis, the agent who obtained the warrant based on the information received from the informant, faces disciplinary action by the Treasury Department for refusing to disclose his personal notes revealing what the informant "Burt" actually said, the report revealed.

The report reveals that twelve agents, twelve Montgomery police and two Prince Georges police took part in the raid on Mr. Ballew's apartment to execute the federal search warrant.

Two Treasury area supervisors sat in a car across the parking lot outside but did not take part in the raids led by the junior men.

The Montgomery County government has already acknowledged that residents of the second apartment which agents battered their way into that night, will receive official apologies and compensation.

INEXPERIENCED

The confidential report reveals that both raids were under the command of Treasury agent Marcus Davis who the report says admits to deliberately placing each team of raiders in the control of an inexperienced man as a training mission. Of the twelve agents on the Ballew raid, five had a year or less experience with AT&F.

Mrs. Ballew, who was dressed only in underpants at the time of the raid, has stated that on hearing someone at the door she called out to them to wait a minute and she would open the door. Agent William Seals, who had one year's experience with AT&F said in his signed statement the night of the raid that he ordered the door battered in because he heard no reply to the raiders' knocks but "scuffling."

Altho in a later report Mr. Seals admits that he did hear an indistinguishable reply, the confidential report reveals that Prince Georges Det. Sgt. Thomas Blount, standing at another entrance to the apartment, was clearly able to hear Mrs. Ballew say she would open the door.

The report reveals that the raid on the second apartment was led by agent Joseph T. Long, a GS-7 with four months experience with AT&F and still in basic training.

The details of the raid have caused Rep. John Dingell, R-Mich. to term it "worthy of the worst raiders in Nazi Germany."

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., has joined with Rep. Dingell in asking for a report from Treasury Secretary John Connally, but because of continued efforts to revise the report to withstand public scrutiny it has not yet been made public, The News was told.

INVESTIGATION

An inquiry by the White House has also been made and the Maryland State Human Relations Commission last week agreed to investigate Montgomery police tactics to see if a full-scale investigative hearing into police discrimination and brutality in the county is necessary.

Treasury agents last week refused to testify before a Montgomery grand jury investigating the case because no immunity from prosecution was offered them.

Federal officials are concerned that possible charges could be brought regarding the legality of the search warrant, unnecessary severity in executing the warrant and a pos-

sible manslaughter or murder charges if Mr. Ballew should die.

NO AUTHORITY

Montgomery County acting police chief Kenneth W. Watkins told The News that no formal authorization for a joint raid by federal agents and county police had been obtained, but that the federal agents were in charge of the county police on the raid.

Altho the report identifies the agents in charge of the raiding parties, Treasury official Scott Waffle said "there wasn't one man out there in charge of the whole shooting match."

In a "review" of the case by the Montgomery government, County Executive James P. Gleason, who last week announced that police execution of the raid was procedurally correct in every way, refused to question neighbors and witnesses at Quebec Terrace about police tactics used in the predominantly black area during the raid.

Other discrepancies revealed in the report include a statement from a Ballew neighbor that Montgomery County police in scruffy undercover agents clothes, who said they wore police armbands during the raid, actually hurried outside to their police car to don the armbands after the shooting.

John T. Bonner, lawyer for Mr. Ballew, said his findings are also in conflict with official reports released by Mr. Gleason.

Mr. Bonner said that he has turned over to a ballistics expert fragments found in the apartment of shells fired by the same gun that injured Mr. Ballew.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 16, 1971]

GLEASON'S JUDGMENT

Montgomery County Executive James Gleason has studied the official county report of the June 7 raid at Quebec Terrace. He has pronounced the police procedures "adequate and correct," adding that "in my judgment there isn't anything that could have been done differently by the officers who took part in the raid.

That judgment is the latest addition to the list of official error that has marked the case from the beginning.

Gleason's judgment was based on the following facts:

Treasury agents and county policemen—some 25 of them—acting on information from an informer, carried out two raids at 1014 Quebec Terrace on the night in question. In both cases, the suspected crime was possession of illegal firearms.

First, the raider broke down the door of apartment number 102—an apartment occupied by a woman and her two daughters. It was the wrong apartment. Their suspect, it turned out, lived in number 103.

The party next went to the rear of apartment number 2, the residence of Kenyon Ballew. They called through the metal door, identifying themselves and demanding entry. They heard a woman's voice answering them but were unable to understand what was being said. Using a battering ram, they broke in. The first men through the door were undercover agents, dressed in old clothes and bearded.

They were confronted by Mrs. Ballew, dressed only in underpants, and her husband, naked and dripping wet, who had come from his bath when the shouting began. Ballew, a gun collector, took an antique pistol from a wall rack. Several shots were fired, one by Ballew. Ballew's shot, according to Gleason, was accidental. It was not aimed at police. It may, indeed, have been fired after he was hit in the head by a police bullet. Police, acting on the informer's tip, searched the apartment for hand grenades. Several were found, all of them harmless dummies.

