

Perry, John T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perry, Richard E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Persons, Dale A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phelps, Kenneth D., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Jeff J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, William J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Picanso, Richard F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pinkerton, Laurence L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pittman, Donald W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plantholt, Warren J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pohlman, Randolph A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pomeroy, Don A., III xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pool, William F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Post, Philip N. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Potter, Diana D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Priddy, Nathern B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raguskus, Andrew G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rainbolt, Harold E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Redigan, John P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Kendrick E., II xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reinoso, Jorge E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richards, Stevan B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, Barry H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, James W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ricks, James V. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riess, Jack A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rightmyer, Charles W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rispoli, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ritchey, Joseph L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodgers, Richard R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodriguez Torres Cristobal xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roggio, Robert F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rolosen, Diane E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosander, Glenn M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rossbach, Dennis R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roux, Armand R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rucker, Dale M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ruffenach, Gayle A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rush, Arthur L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sakai, Jack T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sample, William A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Savena, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schafer, David J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schaff, Gary C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schable, Brian W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmidt, Richard W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schroeder, Douglas R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwartz, Thomas R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schween, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, James J. xxx-xx-xxxx

Scratchfield, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, Harold W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shuckstes, David V. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simms, Ernest H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simonson, Joseph W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sipes, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sipes, Ronald L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Skelton, Ronald J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Bruce R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Gene C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Hugh E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Michael R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snyder, Allen T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sorrow, Ronald T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sotkovsky, Russell A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spencer, Robert N. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spivey, Glenward L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spruill, Stephen E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stamp Dannie L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Starnes, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stensvad, Bruce J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephenson, James F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Jay M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steyer, Terrance F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stickel, John L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stinger, William A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stoddard, Forrest S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stringer, George T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Suarez, George L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sunde, Robert J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sutton, William G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Symonds Thomas E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Syper, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tapp, James B. Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tarascio, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, David M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Roy E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thrasher, Milton H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thrift, Peter A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tice, Larry G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tillar, David B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trammell, Douglas E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trithart, Ronald K. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trunzo, Samuel E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tsoucalas, Gregory A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turnbull, Duane E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tyree, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ulich, William L. xxx-xx-xxxx

Vanduyn, Larry D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanschoyck, Nicholas R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vejck, Steve, Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Velez, Manuel A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Viscasillas, Rafael A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vonflotow, Charles S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wadleigh, Stuart A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Arthur M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Howard R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warburton, John D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warejko, Michael D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warner, Charles H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watkins, Warren S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weber, Warren E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weeks, Edward R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weeks, William A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weidl, George F., III xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weiss, Howard S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welle, Allen H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wenrick, Steven C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Westemeier, Edward P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Westfall, Charles G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Westgate, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, David L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Thomas S. C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitman, Walter J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitson, William F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whittenburg, William M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wigton, Norman P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wiley, Jerold W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willey, Scott A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Mary P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willingham, Frank M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Bascombe J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Zelmer C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winter, Doris K. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winters, David W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wohltman, John W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolchina, Kenneth G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolochowicz, Francis J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Wendall E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Worsley, Kenneth L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wylie, Jackie L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yagmin, Deborah B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Alvin L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Youngblood, Francis G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zauner, Frank G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zimmerman, Bradford R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zuelsdorf, Gary A. xxx-xx-xxxx

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 28, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.—Romans 12: 21.*

O Thou who art ever speaking to Thy children and seeking to enter their lives speak to us now and come to new life within us as we bow before the altar of prayer. Give to us a fresh sense of the privilege which is ours to lead our Nation in right paths, along good ways, and by peaceful means. Save us from the subtle sins of self-seeking and self-importance; and bestow upon us the high happiness which comes to those who work for the welfare of our Nation and the prosperity of our people.

By Thy grace may we be consistent in faith and practice; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing steadfastly in prayer; and overcoming evil with good.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 65. An act for the relief of Dennis Yantos; and
- S. 1939. An act for the relief of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District, Colorado.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.  
 July 21, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
 The Speaker,  
 U.S. House of Representatives,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 301(a) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has approved the enclosed resolution for a compliance test facility at the Ohio Highway Transportation Research Center, East Liberty, Ohio.

Sincerely yours,  
 HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
 Chairman, Committee on Interstate  
 and Foreign Commerce.

PRINTING OF CEREMONIAL PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS TODAY

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ceremonial proceedings to be had in Statuary Hall, relating to the unveiling of portraits of the Honorable Clarence Cannon and the Honorable John Taber, to be held during the recess of the House today, may be printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED EDUCATOR: THE HONORABLE CLARENCE BLAIR

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, my good friend Clarence Blair retires after serving 32 years as superintendent of St. Clair County's educational service region.

Holding the position longer than any man in the history of the county, Superintendent Blair has been responsible for guiding the development and expansion of education services in an area that has changed from a largely rural base to an urban sector of the St. Louis metropolitan area. During this period of change, Clarence Blair has exercised resolute and determined leadership to see that the people of St. Clair County have received the best possible education.

Having been elected to eight successive 4-year terms, Clarence Blair has amply demonstrated his willingness to deal with difficult problems and to make decisions that have been in the best interests of the public he has served so well. Clarence Blair has left his mark on education in St. Clair County. He has bequeathed a rich legacy of sound leadership.

St. Clair County will miss this dedicated public servant. Fortunately, his contributions will remind us of the debt we owe this distinguished gentleman.

#### INVASION OF PRIVACY BY EXECUTIVE ORDER 11611

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's copy of the Federal Register, an Executive Order No. 11611, issued by the President on July 26 is published. This order authorizes the House Committee on Internal Security to inspect any income, excess profits, estate or gift tax returns for the years 1950 to 1971.

Once again privacy is cast to the winds as the Executive, in conjunction with the Internal Security Committee, has contrived to open up to that committee's scrutiny the tax returns of every individual and business in the Nation. This invasion of privacy cannot be condoned. It cannot be condoned because the committee to whose snooping curiosity these documents have been opened serves no legitimate purpose. Its sole purpose is to cast a chill on the exercise of constitutional freedoms as it searches out imagined dangers which are in fact created by the suspicion of its own peculiar perception of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Executive order with my remarks; it is another example of the administration's assault on civil liberties.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER 11611

INSPECTION OF INCOME, EXCESS-PROFITS, ESTATE, AND GIFT TAX RETURNS BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 55(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended (26 U.S.C. (1952 Ed.) 55(a)), and by section 6103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 6103(a)), I do hereby order that any income, excess-profits, estate, or gift tax return for the years 1950 to 1971, inclusive, shall, during the Ninety-second Congress, be open to inspection by the Committee on Internal Security, House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of carrying on those investigations authorized by clause 11 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such inspection shall be in accordance and upon compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury in Treasury Decisions 6132 and 6133, relating to the inspection of returns by committees of the Congress, approved by the President on May 3, 1955.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1971.  
[FR Doc. 71-10864 Filed 7-27-71; 9:30 am]

#### THE NEW INDEPENDENT U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct the attention of the Members to the smooth implementation of the new and independent U.S. Postal Service which we all hope will deliver the mail efficiently, economically, and promptly.

While the new Postal Service has the power to set rates, determine wages, and streamline operations, it will need more than power if it is to function effectively with a minimum of difficulty. It will need the wholehearted cooperation of management, employees, and patrons.

The American people, who, in their dual capacity as postal patrons and taxpayers, will be required to pay more for postage and finance higher wages for postal employees, have the right to insist upon constantly improved service.

A point that must be stressed, Mr. Speaker, is that the Post Office administrators and the officials of the postal unions worked out a noninflationary, responsible contract which was the first of its kind in Federal Government management-employee relations. Under the conditions that we provided by law in establishing the new Postal Service, employees do not have the right to strike but have the alternative of binding arbitration, and the leadership and progressive attitude exhibited by management and the leaders of the postal unions are a credit to all parties concerned and are in the interest of the mail users and taxpayers of our Nation.

Even though this new Postal Service is a uniquely independent Federal Government entity, we in the Congress retain legislative oversight over its operations. I am pleased that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is actively scrutinizing developments in the

Postal Service, and that it maintained a keen interest in the negotiations which produced the labor contract to which I have referred.

#### THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the House passed the \$13.3 billion agriculture appropriation, I voted no. I had supported the passage of the bill when it originally passed the House at \$12.4 billion. At that time it contained the \$20,000 per crop limit.

When the bill returned from conference committee, it had picked up \$900 million and had lost the \$20,000 limitation. My final vote had to be against a bill costing \$1.2 billion—10 percent—over the budget and \$3.7 billion—nearly 40 percent—over last year's expense.

Agriculture is enormously important to our country, and my own State's largest industry. It must also be conceded that certain consumer and food stamp programs have been expanded. Nevertheless, without expectations of more effective programs or new approaches, I could not support such vast increases in Federal expenditures for agriculture in a time of continuing deficits and continuing inflation.

#### TRIAL OF EIGHT PERSONS ARRESTED ON CAPITOL STEPS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I note by the edition of the Washington Post this morning that the trial of eight persons arrested for their conduct on the Capitol steps has resulted in an acquittal. I simply call this to the attention of Members, because the trial of the eight persons downtown involved many aspects of the thing we have been seeking to do in this country; that is, to restore law and order.

It becomes pretty rough for a police department to take nude people off the steps, people who have been using spray cans of paint to write obscene four-letter words on the steps, people who have expectorated against the policemen's vehicles, while the police were making the arrests, and then to have a jury acquit them for these ridiculous actions, even though they were warned 10 minutes in advance by Chief Powell that unless they desisted they would be arrested.

I believe it is about time the people of this Nation began to realize we can no longer be passive in this respect, and that citizens now assert their rights and demand commonsense in the halls of justice. We are not getting it today. The violators of the law and their vocal supporters appear to have thwarted general good order once more. The police of Washington, D.C., can hold their heads high—they performed their duty well.

**WHAT THE WASHINGTON POST DID NOT PRINT ABOUT YESTERDAY'S AD HOC COMMITTEE HEARING ON THE PENTAGON PAPERS**

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried a story concerning an ad hoc hearing which was staged yesterday afternoon in the Rayburn Building with respect to the Pentagon papers.

The Post story reported on the statements of a succession of witnesses who had nothing good to say about the United States of America, and then it concluded with a list of the 17 Congressmen who sponsored the hearing.

There was one omission in the Washington Post story. I appeared yesterday afternoon at the hearing and said somewhat as follows:

I commend this group in its search for truth but I remind them that the full truth about the Pentagon papers, all 47 volumes, is in this building and are available to all Members of Congress.

To this date only 14 Congressmen have been interested enough to go down and see the full text of the Pentagon papers.

These gentlemen are:

Mr. McCLOY of Illinois.  
Mr. REID of New York.  
Mr. PEYSER of New York.  
Mr. REUSS of Wisconsin.  
Mr. MONTGOMERY of Mississippi.  
Mr. HUNGATE of Missouri.  
Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia.  
Mr. RANDALL of Missouri.  
Mr. STRATTON of New York.  
Mr. PUCINSKI of Illinois.  
Mr. TALCOTT of California.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.  
Mr. KING of New York.

That is the list of Congressmen who were interested enough in the Pentagon papers to take the time to even look at their full text. It is interesting that the list does not include even one of the people who sponsored the hearing yesterday afternoon. Not a one.

**ADMINISTRATION'S POWERPLANT SITING BILL**

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, with the three-way pulling contest between the Atomic Energy Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Federal District Court, the Calvert Cliffs, Md., nuclear-power electric plant, when completed may resemble the "House That Jack Built." A solution to hodgepodge, after-the-fact planning of atomic and fossil fuel plants is the legislation recommended by President Nixon of which I am a sponsor. The administration's powerplant siting bill would provide for advance planning and advance public hearings wherein environmental factors involved with powerplants would be well investigated years beforehand. With the President's legislation we can

avoid environmental damage, and we can guarantee adequate electric power for all Americans before the lights go out.

**PROPOSED FEDERAL LOAN GUARANTEE FOR LOCKHEED**

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take sharp exception to the Member of the other body who asked his colleagues if they were "men or spineless errand-boys for finger-snapping fat cats" in reference to the proposed Federal loan guarantee for Lockheed.

The bankruptcy of Lockheed could mean the loss of 60,000 jobs, both of Lockheed employees and employees of their subcontractors. These are 60,000 working people. These are 60,000 American working people who will go on unemployment compensation and, probably, will eventually wind up on welfare.

Does the Member of the other body who referred to "finger-snapping fat cats" think that the 60,000 American working people are fat cats? Does he not understand the importance of 60,000 jobs to our economy and to our people.

The fact is that the Federal Government will not advance 1 penny but will simply guarantee a \$250 million loan to Lockheed and the loan will be made by the banks that have already loaned Lockheed \$400 million.

This loan will be a first lien on the assets of Lockheed and the banks have agreed to subordinate their \$400 million in loans to the Government-guaranteed loan. The fact is that during the period of 1961 through 1968, Lockheed paid \$328.9 million in taxes to the Federal Government, and this does not include the additional millions of dollars paid in income taxes by their employees.

It is obvious that the important thing in the Government-guaranteed loan program, we are talking about jobs for our working people, taxes for our Federal Government, and not fat cats.

**WATER STORAGE IN WYOMING**

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility study for the modification of Seminole Dam, on the North Platte River, Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming.

The feasibility study would examine the possibilities of raising the Seminole Dam by about 15 feet and thereby providing an increased storage capacity of about 300,000 acre-feet. It is estimated that this addition to the Seminole Dam would cost about \$2,300,000—a modest cost of \$6.80 per acre-foot of space.

Two factors justify the enlargement of the Seminole Dam:

First, in the spring-thaw months in Wyoming the Seminole Dam is generally

at peak capacity, and the lowland areas are flooded. While no critical flooding has yet developed, there is the constant threat of sudden destruction should a heavy rain fall on the melting snowpack. At the present time, this dam has no flexibility and no capacity for unexpected moisture; and

Second, a North Platte River pilot project is now being initiated under the Bureau of Reclamations' atmospheric water resources management program to increase precipitation and runoff in the river basin. Preliminary analysis indicate that as much as 140,000 acre-feet of additional runoff could result from inducing precipitation on the North Platte River above the Seminole Dam. The enlarged capacity of Seminole Dam would ideally serve the purposes of this pilot study and the added water could be used for irrigation, municipal and industrial purposes, and generate significant amounts of additional power in the North Platte power system.

A feasibility study of the enlargement of Seminole Dam has been deemed justifiable by the Bureau of Reclamation, and would require 3 years of study at a cost of about \$400,000. I am hopeful this \$400,000 can be authorized so the project can get underway.

**AMENDING EGG PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT**

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill—H.R. 9020—to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such act for a certain period of time, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 15 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (84 Stat. 1629) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall, by regulation and under such procedures as he may prescribe, exempt any plant located within non-contiguous areas of the United States from specific provisions of this Act where, despite good faith efforts by the owner of such plant, such owner has not been able to bring his plant into full compliance with this Act: *Provided*, That in order to provide at least minimum standards for the protection of the public health, whenever processing operations are being conducted at any such plant, continuous inspection shall be maintained to assure that it is operated in a sanitary manner. No exemption under this subsection shall be granted for a period extending beyond December 31, 1971."

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Hawaii if the amendment provides a permanent exemption or a temporary one?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It is a temporary exemption, to December 31 of this year.

I might say to the gentleman that the bill as amended has been cleared with the minority leaders of the House and of the Agriculture Committee. The Senate amendment made to the original House bill is of a technical nature and recommended by the Department of Agriculture, I am informed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. 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. 211]

Abourezk	Edwards, La.	Melcher
Alexander	Esch	Montgomery
Baring	Foley	Murphy, N.Y.
Blackburn	Ford,	Pickle
Byrnes, Wis.	Gerald R.	Poage
Carter	Gallfianakis	Rees
Celler	Gallagher	Reid, N.Y.
Chappell	Hagan	Riegle
Chisholm	Hosmer	Rosenthal
Clark	Howard	Sarbanes
Clay	Hungate	Saylor
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Scheuer
Dellums	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	McCulloch	Thompson, N.J.
Downing	McKinney	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Madden	Yatron
Eckhardt	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREE ON H.R. 8629 AND H.R. 8630

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one additional conferee be appointed on the bill—H.R. 8629—to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferee: Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one additional conferee be appointed on the bill—H.R. 8630—to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferee: Mr. HASTINGS.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

#### PAY SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 553 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 553

*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. 9092) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes. 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 Post Office and Civil Service, 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 553 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9092, the pay system for Government prevailing rate employees.

The purpose of H.R. 9092 is to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government. Also covered by the legislation would be prevailing rate employees paid from non-appropriated funds of the Armed Forces and the Veterans' Canteen Service.

A Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee will be established to replace the present Coordinated Federal Wage System Advisory Committee. It would consist of 11 members, one of whom would be full-time chairman. He shall be appointed by the President and may not hold any other Federal office.

A five-step wage schedule is provided to replace the present three-step schedule.

Automatic step advancements are provided after 26 weeks in step 1, 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks in each of steps 3 and 4. Step 5 will be 112 percent of the prevailing wage.

A pay differential of 7½ percent is provided, nationwide, for scheduled non-overtime work during the 3 p.m. to mid-

night shift and 10 percent for the 11 p.m. to 8 a.m. shift.

Two years saved pay is provided for employees reduced in grade.

The legislation will become effective 90 days after date of enactment and the cost for fiscal year 1972 is estimated at \$76.8 million.

The cost for fiscal year 1973 is estimated at \$115.3 million and, because of the additional cost of the fifth step, the cost for the next 4 fiscal years is estimated at \$181.3 each.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that H.R. 9092 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California has explained, House Resolution 553 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of debate on H.R. 9092.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that a similar bill was passed by the House and the other body last year. However, it was vetoed by the President.

This bill which we have before us today goes even further than the bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation should be rejected by this body.

The present system of paying the so-called rate employees was established back in 1862 to place it on a comparable basis with wage rates paid by private industry. It has worked successfully for over 100 years. Now, however, the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service comes out with legislation placing the wage rates in a straitjacket and proposing to pay more than private industry. This is completely wrong, it is completely unfair and it is not proper for the Congress to enact legislation requiring that Government employees be paid more than private enterprise employees.

In fiscal year 1969, Mr. Speaker, these employees covered by the bill—and there are approximately 850,000 of them—received increases of 9.5 percent versus an increase in cost of living of 4.8 percent. In fiscal year 1970—and this is under present law—these employees received increases of 8.9 percent versus a 6-percent increase in the cost of living.

What does this bill propose to do? Instead of the three steps that we have in the current law that has been in effect for many, many years, it provides for two additional steps or increases, five steps in all. Employees in the third step, as at present, would receive a 4-percent bonus over and above the prevailing wage scale in that particular area. But step 4 goes further, and increases this to 8 percent over the wage rate paid to private employees in the free enterprise system. Step 5 goes to 12 percent over the prevailing wage rate.

Then, in addition to this, the committee has thought of everything to increase the wages of these employees. The bill provides, on a mandatory basis, that employees working the swing shift, the second shift, shall be paid 7.5 percent above the basic wage, and those working from midnight to 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning would receive a bonus of 10 percent.

The total cost is estimated, when this legislation would be fully implemented, at \$181 million a year at the taxpayers' cost.

There is no logic, there is no justification why Federal employees should be paid more than employees in private enterprise. It creates undue competition for labor, and it contributes to the inflationary spiral, because private enterprise on a competitive basis for labor is going to have to pay more for their labor in order to come up to the Federal wage scales.

In view of the fact that the President vetoed a bill which only went to four steps last year, this one goes to five steps—and it is a worse bill. In view of the fact that the legislation faces a probable veto by the President again this year, I hope that the House of Representatives will reject this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. 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.

Mr. HENDERSON. 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. 9092) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS, to preside as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9092, and requests the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) to kindly take the chair pending the arrival of the gentleman from Texas.

#### 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. 9092, with Mr. SISK (Chairman pro tempore) 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 pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to request favorable floor action on H.R. 9092, a bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government and for other purposes.

The purpose of this legislation is to establish statutory policy for setting the

pay of the Federal Government's 810,000 prevailing rate employees. Of these prevailing rate employees, 670,000 are paid from appropriated funds. They are commonly referred to as wage board or blue collar workers. They are laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen; as for example: truckdrivers, welders, aircraft mechanics, carpenters, and tool and diemakers.

The definition of "prevailing rate employee" is amplified by this bill to include 140,000 employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the armed forces and employees of the veterans' canteen service.

The bill before us today, H.R. 9092, with a few minor changes is the same as the prevailing rate bill H.R. 17809, which was passed by the House last September by a substantial vote of 231 to 90.

This bill, H.R. 9092, has two major purposes:

One, enacts into law the long-established principles and policies for setting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

Two, makes the following changes in the current operating system and procedures:

a. Establishes a Federal prevailing wage advisory committee to replace an advisory committee currently established by administrative action to guide the coordinated Federal wage system. The Committee currently has six representatives from management and five from employee groups. The proposed legislation requires one of the 11 members to be a full-time Chairman, who shall not hold any office in the Federal service, and shall be appointed by the President.

b. Provides that the new wage schedules have five pay steps instead of the present three steps. The present third step is 104 percent of the prevailing wage. The fourth step would be 108 percent. The fifth step, as proposed, would be 112 percent but would not become effective for 2 years.

c. Provides automatic step advancements after 26 weeks work in step 1; 78 weeks in step 2; and 104 weeks in each of steps 3 and 4.

d. Provides for 7½ percent pay differentials, nationwide, for nonovertime work during the second shift—3 p.m. until midnight—and 10 percent for the third shift—11 p.m. until 8 a.m.—currently the premium pay depends on the prevailing custom of each labor market area.

e. Provides "saved pay" for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade. General schedule employees now have this, but prevailing rate employees, who must take a general schedule position due to reduction-in-force, do not.

f. Brings the employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces and employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service under the provisions of the prevailing rate system.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

About 80 percent of the Federal Government's 810,000 prevailing rate employees work for the Department of Defense. Other leading employers are the Veterans' Administration, General Services Administration, and the Department of Interior.

In 1862 Congress authorized the Secretary of the Navy to establish the rates of pay of blue collar employees. The only existing legislation relating to these employees is found in 5 U.S. Code, Sections 5341, 5342, and 5343. These sections briefly relate to a policy for setting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

During all these years the pay for wage board workers has been based on a survey of a sample of private industry firms in the local labor market area, generally within a 50-mile radius of the Government activity.

Since July 1968, the Federal Government has had a coordinated wage system, insuring like pay for like work in the same labor market area. This was not necessarily true prior to 1968. The coordinated Federal wage system was established by Civil Service Commission regulations as the result of presidential memoranda of November 16, 1965; one to the Civil Service Commission and the other to the heads of agencies, requiring equitable coordination of wage board practices.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive public hearings during the past several weeks on wage board pay policies and problems. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for manpower appeared before the subcommittee. They were specifically opposed to having five pay steps and also to bringing the nonappropriated fund employees under the provisions of the coordinated wage system.

These administration officials indicated their support of H.R. 7691, introduced by Chairman DULSKI at the request of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in preference to the provisions as found in H.R. 9092.

The administration bill, H.R. 7691, made no provision for specific wage steps or for uniform pay for second and third shift work. Likewise, nonappropriated fund employees were not included in the administration bill.

Members took testimony from the heads of five national employee organizations representing over 350,000 wage board employees. All strongly endorsed the need for legislation.

#### COSTS

Since the legislation would not become effective until 90 days after date of enactment, it is estimated that the cost of this legislation for fiscal year 1972 will not exceed \$76.8 million. This is based on an annual cost of \$109 million for the fourth pay step and \$6.3 million for night differential pay.

The cost for fiscal year 1973 should be approximately \$115.3 million.

After 2 full years of operation, there would be an additional annual cost of \$66 million, representing the additional cost of the fifth pay step. This would make the annual cost for the next 4 fiscal years \$181.3 million. These costs do not vary from the cost date submitted by the administration.

The current annual wage board payroll is approximately \$4 billion. The legislation before you represents at the most

when fully operational, in 2 years, a modest 4.5 percent pay raise. This comparison with the 6-percent across-the-board pay raises earlier this year for the white collar civilian Federal employees and for our military personnel becomes even more striking when we recognize the recent postal workers pay compact with the new postal corporation for a raise of \$2 billion over a 2-year period for about the same number of workers.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I would get right to the arguments now pertaining to the need and necessity for this legislation. I think five questions quickly come to mind.

The first question will be—why should this bill become law?

Second, why should nonappropriated fund activities be covered by the bill?

Third, why should there be five steps?

Also, covering the cost of the legislation very briefly.

In answer to the question—why should the bill become law? I would point out to the House that this is the same bill which passed the House last year with an overwhelming majority vote. It is true that through its passage in the other body and conference thereafter, the bill was amended and was vetoed by a pocket veto and, hence, we are back today with practically the same legislation that was presented to the House last year.

Now, who are wage board employees? These are the little people who work for the Federal Government with their hands. Forty percent—or 225,000 of these wage board employees receive top wages in excess of \$8,000 a year. Thirty-five percent are paid approximately \$6,000 a year. These are the workers for whom we are legislating for today.

The charges, I am sure, will be made that this bill is inflationary. Well, to the extent that it expends Federal money, I am sure that argument is valid. But I would like to ask the question, Why should these blue collar Government workers be the only ones in this Nation who are deprived of a living wage, if they have reasonable employment? Certainly, we know that organized labor both within and without the Federal Government have received large pay increases, and many of them very recently.

This is because in my opinion big business, and our top Government managers are personally interested in the pay increases. Certainly, those pay increases are far more inflationary than those contained in this bill.

I would point out that if the administration and those of us in the Congress want to offset inflation, and if we want to get at that problem as it pertains to Federal employment, we should reduce the number of employees and not attempt to just hold down the pay of those employees who are on our payrolls.

Now with regard to the second question, Why should nonappropriated fund employees be covered?

I point out that this provision of the bill will not cost the Federal taxpayers 1 penny, because the cost will come from the profits of operating the nonappropriated fund activities. But, as we have studied this subject, we have found that over one-third of the employees on the

military installations, they being the primary employer, one-third of them are military dependents. The primary purpose of the nonappropriated fund activity is to benefit through the profit device the military in their recreational activities. So one-third of these employees could thus be benefited certainly by coverage under the bill.

At the present time these employees have only the Federal minimum wage protection. It seems to me that they are entitled to more than that, and especially at a time that very serious consideration is being given to an increase in the Federal minimum wage law.

I would point out that for purposes other than pay the nonappropriated fund activity employees are covered by Federal law.

I would like next to answer the question, why five wage steps? The blue collar workers, first of all, need the guarantee of the system to determine their wages. At the present time they have what I would prefer to refer to as one step, because the so-called third step is 4 percent above the prevailing rate. I would point out that the classified employees working under the Federal service have 10 steps. The supervisors of the wage board employees have five steps. The Foreign Service employees have step increases. We all know that our military get longevity pay, so everybody in the Federal service gets some longevity pay at the present time. But these wage board employees that would be covered by this bill now have only one step above the base pay and that is 4 percent.

We might compare that with what industry in the United States does. The Civil Service has recently written to the chairman of our full committee and in sum and substance it is my conclusion from what they say that they do not know exactly what industry does, but we think, and there is some evidence to substantiate the fact that blue ribbon industries do pay for longevity. It is my opinion that the U.S. Government should be a blue ribbon employer. We know that where the Government contracts for labor, and exactly the same labor in the blue collar area, it is a common and accepted practice that the contractor receive 12 to 15 percent profit. This bill would pay that to the worker, not to the "flesh merchant."

Very briefly, I would like to move to the cost of the bill. In fiscal 1972 the cost will be \$76.8 million. For the fourth step contained in the bill there will be a cost of \$108 million. For the night differential the cost will be \$6.3 million. This is substantially below the costs that we gave to the House last year as the bill passed, and this is because the administration through its management has been able to reduce the amount of the night differential, and they should be commended for this very fine manpower action on their part.

For the fiscal year 1973, the second year the bill would be effective, the cost would be \$115.3 million, and for the fifth step as contained in the bill the cost would be \$66 million.

Let me relate this cost to figures that I think I can better understand, and hope-

fully some of you. There are 670,000 wage board employees throughout the Federal Establishment today. The cost of the fourth step in this bill is \$76.8 million. This is an average pay increase of less than \$120 a year, less than \$10 per month for the Federal blue collar workers covered by this bill.

The fifth step when it becomes effective 2 years after the enactment of the bill will give these employees less than \$100 a year additional pay.

What has been our recent history in other negotiations affecting both the Government workers and perhaps those outside I am sure all Members are familiar with the recent rounds in the new Postal Service. My understanding is that there will be a one-shot bonus of over \$300 in that settlement. There will be increases over a 2-year period equaling or approximating 30 percent for those employees. As I understand it, the current steel negotiations anticipate the workers will receive and are demanding 30 percent over a 2-year period. This is based on their success in prior negotiations with the aluminum or the can industry.

So I think this bill is a very modest and a very reasonable bill. It is the same bill that passed the House last year. I certainly think the Members that voted in favor of the bill last year should ask very probing questions and find answers that I have not been able to find before they would change their position and vote otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I note that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, has said this is the same bill that was considered last year. I would like to remind my friend, and the Members of the House that it is not the same bill. It is a worse bill, in my opinion, than that which the President vetoed last year.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the enactment of H.R. 9092 because it is completely unnecessary, because it is dangerously inflationary, and because its enactment would completely destroy the area wage system that has operated so successfully for many years.

First of all, it must be emphasized that a uniform Government-wide pay system for the Federal Government's so-called blue collar employees has existed and operated successfully for nearly 100 years.

The existing coordinated Federal wage system operates under a rather simple policy enactment by Congress which directs the agencies to set the pay of their employees on the basis of prevailing rates of pay in local private industries. This system operates very well; it assures the wage board employees of full pay comparability with their counterparts in local private industries and it operates with no congressional involvement.

The existing wage system is flexible, it can immediately respond to changing

local labor market conditions, and it can conform to any changes that may be necessary in order to adapt to local prevailing wage prices.

An example of the effectiveness of the operation of the present wage board system is the fact that in fiscal year 1969 wage board employees received pay raises averaging 9.5 percent in comparison to the Consumer Price Index which rose 4.8 percent, and in fiscal year 1970 these employees received pay raises averaging 8.1 percent while the price index rose 6 percent.

In general, what this bill proposes to do is write into law a rigid, cumbersome, and inflexible set of rules, procedures, and policies which will then become both the floor and ceiling as far as any future improvements and benefits are concerned.

The bill effectively locks into statute every conceivable procedure and system for pay setting purposes. Any future adjustments so-called "fine-tuning" of the system will require endless future enactments by the Congress. While the immediate effect of enactment of the bill will be to give most Federal wage board employees a pay raise, the long range effect will be to deprive them of a sound pay system that is flexible enough to immediately respond to every employee need as that need may arise.

H.R. 9092 begins with a fine sounding policy statement relative to the pay of prevailing rate employees; it elaborately defines prevailing rate employees; and then it proceeds to shatter the entire concept of prevailing rates. The bill writes into law a five-step longevity pay schedule with the so-called prevailing rate at the second step. The third step is 4 percent higher, the fourth step is 8 percent higher and the fifth step is 12 percent higher than the prevailing rate. In other words, an employee who remains under the system for 6 years will automatically receive 12 percent of the prevailing rate of pay in his area.

On the date of enactment of this bill, a great majority of blue collar workers will automatically go into the fourth step and be paid 8 percent higher than the prevailing rate and 2 years after the date of enactment all of these employees will go into the fifth step and be guaranteed 12 percent higher pay than the prevailing rate. It is quite apparent that for all intents and purposes the whole concept of paying Federal employees in a local wage area the same rate as that paid by private industry is to be abandoned by the bill.

Since recent studies show that Federal employee pay in many areas of the country is now higher than local industry pay, and that the Federal Government is unfairly competing in local labor markets, enactment of this bill would further compound an already bad situation. There is simply no justification for enacting a bill, such as this, which abandons the comparability and prevailing rate concepts for paying Federal employees and which forever guarantees that blue collar Federal employees in every local wage area in the country would be paid 12 percent more than the prevailing local industry rate.

Mr. Chairman, there are additional

provisions contained in this legislation which in themselves are reasons enough to defeat the bill. They are not only costly but are also in complete variance with existing prevailing wage practices and they will create serious inequities and unbelievable administrative problems.

The first, as I have already indicated, is the creation of a pay system with five pay steps. A recent survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission shows that most private companies pay their employees a single rate. The present wage board system, which has three pay steps, is already more liberal than most private industries. The five steps required in this bill will not only add an additional \$190 million per year to the existing \$4 billion blue collar payroll, but it will also have a pronounced inflationary effect on local wage markets.

The bill will write into law nationwide percentage pay differentials of 7½ percent for evening work and 10 percent for night work. The differentials paid in local private industries vary throughout the country according to local pay practices. They are seldom paid in percentages but instead are paid in fixed sums of money of so many additional cents per hour. Ironically, some Federal wage board employees currently are being paid higher differentials than those called for in this bill. Enactment of this bill could actually reduce their total take-home pay.

Another extremely unsound provision contained in H.R. 9092 is the inclusion therein of the so-called non-appropriated-fund employees. These employees are not Federal employees and there is no conceivable reason why they should be blanketed into a pay system that is designed exclusively for Federal civil service employees. These people, who are employed principally by the Department of Defense in PX's, service clubs, bowling alleys, et cetera, are not in the competitive civil service. They have none of the obligations, responsibilities, or commitments of Federal employees.

The bill not only brings these non-Federal employees into a Federal wage system but it will also guarantee them the five-step pay system, the nighttime differentials, and the premium and holiday pay.

The five-step pay systems in the bill would guarantee that most of these people would be paid 12 percent more than their counterparts in local private industries. This again automatically inflates local wage rates requiring local merchants, hiring similar personnel, to continuously raise their rates of pay in order to compete with the Federal Government. In addition, since all of these people work in programs involving the morale of military personnel, the prices of goods and services made available to service personnel will have to be increased appreciably in order to pay for the inflated wage rates of the employees involved. The entire idea of the commissary—post exchange system—of providing low-cost goods and services to servicemen—whether right or wrong—could be destroyed.

At the same time, they will remain out of the civil service retirement system, and Federal employees' health benefits and life insurance programs. If the Con-

gress is to deal legislatively with these employees, it should come to a clear-cut decision on their Federal status. This bill opens the door for a prolonged series of proposals to "correct inequities" of employees of nonappropriated fund activities.

Mr. Chairman, in every possible respect this is extremely bad legislation. The bill is much worse than H.R. 17809, which was enacted in the last Congress, and which was vetoed by the President.

I sincerely urge that H.R. 9092 be defeated; otherwise, I am confident that the President will have no other recourse than to veto it.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill and endorse the statement that the gentleman in the well has made and commend him for his leadership in this field.

Mr. Chairman, during the years I have been in Congress, I have firmly supported the principle that our Federal employees should be paid salaries and wages comparable to those being paid in private industries. People who work for the Federal Government should not be required to suffer financially for doing so.

However, I simply must oppose enactment of the bill now before us if for no other reason than it completely violates the so-called pay comparability principle.

For nearly 100 years, the class of people who work for the Government in the crafts and trades, otherwise known as blue-collar employees, have been assured of full pay comparability in their localities. The present law requires that they be paid the "prevailing rate" of pay for that locality based upon continuing wage surveys of local businesses.

The coordinated Federal wage system which the Civil Service Commission has implemented nationwide, throughout the Government, is working exceedingly well and it is assuring that this class of Federal employees keeps pace with local pay scales. In fact, blue-collar Federal employees, by reason of the operation of the existing system, received pay raises in 1969 averaging 9.5 percent and in 1970 of 8.1 percent.

Additionally, the present pay system adopted by the Civil Service Commission contains three pay steps while most private industries have only one pay step, and most Federal blue-collar workers in any local wage area are now receiving an average 4 percent higher rate than exists on the local labor market.

While H.R. 9092 proposes in its policy statement to continue paying prevailing rates, the bill, in setting up a 5-step pay system with the fifth step paying 12 percent more than local wages, actually destroys the prevailing rate concept. It guarantees that these Federal employees will continuously be paid 12 percent more than local wage rates.

So really, Mr. Chairman, the bill in itself is a deception. It abandons the prevailing rate system which has worked

so effectively for so many years and it adopts instead a policy of paying higher wages to Federal employees than are paid to private industry employees.

However, the drastic change in pay policy is actually the least of the problems involved in this bill. The real, very serious problem is inflation. That will be the result of its enactment, with its mandate that Federal salaries be priced out of the local industry market.

The recent jump in the cost-of-living index in June certainly indicates that inflation is a matter of serious national concern. It simply does not make good sense, at a time when the administration is being urged to institute a policy of wage restraints, for the Congress to be enacting a bill such as this with built-in inflationary pressures.

Enactment of this legislation could cause a wage spiral throughout the country that would be next to impossible to control. The Federal Government, by setting Federal wages 12 percent higher than local wages in every area throughout the country, would be inviting inflated pay demands from every trade, craft, and union nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of excellent reasons why this legislation should be defeated. Most of them have been adequately discussed here this afternoon. The bill is not a good bill, it does nothing to improve Federal wage administration, it is not needed, and certainly, if enacted, it could raise havoc with our national economy.

I sincerely urge that we defeat this legislation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9092 was ordered reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a vote of 21 to 3.

This bill is very similar to H.R. 17809 which was approved by the House last September.

The final version approved by the 91st Congress was vetoed by President Nixon last New Year's Day.

The main purpose of the pending bill is to establish a long-needed statutory system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Federal Government.

As of December 30, 1970, there were approximately 670,000 full- and part-time prevailing rate employees on the rolls of the Government. About 80 percent of these employees, who are more commonly identified as wage board or blue collar workers, are employed by the Department of Defense.

The other major employers of prevailing rate employees are the Department of the Interior, the Veterans' Administration, and the General Services Administration.

Prevailing rate employees are laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen who occupy various positions such as truckdriver, carpenter, painter, welder, and airplane mechanic.

The definition of prevailing rate employee has been expanded in this bill to include approximately 140,000 employees

of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces and approximately 3,200 employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service.

At the present time, the pay of most of the 800,000 employees who would be covered by this legislation is fixed by administrative action in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

While we have no quarrel with the regulations of the Commission, the obvious disadvantage of such a system is that the Government's prevailing rate employees—unlike most other Federal employees—are subject to continuing uncertainty about the rules and policies under which their pay is fixed.

There is no justification for giving these employees less stability on their pay checks than other Federal employees.

To remedy this unfavorable situation, H.R. 9092 proposes to enact into law the established principles and policies for fixing and adjusting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

In addition, the bill proposes to make certain needed changes in the existing pay system for these employees. These include: Requiring an independent, full-time Chairman for the Pay Advisory Committee; providing that each nonsupervisory wage schedule shall have five steps instead of the present three steps; and providing for uniform night differentials of 7½ and 10 percent for second and third shift work.

Mr. Chairman, our Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service has studied this matter very thoroughly, and I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and his subcommittee for their excellent work.

I urge the passage of this proposal. Action is long overdue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9092 is to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees—commonly called blue collar workers—of the Federal Government. It provides a statutory pay system for wage board employees rather than a system based on executive memoranda.