Ballew is now reported in good condition at Washington Sanitarium and Hospital. The bullet is still in his brain. He is par-

tially paralyzed. His chances for complete recovery are doubtful.

Nothing, in Gleason's judgment, could have been done differently.

Well, for openers, how about those undercover agents who led the raiders into the room? It seems doubtful that if a uniform had been seen immediately by Mrs. Ballew, she would have thought, as she says, that she was being attacked by "hippies or racketeers."

Why did police come to the back door instead of the front, where they could have been seen and identified through the glass panels? Why did they assume that they could be heard when they were unable to understand what was being said to them? Why was there no preliminary investigation of Ballew—an investigation that would have disclosed no criminal record and no reason to believe that the police were dealing with a dangerous and desperate felon? Why did they maintain their blind trust in their informant when the quality of his information had appeared so faulty in the raid staged minutes before?

Gleason's motive in stating his unqualified support of police tactics is, it may be assumed, thoroughly honorable. He does not want to add to the problems of the law enforcers by unjustified criticism. The only greater disservice that can be done the cause of law and order and police-community relations is official condonation of police action that is obviously stupid, sloppy, dangerous and correctable.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 17, 1971]

MR. GLEASON ON RAIDS

There are still some official inquiries under way to find out more about the raid June 7 that resulted in the shooting in the head of Kenyon F. Ballew of Silver Spring—as well there should be. But in the meantime, Montgomery County Executive James P. Gleason has apparently closed the county government's investigation, by concluding that the incident couldn't have been handled better.

"When you take all the circumstances of the case," said Mr. Gleason, "it was justifiable . . . there isn't anything that could have been done differently; it was a dangerous situation."

That is a pretty categorical statement, when you consider that, as Mr. Gleason went on to acknowledge, there are "different recollections about who shot first"—the authorities, seven of whom were dressed in scruffy clothes, or Mr. Ballew, who collects guns and had one in his hand when shouting authorities barged into his apartment. When you also consider that there are discrepancies between police accounts given on the night of the raid and accounts of police officers in subsequent interviews, Mr. Gleason doesn't appear to be a man terribly concerned about law enforcement procedures.

As we said at the time, the use of plain-clothesmen in raids is an extremely dangerous policy in any event, even if these forays turn out to be faultlessly carried out from a strictly legal standpoint. But Mr. Gleason, arguing that the area around the Ballew apartment is dangerous, speaks of recent shootings of police officers and "the breakdown of law and order" as justification for police conduct in the raid.

Such a "breakdown" is encouraged all the more when authorities are given an unequivocal blessing for questionable behavior before all the facts are in. The case, in our view, is not closed.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1971]
LAWYER SAYS MARYLAND RAID BASED ON YOUNG HOUSEBREAKER'S TIP

(By Jim Mann)

U.S. Treasury agents obtained a warrant to raid the Silver Spring apartment of Kenyon F. Ballew last month solely on the basis of

information from a 17-year-old youth who had been arrested on housebreaking charges, Ballew's attorney charged yesterday.

In an affidavit filed in support of the request for a search warrant, a Treasury agent had said the youth was reliable because he had provided police with accurate information on three housebreakings. But the affidavit did not point out that the accurate information was based on the confession of the youth that he had committed the break-ins himself, John T. Bonner, Ballew's attorney, said.

Ballew, a gun collector with more than 30 firearms in his apartment, was shot in the head and critically wounded in the raid June 7 by Treasury agents and Montgomery and Prince Georges police.

Ballew's wife has said the Ballews believed the lawmen—some of whom were dressed in casual clothes—were attempting a burglary when they broke into the apartment. The incident has sparked investigation by the Treasury Department, Montgomery County officials, a county grand jury and the State Human Relations Commission.

In other developments in the case yesterday:

Treasury officials confirmed reports that five of the 14 Treasury agents participating in the raid had had one year or less experience with the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division of the Treasury Department and that the first agent to enter the apartment—apparently the leader of the raid—was one of the five.

Montgomery County Executive James P. Gleason, in his weekly press conference, hit back at criticism of the raid as "Monday-morning quarterbacking." Gleason chose the occasion to appoint Col. Kenneth M. Watkins, who has been acting county police chief since March 31 and headed the department at the time of the Ballew, raid as his permanent police chief.

In applying for a search warrant to raid Ballew's apartment, Treasury agent Marcus David cited two different instances—one in Montgomery and the other in Prince Georges—in which an unnamed "source" provided "information" to local police regarding illegal hand grenades in Ballew's apartment.

In the Prince Georges case Davis said in an affidavit, "the source's reliability is based on three separate reports of burglaries in the Langley Park area of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, which, according to police reports, in fact took place or were attempted."

Bonner charged yesterday that the "source" was the same in both counties: a 17-year-old who lived in the building next to Ballew's at the Quebec Terrace Apartments on New Hampshire Avenue.

On June 6, the night before the raid, the informant was brought to headquarters by Montgomery police for questioning regarding housebreakings in which he had been implicated, Bonner charged.

Bonner charged that the informant confessed to three housebreakings.

Bonner said that after the youth was questioned by Silver Spring detectives he was taken to Prince Georges County detectives for further interviews, and it was there that he became the "source" for the information provided to Prince Georges County detectives.

"He never really gave them information like an informer," Bonner said. "He hates police, has been a thief all his life."

The affidavit provided in support of the search warrant says that two Montgomery County detectives interviewed the "source" at the Silver Spring police station on June 6, the day before the Ballew raid. No date is given in the affidavit for the interview with the "source" in Prince Georges County.

Montgomery County police refused to com-

ment in any way on the basis for the information regarding Ballew.

"I honestly do not know who the informant is," said Col. Watkins, shortly after he was sworn in as the new police chief yesterday. "An officer never asks another officer the identity of an informant."

All attempts to find confirmation of Bonner's account were unsuccessful.

When Lt. Miles R. Daniels of the Silver Spring detective bureau was asked whether the youth named by Bonner had been questioned on June 6 by his detectives about housebreakings, he told a reporter: "You'd have to get that from central headquarters."

At central headquarters, Insp. Fred P. Thrailkill, who is in charge of all investigations by county detectives, was asked the same question.

"I don't know why he (Daniels) referred that to me. It's not normal for him to refer something like that to me," Thrailkill said.

The inspector said he would obtain the information and call back, but he did not do so, and further attempts to reach him were unsuccessful.

In Baltimore, Assistant U.S. Attorney Charles Bernstein said that the U.S. attorney's office is never told the identity of confidential informants.

"We don't know who the sources are," Bernstein said. "My understanding was that these were two different sources of information used by the two different departments in Montgomery and Prince Georges."

Asked whether it was possible that there was only one informant in the case, Bernstein said, "If that is so, it's contrary to what I'd been led to believe by the agent."

But Bernstein reaffirmed the position of U.S. Attorney George Beall that the search warrant was valid.

He said that federal report on the raid being prepared by the Treasury Department "will confirm George Beall's original statement that there was nothing improper by any of the officers."

Bonner said yesterday that last Friday for the first time he interviewed the youth who he says was the informant in the Ballew raid.

He says he deduced the identity of the informant from a statement in the affidavit that says "on May 5 or 6, 1971, the source observed a quantity of hand grenades in Apt. 2, 1014 Quebec Terr. (Ballew's apartment)."

Mrs. Ballew remembered a youth who had been in the apartment on one of those days, Bonner said.

Bonner said he could not persuade the juvenile to record or sign a statement. The juvenile has been subpoenaed to appear today before a Montgomery County grand jury investigating the Ballew shooting, Bonner said.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for the Treasury Department confirmed that William H. Seals first law enforcement official inside the Ballew home, had one year of experience with the department. The spokesman said that Seals had also had four years of experience with the Louisiana State Police.

Another Treasury agent in the raid, Joseph T. Long, had been with the department for four months, the spokesman said, but had previously worked for more than three years with Fairfax County police and the Naval Investigation Service.

At Gleason's press conference yesterday, Watkins said he was not aware of the experience levels of the federal officers. "On my own force, I would not want to have trainees at the critical points in a raid," he said.

Last week, Gleason concluded his own investigation of the incident by announcing that he had found nothing improper regarding the police procedures used in the raid.

His defense of the raid prompted editorial criticism in Washington newspapers and also

by television commentator James J. Kilpatrick, a conservative who said he usually supports efforts at law and order but took exception in this case.

Yesterday, Gleason responded, by declaring, "Anybody can be a Monday-morning quarterback, and I think that's what's happening in editorials. It doesn't make me feel good. What would you have us change?"

He said press accounts "constantly ignore the circumstances," including the number of weapons in Ballew's apartment and vandalism and shootings in Quebec Terrace.

Asked whether the weapons in the apartment might have been used to start a riot, Gleason replied: "If he (Ballew) had a military installation inside his apartment, it does not justify an illegal raid." But he said he had found the raid was valid.

In the raid, the Treasury agents and police used a battering ram to knock down the Ballews' door and forced their way into the apartment. Ballew was apparently in the bathtub at the time, and his wife was wearing only underpants. Ballew, who was a gun collector, grabbed an antique pistol and headed toward the agents, but was shot in the head. Whether he shot at police is in dispute.

Bonner said yesterday that Ballew's condition has improved to "good" but that he remains in the hospital with the bullet still lodged in his brain. Doctors have been afraid to operate.

The Treasury agents and police found hand grenades in the apartment, but upon testing they turned out to be dummies.