This bill makes four major changes in blue collar wage setting policy: First, it provides for five steps in each wage grade, as opposed to three in-grade steps under the current system; second, it provides for a nationwide 7.5 and 10 percent differential for second- and third-shift nightwork; third, it requires appointment of a neutral chairman of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee; and fourth, it includes nonappropriated fund employees, who are not now included under the Federal wage system.

First. Five in-grade steps: This is the most important change in former policy. U.S. Postal employees have 12 in-grade steps and civil service employees have 10 in-grade steps. Why should not Federal blue-collar workers—those in the craft, trades, and labor forces—have at least five steps, to insure fuller comparability with like employees in private industry.

Increasing the number of in-grade steps

assures greater incentives for wage employees who are locked into a wage grade by job classification. The American Federation of Government Employees reports that 90 percent of Federal blue collar workers are now in their top grade step.

Under the present system, a worker can rise from 96 percent of the average prevailing rate to 100 percent, to 104 percent, but that is it. After many years of accumulating experience and seniority, should he not be rewarded by more than an 8 percent increase in pay?

It must also be remembered that the 100 percent, or prevailing rate level, is based on the average amount paid in private industry. Should not a man who has been on the job 20 years and performs his job well receive a little more than just 4 percent more than the average worker in that field? This proposed legislation would allow Federal blue-collar workers to earn up to 12 percent above the average, if they have proved themselves through experience.

Second. H.R. 9092 also provides for a nationwide 7.5- and 10-percent differential for regulatory scheduled second- and third-shift nightwork, whereas local area wage practices are now followed in this regard. However, there may be no other industry in an area working a night shift, so there is nothing to compare night wages with. Certainly night work is equally odious to a Federal employee in California as to one in Nebraska—should they not receive equal pay differentials for this?

Third. Neutral Chairman: By providing for a full-time Chairman on a 4-year basis, this legislation assures deliberations by the Committee will be fair.

Fourth. Nonappropriated fund employees: Nonappropriated fund employees, of which there are an estimated 160,000, are neither man nor beast under present law. Although they work for the Federal Government and are subject to most policies regarding Government employees, they have no job security or pay equity assurances. Many of these individuals work for the Department of Defense. The proposed bill would assure pay based on prevailing rates in private industry—a right they do not now enjoy.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT).

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity, and appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the subcommittee in yielding to me. I wholeheartedly support this legislation, H.R. 9092.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to one of the Members who just preceded me, and in his statement he referred to the bill as being worse than the bill we had last year. I would say that that would depend upon whose eyes are looking at the bill. To my mind, and to the people in my district, this is a little better bill than it was last year, but the bill does not go nearly as far as some Members wished it to go.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thought that the bill applied to the blue-collar workers of Congress.

Mr. ABBITT. It does not, but we could make it that way if the gentleman from Iowa offers the right amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend particularly the chairman and members of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee. They have worked long and hard on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this legislation does not go nearly as far as many Members of this body wished, but it is a realistic bill, it is moderate, and it will bring some relief to these much-deserving workers in the very near future if we can get the bill enacted into law.

It sets up by statute a Federal Prevailing Wage Rate Committee, and this for the first time would have an independent Chairman. Heretofore we have had a Committee appointed by Executive order, which had a Chairman who was a representative from management. Under this bill it would mean that the Chairman would be independent, and he would have no other functions or duties with the Federal Government.

In my opinion this bill will go a long way toward bringing necessary relief and an adequate pay system to our blue-collar workers.

The five steps that the bill sets up in place of the three steps is going to also be of tremendous benefit.

I feel that our blue collar workers are among the most loyal workers we have in America. They have needed relief for a long time. They needed this relief last year but, as has been pointed out by those who have spoken heretofore, the bill last year was vetoed. However, I believe that this is such a modest and moderate bill that even if the Executive were to veto it, this body and the entire Congress would pass it over his veto, but I cannot imagine it being vetoed, as suggested by one of the former speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the bill wholeheartedly to the membership of the House, and I hope that it will pass overwhelmingly.

I feel that H.R. 9092 is a "must" piece of legislation, in view of the failure of our efforts last year. It was most unfortunate that the administration saw fit to recommend a veto of our bill in the closing hours of the last session—and I am, therefore, strongly of the opinion that we need to guard against any action which would further delay this badly needed relief for our blue collar workers.

As one of the original sponsors of this legislation, I feel that we have a good bill. Obviously, it does not go as far as some would like, and I personally would like to see further provisions approved; but I believe this is a bill which we can pass and one which the President should sign. If the administration chooses to follow last year's course, I believe that we can override a veto.

It is perfectly apparent that the present administration is not willing to adequately compensate the Government's blue-collar workers for the services they are rendering. It is likewise obvious that the administration is not willing for Con-

gress to enact the legislation to provide the necessary adjustments. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in his testimony before the Manpower Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, clearly indicated that he endorse a status quo condition for the wage board employees. This is not good enough. It is not fair and it is not a sound policy for the Government to follow. Our blue-collar workers have been discriminated against for many years and, in my opinion, there will be no relief until Congress gives it.

H.R. 9092 is a first step toward equal treatment for the wage board employees. Personally, I favor a 10-step pay system but it is obvious that to get a bill enacted into law, we have to take a realistic approach. The five-step bill now before us would right many of the wrongs which now exist and, in addition, would boost the morale of the blue collar workers. Many of these workers feel—and rightly so—that their Government has forgotten them. They did not understand why their bill was vetoed while at the same time the administration approved raises for classified employees and the military.

I urge the House to give overwhelming approval of this legislation in recognition of the fine work which the wage board people are doing. Many of them are convinced that relief is going to come to them only through legislative action by Congress and past experience has clearly indicated that this is true.

This bill would put into law the basic policies of setting the pay of the Federal production workers. It would also correct obsolete pay procedures and would bring a number of nonappropriated fund employees into the same wage-fixing authority used for the 750,000 appropriated fund blue collar employees.

I am personally familiar with the situation confronting many of the blue collar workers in the Tidewater area of Virginia, whom I have the privilege of representing. Many of these people are having a great deal of difficulty meeting the rising cost of living and have waited patiently for the benefits which this bill would provide. They are disappointed that the treatment they have received would seem to indicate that the administrative branch considers them in somewhat of a lesser category than it does the classified employees.

Thousands of our production workers are loyal, hard-working Government people who have responded magnificently to the country's need for maximum production, but they have begun to wonder if their work is really appreciated. These are the people who build the ships, overhaul the planes, load shells, maintain Government facilities, and perform hundreds of other important functions for the Government, often in an unheralded way. There is no bureaucracy but it is they who keep things moving. There is a vital role in keeping our defenses at a top-flight state of readiness and in supplying our forces overseas. The hundreds of jobs which they perform cannot and should not be taken for granted. They should be on a par with the status accorded the white collar workers who are on a classified basis.

I count it a real honor and privilege to represent a large group of the Nation's blue-collar employees and I wish to assure them of my continued support for their cause. The relief provided in this bill is not only well deserved but it is long overdue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting pay rates for wage board employees. I have sponsored an identical bill, H.R. 9164.

While I give my wholehearted support to the measure before us as a long step in the right direction, I would have preferred to go even farther toward equitable treatment for wage board employees. In this regard, I had originally introduced H.R. 2481 which I offered in full committee as a substitute for H.R. 9092. H.R. 2481 included some features which, in my opinion, are preferable to H.R. 9092 from the employee's standpoint. Primarily, instead of the five steps in the bill before us H.R. 2481 would have provided a 10-step pay system, as the classified employees now have. These 10 steps would be achieved over a period of 17½ years of service. The bill would also have provided for a clear, orderly, legal mechanism for participation by blue-collar representatives in the pay-setting process. Unfortunately, this substitute measure—which had the support of the major Government employee unions—went down to defeat in committee.

However, with the choice before us today of either supporting or defeating H.R. 9092, I urge approval of the measure before us.

This legislation includes a five-step prevailing wage rate system which offers progression from the lowest grade to the top grade in 6 years of service. The fifth step would become effective following 2 years of service in step 4. Most employees already qualify for the fourth step, which translates into a 4-percent salary increase, and the fifth step is 12 percent above the starting pay for that grade.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress last year approved an equitable pay system for general schedule, or white collar, employees of the Federal Government. We should do no less for the wage board employees. This major provision of H.R. 9092 will go a long way toward assuring that these employees of the Federal Government are in a position comparable with their counterparts in private industry.

In addition, H.R. 9092 also provides a 7.5-percent pay differential, nationwide, for scheduled nonovertime work during the second shift—3 p.m. to midnight—and 10 percent for the third shift—11 p.m. to 8 a.m. Currently, the premium pay depends on the prevailing custom of each labor market area. The bill provides "saved pay" for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade. General schedule employees now have this protection. Prevailing rate employees who must take a general schedule position, due to reduction in force, do not.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the legislation

before us establishes a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee to replace the advisory committee currently established by administrative action to guide the coordinated Federal wage system. This bill requires one of the 11 members of the new committee to be a full-time chairman, who shall not hold any other office in the Federal service, and shall be appointed by the President of the United States. The primary function of the committee will be to study the prevailing rate system and advise the Civil Service Commission of their views. The committee would also be required to make an annual report to the Commission and the President for transmittal to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in urging my colleagues to support this legislation, I would like for a moment to quote from a very telling letter which I received from a fellow Marylander. This lady, who, I might add is not one of my constituents, expresses very simply and directly the feelings of the great majority of wage board employees.

She writes:

I notice on your letterhead that you are on the civil service committee. Could I prevail upon you to consider our plight? My husband is a blue collar worker—federally employed and civil service. Recently our President saw fit to give increases to the white collar Federal employees but when it came to the skilled worker, he said it would be inflationary to grant increases to the blue collar workers. Why is it only inflationary to one grade—the wage board grade—and not the salary grade? It costs us the same amount for the same amount of food and today that is our prime concern—food.

These words, Mr. Chairman, can be multiplied a hundredfold in my congressional district alone, where thousands of wage board Federal employees reside.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this upgrading and revision of the prevailing rate system is long overdue, and necessary if the Federal Government is going to be in a position to compete with private industry for top-flight laborers and tradesmen.

This bill is realistic, equitable, and just, and will provide necessary guidelines for the wage board rates for many years to come.

Therefore, in addition to urging the support of my colleagues for this necessary measure, I sincerely hope that President Nixon has reconsidered his action earlier this year when he vetoed a similar wage board bill passed by the 91st Congress and that he will give this legislation his approval.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9092) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2:50 p.m., this afternoon.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House, under its previous order, stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

#### A CEREMONY FOR THE UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAITS OF CHAIRMAN CLARENCE CANNON AND CHAIRMAN JOHN TABER—THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THE U.S. CAPITOL—2 P.M., JULY 28, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Dr. Latch, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, will open this ceremony with the invocation. Dr. Latch.

(The President, Members of Congress, and guests rose for the invocation.)

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

O God, our Father who hast made of one spirit all nations of men to dwell upon the earth and who didst send thy Son to bring peace to the world and to establish good will among men, we pause in Thy presence invoking Thy blessing upon us as we unveil the portraits of Chairman Clarence Cannon and Chairman John Taber.

We thank Thee for these men who so faithfully and so truly lived—for their integrity of spirit, for their courage to stand firm for what they believed, for their willingness to adventure along high and noble ways, for their unflagging devotion to our country. May these portraits serve to remind us of their loyal and devoted service in handling the appropriations of the House of Representatives.

We unveil these portraits in their memory, for the good of our country, and to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished officials of the Executive and Legislative Branches, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is especially appropriate today that we meet here in this historic Chamber, steeped as it is in history, because our business is to unveil the portraits of two men who earned a permanent place in the history of the House of Representatives. Many of us here served with these two distinguished men, and one of us here took the oath of office in the House at the same time these two men took the oath of office.

We are especially honored to have with us the President of the United States, who served in the House of Representatives during a portion of the chairmanship of both Clarence Cannon and John Taber.

Thucydides, a warrior of ancient Greece, concluded his career and achieved fame as the father of history by writing about the active role he played in the great events of his lifetime.

Clarence Cannon began his career by reading and teaching history, and then—as if what he read and taught did not quite meet his standards—he turned to a life of action. And it is in the world of affairs that Clarence Cannon achieved his fame—as a shaper of policy, as a maker of history.

The national legislative branch of government was his field of action. His mentor, Speaker Champ Clark, from Missouri's "Mark Twain Region" taught that "no man is a born Congressman," and Clarence Cannon energetically set himself to the task of excellence in his chosen field. He studied the House. He mastered its ways. He absorbed its spirit.

As a legislative craftsman he had a tremendous impact on democratic government. He wrote about the House, conveying a full appreciation of the stabilizing virtues of its customs, its traditions, and its precedents. Which one of us here assembled has not consulted his practical handbooks on House procedure? What serious student of the House has not drawn from his scholarly works?

Chairing the Committee on Appropriations, he championed the preeminence of the House in money matters and forcefully advocated constructive economy in public expenditure. For decades all Washington knew that when fiscal prudence prevailed as policy, Clarence Cannon had probably earned some pride of authorship.

He was known to all as a tireless, disciplined public servant, driven by a strong spirit, and anchored by a will of iron. He was famous for vigorously promoting his strong convictions about what he thought was right for this country, and for holding to them defiantly when they came under attack.

But Clarence Cannon was something more than an awesome figure casting lightning bolts from the center of power. Those of us who served with him for so many years knew him and loved him as a broad-ranging man with an impressive knowledge of history and literature—as a courtly and thoughtful friend, a man of great compassion.

We honor him today as a brilliant champion of the House and a great servant of the American people.

Clarence Cannon and John Taber, although of opposite political persuasion, being tireless advocates of economy, often found themselves pulling in the same harness. Inevitably, the Chairman and the ranking minority Member of a committee can be more effective if they work together.

I have had the privilege of sharing a most agreeable working relationship with the statesman from Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) the ranking minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations, whom I now present, Mr. Bow.

[Applause.]

Mr. BOW. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minority Leader, Mr. Chairman of

the Committee, and Mr. Speaker McCormack—we are delighted you are with us today—I should like to quote John Taber. Like the prophet Isaiah, he held high a standard for the people of his day, which he frequently expressed in these words—and I quote John Taber:

I appreciate that mine is perhaps a lone voice in the wilderness, but I am expressing the sentiment and issuing a warning that I believe needs to be issued to all America at the present time. That warning is to balance our budget or face disaster.

John Taber had an abiding philosophical attachment to the proposition of limited Central Government and was an apostle of economy in public expenditures—an enemy of unneeded frills and embellishments in Government programs—all of his days in Congress. This was the life he led. It was his belief that the House of Representatives is the supreme guardian of the people's liberties and that the power of the purse is the weapon through which to assure their preservation.

Those were his principles, his deep convictions. And for close to half a century John Taber was one of the real leaders of the House on behalf of those principles. It was said during his chairmanship that there were three Houses of Congress—the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the House Committee on Appropriations. Courage and integrity were among his most outstanding attributes. He was as solid as a rock. With a determination typical of the best in his upstate New York background, he defended his fiscal views.

Not everybody always agreed with where John Taber stood, but everybody, bar none, admired the courage and forthrightness with which he expressed his point of view and the fairness he extended to others in the expression of their own. Honesty, integrity, and sincerity went right along with the characteristic vigorous pursuit of his high calling to public service. In the eyes of all he earned the highest accolade one politician can bestow upon another: He was a man of his word.

First and foremost, he was a legislator and political leader who had a profound influence on the financial affairs of this country over a period of two decades. He was a legend in his own time for the depth and breadth of his fiscal knowledge. He was variously known as the "Fiscal Vigilante," "John Cash and Carry Taber," or more ironically as "Generous John."

But perhaps he would want to be remembered here today by the title earned by Thaddeus Stevens, the first chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and coveted by all of those who have followed: The "Watchdog of the Treasury."

[Applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Frank de Bruin Valerius, the distinguished artist who did Mr. Taber's portrait, is unable to be with us today. Mr. Charles J. Fox, the famous artist from New York City who painted Mr. Cannon's portrait, is here. And I should like for him to stand.

[Mr. Fox stood, to applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Thank you.

I had a conversation on the telephone with Mrs. Cannon. She still retains that

same charm as of yesterday. She said she regretted she could not be here today for this ceremony. But the two daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Cannon are here; Mrs. William I. Pixley, the former Ida Lee Cannon, and Mrs. Harry Hackethorn, the former Linda Cannon.

We are also pleased to have the niece of Mr. Taber, Mrs. Ann Taber Hassett, here.

Mrs. Pixley, will you unveil the portrait of Mr. Cannon?

[Mrs. Pixley unveiled the portrait of Chairman Clarence Cannon, to applause, the President, Members of Congress and guests rising.]

Mr. MAHON. And now, Mrs. Hassett, will you unveil the portrait of Mr. Taber?

[Mrs. Hassett unveiled the portrait of Chairman John Taber, to applause, the President, Members of Congress, and guests rising.]

Mr. MAHON. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

[Applause, the President, Members of Congress, and guests rising.]

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker—once a Speaker, always a Speaker—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minority Leader, Mr. Ranking Member, Reverend Latch, ladies and gentlemen: On March 3, 1923, more than 48 years ago, three of the most remarkable men ever to serve in the House of Representatives came to Congress. One of them was the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York, who is still with us. The other two were the Honorable Clarence Cannon and the Honorable John Taber, who have passed on.

Some 23 years later one of the largest freshmen classes in history—I was among them—stood in awe in the presence of such greatness. Another one is at my left today, the President of the United States.

[Applause.]

That these men were unique among their fellows is evident from their illustrious careers. Both were tireless watchdogs of the Treasury. John Taber, it has been said, was the "fiscal vigilante" of the century.

I remember one day, as though it were yesterday, sitting in the Speaker's lobby with former Speaker Rayburn, during the first Eisenhower Administration. Mr. Taber was Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and was walking down the corridor when Mr. Rayburn stopped him. He said, "John, one of the Cabinet officers says that you are applying the meat ax too hard to him." Mr. Taber replied—Mr. Rayburn almost rolled out of his chair with laughter when he said—"Sam, I have got to keep them squealing; otherwise they won't appreciate what I am giving them."

Clarence Cannon was tough and unrelenting. The new Member who did not know how he could finesse would wake up suddenly to find out that his pet project might have been discarded from the Public Works appropriation bill. Clarence Cannon, however, was a man of many great qualities. He was a scholar, perhaps the greatest in the House of his time. He was a great parliamentarian. He became a student of history and a master of English rhetoric.

Mr. President and Mr. Chairman, I join with you and others in saying that it was an honor to serve with these extraordinary men and to observe the skill with which they went about their daily work. They were great Congressmen; they were good men; they were statesmen of high caliber. They were what we would all like to be; they were good men.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MAHON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It would be a wonderful experience to those of us here if in this sacred place we might hear many of our colleagues who come back to be with us today; if we could hear from members of the Cabinet who are here, and others; if we could hear from Speaker John McCormack, who could say so many interesting things about these two men. That is impossible under the circumstances, but it is heartwarming to have them with us in this occasion.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD.

[Applause, the President, Members of Congress, and guests rising.]

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, Speaker McCormack, distinguished guests: A little over 6 years ago I was kicked off the Committee on Appropriations when I assumed some different responsibilities, but let me say that I look back with wonderful thoughts and a great deal of nostalgia about the 14 years that I was privileged to be a Member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

During all the time I served on the Committee either Mr. Taber or Mr. Cannon chaired that great committee.

Let me say without any hesitation or qualification that I am today a better Member of the House and of the Congress because of the personal experiences that I had in my association with Clarence Cannon and with John Taber. And I think that is true of every Member of the House who had a similar association with these two giants either on the committee or in the House as a whole—and I suspect it is also true of some Members of the other body who from time to time met both of them in conferences on appropriation bills.

But, more importantly, the Committee on Appropriations is a better committee today because of the things that John Taber and Clarence Cannon stood for in their long and distinguished service on that committee.

Let me briefly relate an experience I had with Mr. Taber in January of 1953. I had served 2 years' apprenticeship on the committee at the very, very bottom of the committee—when the Republicans came into the majority. John Taber was looking for some new Members from our side to serve on certain subcommittees. In those days, the Defense Subcommittee was broken up into three panels—Army, Navy, Air Force—and I was fortunate to be made a Member of the Army panel. Mr. Taber was looking for someone to head that subcommittee and he looked at me one day on the floor of the House and said, "What branch did you serve with in World War II?" And I proudly said that I had been in the Navy for 4

years. He said, "You will make a good chairman of the Army Subcommittee."

[Laughter.]

I think the House of Representatives is better now, as it was then, because John Taber and Clarence Cannon were leaders in the handling of those important appropriation bills.

There is no doubt that the Congress as a whole during their service was better because of their participation.

I would say without any qualification that America then—and America now—is better because of the long years of devoted service by those two giants of the Congress.

We could all mention unforgettable experiences we had with them individually or together. I was a spectator in the "fisticuffs" between Mr. Taber and Mr. Cannon. It was an interesting battle. I have seen them fight in the committee room by word and by action; but the two, despite occasional differences, were close personal friends.

I was privileged to see them plot in behalf of a President, Democrat or Republican. I saw them plot in opposition to a President, Democrat or Republican. And they usually were successful, whether they were for a President or against a President.

But, despite their images, they were the kind of people that we all love. Mr. Cannon could almost walk out of one of Dickens' novels as sort of a Scrooge, but when you got to know him you could not help but feel the warmth and friendship he really gave to everybody with whom he was associated. The image of John Taber was rough, inflexible, stern, uncompromising. The truth is John Taber was a warm, friendly, flexible person who could and did give more than he expected, whether it involved the President or a freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

They both made an indelible impression on me and I am sure all with whom they served. They both made an indelible impression on the Congress.

[Applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Thank you, Mr. FORD.

And now it is my high privilege and very great honor to present the President of the United States.

[Applause, Members of Congress and guests rising.]

President NIXON. Mr. Speaker, Speaker McCORMACK, Mr. Chairman, Congressman FORD, Congressman Bow, and all of the distinguished guests on this occasion:

In a room like this, at a time like this, we think of the history of this country and of the men who helped to make it and the women who helped to make it. We think of this room, up until about the year 1850, being the room in which the House of Representatives met.

We think, for example, of Henry Clay and Abraham Lincoln speaking in this room. Then we move on into this century and we go back 25 years, or 20 years, as the case might be, to think of two of the giants of the Congress. We do not see the giants of our own time. No one knows at the time who really is a giant.

But as the years pass, we look back and we realize who the great men were. Two

of them we honor today, Clarence Cannon and John Taber. Everything has been said about them, by those who served with them, so eloquently that I will not try to add, except to say that I was privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives and to have known both of them as a Member of the House and then as a Member of the Senate and as Vice President of the United States.

I can certainly endorse everything that has been said so generously about them and so well by others who have appeared on this program.

I do know, too, that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives is an enormously important committee, and that whoever is the chairman of that committee is a very important and powerful individual.

Now, I have to be very careful at this point, because I realize that represented in this room are chairmen of other committees, and men who serve on other committees as well, so I will choose my words very carefully.

As I looked over the record of those who have been chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, going back to the year 1865 when it was first set up, I found that some went on to be Speaker of the House; a few, very few. Some went on to be Governors. Only one became President, James Garfield.

Yet I can stand here, looking back over my own public service, and also looking back over the history of this country, and say, as has already been implied by other speakers, that the hardest working committee in the House of Representatives is probably the Appropriations Committee, because of its workload; that the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives, because of its control of the money that is spent, is the Appropriations Committee; and then third, that potentially the most unpopular committee in the House of Representatives is the Appropriations Committee, because the Appropriations Committee members and its chairman and its ranking minority member have responsibilities that go beyond the committees, the very important ones on the legislative side.

They meet, they determine what is in the public interest as far as their views are concerned. They submit that legislation to the Congress. They get it passed. And then the question is: Should the money be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out those spending programs that the legislative committees have approved? It is here that the unpopularity comes in.

I was studying recently a poll that was taken by a group of business executives with regard to national attitudes in this country on spending. The business executives were terribly disappointed by the results of the poll because they thought it would come out strongly against Government spending, but I was not surprised, and anyone who is a sophisticated observer of Government would not be surprised to find that a great majority of the American people, when asked about spending for almost any program in the domestic area, are

for it, whether it is for billions for education, for health, or housing, or in the field of agriculture, or any other area.

If an individual is asked, "Do you favor more Federal money spent for this program?" the answer is "Yes." So you can see, therefore, that if an individual really is seeking popularity, the thing is to get on a committee where he can vote yes for that program and go back and say to his constituents, "I was for what you wanted."

But there was another interesting result at the bottom of this poll, and here is where the Appropriations Committee came in. The great majority of the people who voted for every one of the spending proposals listed on the domestic front, when they were asked, "Do you favor higher taxes?" said "No"; "Do you favor higher prices?" "No."

That is where the Appropriations Committee comes in, because the Members of this committee must take these tremendously popular programs, they must examine them, they must cut out all the waste to be sure that is taken out, and then they must see whether or not all of them put together, no matter how desirable individually, whether all of them put together will be so much that they will raise taxes. Then they must say no, or, when they are put together, they will have the effect of causing inflation and raised prices, and then they must say no.

That is why men and women who serve on this very important and powerful committee are not necessarily always the most popular Congressmen or Congresswomen in the country.

But on the other hand, they are absolutely essential to responsible government, because there must be at some point along the line those people in government who will look at the whole picture and rather than representing this interest or that interest or the other interest, will represent the interest of all the American people. Every American is interested in how high his taxes are. Every American is interested in how high his prices are. That is why the Appropriations Committee, more than any other committee in the House of Representatives, speaks for all of the American people.

That is where these two men come in. That is where, also, the men who are seated on this platform, the Chairman of this committee, GEORGE MAHON from Texas, a Democrat, the ranking Republican, FRANK BOW from Ohio, where they come in.

I have been trying to think of an appropriate way to describe what they are. We often hear, when we hear of politicians in either the House or Senate who have reached high ranks, labels of certain favorite terms. One will be called "Mr. Republican." Another may be called "Mr. Democrat." And somebody will be called "Mr. Conservative." Someone else will be called "Mr. Liberal." The main thing is to be sure you call them the same thing at the right time and the right place.

So the real question then, and that is what it seems to me the unveiling of these portraits brings to mind, is what would

one call the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I would not call him "Mr. Republican" or "Mr. Democrat." I know that both GEORGE MAHON and FRANK BOW will speak up to any President, Democrat or Republican, that they speak up to any partisan, Republican or Democrat, that they look upon their role as being bigger than Party, as big as all America itself, because they represent all of the American people.

No, I would not call the Chairman of this committee or his colleague, the ranking member, "Mr. Republican" or "Mr. Democrat," "Mr. Liberal," or "Mr. Conservative." I would call him "Mr. Responsible." Responsibility may not be popular always, but it is enormously necessary, absolutely indispensable for the future of this country.

So, this gives me the opportunity to express on behalf of all the American people our thanks to the people through the years who have served on this committee that have kept us on a steady course, that have seen to it that those things that should not be funded are not funded, to see to it that money that should not be wasted is not wasted, and to see to it that our policy, whether it is under a Democrat or a Republican President, to the greatest extent possible, will be one that will not raise the taxes of the people unless the people are in a position where they want them raised, and they usually do not, and will see to it that our policy will not have the effect of raising our prices by reducing the value of their money.

I would simply close this by saying that I remember only two things that have not been mentioned up to this point about the descriptions of John Taber and Clarence Cannon. When John Taber in the 80th Congress was cutting budgets, they said he was "Taberizing" the budget and Clarence Cannon "Cannonized" the budget after that.

I would say in tribute to GEORGE MAHON and FRANK BOW that they are trying to bring the budget back to earth again.

[Applause, Members of Congress and guests rising.]

Mr. MAHON. Will everyone remain in his place until the President has left the Chamber. Thank you.

[Applause, Members of Congress and guests rising.]

Mr. MAHON. The ceremony is concluded. Thank you very much.

#### PAY SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9092), to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes.

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

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 9092, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) had 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) had 39 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX), chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Mail.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 9092, I want to offer my support today to the chairman of the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, Congressman HENDERSON, to whom we all owe a great deal for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is through his persistence and the hard work of his subcommittee that the groundwork has been laid for the enactment of this legislation.

It is good legislation because it supplies a congressional compensation policy for blue collar workers as the Congress has done in the past for white collar workers and military personnel.

This legislation is necessary to insure equality of treatment for blue collar workers. The wage board system which is based on an area wage idea has begun to breakdown after a successful history. It needs shoring up and this legislation will do it, and I would remind the House that we supported such legislation during the last Congress by a vote of 231 to 90.

Besides creating a Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee by statute rather than administrative action, the bill provides that new wage schedules should have five pay steps within a grade rather than three. This will, in effect, provide a much needed pay raise for blue collar employees. The bill will provide much needed pay differential for second and third shift or nightwork.

This legislation, in addition, corrects by statute an inequity which has existed for a long period of time. The PX system of the Armed Forces is the biggest retail store operation in the world. Yet, its employees do not receive the benefits of decent pay. This bill will bring them into the wage board system so that they can receive like pay for like work in the communities in which they are employed.

There may be some who will describe this legislation as costly, I believe, to fail to pay adequate wages is in itself costly because it tears down employee morale. Such a short sighted policy destroys efficiency and is, in fact, in the long run wasteful.

Once again, I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, I would like at the same time to congratulate Mr. John Griner, president of AFGE, who has worked so long and hard on this legislation. The foresight and dedication of these men will finally end an oversight in congressional policy and make the Gov-

ernment of the United States once again the best employer in the United States.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first, let me congratulate the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and the distinguished members of his committee for their sterling efforts in bringing this bill to the floor. They have worked long and hard and the bill they are now presenting is a happy solution to a long-standing serious problem. It will apply to a deserving and large group of Federal employees whose real interests have been overlooked much too long. In this bill the Congress now has an opportunity to correct a serious inequity. Of course, I refer to the proposed new wage system for Federal blue collar workers and those paid from nonappropriated funds. But let me state also that through the leadership of Mr. HENDERSON and his committee, Congress has not been indifferent to this problem. In fact, we passed a measure last year which would be law today had it not been the victim of a presidential veto. Now we must perform our task again even to the point of overriding a veto.

There are nearly 800,000 such workers on the Federal payroll today and almost without exception they are being discriminated against when it comes to receiving a fair wage for a day's work. As things now stand, prevailing rate workers earn on an average of about 30 percent less than classified white collar workers, and 16 percent less than workers in the postal field service. Their work also is responsible and essential. This is a regrettable situation and Congress should take the necessary steps to correct it.

These workers comprise 27 percent of those paid exclusively from appropriated funds. Additional thousands of workers are included in the nonappropriated list. For long years these workers have not only been patient with the situation, they also have demonstrated beyond doubt they are among the most loyal of employees; this despite the obvious inequities under which they work.

I am confident the additional money this bill will cost the taxpayers will be repaid in improved spirit, in higher morale and in greater productivity. This result is, of course, essential. There is a threat of contact employment which consistently hangs over all of this large group of employees. We in the Congress do not want these workers to be deprived of employment. We count on them by their cooperation and contributions to justify the additional costs which will be generated.

I hasten to congratulate those who are capably representing the workers covered in this bill and who have striven in such a conscientious manner to help bring about today's action by the Congress. They are representative of our own constituents from throughout the Nation.

I have supported this proposal from its inception. I am a cosponsor of the bill now before us. It is only right and proper that the Congress provide the machinery for orderly wage adjustment

for these hundreds of thousands of deserving workers.

The fact a similar bill was vetoed during the last session should not deter us from again passing this measure. That bill, you will recall, passed the House by a vote of 272 to 89 and the Senate by voice vote. Due to the lateness of the veto, no attempt to override was possible.

This time is must be different. The Congress should pass this measure promptly and override a veto should one be forthcoming.

I urge speedy and affirmative action on this bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today will provide, for the first time, a legally established system for determining the pay of some 775,200 Federal employees, who have had to consider themselves as stepchildren under the Federal pay system.

They have a system for determining their pay, but it is subject to administrative whim. This bill will give legal sanction to the system of determining wages that are comparable to those being paid for the same type of work in the surrounding area. The employees affected are the so-called Federal blue-collar employees, laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen.

The bill establishes a Federal prevailing wage advisory committee and establishes guidelines for its determination of prevailing wages.

Our committee also felt an obligation to bring under this same wage determining system some 138,000 employees of the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration, who are paid from nonappropriated funds. These are employed principally at post exchanges, service clubs, veterans canteen services, and similar organizations where the employees are paid from the income of the establishments, rather than from appropriated funds.

Our committee heard considerable testimony over the past few years that many of these employees were paid disgracefully low wages, sometimes well below the minimum wage. A good many of these employees are wives, or other dependents, of enlisted men whose salaries are simply not enough to maintain a satisfactory family income. This bill will assure them pay comparable to others doing similar work in the area.

Our committee felt that the laborers and craftsmen employed by the Federal Government deserve the assurance that, if they perform their services well, they can rely upon pay increases if they remain in the Federal service. We compared the pay and fringe benefits in private industry, and in the classified service, and we are recommending a five-step pay system instead of the current three-step system.

To reach step 2, an employee must perform 6 months of service in step 1—then a year and a half in step 2, and 2 years each in steps 3 and 4. After 6 years of satisfactory service, an employee has become highly valuable and will be paid 112 percent of the prevailing wage determined under the law. We believe this incentive

will be of great importance in upgrading the performance of Federal workers.

Another incentive, bringing the prevailing-wage employees more in line with other Federal employees, offers special incentive pay for night work—7½ percent for the second shift and 10 percent for the third shift.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his contribution as a ranking member of the subcommittee on this legislation. I know of one specific amendment that he offered to the legislation that will be very helpful, and I commend him for his deliberation on this matter and for his painstaking efforts in this regard.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman very much.

To adjust an existing inequity, this bill provides "saved pay" for a prevailing-rate employee who is transferred to a general-schedule position paying less money. Under the present system, if he is transferred to a lower grade as a prevailing-wage employee, he retains his previous pay during a 2-year adjustment period. This is not true if he transfers to a general-schedule position. The bill we are considering today removes that inequity.

The amendment that the chairman of the subcommittee speaks of I did offer in the committee, and it is a part of the bill. It provides that each prevailing-wage employee appointed within the several States or the District of Columbia shall be either a U.S. citizen or a bona fide resident of the United States, unless the Secretary of Labor determines that a U.S. citizen or bona fide resident is not obtainable. This is a problem we have had in different parts of this country and certainly including my area along the border.

Although not specifically stated in the bill, your committee felt, as stated in the report, that, in connection with the employment of personnel at any U.S. installation outside of the United States, a policy should be adopted that no person shall be denied employment in a prevailing-rate position solely on the basis that such person is a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill fills an important gap in our legislative authorization for Federal employees. It is, in nearly all respects, similar to the bill which this House passed by a large majority last September. The need is still there, and three-fourths of a million Federal employees are looking to us to remove inequities and give them the statutory assurance they need that their work is appreciated and that good service will be properly rewarded.

Thank you.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

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

THE FLIGHT OF APOLLO 15

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me. I asked for it merely so that I could report to the House that the Saturn missile now on its way to the moon is functioning perfectly and it is on target, and should land on the moon next Friday.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL).

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, a bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate Federal employees.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation and feel that now is the time for the House to assist these 800,000 workers who are: laborers, truck drivers, mechanics, carpenters, aircraft mechanics and include some 140,000 employees in nonappropriated fund activities in the military departments.

The employees, often called blue-collar workers, have a wage setting procedure that is almost entirely based on administrative authority. The many wage board employees who have contacted me want some form of congressional policy that has a guarantee that administrative changes must conform to certain basic principles now. This is only proper. We have such principles now for military personnel pay, for white-collar employees, and for foreign service personnel.

H.R. 9092 merely puts into law basic policies for setting the pay of our wage board employees. By enacting this legislation we, as Members of Congress, indicate to the taxpayers as well as to the heads of departments and agencies our continuing interest in the pay fixing policies of a large segment of the Government's workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join my subcommittee chairman, Hon. DAVID N. HENDERSON of North Carolina in active support of our bill H.R. 9092, for 800,000 blue-collar workers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in support of this legislation. I had the pleasure of testifying in its behalf before the distinguished committee chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON). I was disturbed last year when the President vetoed this bill while he signed another bill for general service employees and military personnel which was considerably in excess of this type of legislation because it was called inflationary. The President vetoed the wage board bill but signed the other one.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 9092, the pay system for Government prevailing rate employees.

On September 9, 1970, the House passed H.R. 17809, a bill almost identical to the one which we are considering today. One day later, the Senate passed its version of the bill. There were to be two

additional House actions, with final consideration coming on December 17, before it was ultimately vetoed on January 1, 1971. I certainly hope that the legislation we are considering today does not fall victim to similar action.

The purpose of H.R. 9092 is to bring equity and stability to the pay system of prevailing rate employees. For too many years, these employees, who make up the crafts, trades, and labor forces in the Federal Government, have been under a pay system that at best has been unresponsive and subject to administrative inclination. This situation has been going on for more than 140 years, since the time in 1830 when naval production workers led the fight to obtain a 10-hour workday for Federal production workers. This had long been available to employees in the private sector of the economy.

In 1840, President Van Buren signed an Executive order establishing this measure for Government production workers. This was the first Executive order ever signed for wage board employees.

This was followed in 1861 by Congress' passing a law calling for the employees of Navy yards to receive pay equivalent to that received by their counterparts in the private sector of the economy located in the immediate vicinity of the respective yards. It is this system that these employees are still under today.

Many inequities have arisen since that first congressional action. Some have been corrected, but more often than not, each alteration or wage survey has uncovered additional difficulties, and the cycle, in effect, starts all over again.

I am reminded of the story of the employee in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard during the war. He was being given an award for a record number of consecutive welds. The award was ostensibly for his welding, but in reality it was a testimonial to his many years of experience and hard work, and the effort it had taken for him to reach such a high level of proficiency. During the ceremony, he remarked that the award was appreciated and gratefully received, but that wage equity would be more in order.

He proceeded to point out how a young man, standing not too far away, had been employed in the yard for about 3 years and was already receiving the same income as the recipient of the award. This story may represent an extreme situation, but it is the kind of thing that takes place all too often, and it points up one of the greater inequities existing in the current wage board system.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for the almost 800,000 "forgotten men and women" comprising the wage board employees of the Federal Government to receive comparability with those doing the same work in the private sector of the economy. We have been debating this point, not just a few hours, or a few weeks, but for many years. It is time to act.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure.

H.R. 9092 provides that prevailing rate employees, also referred to as wage board or blue collar workers, will have their

compensation based on the principles of equal pay for equal work. There will be pay differences based on substantial or recognizable differences in work, and the rates of pay will be maintained with prevailing rates of comparable work in private industry, so that the rates will attract and retain qualified employees.

The legislation establishes a new Federal Wage Advisory Committee with the chairman appointed by the President for a 4-year term. It will have five agency representatives and five from employee organizations, representing under exclusive recognition of the Government, the largest numbers of prevailing rate employees.

There will be five steps in each grade, instead of the present three step scale, with the steps at 96, 100, 104, 108, and 112 percent, respectively, of the prevailing rate. Employees with satisfactory work performance will be automatically advanced to the next higher step within grade, following 26 weeks of service in step 1, 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks each in steps 3 and 4.

Differentials are provided for duty involving unusually severe working conditions or unusually severe hazards. In addition, 7½ percent and 10 percent differentials are provided for regularly scheduled nonovertime work where a majority of the hours occur between 3 p.m. and midnight, and 11 p.m. and 8 a.m. respectively.