DONABLE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS REMARKS OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

(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, today I introduce a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to permit donations of surplus property to public museums and to agencies of States and their political subdivisions which are operated primarily for environmental protection or the provision of services to schools or school systems and for other purposes.

For over two decades, the Federal donable property program has operated to bring surplus personal property to local institutions for education, public health, and civil defense purposes. It is one of the most extensive and economical types of Federal assistance. Its benefits reach every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The property to be donated is channeled through State government agencies which receive, control, and distribute great quantities and varieties of surplus property to the eligible institutions. These State agencies operate the program locally but are subject to the general administrative guidance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Carried on without fanfare year after year, this program makes available annually to our schools, hospitals, civil defense units, surplus property which originally costs hundreds of millions of dollars but which, if sold, would bring only a marginal return to the Government. In fiscal year 1970, property was donated which cost \$279,669,921. The

projected figure for fiscal year 1971 is \$330,742,803. A significant new aspect of the program is the large amount of overseas property now being returned to the United States for donation. During fiscal year 1970, overseas property reaching the State agencies comprised 183 container-van loads. The original acquisition cost of that property was \$8,170,711. In fiscal year 1971, overseas property donations filled 408 container-vans. It had an original acquisition cost of \$12,246,385. As a rule, the overseas property is of very high quality and has had the propitious side effect of generally stimulating more local interest in acquiring surplus donable property regardless of point of origin.

Mr. Speaker, before assuming my present chairmanship of the Government Operations Committee's Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, I chaired the subcommittee which exercised oversight and investigative jurisdiction of the donable property program. In this Congress, I am pleased to be able to continue close association with the donation program because of my membership on our Government Activities Subcommittee which, under its chairman, the Honorable Jack Brooks, now exercises jurisdiction over the program.

The authority for the donation program is section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—40 U.S.C. 484(j). The provision has been amended several times since 1949. In 1962, Public Law 87-786 broadened the category of eligible educational institutions so as to include schools for the mentally and physically handicapped, educational radio and TV stations, and public libraries.

From 1962 to 1970, a large number of amendments to section 203(j) were proposed but not enacted. Last year, my Special Studies Subcommittee carefully reviewed pending proposals to amend section 203(j) with a view to selecting particularly meritorious provisions on which it appeared a consensus of Congressional, Executive, and State interests might be reached.

We narrowed our consideration to four provisions. One has already been enacted as section 2 of Public Law 91-426, which gives affirmative congressional sanction to the return to the United States of foreign excess property for further Federal utilization or donation, under GSA regulations, subject to payment of transportation charges by the Federal or local agency which obtains the property.

The other provisions we selected were incorporated in H.R. 20014, which I introduced in the last Congress and which was referred to the Government Operations Committee. H.R. 20014 was the result of long and careful consultation with the Department of HEW, the General Services Administration, the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, and the Office of Management and Budget. That bill sought to do three things:

First, to add public museums to the categories of eligible educational institutions—an addition, by the way, that the Senate approved through its passage of S. 2210, 91st Congress.

Second, to permit local government agencies not otherwise eligible to receive donations if they are organized mainly for purposes of environmental protection or the provision of services to schools or school systems, for example, a tax-supported air pollution instrumentality or an administrative school district furnishing special services to a number of schools or school systems.

Third, to remove from the law an ambiguity which heretofore has deterred the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from making needed administrative adjustments with respect to overly burdensome restrictions on the use of items which, though originally costing the Government \$2,500 or more, have little or no intrinsic value today.

These provisions, incorporated in the bill I now introduce, will enhance the program and also contribute to its more economical and efficient operation. The bill offers the Congress an excellent opportunity to reemphasize the importance of this remarkable program. Beyond its great basic benefits, the donation program can make the rare claim that it returns more money to the Treasury than its administrative costs. It also boasts an unusually able, experienced, and dedicated group of public servants, Federal and State, whose energies and talents have succeeded in maintaining the program's forward momentum. I urge all Members to share in this opportunity through support of my bill.

SUN SHINES ON SHORT CAMPAIGNS

(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, nearly everyone agrees that our presidential campaigns are too long, yet except for the period directly after an election, there is little official support for regulating campaign length. Even now, despite the prospect of a July 9 Democratic convention in 1972, with the Republican convention to follow shortly thereafter, there is little endeavor toward limiting the time of presidential contests. Several congressional committees are presently considering campaign reform, but none is holding hearings specifically on the length we allow our campaigns to run, a primary cause of many of the electoral ills which the Congress is considering.