"Saved" pay for a period of 2 years is also provided for employees who are reduced in grade. This is similar to that now provided for employees under the General Schedule.

I do have reservations concerning the inclusion of nonappropriated fund employees, previously not covered by the prevailing rate system. Of course, they too, should be fairly treated but not lumped together with regular Government employees.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Government has been much more attentive to the needs of white collar workers over the years, and fairness requires approval of this bill. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the measure and I am hopeful that, upon reconsideration, the President will approve the bill rather than veto it as he did a similar measure last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the enactment of H.R. 9092, of which I am a cosponsor and which would provide an equitable system of setting and adjusting the pay for prevailing-rate employees of the Federal Government.

As the membership of the House well remembers, this body passed similar legislation last September, by the convincing vote of 231 to 90. Despite the compromise nature of that bill, the President saw fit to veto it. I commend the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, particularly the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, Mr. HENDERSON, for having acted so expeditiously to give this measure another chance for enactment.

There is, Mr. Chairman, virtually universal agreement on the need for some legislation in the area covered by the pending bill. Even the administration has submitted a proposal. The approximately 810,000 prevailing-rate employees of the Government, including 11,000 who work in Hawaii, deserve immediate attention. Their pay is determined by administrative regulation, subject to change when administrations change, when a different bureaucrat succeeds to a particular job, or when an administration decides to change its policies. The basic thrust of H.R. 9092 is to enact into law the present procedures used to determine and adjust wages for these workers.

The major provisions of H.R. 9092 are familiar, I am sure, to most Members, for they are very similar to those of the bill vetoed by the President last year. There is established a five-step within-grade schedule, as contrasted with the present three. The bill sets up a revised Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee; provides a 7½- and 10-percent differential to workers on the second and third shifts, respectively; allows "saved pay" for 2 years for prevailing-rate employees who are reduced in grade; and includes for the first time in the definition of "prevailing rate employees" those persons who work for veterans canteens and for non-appropriated-fund activities of the Armed Forces such as post exchanges and movie theaters.

Mr. Chairman, it has been estimated that more than 90 percent of all wage board employees are in the third and last step of each grade. Most of them took just 2 years of satisfactory service to reach that point. Where is the incentive in such a system for an employee to continue performing at his best when the chances for advancement without a promotion in grade have been completely foreclosed?

Although my own bill proposed a 10-step, 27-percent range schedule, making it more generous than the pending bill, I am realistically supporting the 5-step proposal as being much more readily acceptable. There is little doubt that the present 3-step, 8-percent range schedule is grossly inadequate. The administration tacitly admits this by maintaining a 5-step system for wage board supervisors. The logic which allows a 5-step system for supervisors, yet condemns exactly the same system for rank and file workers, is incomprehensible, to say the least.

For more than 100 years, Mr. Chairman, Congress has recognized that the Federal Government's blue collar employees should be paid wages comparable to those prevailing for employees in private industry in the regional labor market. Increasingly, governmental pay has not been comparable to that of private industry. The results have been both inequity to the employees involved, and a lack of ability to compete on the part of the Federal Government, in the skilled manpower market. Both the employees and the Government need the protection of a statutory, realistic, and actually comparable system for setting and adjusting these wages. H.R. 9092, at the

very least, represents movement toward such a system.

I urge its speedy and overwhelming passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I will offer an amendment at the appropriate time to reduce the within grade pay steps in order to achieve some minimum economy here this afternoon. But as I watch the flow of outstanding orators in the well supporting this bill, I can see a bandwagon rolling. I have been here long enough to know that.

I feel like the little Dutch boy with his finger in the dike with the whole wall about to come apart. But, nevertheless, the truth, and at least some emphasis on the poor downtrodden taxpayer requires that I make a few comments to set forth a position which I believe the record will sustain.

First, may I remind the Members that we went through this exercise approximately 1 year ago, and there is a bit of legislative history on this bill.

A year ago the union which has been lobbying for this bill had a convention scheduled in Honolulu, a far away place, where the cost of living is low and where they can afford to take their delegates at the expenses of rank and file members. It was assumed that this bill would have passed the House, and that certain members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service could rush out to Honolulu like conquering heroes with the goodies.

They ran out of time. The result was that all they managed to do was to pass a rule for the bill and then they had to come back after recess to finally pass the bill. I mention this as a matter of political history since this afternoon we had a 1-hour delay on this piece of legislation while we took a recess to hear the President so for 1 hour the taxpayer was spared the extra cost that this bill will bring.

I also would suggest to the Members that they pay special attention to the fact that we have in the bill before us 17 corrections—17 technical errors. Unanimous consent was granted in committee to introduce a clean bill to clean up those errors. This would lead you to believe that we have a very, very complex and very technical bill before us—since 17 technical mistakes in a bill this brief should not develop. I submit to you that the bill is not that technical. What really happened was that there was very sloppy drafting by the lobbyists supporting the bill and a very sloppy review by the staff of the subcommittee—and therefore the 17 technical errors in the bill were understandable.

I would not be too surprised if there were other errors. I would certainly hope that the organizations supporting this bill have a careful review by the Senate staff in case the language is written so that they will not wind up with a pay decrease rather than a pay increase. I say that as a friend of all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the three members of the Post Office and Civil

Service Committee who signed the minority views recommending against the enactment of H.R. 9092, I want to re-emphasize a single thought expressed by the minority: H.R. 9092 is even worse legislation than H.R. 17809 which was similarly pressured through in the last Congress and which was wisely vetoed by the President on January 1, 1971. Again this year there remains no need for the bill.

A careful reading of the majority report itself supports this position. One of the major provisions of the bill, according to the report, is that:

It enacts into law the long established principles and policies for setting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

And, on page 7 the report confirms that:

Since July 1968, the Federal Government has had a coordinated wage system, insuring like pay for like work in the same labor market area.

If this is so, why do we need the legislation?

On page 11, the report says:

Section 5343(a), with the committee amendment, states the well-established principle that the pay of prevailing rate employees shall be fixed and adjusted as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

On page 14, the report in its explanation of the hazardous pay differentials says:

It is the intent of the committee that such environmental differentials will be regarded as part of base pay, as is the current practice under the Federal Coordinated Wage System.

And in discussing overseas wage schedules, on page 12, the report says:

Most likely (but not necessarily) such rates of pay will be based upon the average of appropriate rates paid to prevailing rate employees within the several states as is the current practice under the Coordinated Federal Wage System.

This being the case, what is the purpose of this legislation? The purpose is, of course, to establish by law the policy of paying wage board employees not "prevailing rates" but instead rates of pay which are 12 percent above the prevailing rates of local private industry.

In view of the current economic trends, I would hope the Congress would think twice before charging ahead with a legislative package that has "inflation" written all over it.

There are other disturbing features of this legislation as well, Mr. Chairman. For example, this bill, H.R. 9092, was a so-called "clean bill" reported from the subcommittee in lieu of the originally introduced bill. Yet, as can be noted from the first five pages of the committee's report there have already been 17 "technical and clarifying" amendments added to the bill.

Of particular interest is the so-called technical amendment which removes from the coverage of the bill the employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. When the Treasury Department learned that these employees were covered by the bill, it fired off a letter to Chairman DULSKI, which is found on page 31 of the report, pointing out that:

It would not be possible either to continue the present 15% night differential for E&P employees or to set their pay rates in accordance with comparisons with comparable industry and Government pay scales.

The surprising fact, Mr. Chairman, is that the Treasury Department finds the bill will not permit them to set the rates of pay for their employees "in accordance with comparisons with comparable industry in Government pay scales." It is my understanding that this is what this entire bill is supposed to be about—that it is supposed to permit agencies to pay comparable pay rates. If the Treasury Department has problems with this bill, I wonder what kind of problems all the other departments and agencies are going to have.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that there are enough built-in problems in this legislation to keep the Congress busy for the next 10 years.

The worth of this legislation has not been shown. Its defects are mostly evident—for I am sure there are defects that are yet undiscovered—and its inflationary effect is obvious.

Despite the pressure tactics that have moved this legislation this far along, it is nevertheless vulnerable to Presidential veto. It is, in my estimation, a piece of legislation that unquestionably deserves the disapproval of the Congress and the President.

But I wish to reemphasize that I recognize a bandwagon when I see it. I know this by the great interest that so many Members have displayed and from the statements which are already in the RECORD that we are doomed to be rolled over in this effort to save the taxpayers. I am very philosophical about it, but I do hope that before final passage that all other technical problems in this legislation will be corrected.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. I merely wish to assure the gentleman in the well that there is no way he would ever be confused with the little Dutch boy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman make his point again? It went over my head.

Mr. HOGAN. When the gentleman began his remarks, he said that he felt like the little Dutch boy who plugged the dike. I just wished to assure the gentleman that that confusion would never take place.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I take that as a compliment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 9092, a bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for blue collar employees of the Federal Government; and I am especially honored to support my esteemed colleague from North Carolina, the most able chairman of the Manpower Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, DAVID N. HENDERSON. I commend

him and the other members of the committee most highly for bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Thousands—actually thousands of my constituents say that the time is long past due for this legislation. I am in complete agreement with them. During the past several years, thousands upon thousands of laborers, aircraft mechanics, carpenters and the many other occupations in the wage board category have witnessed Congress improve the salary scale of other Government employees again and again. Rightfully they have asked the question: Why cannot Congress give us fair pay? If any of us had been in their place, we would have asked the same question and I doubt seriously if we would have been content to sit and wait like they have.

I have reviewed H.R. 9092 and this bill does give proper recognition to our productive employees. This will give them fair pay. Additional wage steps are provided and these in turn give added incentive to the employees.

I am happy to note that the Henderson bill provides assistance to our more than 100,000 non-appropriated-fund employees. These are the employees of post exchanges, hobby shops, and so forth. They are the forgotten employees in the Federal service. This bill brings them under the wage board pay system and guarantees them step raises that previously had been denied to them.

Mr. Chairman, this is sound legislation. It deserves the support of all the Members. To do otherwise would deny the Federal blue-collar worker the basic right of every American citizen—his and her right to equal pay for equal work.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, President Nixon has spoken on numerous occasions about the forgotten American. H.R. 9092 deals with the plight of the forgotten members of our civil service—the laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen—the blue collar workers. This bill extends to these employees of the Federal Government the same rights and procedures that already belong to other members of the Civil Service.

Yet last year, when H.R. 17809, which differs from this bill only in a minor way, was passed by the Congress, President Nixon saw fit to veto it. Its \$130 million price tag was termed too inflationary by the President. Yet the very next day he signed into law a 6 percent pay raise for white collar workers that cost \$2.5 billion. The only explanation for this inconsistency on the part of the President can be the fact that the forgotten blue collar workers of the civil service are not part of the President's great silent majority.

We cannot expect these individuals to remain passive and silent much longer if we continue to treat them as second class members of our civil service. There are specific and comprehensive laws dealing with the pay and perquisites of every other kind of Federal employment. The saved pay protection extended to prevailing rate employees under H.R. 9092 in the event that a worker is forced

to take a lower grade job because of reductions in the work force is in effect for all other civil servants. The need to apply this safeguard to blue collar employees is made evident by the fact that of the 73,114 workers laid off by the Federal Government from July of 1969 to July of 1970, all but 1,629 were blue collar employees. In fact one third of the currently employed blue collar workers of the Federal Government are living at or below the poverty level. This is inexcusable.

All other Federal employees have their salary schedule set by the Congress. To fail to do so in this instance will exacerbate the difficulties the Government faces in retaining prevailing rate employees in the face of higher wages paid by private industry. By establishing a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, on which employee organizations will be represented, H.R. 9092 has extended to the prevailing rate employee the rights and benefits that accrue to the members of all other labor organizations.

The estimated cost of this legislation for fiscal year 1972 is \$76.8 billion. That is far from being inflationary. I urge my colleagues and President Nixon as well to support this bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Federal Government.

After a number of years during which most of us recognized the need for this legislation, we finally succeeded last year in reaching a barely acceptable compromise measure with our colleagues in the Senate only to have the President veto the bill. He did so partly, I feel, because he was poorly advised about the inequities which have always plagued our federally employed laborers, craftsmen and tradesmen, and even more adversely affected our often forgotten nonappropriated fund employees.

I supported the bill as it passed the House last September, even though I felt then as I feel now that it might be more fair if we allowed for more in-grade step increases as are provided for in my own bill, H.R. 5810. By the time the bill reached the President, these within grade promotions had been reduced still further, a reduction which I am pleased has been eliminated by our committee colleagues today. But the main thrust of the legislation both last year and this, the statutory establishment of an equitable pay system, and inclusion thereunder of nonappropriated fund employees would have been accomplished had the bill not been vetoed, and I urgently hope the White House advisers will have reconsidered their opposition when the legislation is sent downtown this year.

Mr. Chairman, in many instances the system now in operation, of determining the pay of wage board employees by attempting to set salaries comparable to those paid by private industry for similar work in a labor market area, has proven most inequitable. I have had many cases in my office where employees doing identical work for one agency are paid less than those in another agency

just down the street. While an effort to create a coordinated wage system has been underway for some time, it is still far from perfect and, as our colleagues know, a large number of employees of support services for the Armed Forces are not even included in the system.

Certainly there is equity in increasing the number of within grade step increases for our prevailing rate employees. Promotions within the ranks of laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen are far too few to force loyal and capable employees to wait for grade promotions for any advancement beyond the present three steps, while their white-collar contemporaries are provided 10-step increases over 17 years. They are also entitled to special compensation when assigned regularly to less desirable hours, and I believe the committee is to be commended for providing a 7½-percent pay differential for the 3-to-midnight shift and 10 percent for the 11 to 8 in the morning. Even more important is the provision for "saved pay" for 2 years for employees reduced in grade, which has been provided for classified employees for some time now.

Finally, I think it is most important that we include in the system we create the thousands of nonappropriated employees, working mostly in supply depots, post exchanges, and clubs operated for service personnel, many of whom have suffered grave inequities both with regard to compensation and to other benefits available to wage board and classified employees. While the Civil Service Commission has long expressed concern about the manner in which their pay is fixed and administered, the extent of differences between their pay and that of other employees doing similar work, we have yet to receive a recommendation from the commission that we guarantee them the same employment rights other Federal employees enjoy. I believe we should bring them into the system without delay.

Mr. Chairman, I believe H.R. 9092 is sorely needed and long overdue, and I urge its enactment.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, a bill to establish fair and equitable pay procedure for the Federal Government's 670,000 appropriated fund blue collar employees and the 140,000 nonappropriated fund employees.

The basic thrust of this bill before us today is to enact into law basic policy procedures used to determine and adjust the wages for our laborers, craftsmen and tradesmen.

There is a universal agreement that legislation is necessary. We have today practically no congressional guidance for handling the pay of this group of 800,000 employees. During our pay hearings, which lasted over a period of several days earlier this year, the committee, time and again, heard employee representatives urge legislation so that they would have some kind of guarantee for future pay plans.

The administration submitted a proposal, but it lacked specifics. There was no guarantee in the administration's proposal as to future pay steps. There

was no comment concerning saved pay or uniform pay for overtime work. In fact, the 140,000 very much neglected nonappropriated fund employees were not even mentioned in the administration's proposal.

H.R. 9092 before us today, stipulates that there shall be five pay steps; it indicates that there shall be 7½ percent to 10 percent differential for night shifts. This bill also establishes an 11-member advisory committee within the Civil Service Commission to see that the principles of this legislation are properly carried out. Similarly, this bill brings into the coordinated wage system of the Federal Government, the 140,000 nonappropriated fund employees who work at the post exchanges, golf clubs, officer clubs, and related activities.

In my own State of Florida, there are more than 20,000 of these wage board employees. We must protect these men and women from vague and inconsistent practices.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration by the Congress of this legislation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, legislation to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Federal Government.

Adoption of this bill will benefit some 800,000 Federal blue collar and nonappropriated fund employees, whose salaries have fallen seriously behind equitable levels because of the great amount of time now required for promotion to higher grade levels. The bill before us would offer progression from the lowest to the highest of five grades in 6 years of service, thereby allowing these employees to derive more adequate incomes from their years of service to the Government.

The bill is similar to H.R. 17809 which passed the House by a vote of 231-90 in the last Congress but was vetoed by President Nixon on January 1, 1971. I certainly hope that after this bill is enacted by Congress, President Nixon will realize the error of denying our deserving employees a more equitable pay system.

In addition to its much-needed five-grade feature, the bill provides for a 7.5 to 10 percent night differential; has a save pay formula; and provides for an 11-member Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee with a fulltime chairman not in Federal service. I feel these benefits will go far toward improving our present inadequate system.

Prevailing rate supervisors are also included in the legislation, so that a coordinated and workable pay relationship of all prevailing rate employees can be achieved. The bill continues the present system of basing blue-collar pay on a sampling of private industry pay in the local labor market area, and requires that the Civil Service Commission define the wage areas for non-appropriated fund employees.

The bill sets forth the general policy of the Congress that the rates of pay of prevailing rate employees shall be fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates and shall be based on principles that, first, there will be equal pay for

substantially equal work; second, there will be relative differences in pay within a local wage area when there exist recognizable differences in duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements among positions; third, the level of rates of pay will be maintained in line with prevailing levels for comparable work within a local wage area; and fourth, rates of pay will be maintained so as to attract and retain qualified prevailing rate employees.

I feel these principles are deserving of our support, and urge the adoption of H.R. 9092 to correct the longstanding inequities borne by our loyal Federal blue-collar workers.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, the Congress ought to bring under the protection of this act employees of private contractors who are engaged in maintenance, overhaul, and repair-type activities for the Government.

Under existing procedure these employees are subject to the most extreme kinds of exploitation.

This situation works to the disadvantage of contractors and employees alike. It creates problems for the Government, and should not be tolerated.

Under existing statutes a contractor who pays decent wages will find that when contract renewal time comes around he will be underbid by a competitor who is in a lower wage area, or who is not union organized, or who simply has no obligations to his employees. A man who has a contract today and who pays his employees on the basis of seniority, or even at terms commensurate with their skills and productivity will find that at contract renewal time he is underbid, because his competitor does not have seniority to recognize, does not have obligations to these employees, and whose greatest interest is to obtain the lowest possible wage rate and still get the job done.

Under this system it is possible—and I have seen it happen—for a contractor to pay just a few cents above the Federal minimum wage and still be underbid. Under this system—and I have seen it happen—a highly skilled man may earn \$6 an hour under one contract only to see his employer lose the contract to somebody who pays \$4 an hour. That employee may end up working in the same shop at the same job, but for a 20 or 30 percent reduction in wages.

This situation results in chaotic conditions for employers and employees alike. It results in destructive exploitation of labor. It results in great waste and losses to the Government.

We need to assure that employees engaged in work for the Government would at least be assured of uniform wages within a given labor market. This would end the exploitation of labor in Government contract work, would assure that competition among contractors is on some basis other than low wage rates, and would bring order and sanity into the contracting system.

To put it simply, we have the Service Contract Act.

That act assured that contract employees would at least get the minimum

wage. We need to perfect the Service Contract Act by making its benefits and protection available to all contract employees regardless of the location and nature of their work, regardless of the size of the job.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9092—a bill which provides long-needed changes in the wage board system.

I am firmly convinced that H.R. 9092 is urgently required to provide equity and justice for the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees who work under a prevailing wage system as well as for those now employed under non-appropriated fund activities.

Fundamentally, the bill sets into law the coordinated wage system which now relies on the whim of an Executive order. By providing for a balanced membership on the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee with an impartial chairman, we can insure that the voice of Federal employee representatives will be heard. In the past, some problems have arisen because of a 6-to-5 split against employee representatives on the advisory council.

H.R. 9092 also makes important and necessary changes in the salary structure for wage grade employees. The creation of a five-step schedule, rather than the present three, will give employees in "dead end" jobs some added recognition for increased performance due to length of time on a job. The provisions for uniform swingshift and night differentials will provide a common and equitable system for all prevailing rate employees throughout the country. And the new "saved pay" provisions merely give the prevailing rate employees the same salary protection in reductions in force enjoyed by their General Schedule counterparts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9092 takes a great step forward by including non-appropriated fund employees. For years, these employees have been the stepchildren of the Federal Government. Suffering from low wages, these employees have had nowhere to turn because they technically are not Federal employees. Now, we will guarantee that they, too, will receive an adequate, living wage.

Congress passed a similar measure last year, only to face an unjustified and unnecessary Presidential veto. I would urge the House, with the interest of an efficient, dedicated Federal service at heart, to pass H.R. 9092, as a piece of just and equitable legislation.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092.

Because of a Presidential veto, blue-collar employees, unlike white-collar employees, are still not covered by any statute which governs the procedure for setting their base pay. For this reason they still suffer difficulties in obtaining their proper wages. This is especially unjust because they are the employees most subject to loss of their jobs through budget cuts as well as the Government practice of contracting out work. On top of these disadvantages, the way the Government sets their pay, the prevailing-rate system, combined with the three-step within-grade pay structure

keeps many wage-grade employees at or below the poverty level. This deprives them of pay comparability with private enterprise employees. Justice and equity are, indeed, long overdue for these men and women.

Last year we passed H.R. 17809. Although not providing as much as the bill I have introduced this year, H.R. 17809 was still undeniably a step in the right direction. However, H.R. 17809 met its demise in a Presidential veto. One of the reasons given for the veto was cost. The President said H.R. 17809 would have "fueled" the "fires of inflation." This argument was contradicted by administration actions within the weeks immediately following this veto. The President took actions increasing annual costs by \$5.5 billion, or \$1 billion more than the total blue-collar budget. The first action, costing \$2.5 billion, increased the pay of military and Federal white-collar personnel; the second, costing annually about \$3 billion, authorized a depreciation allowance on machinery by colossal industrial enterprises.

Cost obviously was not the excuse for denying wage-grade employees their due.

Because of the three-step, blue-collar employees are the victims of an inequitable pay structure. The range of pay in their three-step system between the bottom and the top is only 8 percent. Federal white-collar workers have had a 10-step system since 1941. This 10-step system has a range of pay between bottom and top of 30 percent. Surveys show that ranges of pay in blue-collar private enterprise communities are even greater than 30 percent. Furthermore, today more than 90 percent of all wage board employees are in the third and last step of each grade. It took many of them only 2 years of satisfactory service to reach this last step. In a three-step system there is no higher step for them to go. Thus, a man with 20 years of service can be frozen into the same step and receive the same pay as a man with only 2 years' experience. This demoralizing and discriminatory situation must be changed.

In order to provide true equity and justice, we must pass a bill which includes at least three essential elements. First, it should provide for an orderly, legal means for blue-collar participation in the pay-setting process. Through the 11-member Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee of the Civil Service Commission, labor representatives will have a voice in studying, advising, and recommending to the Civil Service Commission actions on the prevailing-rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates. Second, there must be a five within-grade step system to give blue-collar employees the same career ladder that white-collar workers and private enterprise blue-collar workers have. Third, there should be a 7½-percent differential for second-shift work and a 10-percent differential for third-shift work. The bill before us does contain these essentials.

Now is the time to act for these 800,000 forgotten Federal employees and I urge the committee to pass H.R. 9092.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, regarding this wage board legislation, I wish to associate myself with remarks of the Honorable DAVID HENDERSON, distinguished subcommittee chairman, in support of H.R. 9092. Our wage board employees are the forgotten ones. They are hardworking Federal service employees with the same rights and privileges as postal workers and other civil service employees yet they have been passed over, neglected and turned away when their time for pay increases has come up.

I supported last year's wage board bill, H.R. 17809, which of course was vetoed by the President on January 1 and I have introduced a companion bill to this pending legislation in behalf of our wage board employees who are most deserving of increased benefits.

In my own congressional district I have many wage board employees and when I use the term "forgotten people" I am thinking of the dedicated wage board employees at the Anniston Army Depot, one of the finest depots in the entire country, who has consistently placed No. 1 in the Nation in repairing and overhauling Army materiel at the lowest dollar cost to the Federal Government. These wage board employees at the Anniston Army Depot have waited, with considerable patience, for the implementation of the Monroney amendment, granting minimal changes in hourly rates of pay in keeping with the prevailing rates being paid for comparable work in the civilian sector. The Monroney amendment was signed by the President on October 12, 1968—almost 3 years ago and is retroactive to that date. Despite the fact that the Monroney amendment is now almost 3 years into law, the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Defense are still working on implementation of this law and as this bill is being debated, these wage board employees are continuing to turn out the best repair work in the Nation and are patiently awaiting that tomorrow when the wage policy committee might make some decision and implementation might be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that problems do arise when trying to equitably compare one type job to another, but when our Federal Service Employees are being deprived of passed legislation since 1968, hopefully they might feel some relief through this new legislation, not only to help them financially but to restore their faith in the federal system.

I say this increase is most essential and we must act fairly and justly in the treatment of our blue collar employees as we do all other areas of Federal service. This five step plan would definitely be a great asset to the many who have devoted their lives to maintaining and upgrading this country of ours, therefore, I would respectfully urge each Member of the House to act compassionately and with clear conscience in voting to support this worthy legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, a bill to establish by law an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the government of the United States.

This legislation would:

First, establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee;

Second, H.R. 9092 would provide for a five-step wage schedule instead of the present three steps. The present third step is 104 percent of the prevailing wage. The fifth step, as proposed by the bill, would be 112 percent.

Third, this measure provides automatic step advances after 26 weeks in step 1, 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks in each of steps 3 and 4.

Fourth, it provides for a 7½ percent pay differential. Nationwide, for scheduled, nonovertime work during the second shift, and 10 percent for the third, or "graveyard" shift.

Fifth, the bill would provide "saved pay" for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade. This protection is now afforded to general schedule employees.

Last, H.R. 9092 brings the 140,000 employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the armed forces and the employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service under the provisions of the prevailing rate pay system.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation is evident. Presently, over one-third of the wage board employees earn less than \$6,000 a year.

We must establish, by law, an equitable pay system whereby a Federal government employee would receive equal pay with those employed by private industry for comparable duties and responsibilities.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, which will give legal and statutory authority for the establishment of a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

Federal employees working as craftsmen, tradesmen, and in other similar capacities, are now being paid at rates largely determined by the Coordinated Federal Wage System which was the result of a 1965 Presidential memorandum. Since July 1968, the Federal Government has operated under a coordinated wage system insuring like pay for like work in the same labor market. This system is now working quite satisfactorily, I believe though it is not working with the benefit of statutory authority, but only with the authority conferred by a Presidential decree.

I support H.R. 9092, Mr. Chairman, because I believe it will provide substantial security for Federal workers by establishing legislative and statutory authority for those principles now working well.

Other major provisions of the bill are that it will authorize a full-time Chairman for the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee will be composed of the Chairman, five management representatives, and five employee representatives.

It will revamp the existing three-step wage schedule that now allows a maximum wage of 4 percent more than the prevailing rate at its third, and highest, level. The replacement will be a five-step schedule allowing a maximum wage of 12 percent above the prevailing rate at its fifth, or top, level.

Also, it will bring automatic advancement up the wage level schedule after specified terms at each level.

It will create uniformity in overtime and night pay rates whereas such pay now depends on regional customs.

Further, it will prevent unfair reductions in pay to employees who suffer grade reduction through reductions in force for up to 2 years.

This measure will clearly bring necessary security to our hard-working Federal employees in the equitable adjustment and fixing of their wages. It does not require extensive rebuilding of existing governmental mechanisms but only replaces, with a few minor changes previously mentioned, the Presidentially proclaimed authority for the mechanism with a legislative base.

I urge all our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to vote for this most worthwhile measure.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9092, a bill long overdue to eliminate the inequities in the system for establishing the pay for more than 800,000 Federal employees. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

For years, the Federal Government has had specific legislation outlining the manner in which the pay of our white-collar employees, postal workers, and employees of the foreign service are to be paid. But the blue-collar employees have not had this protection. Their pay has been based on administrative practices.

The purpose of this bill is to replace the inconsistencies in the present administrative system with a workable, unbiased coordinated wage system. Included in this bill are: First, a provision that the new wage schedules have five pay steps with automatic step increases instead of the present three steps. Second, a provision for premium pay for second- and third-shift work; and third, provisions to bring under the provisions of the prevailing rate system the more than 140,000 employees of nonappropriated fund activities who have had little or no voice in their pay and have been grossly underpaid for many years.

Mr. Chairman, the wage board employees deserve to have the inequities in their present pay schedules corrected. H.R. 9092 corrects these inequities and gives some form of uniform guarantee to a large group of loyal and dedicated Federal employees.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I 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 (a) subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

**"SUBCHAPTER IV—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS**

**"§ 5341. Policy**

"It is the policy of Congress that rates of pay of prevailing rate employees be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accord-

ance with prevailing rates and be based on principles that—

"(1) there will be equal pay for substantially equal work for all prevailing rate employees who are working under similar conditions of employment in all agencies within the same local wage area;

"(2) there will be relative differences in pay within a local wage area when there are substantial or recognizable differences in duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements among positions;

"(3) the level of rates of pay will be maintained in line with prevailing levels for comparable work within a local wage area; and

"(4) the level of rates of pay will be maintained so as to attract and retain qualified prevailing rate employees.

**"§ 5342. Definitions; application**

"(a) For the purpose of this subchapter—

"(1) 'agency' means an Executive agency; but does not include—

"(A) a Government controlled operation;

"(B) the Tennessee Valley Authority;

"(C) the Alaska Railroad;

"(D) the Virgin Islands Corporation;

"(E) the Atomic Energy Commission;

"(F) the Central Intelligence Agency;

"(G) the Panama Canal Company;

"(H) the National Security Agency, Department of Defense; or

"(I) the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, except for the purposes of section 5349 of this title;

"(2) 'prevailing rate employee' means—

(A) an individual employed in or under an agency in a recognized trade or craft, or other skilled mechanical craft, or in an unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual labor occupation, and any other individual, including a foreman and a supervisor, in a position having trade, craft, or laboring experience and knowledge as the paramount requirement;

"(B) an employee of a nonappropriated fund instrumentality described by section 2105(c) of this title who is employed in a recognized trade or craft, or other skilled mechanical craft, or in an unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual labor occupation, and any other individual, including a foreman and a supervisor, in a position having trade, craft, or laboring experience and knowledge as the paramount requirement; and

"(C) an employee of the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, excepted from chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (14) of this title who is employed in a recognized trade or craft, or other skilled mechanical craft, or in an unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual labor occupation, and any other individual, including a foreman and a supervisor, in a position having trade, craft, or laboring experience and knowledge as the paramount requirement; and

"(3) 'position' means the work, consisting of duties and responsibilities, assignable to a prevailing rate employee.

"(b) (1) Except as provided by paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, this subchapter applies to all prevailing rate employees and positions in or under an agency.

"(2) This subchapter does not apply to employees and positions described by section 5102(c) of this title other than by—

"(A) paragraph (7) of that section to the extent that such paragraph (7) applies to employees and positions other than employees and positions of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and

"(B) paragraph (14) of that section.

"(3) This subchapter, except section 5348, does not apply to officers and members of crews of vessels excepted from chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (8) of this title.

"(c) Each prevailing rate employee employed within any of the several States or the District of Columbia shall be a United States citizen or a bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia unless the Secretary of Labor cer-

tifies that no United States citizen or bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia is available to fill the particular position.

**"§ 5343. Prevailing rate determinations; wage schedules; night differentials**

"(a) The pay of prevailing rate employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates. Subject to section 213(f) of title 29, the rates may not be less than the appropriate rates provided by section 206(a) (1) of title 29. To carry out this subsection—

"(1) the Civil Service Commission shall define, as appropriate—

"(A) with respect to prevailing rate employees other than prevailing rate employees under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title, the boundaries of—

"(i) individual local wage areas for prevailing rate employees having regular wage schedules and rates; and

"(ii) wage areas for prevailing rate employees having special wage schedules and rates;

"(B) with respect to prevailing rate employees under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title, the boundaries of—

"(i) individual local wage areas for prevailing rate employees under such paragraphs having regular wage schedules and rates (but such boundaries shall not extend beyond the immediate locality in which the particular prevailing rate employees are employed); and

"(ii) wage areas for prevailing rate employees under such paragraphs having special wage schedules and rates;

"(2) the Civil Service Commission shall designate a lead agency for each wage area;

"(3) subject to paragraph (5) of this subsection, and subsections (c) (1)-(3) and (d) of this section, a lead agency shall conduct wage surveys, analyze wage survey data, and develop and establish appropriate wage schedules and rates for prevailing rate employees;

"(4) the head of each agency having prevailing rate employees in a wage area shall apply, to the prevailing rate employees of that agency in that area, the wage schedules and rates established by the lead agency, or by the Civil Service Commission, as appropriate, for prevailing rate employees in that area; and

"(5) the Civil Service Commission shall establish wage schedules and rates for prevailing rate employees who are United States citizens employed in any area which is outside the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall schedule full-scale wage surveys every 2 years and shall schedule interim surveys to be conducted between each two consecutive full-scale wage surveys. The Commission may schedule more frequent surveys when conditions so suggest.

"(c) The Civil Service Commission, by regulation, shall prescribe practices and procedures for conducting wage surveys, analyzing wage survey data, developing and establishing wage schedules and rates, and administering the prevailing rate system. The regulations shall provide—

"(1) that, subject to subsection (d) of this section, wages surveyed be those paid by private employers in the wage area for similar work performed by regular full-time employees, except that, for prevailing rate employees under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title, the wages surveyed shall be those paid by private employers to full-time employees in a representative number of retail, wholesale, service, and recreational establishments similar to

those in which such prevailing rate employees are employed;

"(2) for participation at all levels by representatives of organizations accorded recognition as the representatives of prevailing rate employees in every phase of providing an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees, including the planning of the surveys, the drafting of specifications, the selection of data collectors, the collection and the analysis of the data, and the submission of recommendations to the head of the lead agency for wage schedules and rates and for special wage schedules and rates where appropriate;

"(3) for requirements for the accomplishment of wage surveys and for the development of wage schedules and rates for prevailing rate employees, including, but not limited to—

"(A) nonsupervisory and supervisory prevailing rate employees paid under regular wage schedules and rates;

"(B) nonsupervisory and supervisory prevailing rate employees paid under special wage schedules and rates; and

"(C) nonsupervisory and supervisory prevailing rate employees described under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title;

"(4) for proper differentials, as determined by the Commission, for duty involving unusually severe working conditions or unusually severe hazards;

"(5) rules governing the administration of pay for individuals employees on appointment, transfer, promotion, demotion, and other similar changes in employment status; and

"(6) for a continuing program of maintenance and improvement designed to keep the prevailing rate system fully abreast of changing conditions, practices, and techniques both in and out of the Government of the United States.

"(d) (1) A lead agency, in making a wage survey, shall determine whether there exists in the local wage area a number of comparable positions in private industry sufficient to establish wage schedules and rates for the principal types of positions for which the survey is made. The determination shall be in writing and shall take into consideration all relevant evidence, including evidence submitted by employee organizations recognized as representative of prevailing rate employees in that area.

"(2) When a lead agency determines that there is a number of comparable positions in private industry insufficient to establish the wage schedules and rates, such agency shall establish those schedules and rates on the basis of—

"(A) local private industry rates; and

"(B) rates paid for comparable positions in private industry in the nearest wage area that such agency determines is most similar in the nature of its population, employment, manpower, and industry to the local wage area for which the wage survey is being made.

"(e) (1) Each grade of a regular wage schedule for nonsupervisor prevailing rate employees shall have 5 steps with—

"(A) the first step at 96 percent of the prevailing rate;

"(B) the second step at 100 percent of the prevailing rate;

"(C) the third step at 104 percent of the prevailing rate;

"(D) the fourth step at 108 percent of the prevailing rate; and

"(E) the fifth step at 112 percent of the prevailing rate.

"(2) A prevailing rate employee under a regular wage schedule who has a work performance rating of satisfactory or better, as determined by the head of the agency, shall advance automatically to the next higher step within the grade at the beginning of

the first applicable pay period following his completion of—

"(A) 26 calendar weeks of continuous service in step 1;

"(B) 78 calendar weeks of continuous service in step 2; and

"(C) 104 calendar weeks of continuous service in each of steps 3 and 4.

"(3) Under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, the benefits of successive step increases shall be preserved for prevailing rate employees under a regular wage schedule whose continuous service is interrupted in the public interest by service with the armed forces or by service in essential non-Government civilian employment during a period of war or national emergency.

"(4) Supervisory wage schedules and special wage schedules authorized under subsection (c) (3) of this section may have single or multiple rates or steps according to prevailing practices in the industry on which the schedule is based.

"(f) A prevailing rate employee is entitled to pay at his scheduled rate plus a night differential—

"(1) amounting to 7½ percent of that scheduled rate for regularly scheduled non-overtime work a majority of the hours of which occur between 3 o'clock post-meridian and midnight; and

"(2) amounting to 10 percent of that scheduled rate for regularly scheduled non-overtime work a majority of the hours of which occur between 11 o'clock post-meridian and 8 o'clock antemeridian.

A night differential under this subsection is a part of basic pay.

"§ 5344. Effective date of wage increase; retroactive pay

"(a) Each increase in rates of basic pay granted, pursuant to a wage survey, to prevailing rate employees is effective not later than the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 45th day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, following the date the wage survey is ordered to be made.

"(b) Retroactive pay is payable by reason of an increase in rates of basic pay referred to in subsection (a) of this section only when—

"(1) the individual is in the service of the Government of the United States, including service in the armed forces, or the government of the District of Columbia on the date of the issuance of the order granting the increase; or

"(2) the individual retired or died during the period beginning on the effective date of the increase and ending on the date of issuance of the order granting the increase, and only for services performed during that period.

For the purpose of this subsection, service in the armed forces includes the period provided by statute for the mandatory restoration of the individual to a position in or under the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia after he is relieved from training and service in the armed forces or discharged from hospitalization following that training and service.

"§ 5345. Retained rate of pay on reduction in grade or reassignment

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to the limitation in subsection (b) of this section, a prevailing rate employee—

"(1) who is reduced in grade or reassigned to a wage schedule position having an established maximum scheduled rate of pay which is less than the employee's then existing scheduled rate of pay;

"(2) who holds a career or a career-conditional appointment in the competitive service, or an appointment of equivalent tenure in the excepted service;

"(3) whose reduction in grade or re-

assignment is not (A) caused by a demotion for personal cause, (B) at his request, (C) effected in a reduction in force due to lack of funds or curtailment of work, or (D) with respect to a temporary promotion, a condition of the temporary promotion to a higher grade;

"(4) who, for 2 continuous years immediately before the reduction in grade or reassignment, served (A) in the same agency and (B) in a grade or grades higher than the grade to which demoted; and

"(5) whose work performance during the 2-year period is satisfactory or better; is entitled to basic pay at the scheduled rate to which he was entitled immediately before the reduction in grade or reassignment (including each increase in scheduled rate of pay granted pursuant to a wage survey) for a period of 2 years from the effective date of the reduction in grade or reassignment, so long as he—

"(A) continues in the same agency without a break in service of one workday or more;

"(B) is not entitled to a higher scheduled rate of pay by operation of this subchapter; and

"(C) is not demoted or reassigned (i) for personal cause, (ii) at his request, or (iii) in a reduction in force due to a lack of funds or curtailment of work.