On June 29, with seven cosponsors I introduced legislation which would correct the excessive length of presidential races, and in the process, reduce other campaign excesses. My bill, H.R. 9507, would reduce presidential campaigns to 60 days by making impossible the nomination of a candidate for President more than 60 days prior to election.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column by Mr. Richard O'Mara of the Baltimore Sun which places the issues surrounding the 60-day campaign bill in proper perspective. I urge all Members to consider these issues and then join me in working for passage of a 60-day presidential campaign in time for the 1972 elections:

A SHORTER, CHEAPER ROAD TO THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Richard O'Mara)

John S. Monagan is a Democratic congressman from Connecticut, and he has been trying for over a decade to end the cruel marathon that is the American presidential campaign. Every year since he came to Congress in 1958, Mr. Monagan has introduced his bill to put a rational brake to a wildly irrational extravaganza. In early July he introduced it again, with seven co-sponsors.

HR 8606 is a terse piece of legislation, only 10 lines long. It proposes a 60-day limit to presidential campaigns. It would make illegal the nomination of anyone for President or Vice President more than 60 days before Election Day. The congressman feels that 60 days is "a reasonable and adequate period of time for voters and candidates to communicate."

Mr. Monagan's arguments for shorter presidential campaigns are various and almost irrefutable. Long campaigns are expensive, exhausting, repetitious, disruptive of the nation's business, boring. They tend to muddle rather than to clarify, and they leave the public numb and fed up.

Primary among the Monagan concerns is expense. It is one shared by members of both parties. By way of comparison, Mr. Monagan observed that in the 1860 election which put Abraham Lincoln in the White House the two major parties spent together only \$160,000. A century later, in the election that put John F. Kennedy in the White House, the combined expenses of the parties reached \$20 million. Kennedy traveled 40,000 miles and delivered 360 speeches. Lincoln didn't campaign at all.

A recent report by the Citizens Research Foundation revealed that in 1968 the Republicans spent nearly \$25 million on Richard Nixon's presidential campaign alone. The Democrats, who spent over \$10 million in losing, haven't yet paid off their campaign debt. The spending was so profligate in 1968 that it prompted former Senator Paul H. Douglas to warn the American democracy was in danger of becoming the American plutocracy. Mr. Monagan presumes, not unreasonably, that shorter campaigns would afford the parties less time to overspend.

Despite his good counsel, Mr. Monagan fears things are moving in the other direction. He recently denounced the Democratic National Committee for scheduling the party's convention next July 9, "... nearly four full months" before Election Day. And this doesn't include the primaries. They are getting even longer and more numerous. Mr. Monagan cites an observation by the political columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak who not long ago accompanied Senator Edmund Muskie to Wisconsin: "Bone tired because of an insanely arduous schedule, Muskie was more drowsy than dynamic during a televised press conference."

Most countries manage to hold elections without having them preceded by endless weeks of speeches and turmoil. England, Canada, India and Israel, to name a few, get through their national election campaigns in about a month. So do most of the other democracies of the world.

The point is, the principal reason for long presidential campaigns in America has vanished. It's a big country, and in the past it took a presidential candidate a long time to get around it by train, to meet a sufficient number of voters. Today jets cross from coast to coast and border to border in hours. Network radio and television, the wire services, flash the words, images and views of the candidates instantaneously to all parts of the nation. The candidate reaches more people and he reaches them faster. He has just so many things to say although, at the same time, he has an over-abundance of opportunities to say them.

After a while the words lose all meaning,

a numbness sets in among the constituents. A lesson politicians seem not to have learned is that there is such a thing as overexposure. Observing the early ramblings of Messrs. Muskie, McGovern, Bayh, et al., Mr. Monagan noted plaintively, "They've started again, already."

Mr. Monagan's proposal treats only with presidential elections, not with state primaries. Presumably it would not affect directly the pre-convention scrambles, which are the cause of most immediate concern for the Democratic party. Indirectly, however, it could have a strong impact, for if Democrats and Republicans could agree to limit the length of their general election campaign against each other, the agreement could encourage intra-party harmony.

Nearly everyone agrees that campaign reform is necessary. By one estimate there are some 55 separate campaign reform bills in various committees of the House and Senate. They deal with overall campaign spending, the amounts of political contributions allowable, the amount spent on the electronic media and on the print media, how much should be permitted for each voter in the last election.

Only Mr. Monagan's bill seeks to limit the campaign duration. In the words of its author, it is "the simplest, most direct approach to attacking the ills of our electoral process." Given the chance, it could prove the most effective.

ISRAELI DESALTING PLANT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with 26 cosponsors, legislation appropriating \$20 million to be used in a joint effort with Israel for the construction of a prototype water desalination plant in Israel. I have previously introduced this legislation as H.R. 9666.

The construction of such a plant is authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, Public Law 91-175. Section 104 of that act, creating a new section 219 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, provides that the United States may enter into a cooperative agreement with Israel to construct the prototype plant.

Thus far, section 104 of Public Law 91-175 has not been implemented. While \$20 million was in fact appropriated in fiscal year 1970, this funding was not employed. Since then, the authorizing law has been moribund.