"(b) The scheduled rate of pay to which a prevailing rate employee is entitled under subsection (a) of this section with respect to each reduction in grade or reassignment to which that subsection applies may not exceed the sum of—

"(1) the minimum scheduled rate of the grade to which he is reduced or reassigned under each reduction in grade or reassignment to which that subsection applies (including each increase in scheduled rate of pay granted pursuant to a wage survey); and

"(2) the difference between his scheduled rate immediately before the first reduction in grade or reassignment to which that subsection applies (including each increase in scheduled rate of pay granted pursuant to a wage survey) and the minimum scheduled rate of that grade which is three grades lower than the grade from which he was reduced or reassigned under the first of the reductions in grade or reassignment (including each increase in the scheduled rate of pay granted pursuant to a wage survey).

"(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Commission, a prevailing rate employee who is reduced in grade or reassigned to a wage schedule position from another local wage area, or from another wage schedule, or from a position not subject to this subchapter, is entitled to a retained scheduled rate of pay.

"(d) The Commission may prescribe regulations governing the retention of the scheduled rate of pay of an employee who together with his position is brought under this subchapter. If an employee so entitled to a retained rate under these regulations is later demoted to a position under this subchapter, his scheduled rate of pay is determined under subsections (a) and (b) of this section. For the purpose of those subsections, service in the position which was brought under this subchapter is deemed service under this subchapter.

"§ 5346. Job grading system

"(a) The Civil Service Commission, after consulting with the agencies and with employee organizations, shall establish and maintain a job grading system for positions to which this subchapter applies. In carrying out this subsection, the Commission shall—

"(1) establish the basic occupational alignment and grade structure or structures for the job grading system;

"(2) establish and define individual occupations and the boundaries of each occupation;

"(3) establish job titles within occupations;

"(4) develop and publish job grading standards; and

"(5) provide a method to assure consistency in the application of job standards.

"(b) The Commission, from time to time, shall review such numbers of positions in each agency as will enable the Commission to determine whether the agency is placing positions in occupations and grades in conformance with or consistently with published job standards. When the Commission finds that a position is not placed in its proper occupation and grade in conformance with published standards or that a position for which there is no published standard is not placed in the occupation and grade consistently with published standards, it shall, after consultation with appropriate officials of the agency concerned, place the position in its appropriate occupation and grade and shall certify this action to the agency. The agency shall act in accordance with the certificate, and the certificate is binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials.

"(c) On application, made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission, by a prevailing rate employee for the review of the action of an employing agency in placing his position in an occupation and grade for pay purposes, the Commission shall—

"(1) ascertain currently the facts as to the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of the position;

"(2) decide whether the position has been placed in the proper occupation and grade; and

"(3) approve, disapprove, or modify, in accordance with its decision, the action of the employing agency in placing the position in an occupation and grade.

The Commission shall certify to the agency concerned its action under paragraph (3) of this subsection. The agency shall act in accordance with the certificate, and the certificate is binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials.

"§ 5347. Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee

"(a) There is established a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee composed of—

"(1) the Chairman, who shall not hold any other office or position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, and who shall be appointed by the President for a 4-year term;

"(2) one member from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, designated by the Secretary of Defense;

"(3) two members from the military departments, designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission;

"(4) one member, designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from time to time from an agency (other than the Department of Defense, a military department, and the Civil Service Commission);

"(5) an employee of the Civil Service Commission, designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and

"(6) five members, designated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, from among the employee organizations representing, under exclusive recognition of the Government of the United States, the largest numbers of prevailing rate employees.

"(b) In designating members from among employee organizations under subsection (a) (6) of this section, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission shall designate, as nearly as practicable, a number of members from a particular employee organization in the same proportion to the total number of employee representatives appointed to the Committee under subsection (a) (6) of this section as the number of prevailing rate em-

ployees represented by such organization is to the total number of prevailing rate employees. However, there shall not be more than two members from any one employee organization nor more than four members from a single council, federation, alliance, association, or affiliation of employee organizations.

"(c) Every 2 years the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission shall review employee organization representation to determine adequate or proportional representation under the guidelines of subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) The members from the employee organizations serve at the pleasure of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

"(e) The Committee shall study the prevailing rate system and other matters pertinent to the establishment of prevailing rates under this subchapter and, from time to time, advise the Civil Service Commission thereon. Conclusions and recommendations of the Committee shall be formulated by majority vote. The Chairman of the Committee may vote only to break a tie vote of the Committee. The Committee shall make an annual report to the Commission and the President for transmittal to Congress, including recommendations and other matters considered appropriate. Any member of the Committee may include in the annual report recommendations and other matters he considers appropriate.

"(f) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman. However, a special meeting shall be called by the Chairman if 5 members make a written request to the Chairman to call a special meeting to consider matters within the purview of the Committee.

"(g) Members of the Committee described in paragraphs (2)–(5) of subsection (a) of this section serve without additional pay. The Chairman is entitled to a rate of pay equal to the maximum rate currently paid, from time to time, under the General Schedule. Members who represent employee organizations are not entitled to pay from the Government of the United States for services rendered to the Committee.

"(h) The Civil Service Commission shall provide such clerical and professional personnel as the Chairman of the Committee considers appropriate and necessary to carry out its functions under this subchapter. Such personnel shall be responsible to the Chairman of the Committee.

"§ 5348. Crews of vessels

"(a) Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the pay of officers and members of crews of vessels excepted from chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (8) of this title shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates and practices in the maritime industry.

"(b) Vessel employees of the Panama Canal Company may be paid in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

"(c) Vessel employees in an area where inadequate maritime industry practice exists and vessel employees of the Corps of Engineers shall have their pay fixed and adjusted under the provisions of this subchapter other than this section, as appropriate.

"§ 5349. Prevailing rate employees; legislative, judicial, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and government of the District of Columbia

"(a) The pay of employees, described under section 5102(c) (7) of this title, in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, the Government Printing Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the government of the District of Columbia, shall

be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates and in accordance with such provisions of this subchapter, including the provisions of section 5344, relating to retroactive pay, and section 5345, relating to retention of pay, as the pay-fixing authority of each such agency may determine. Subject to section 213 (f) of title 29, the rates may not be less than the appropriate rates provided for by section 206(a) (1) of title 29. If the pay-fixing authority concerned determines that the provisions of section 5345 of this title should apply to any employee under his jurisdiction, then the employee concerned shall be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of paragraph (2) of section 5345(a) of this title if the tenure of his appointment is substantially equivalent to the tenure of any appointment referred to in such paragraph.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section does not modify or otherwise affect section 5102 (d) of this title, section 305 of title 44, and section 180 of title 31."

(b) The analysis of subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

"5341. Policy.

"5342. Definitions; application.

"5343. Prevailing rate determinations; wage schedules; night differentials.

"5344. Effective date of wage increase; retroactive pay.

"5345. Retained rate of pay on reduction in grade or reassignment.

"5346. Job grading system.

"5347. Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

"5348. Crews of vessels.

"5349. Prevailing rate employees; legislative, judicial, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and government of the District of Columbia."

Sec. 2. Section 2105(c) (1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(other than subchapter IV of chapter 53 and sections 5550 and 7154 of this title)" immediately following "laws".

Sec. 3. Section 5337 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "to which this section applies" wherever they appear in subsection (b) and inserting "to which that subsection applies" in place thereof; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof:

"(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission consistent with the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, an employee who is reduced to a grade of the General Schedule from a position to which this subchapter does not apply is entitled to a retained scheduled rate of pay."

Sec. 4. Section 5541(2)(xi) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(xi) an employee whose pay is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of this title, or by a wage board or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, except as provided by section 5544 of this title;"

Sec. 5. The first sentence of section 5544(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "An employee whose pay is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates under section 5343 or 5349 of this title, or by a wage board or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, is entitled to overtime pay for overtime work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week."

Sec. 6. Subsection (a) (1) of section 6101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) For the purpose of this subsection,

'employee' includes an employee of the government of the District of Columbia and an employee whose pay is fixed and adjusted from time to time under section 5343 or 5349 of this title, or by a wage board or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, but does not include an employee or individual excluded from the definition of employee in section 5541(2) of this title, except as specifically provided under this paragraph."

Sec. 7. (a) Section 6102 of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"6102. Eight-hour day; 40-hour workweek; wage-board employees."

Sec. 8. Section 7154(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "subchapter III of chapter 53" and inserting "subchapters III and IV of chapter 53" in place thereof.

Sec. 9. (a) (1) Except as provided by this subsection an employee's initial rate of pay on conversion to a wage schedule established pursuant to the amendments made by this Act shall be determined under conversion rules prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. Service by an employee in a grade of a wage schedule performed before the effective date of the conversion of the employee to a wage schedule established pursuant to the amendments made by this Act shall be counted toward not to exceed one step increase under the time in step provisions of section 5343(e)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by the first section of this Act.

(2) In the case of any employee described in section 2105(c), 5102(c) (7), (8), or (14) of title 5, United States Code, who is in the service as such an employee immediately before the effective date, with respect to him, of the amendments made by this Act, such amendments shall not be construed to decrease his rate of basic pay in effect immediately before the date on which such amendments become effective with respect to him. In addition, if an employee is receiving retained pay by virtue of law or agency policy immediately before the date on which the first wage schedule applicable to him under this Act is effective, he shall continue to retain that pay in accordance with the specific instructions under which the retained pay was granted until he leaves his position or until he becomes entitled to a higher rate.

(b) The amendments made by this Act shall not be construed to—

(1) abrogate, modify, or otherwise affect in any way the provisions of any contract in effect on the date of enactment of this Act pertaining to the wages, the terms and conditions of employment, and other employment benefits, or any of the foregoing matters, for Government prevailing rate employees and resulting from negotiations between Government agencies and organizations of Government employees;

(2) nullify, curtail, or otherwise impair in any way the right of any party to such contract to enter into negotiations after the date of enactment of this Act for the renewal, extension, modification, or improvement of the provisions of such contract or for the replacement of such contract with a new contract; or

(3) nullify, change, or otherwise affect in any way after such date of enactment any agreement, arrangement, or understanding in effect on such date with respect to the various items of subject matter of the negotiations on which any such contract in effect on such date is based or prevent the inclusion of such items of subject matter in connection with the renegotiation of any such contract, or the replacement of such contract with a new contract, after such date.

Sec. 10. (a) Subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, relating to pre-

mum pay, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5550. Pay for Sunday and overtime work; employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities

"A 'prevailing rate employee' described in paragraph (B) of section 5342 (a) (2) of this title—

"(1) if his regular work schedule includes an 8-hour period of service, a part of which is on Sunday, is entitled to additional pay at the rate of 25 percent of his hourly rate of basic pay for each hour of work performed during that 8-hour period of service;

"(2) is entitled to overtime pay for overtime work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week, computed in accordance with paragraph (1), (2), or (3), as applicable, of section 5544(a) of this title.

However, any such employee who regularly is required to remain at or within the confines of his post of duty in excess of 8 hours a day in a standby or on-call status is entitled to overtime pay only for hours of duty, exclusive of eating and sleeping time, in excess of 40 a week."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof—

"5550. Pay for Sunday and overtime work; employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities."

Sec. 11. Paragraph (2) of section 8704(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) a change in rate of pay under section 5344 or 5349 of this title is deemed effective as of the date of issuance of the order granting the increase or the effective date of the increase, whichever is later, except, that in the case of an employee who dies or retires during the period beginning on the effective date of the increase and ending on the date of the issuance of the order granting the increase, a change in rate of pay under either of such sections shall be deemed as having been in effect for such employee during that period."

Sec. 12. (a) Section 5548(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sections 5544 and" and inserting in lieu thereof "section".

(b) Section 5548(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "section 5545(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 5545(d) and 5550".

Sec. 13. (a) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section does not repeal or otherwise affect section 5102 (d) of title 5, United States Code, section 305 of title 44 of such Code, or the provisions contained in section 180 of title 31, United States Code.

Sec. 14. (a) The last sentence of section 4(a) of the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1952; Public Law 91-656) is amended to read as follows: "Such rates, limitations, and allowances adjusted by the President pro tempore shall become effective on the first day of the month in which any adjustment becomes effective under such section 5305 or section 3(c) of this Act."

(b) Paragraph (1) of section 5(a) of the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1952; Public Law 91-656) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) effective on the first day of the month in which such pay adjustment by the President is made effective as described above, shall adjust—"

Sec. 15. (a) The provisions of this Act are effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after the ninetieth day after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, in the case of those employees referred to in section 5342(a)(2) (B) and (C) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by the first section of this Act), such provisions are effective

on the first day of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after the one hundred and eightieth day after such date of enactment or on such earlier date (not earlier than the ninetieth day after such date of enactment) as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe.

(b) A wage survey conducted by an agency before the effective date (with respect to employees covered by that wage survey) of this Act, for a wage schedule which becomes effective after that effective date, is deemed to meet the requirement in this Act for a survey by a lead agency.

Mr. HENDERSON (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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 3, line 8, strike out "(A)".

On page 3, line 15, immediately following the semicolon insert the word "and".

On page 3, strike out lines 16 through 24 inclusive.

On page 4, strike out lines 1 through 10 inclusive.

On page 4, line 19, strike out "paragraphs (8) and (14)" and insert in lieu thereof "paragraph (8)".

On page 5, line 18, strike out the comma and the word "but" and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and strike out lines 19 through 25 inclusive.

On page 6, strike out lines 1 through 8 inclusive, and renumber the remaining subparagraphs accordingly.

On page 7, strike out lines 17 through 23 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof "full-time employees;"

On page 8, line 16, immediately following the semicolon, insert the word "and".

On page 8, line 19, immediately following the semicolon, strike out the word "and".

On page 8, strike out lines 20 through 22 inclusive.

On page 23, strike out lines 3 through 6 inclusive and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 25, strike out line 24 and insert in lieu thereof "5102(c)(7), or (8) of title 5, United"

On page 26, strike out lines 18 through 25 inclusive.

On page 27, strike out lines 1 through 17 inclusive, and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 29, line 10, strike out the word "Act" and all that follows down through the period in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof "Act."

Mr. GROSS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this amendment is rather lengthy, but it has only one purpose and that is to strike out the nonappropriated fund activities employees. It is necessary for the amendment to be at some length because of the repeated references to nonappropriated employees, so I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from

Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered strikes from the bill all the provisions relating to the so-called nonappropriated fund employees and employees of the Veterans' Administration Canteen Service.

The bill, as now written, includes these two groups of employees within the definition of prevailing rate employee.

There are a number of compelling reasons why my amendment should be adopted.

First of all, they are not Federal employees and are not in the competitive civil service. They are primarily employed by the Department of Defense in post exchanges, service clubs, bowling alleys, golf clubs, and so on. They have none of the obligations, responsibilities, or commitments now imposed upon Federal employees and they certainly should not be included in a pay system that is designed for Federal employees.

If we blanket these nonappropriated fund employees into a Federal pay system, the next logical step will be to include them under the Federal employees' retirement program and the life and health insurance programs. The bill, as written, opens the door for a prolonged series of proposals to correct inequities of employees of nonappropriated fund activities.

The provisions of the bill not only guarantee them the benefits of the Federal pay system but they would also be guaranteed a five-step pay system, the night time differentials and premium and holiday pay.

The five-step pay system automatically guarantees that nonappropriated fund employees in any given local area throughout the country would eventually be paid 12 percent higher pay than people performing similar duties in local private businesses.

This causes several very serious problems. First of all, it automatically inflates local wage rates requiring local merchants hiring similar personnel to continuously raise their rates of pay in order to compete on the labor market with the Federal Government.

Second, since all of these people work in programs directly involving the morale of military personnel, the prices and services made available to the servicemen will have to be increased appreciably in order to pay for the new inflated wage rates. The entire concept of the commissary-post exchange system, of providing low-cost goods and services to servicemen—whether right or wrong—could be destroyed.

And, I must emphasize this point—for every dollar that the pay of a nonappropriated fund employee is increased a dollar is taken out of the pocket of a serviceman. In other words, the total cost of including nonappropriated fund employees in this bill, which is estimated by the Department of Defense at \$59.9 million, will be paid for entirely by service personnel and their total take home pay will be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, there may be some legitimate complaints concerning the past pay and personnel policies for nonappropriated

fund employees. However, the Department of Defense is at the present time implementing a total personnel management system that will cover all phases of the nonappropriated fund work force. The system will insure that these employees will receive full pay comparably, it will provide for fringe benefits, and it will effectively correct any problems that may exist.

I submit that if we do not adopt my amendment and if we include these employees under coverage of this bill, we will be creating many serious problems and many more inequities than we can ever possibly solve. I sincerely urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions in the bill H.R. 9092 that cover the nonappropriated fund employees are a basic and very vital part of this legislation. It was contained in the bill that passed this House last year. And now what do we see? As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, the Department of Defense this year came back before our committee and said that they were going to implement and inaugurate a new system for the nonappropriated fund employees that would do what the House-passed bill last year would have done and what the present bill before the committee would do.

I asked the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower that, if that was the case, the enactment of the legislation really would not require anything of the Department of Defense that they had not testified they were going to do anyway. His answer was in the affirmative.

Again this illustrates the need and the reason for the request of the employees that they be given some assurance as to how their pay will be set.

Mr. Chairman, what is the nonappropriated fund activity all about? The clearest example is in the Department of Defense and in the various military installations as they operate post exchanges and commissaries for the benefit of the servicemen.

Now, mind you, if these were operating at a break-even point and if they were getting the merchandise and food and clothing and many other items that even border on luxuries at a break-even or at the cheapest prices, the arguments against this coverage would be far more valid than they are. But, this is big business and this is profit business.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the nonappropriated activities making a reasonable profit because that is used for the recreation and welfare of the servicemen themselves and is a very laudable purpose. But, last year over \$2.1 billion in goods were sold in the Department of Defense exchanges.

The net profits of \$112 million and the increases in pay that would result by the enactment of the provisions in the bill that the gentleman from Iowa would strike will come out of these profits and it will not cost the American taxpayers one penny.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in the general debate over one-third of the employees are in the nonappropriated fund

activities and are the dependents of the military themselves.

So, Mr. Chairman, it was not until our committee, year after year, brought this to the attention of the Department of Defense, and not until we had enacted a bill in this House did the Secretary of Defense take routine action to assist these employees. I would point out to the House that the other body expanded the provisions for nonappropriated fund beyond what we did in a direction that was far more objectionable to the Department of Defense than the House-passed language.