Yet this state of affairs need not be. And, in fact, it should not be, because the proposed desalination plant would benefit significantly both the United States and Israel.

Insofar as the United States is concerned, we would derive both political and economic benefits. Assistance in construction of the desalination plant would constitute a forthright act of friendship toward a beleaguered nation which continues to struggle for survival. This act would be a clear expression of our determination that Israel shall in fact survive in the future.

The construction of this plant would serve, as well, as a form of encouragement to Israel's neighbors to reach a meaningful peace. The example of peaceful foreign aid afforded by the prototype plant could serve as a means of suasion—

demonstrating the assistance we could provide—to those nations in the Middle East which so desperately need to begin turning to their domestic problems.

In economic and technological terms, the construction of this plant would also be most beneficial to the United States. This was made clear by former Assistant Secretary of the Interior Max N. Edwards, who stated in a letter to the Congress on January 17, 1969:

(W)hile the project is vital to Israel in terms of water supply and power, its significance to the United States is the opportunity to improve and advance science and technology in the field of saline water conversion and to contribute materially to development of low cost desalination processes. We believe we should take advantage of this opportunity.

Moreover, the 1969 provision specifically provides that Israel would bear at least 50 percent of the costs of the project. In addition, the 1969 law provides that, pursuant to the agreement into which the United States would enter with Israel for construction of the plant, "All information, products, uses, processes, patents, and other development of this prototype plant will be available without further cost to the United States." Thus, the technological knowledge gained by construction of the plant would be at our use and disposal.

Finally, insofar as benefits to the United States are concerned, construction of the joint United States-Israeli desalination plant would constitute fulfillment of an executive commitment, made by then President Johnson, and enunciated by the then Premier Levi Eshkol of Israel on January 9, 1969.

The benefits accruing to Israel from the construction of the legislatively authorized plant are also clear. Israel is in desperate need of fresh water. The Sea of Galilee, which provides one-third of her water supply now, is dangerously polluted. Virtually all sources of fresh water have been developed. The plight Israel faces was made clear by Dr. Abel Wolman, who served as chairman of the National Water Resources Board and as president of the American Water Association, when he testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 29, 1969:

Israel's fresh water supply will be used to its fullest by the mid-1970's. It cannot meet the 1970-1980 demand for the water.

Finally, Israel faces severe financial difficulties, largely engendered by the enormous military budget she is forced to bear. U.S. aid for this project would thus be particularly helpful.

Lastly, I would note that not only would this plant be a source of fresh water for Israel. In addition, it would produce several hundred megawatts of electricity daily.

Thus, appropriation of funds to begin construction of the prototype dual-purpose power generating and desalting project marks a particularly beneficial opportunity to use the foreign assistance program for a project of peace, to be constructed within the borders of a long-time and loyal friend of this Nation.

The 26 Members who have joined me in introduction of legislation appropriat-

ing funds for the joint United States-Israeli desalting plant are:

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LENT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WALDIE.

WHERE WILL THE POSTAL SERVICE GET THE MONEY?

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Postal Service and the postal unions signed a \$990 million pay agreement termed by the spokesmen of both sides to have been a "miracle" achievement.

The "miracle," Mr. Speaker, is not in the negotiated agreement, but rather how this fancy package is to be paid for.

According to newspaper reports, the Postmaster General has said there are only two alternatives—increase postage rates or come to Congress for a subsidy. I trust that neither of these alternatives comes as any surprise to my colleagues in the House. From the very outset of the pay negotiations there was never any doubt, at least in my mind, that the source of funds to pay for a wage increase was either higher postage rates or congressional appropriation.

I hope that, should the second alternative materialize, we will in this body give long and serious deliberation to a precedent-setting arrangement whereby the Congress automatically doles out the taxpayers' money to foot the bill for agreements reached by the Postmaster General independent of any congressional involvement.

And speaking of footing the bill for this pay pact, I wish also to remind the Members of this body that inasmuch as Postal Service employees remain under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the net cost of this pay agreement is far in excess of the publicized figure of \$990 million.

According to calculations of the Civil Service Commission, for each dollar increase in salary, the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund is increased in the neighborhood of \$2.65. Therefore, this postal pay raise, over a 2-year period increases the unfunded liability of the retirement fund by \$2.6 billion. This makes the total cost of this package in excess of \$3.5 billion. Who, I ask, is going to foot this bill?

One way of resolving part of the issue is for the other body to act on the bill, S. 1681, which passed the House on May 14 with the so-called Gross amendment and was sent back to the Senate.

The amendment to that bill, added in committee, clarifies the provisions of Public Law 91-93—the act which strengthened and stabilized the civil service retirement fund—to require that any new unfunded liabilities in the fund

caused by increases in postal employee pay resulting from employee-management agreements or administrative action, shall be paid for by the Postal Service in 30 equal annual installments.

Simply stated, the amendment requires the Postal Service to pay for any unfunded liability which it may create in the future in the retirement fund by reason of its own action in granting future pay increases.

The situation with respect to the Postal Service is unique and results from passage of the Postal Reorganization Act. The Congress now has no control—no oversight whatsoever—with respect to the pay machinery in the Postal Service. Since each future pay raise, negotiated or otherwise granted to employees in the Postal Service, will result in a specific unfunded liability and a new financial drain on the retirement fund, the cost of this liability should properly and equitably be borne by the Postal Service.

Enactment of the amendment is urgently needed if this Congress is to fulfill its total commitment made in the last Congress that the solvency of the civil service retirement fund is to be completely insured.

The amendment is also needed in order to place responsibility on the Postal Service for the liabilities it creates in the fund and to be sure those liabilities are paid for.

I hope that with the recent turn of events at the Postal Service-Postal Union negotiating table, the urgency of placing fiscal responsibility where it squarely belongs will be realized. This House properly acted to place that responsibility and I hope that we can soon see some activity from the other side of the Capitol.

Postmaster General Blount has repeatedly asserted that the Postal Service should be a self-sustaining operation. This being the case, we should lay on the table the full cost of negotiated pay raises and make those responsible for negotiated pay increases responsible as well for the resultant costs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, through July 30, on account of official business.

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Wednesday, July 21, through July 22, on account of official business.

Mr. KEMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from 4 p.m., today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK, for 1 hour today, to

revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, on July 22.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, for 10 minutes, on July 22.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, for 15 minutes, on July 22.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIS of Georgia) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McKAY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BIAGGI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CORMAN, for 60 minutes, on July 27.

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today, to

revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONABLE, immediately prior to the vote on House Resolution 457 today.

Mr. ROGERS and to include extraneous matter in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FISH in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. McCLURE in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. WHALLEY.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIS of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in three instances.

Mr. McFALL in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. ULLMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. CONYERS in 11 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. Dow.

Mr. RODINO.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2296. An act to amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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

S. 145. An act for the relief of Esther Catherine Milner;

S. 161. An act for the relief of the West Fargo Pioneer and Dale C. Nesemeier;

S. 566. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Iaccarino; and

S. 672. An act for relief of Nicholas Demitrios Apostolakis.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 20, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 22, 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:

978. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notice of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and national forest lands at Libby Dam and Reservoir, Mont., pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a, b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

979. A letter from the Chairman, Executive Committee, District of Columbia Bail Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Agency for calendar year 1970, pursuant to Public Law 91-358; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

980. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the status and operation of the program authorized by title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, covering fiscal year 1969, pursuant to section 404 of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

981. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the management, protection, and development of the national resource lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

982. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 11th in the series of interim reports stemming from the U.S. metric study, prepared by the National Bureau of Standards, pursuant to Public Law 90-472; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

983. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the progress made toward independent and comprehensive audits of the Inter-American Development Bank, Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

984. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to increase rates to recover the cost of providing service to commercial firms renting multiple post office boxes, U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Government Operations.

985. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in management of projects to develop business opportunities for the poor, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Government Operations.

986. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the further improvements needed in administration of the small business investment company program, Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 7109. (Rept. No. 92-368). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9092. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and ad-

justing the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-369). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 554. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9272. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-370). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 555. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9844. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-371). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 9922. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9941. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 9942. A bill to protect producers' income when rebuilding reserve stocks of feed grains and wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SCHWENGL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 9943. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. McMILLAN):

H.R. 9944. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 9945. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide that the Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy and Air Force shall be a brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9946. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1957 to exempt from the draft physicians who agree to practice at least 4 years in rural and inner city doctor shortage areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas):

H.R. 9947. A bill to facilitate the prosecution of those persons presenting obscene motion pictures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 9948. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LINK, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 9949. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RARICK, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, and Mr. DRINAN):

H.R. 9950. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9951. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HARVEY Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 9952. A bill to permit coordination and cooperation in accelerated research and development of devices and equipment to meet Government standards for motor vehicle exhaust emissions and abatement of air pollution; to the Commerce on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9953. A bill to clarify the right of States and local subdivisions to provide for domes-

tic preference in acquiring materials for public use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 9954. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9955. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 9956. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9957. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to naturalization fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 9958. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that increases in social security benefits, railroad retirement benefits, and cost-of-living adjustments of civil service retirement annuities shall be disregarded under certain circumstances in determining eligibility for or the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents of veterans and non-service-connected pension for veterans and widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9959. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to public museums and to agencies of States and their political subdivisions which are operated primarily for environmental protection or for the provision of services to schools or school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9960. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9961. A bill to provide temporary insurance for the member accounts of certain Federal credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LENT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 9963. A bill making appropriations to the President for the development of a prototype desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 9964. A bill making appropriations to the President for the development of a prototype desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 9965. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 9966. A bill requiring the posting of a bond for the use of publicly owned real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9967. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.R. 9968. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a 10-year delimiting period for educational benefits thereunder in the case of Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 9969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 9970. A bill to establish a national power grid system, for the purpose of assuring an adequate and reliable low-cost electric power supply consistent with the enhancement of environmental values and the preservation of competition in the electric power industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 9971. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9972. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the week of November 12-18, 1972, as "Men's Fashion Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9973. A bill to promote fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 9974. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1909, as amended, to obtain information for agricultural estimates from county extension agents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9975. A bill to revise the laws governing appointments to the service academies so as to relieve Members of Congress from the responsibility of making nominations for appointments thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9976. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9977. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9978. A bill to authorize the disbursement for a limited period from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives of the pay of certain employees paid from the Members' clerk hire allowances who are absent from duty because of injury, illness, or disability; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 9979. A bill to enable citizens of the

United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 9980. A bill to provide for the transfer to the general fund of the Treasury of those portions of the stationery allowance of each Member of the House of Representatives remaining unobligated at the close of each session of the Congress for which the allowance is available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 9981. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9982. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9983. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9984. A bill to amend the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

H.R. 9985. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the area of Broward County or Dade County, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9986. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that travel allowances paid to veterans traveling to and from Veterans' Administration facilities shall in no event be less than those paid to employees of the Federal Government traveling on official business; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9987. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9988. 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. JARMAN (by request):

H.R. 9989. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in labor disputes involving the transportation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 9990. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the distribution of certain surplus Federal property to certain nonprofit educational organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCDABE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 9991. A bill to promote the safety and protect the environmental quality of ports, waterfront areas, and the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9992. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance for State programs of treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9993. A bill to amend the Communica-

tions Act of 1934 to prohibit telephone calls made to collect a nonjudgment debt; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9994. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit harassing telephone calls made to collect a nonjudgment debt, and to prohibit intrastate harassing or obscene telephone calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9995. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9996. A bill to provide certain new transportation services to elderly persons, to authorize studies and demonstration projects for the improvement of transportation services to the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9997. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9998. A bill to provide increased employment opportunities for middle-aged and older workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9999. A bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of senior citizens' community centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10000. A bill to provide for the development of more uniform standards for determining eligibility for the assistance authorized to be provided, under various Federal programs, to facilities for long-term health care (or to the patients thereof); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10001. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to train certain veterans, with appropriate experience as medical personnel, to serve as medical assistants in long-term-health-care facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10002. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for projects to develop or demonstrate programs designed to rehabilitate elderly patients of long-term-health-care facilities or to assist such patients in attaining self-care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10003. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the training and retraining of nurses aides and orderlies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10004. A bill to provide for the conduct, within the Public Health Service, of a training program of State inspectors of long-term-health-care facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10005. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, under part A of such title, of certain drugs which are prescribed and furnished (whenever possible) by generic name; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10006. A bill to provide for the conduct of a study and investigation of the provision, under State programs approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act, of care to individuals in long-term-health-care facilities with a view more effectively to assure that such facilities will be required to comply with appropriate licensing standards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of all expenses for medical care of a tax-

payer and his spouse if either of them attained the age of 65, and to provide a credit or refund of social security taxes withheld from the wages of certain individuals who have attained the age of 65 and corresponding reduction in the tax on self-employment income of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. FISH, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. COTTER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. MANN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINK, Mr. WOLFF and Mr. PODELL):

H.J. Res. 794. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 795. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 11 as "American Family of the Year Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HILLS, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.J. Res. 796. Joint resolution authorizing additional appropriations to the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of providing urgently needed intercity rail passenger service around the Nation and for the purpose of research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.J. Res. 797. Joint resolution to establish a select joint committee to be known as the Joint Committee on U.S. Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 798. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should set a date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam before December 31, 1971, of the totality of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should include in the budget for the fiscal year 1972 an additional \$235 million for urban mass transportation and public housing to replace his original budget request of that amount for the supersonic transport; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution

to extend greetings and commendations to the people of Pensacola, Fla., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the transfer of sovereignty of Florida from Spain to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. THOMSON, of Wisconsin, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 374. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 556. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives relative to the relations between the United States and the Peoples Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Res. 557. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to furnish information regarding the extent of military assistance to certain countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DELANEX, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HALEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LENNON, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 558. Resolution to establish a select committee to be known as the Select Supreme Court Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 10008. A bill for the relief of Gerardo B. Barbero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 10009. A bill for the relief of the Bill Ray Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10010. A bill for the relief of Caterina Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10011. A bill for the relief of Barbara A. Marlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 10012. A bill for the relief of David J. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

110. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ernest E. Seaman, Dallas, Oreg., relative to private use of Federal property on the shoreline of Marion Lake, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

111. Also, petition of Romualdo Maturan, Dumaguete City, Philippines, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.