So, this is what we did last year. As a result of that the Department of Defense says they are going to improve the pay system, but the provisions in this bill will not require them to do anything they have not said they are going to do if the amendment does not stay in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of the bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 26, noes 23.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GROSS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. DULSKI.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 147, noes 232, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—147

Abernethy	Derwinski	Latta
Anderson, III.	Devine	Leggett
Andrews,	Dickinson	Lent
N. Dak.	Dowdy	Lloyd
Archer	du Pont	Lujan
Arends	Dwyer	McClary
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	McClure
Ashley	Erlenborn	McCollister
Baker	Eshleman	McDonald,
Belcher	Findley	Mich.
Betts	Fish	McEwen
Blester	Flynt	McKevitt
Bow	Ford, Gerald R.	Maillard
Bray	Frelinghuysen	Mann
Broomfield	Frenzel	Martin
Brotzman	Frey	Mayne
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Michel
Broyhill, N.C.	Gross	Miller, Ohio
Buchanan	Grover	Mills, Md.
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Minshall
Burlison, Mo.	Haley	Mizell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall	Mosher
Camp	Hammer-	Myers
Cederberg	schmidt	Nelsen
Clancy	Hastings	Pelly
Clausen,	Heckler, Mass.	Peysner
Don H.	Hunt	Poff
Clawson, Del.	Hutchinson	Powell
Cleveland	Jacobs	Price, Tex.
Collier	Jarman	Rarick
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, Ill.
Colmer	Jonas	Rhodes
Conable	Keating	Robinson, Va.
Conte	Keith	Robison, N.Y.
Coughlin	Kemp	Rogers
Crane	King	Roncallo
Daniel, Va.	Kuykendall	Rousselot
Davis, Wis.	Kyl	Ruth
Dellenback	Landgrebe	Scherle
Dennis	Landrum	Schmitz

Schneebeli  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Sebellius  
Shoup  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Stanton,  
J. William

Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thone  
Vander Jagt  
Veysey  
Wampler  
Ware  
Whalley  
Widnall

Wiggins  
Winn  
Wolff  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Young, Fla.  
Zion  
Zwach

NOES—232

Abbitt  
Abourezk  
Abzug  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Alexander  
Anderson,  
Calif.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Aspin  
Aspinall  
Badillo  
Barrett  
Begich  
Bell  
Bennett  
Bergland  
Bevill  
Biaggi  
Bingham  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brinkley  
Brooks  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, Va.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burleson, Tex.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byron  
Cabell  
Caffery  
Carey, N.Y.  
Carney  
Casey, Tex.  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Chappell  
Chisholm  
Clark  
Clay  
Collins, Ill.  
Corman  
Cotter  
Culver  
Daniels, N.J.  
Danielson  
Davis, Ga.  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellums  
Denholm  
Dingell  
Dorn  
Downing  
Drinan  
Dulski  
Duncan  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Calif.  
Ellberg  
Evans, Colo.  
Fascell  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Foley  
Ford,  
William D.  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Fraser

Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Grasso  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Gude  
Hagan  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington  
Harsha  
Harvey  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hicks, Mass.  
Hicks, Wash.  
Hillis  
Hogan  
Hollifield  
Horton  
Howard  
Hull  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kee  
Kluczynski  
Koch  
Kyros  
Link  
Long, Md.  
McCloskey  
McCormack  
McDade  
McFall  
McKay  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mathis, Ga.  
Matsunaga  
Mazzoli  
Meeds  
Metcalfe  
Mikva  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills, Ark.  
Minish  
Mink  
Mitchell  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morse  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nichols

Nix  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Konski  
ONeill  
Passman  
Patten  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Pirnie  
Podell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Quie  
Quillen  
Rallsback  
Randall  
Rangel  
Rees  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Roy  
Roybal  
Runnels  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Sarbanes  
Satterfield  
Scheuer  
Seiberling  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steed  
Steele  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Taylor  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Ullman  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Waldie  
Watts  
Whalen  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wright  
Yates  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—55

Anderson,  
Tenn.  
Annunzio  
Baring  
Blackburn  
Burton  
Carter  
Conyers  
Davis, S.C.  
Dent  
Diggs  
Donohue

Dow  
Edwards, La.  
Esch  
Evins, Tenn.  
Goldwater  
Hanna  
Hébert  
Hosmer  
Hungate  
Ichord  
Jones, Tenn.  
Karth

Lennon  
Long, La.  
McCulloch  
McKinney  
McMillan  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Mathias, Calif.  
Melcher  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moss

Patman  
Pepper  
Pickle  
Terry  
Poage  
Purcell  
Riegle  
Saylor

Skubitz  
Springer  
Stephens  
Stokes  
Stuckey  
Symington  
Talcott  
Teague, Calif.

Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Van Deerlin  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Yatron

Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. Chairman, on this vote I voted "no." I ask unanimous consent to change my vote to "aye."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, on this vote I voted "no." I have my card indicating such a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not qualified. The tellers have already reported.

So the amendment was rejected.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 4, line 14, strike out "paragraph (2)" and insert in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (3)".

On page 4, strike out lines 17 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) This subchapter does not apply to employees and positions described by section 5102(c) of this title other than by—

"(A) paragraph (7) of that section to the extent that such paragraph (7) applies to employees and positions other than employees and positions of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and

"(B) paragraph (14) of that section.

"(3) This subchapter, except section 5348, does not apply to officers and members of crews of vessels excepted from chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (8) of this title."

On page 5, lines 1 to 5, inclusive, strike out—be a bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that no bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia is available to fill the particular position.

and insert in lieu thereof—

be a United States citizen or a bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that no United States citizen or bona fide resident of one of the several States or the District of Columbia is available to fill the particular position.

On page 5, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through the semicolon in line 8 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) the Civil Service Commission shall define, as appropriate—

"(A) with respect to prevailing rate employees other than prevailing rate employees under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title, the boundaries of—

"(i) individual local wage areas for prevailing rate employees having regular wage schedules and rates; and

"(ii) wage areas for prevailing rate employees having special wage schedules and rates;

"(B) with respect to prevailing rate employees under paragraphs (B) and (C) of section 5342(a) (2) of this title, the boundaries of—

"(i) individual local wage areas for prevailing rate employees under such paragraphs having regular wage schedules and rates (but such boundaries shall not extend beyond the immediate locality in which the particular prevailing rate employees are employed); and

"(ii) wage areas for prevailing rate employees under such paragraphs having special wage schedules and rates;

On page 6, line 9, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)" in lieu thereof.

On page 6, line 11, strike out "(4)" and "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)" and "(5)", respectively.

On page 6, line 12, strike out "(C) (1)-(3) and (4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c) (1)-(3) and (d)".

On page 6, line 16, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)" in lieu thereof.

On page 6, line 22, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)" in lieu thereof.

On pages 10 and 11, strike out the word "continuous" where it appears in line 24 on page 10, and in lines 1 and 3 on page 11.

On page 25, lines 16 and 17, strike out "immediately preceding" and insert in lieu thereof "before".

On page 26, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The amendments made by this Act shall not be construed to—

(1) abrogate, modify, or otherwise affect in any way the provisions of any contract in effect on the date of enactment of this Act pertaining to the wages, the terms and conditions of employment, and other employment benefits, or any of the foregoing matters, for Government prevailing rate employees and resulting from negotiations between Government agencies and organizations of Government employees;

(2) nullify, curtail, or otherwise impair in any way the right of any party to such contract to enter into negotiations after the date of enactment of this Act for the renewal, extension, modification, or improvement of the provisions of such contract or for the replacement of such contract with a new contract; or

(3) nullify, change, or otherwise affect in any way after such date of enactment any agreement, arrangement, or understanding in effect on such date with respect to the various items of subject matter of the negotiations on which any such contract in effect on such date is based or prevent the inclusion of such items of subject matter in connection with the renegotiation of any such contract, or the replacement of such contract with a new contract, after such date.

On page 26, lines 22 and 23, strike out "and the Veterans' Canteen Service".

On page 26, line 25, strike out "or (C)".

On page 27, in the matter immediately after line 17, and before line 18, strike out "and the Veterans' Canteen Service".

On page 28, line 7, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 12".

On page 28, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

(b) Section 5548(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "section 5545(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 5545(d) and 5550".

Mr. HENDERSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the committee amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD and be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 10, line 6, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "4";

On page 10, line 13, immediately following the semicolon, add the word "and";

On page 10, line 15, strike out "rate; and" and insert in lieu thereof "rate.";

On page 10, strike out lines 16 and 17;

On page 11, line 4, strike out "each of steps 3 and 4" and insert in lieu thereof "step 3".

Mr. HENDERSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I hope not to take the 5 minutes, since the Members seem very familiar with this issue, but I would direct to the attention of Members, especially those who may not have been on the floor during the general debate, that in addition to the issues involved, we also had to go through the technical exercise of accepting 17 committee amendments to perfect the bill.

My amendment is a bit more than a technical amendment. What it proposes to do is to save \$66 million annually by removing the fifth step from the provisions in the bill, and in support of this amendment may I make the following points?

The bill as written provides that the fifth step would be 112 percent of the prevailing local wage. I emphasize that to the Members: 112 percent, or 12 percent above the prevailing local wage—and this does not take into account the value of the fringe benefits which civil service employees enjoy.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out from a copy of a letter I have just received from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Robert E. Hampton, the following quotation which refers to a study that was reported previously to the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service as being in process. Mr. Hampton's letter states as follows:

Our study shows that, in the companies which we surveyed during the last two years, 64 percent of all nonsupervisory blue collar employees are paid a single rate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. We cannot hear the gentleman. I would appreciate being able to hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The House will be in order.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair and I thank the gentleman.

I am about to come to the punchline in this letter which obviously will produce a sufficient number of votes to carry my amendment.

In his letter Mr. Hampton points out:

Thirty-six percent of the employees are paid a range of rates and of these only 28

percent are paid at specified step rates. Thus 92 percent of all employees in our study are paid at specifically identified rates—either a single rate or from a range within specified step rates.

The study also indicates there is no justifiable basis to increase the number of step rates in the Federal wage system above three. My amendment would provide for four steps. In other words, my amendment is far more liberal than the system advocated by the Federal Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Hampton goes on to say—

I am greatly disturbed at the action taken in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in reporting out H.R. 9092 which provides for a five-step rate system. The existing coordinated Federal wage system already provides for more liberal treatment of step rates for Federal wage employees than is found in private industry.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this amendment is in order. I feel it is a necessary step that we must take in order to hold down inflationary wage increases. It still leaves the Federal blue collar employee better off than his counterpart in private industry.

The existing Coordinated Federal Wage System, which contains three pay steps, already provides for more liberal treatment of Federal wage board employees than is found in private industry.

As indicated earlier, a survey by the Civil Service Commission shows that most blue collar employees in private industry have a single pay rate.

This bill, as written, contains five pay steps, with the two additional pay steps added at the top. The pay line at 100 percent is at the second step, the third is 104 percent, the fourth is 108 percent and the fifth step is 112 percent of the prevailing local wage.

The singular effect of adding two steps at the top is to give immediate pay raises for most wage board employees. Also, the two additional steps automatically insure that eventually most Federal blue collar workers in any local wage area will be paid 12 percent more than local private industry pay rates. The additional two steps will not only cost the Government an additional \$175 million per year, but it will also force massive personnel reductions in the Department of Defense, and have serious inflationary consequences on local private industries.

While I would prefer to see the present system of three pay steps continued, the amendment I have offered simply reduces the number from five to four, with a consequent dollar saving of approximately \$70 million. It would also reduce the pay differential from 12 percent above local wage rates to 8 percent of local wage rates.

I sincerely urge adoption of my amendment.

I believe this amendment would also do away with any fear anyone might have of a veto by the White House.

On that constructive closing note, I offer this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would knock out this fifth step provided for in the bill, but the bill provides that the fifth step will not become effective for 2

years after the enactment of the bill. It will cost \$66 million after 2 years, so the present administration will have no budgetary problems whatsoever. It can be budgeted in the future and certainly it has no immediate budgetary impact.

What will this amendment, if it is to be in the bill, provide? \$66 million for 67,000 wage board employees or less than \$100 a year per employee. That will be effective 2 years in the future.

Certainly I do not believe that the House would take this action when we realize that all Federal employees today have pay steps based on longevity. The classified services employees have 10 steps. These wage board employees have only one, and that is 4 percent above the prevailing rate. The fourth step in the bill would provide a second step, or 8 percent above, and the fifth step, 2 years from now, will provide for 10 percent.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. In just one moment.

We all know that in the military we pay for longevity. The Foreign Service people are paid in steps. This fifth step is not unreasonable. In fact, it is very modest.

I am now delighted to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to call attention to the fact that one of the gentleman's statements was in error. You stated the total cost of step 5 would be approximately \$66 million and that we have approximately 66,000 employees in this category. That would be \$1,000 an employee and not \$100, as the gentleman stated.

Mr. HENDERSON. I stand corrected there are 670,000 wage board employees. The gentleman is right.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important benefit for the employees. I think the majority of this House would prefer that this increase be effective immediately. I think the case has been made for the immediate increase, but we took into account the problems of budgeting the additional pay increases and—this is a great tribute to the Federal employees in the blue collar area—we feel confident that they will continue to perform and to produce for the Federal Government with the assurance that they will get the 4 percent 2 years from now. They feel that they are entitled to it now in the light of the history of the other Federal employees' increases, to say nothing of those in the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9092) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes,

pursuant to House Resolution 553, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

**MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS**

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9092 to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. HENDERSON. 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. 9092 and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7960, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972**

Mr. MILLER of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7960) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes:

**CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-412)**

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7960) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, 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 Science Foundation

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, for the following categories:

(1) Scientific Research Project Support, \$271,000,000.

(2) Specialized Research Facilities and Equipment, \$9,300,000.

(3) National and Special Research Programs, \$144,600,000.

(4) National Research Centers, \$40,200,000.

(5) Computing Activities, \$17,500,000.

(6) Science Information Activities, \$9,800,000.

(7) International Cooperative Scientific Activities, \$4,000,000.

(8) Intergovernmental Science Programs, \$1,000,000.

(9) Institutional Support for Science, \$28,800,000.

(10) Science Education Support, \$99,300,000.

(11) Planning and Policy Studies, \$2,700,000.

(12) Program Development and Management, \$24,300,000.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) not less than \$2,000,000 of the sum stipulated in section 1 for Science Education Support shall be available for the "Student Science Training" program;

(2) not less than \$4,000,000 of the sum stipulated in section for Science Education Support shall be available for the "Undergraduate Research Participation" program;

(3) not to exceed \$59,000,000 of the sum stipulated in section 1 for National and Special Research Programs shall be available for the "Research Applied to National Needs" program.

Sec. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in sections 1 and 5 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

Sec. 4. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$5,000, for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director of the National Science Foundation, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 5. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 6. No funds may be transferred from any particular category listed in section 1 to any other category or categories listed in such section if the total of the funds so transferred from that particular category would exceed 10 per centum thereof, and no funds may be transferred to any particular category listed in section 1 from any other category or categories listed in such section if the total of the funds so transferred to that particular category would exceed 10 per centum thereof, unless—

(A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Director 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 Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning the nature of the transfer and the reason therefor, or

(B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Director written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 7. (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 specified in subsection (c). 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 payments to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

(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 specified in subsection (c).

(c) The programs referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are as follows:

(1) The programs authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and

(2) The programs authorized under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to establishing the Science Information Service.

(d) (1) Nothing in this Act, or any Act amended by 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. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1972".

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,  
JOHN W. DAVIS,  
EARLE CABELL,  
JAMES G. FULTON,  
CHARLES A. MOSHER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD KENNEDY,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
ALAN CRANSTON,  
WINSTON PROUTY,  
PETER H. DOMINICK,  
BOB PACKWOOD,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE  
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7960) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted new language. The Committee of Conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments and stipulations proposed by the conferees.

For Fiscal Year 1972, the National Science Foundation requested authorization in the amount of \$619,000,000. This figure is exclusive of \$3,000,000 to be made available in excess foreign currencies. The latter brought the total request to \$622,000,000.

The House approved a one-year authorization for Fiscal Year 1972 in the amount of \$622,000,000. The Senate approved a two-year authorization which included \$706,500,000 for Fiscal Year 1972 and \$907,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1973.

The Committee of Conference recommends \$655,500,000 for Fiscal Year 1972. No amount was authorized for Fiscal Year 1973. To this sum the Managers on the part of the Senate and of the House agreed. The amount agreed to by the Committee of Conference is \$33,500,000 more than authorized by the House, \$51,000,000 less than authorized by the Senate for Fiscal Year 1972 and \$958,000,000 less than authorized by the Senate for fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

Specific action taken by the conference was as follows:

(1) For *Scientific Research Project Support*, the budget request of the National Science Foundation was \$257,800,000. The House authorized \$246,100,000. The Senate authorized \$292,800,000. The conferees approved \$271,000,000. This amount is \$13,200,000 above the Administration request and will permit the Foundation to assume much quality basic research which is being terminated by mission-oriented agencies.

(2) For *Specialized Research Facilities and Equipment*, the Foundation requested \$5,800,000. The House provided \$9,300,000, while the Senate approved the Foundation's requested figure of \$5,800,000. The purpose of the increase of \$3,500,000 by the House, concurred in by the Senate, is to permit the Foundation to move more efficiently in the provision of facilities and equipment requiring considerable lead time.

(3) For *National and Special Research Programs*, the Foundation's request was \$166,600,000. The House approved \$136,000,000, while the Senate approved the full amount requested. The entire difference of \$30,600,000 involved the program "Research Applied to National Needs" (RANN), for which the Foundation requested \$81,000,000. The conferees agreed upon \$59,000,000 for RANN, which is \$8,600,000 more than approved by the House and \$22,000,000 less than approved by the Senate. This action of the conference brings the total authorization for the category National and Special Research Programs to \$144,600,000.

(4) For *Institutional Support of Science*, the Foundation's budget request was \$12,000,000. The House increased this request to \$28,800,000. The Senate further increased the request to \$34,500,000. Both the Senate and House feel that the rapid reduction in this program from Fiscal Year 1971 by the Foundation was unwarranted, the rate of decrease

being almost 70%. The conferees agreed on the House figure of \$28,800,000.

(5) For *Science Education Support*, the amount requested by the Foundation was \$77,300,000. The House approved \$99,300,000 for this category and the Senate increased the figure to \$104,300,000. Here again, both the Senate and House feel that the elimination of or reduction in a number of valuable education programs would be unwarranted and short-sighted. The Senate accepted the House figure of \$99,300,000, which is \$22,000,000 above the Foundation's request.

(6) While the Senate concurred in a one year authorization rather than two years, the conferees agreed to the following: The Committee of Conference requests the National Science Foundation to provide the Congress with a two year budget projection, including justification for same, covering the fiscal years 1973 and 1974; such projections should be made available to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics during the period in which they will be considering the Foundation's request for funding.

(7) The bill as passed by the House contained a line-item budget with a provision that no funds could be transferred from one category to another without appropriate notification in advance to the Senate and House. The Senate amendment authorized the Foundation's 1972 budget in a lump sum, earmarking specific amounts for Institutional Support for Science and Science Education Support. Conferees agreed to retain the line-item budget and the requirement for advance notice of transfers. They further agreed that such notice need not be given if the amount to be transferred into or out of any category of the line-item budget is 10% or less of that category.

(8) The bill as passed by the House contained provisions that (a) not less than \$2,000,000 of the Science Education Support category should be available for the "Student Science Training" program, (b) not less than \$4,000,000 of the sum authorized for Science Education Support should be available for the "Undergraduate Research Participation" program, and (c) no funds in excess of \$50,400,000 could be utilized for the RANN program. The Senate amendment contained no such provisions. Conferees agreed to the House provisions, but, as noted in the foregoing (3), increased the RANN ceiling to \$59,000,000.

(9) The House authorized the Director of the National Science Foundation \$2,500 for official consultation and extraordinary expenses. The Senate amendment increased this amount to \$7,500. Conferees agreed to approve \$5,000 for this purpose.

(10) The bill as passed in the House contained a provision that no funds appropriated pursuant to this Act could be used for any program which had not been presented to or requested of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics without proper notification and a 30-day waiting period. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. Conferees agreed with the Senate amendment and this provision was deleted.

(11) The bill as passed by the House contained a provision relating to restraints to be applied to persons attending or employed by institutions receiving funds thereunder who violate the law or the regulations of the institution. The Senate amendment contained no similar section. Conferees agreed to retain the provision as passed by the House, which is similar to others enacted in

connection with major Federal programs of higher education.

GEORGE P. MILLER,  
JOHN W. DAVIS,  
EARLE CABELL,  
JAMES G. FULTON,  
CHARLES A. MOSHER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD KENNEDY,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
ALAN CRANSTON,  
WINSTON PRUTY,  
PETER H. DOMINICK,  
BOB PACKWOOD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT ACT AND APPA-  
LACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOP-  
MENT ACT EXTENSIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 561 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 561

*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. 9922) to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and all points of order against section 208 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, 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 by titles instead of by sections. 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. After the passage of H.R. 9922 it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2317 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 9922 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. 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 561 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9922, the purpose of which is to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act—EDA—and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. All points of order are waived against section 208 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI—appropriation in a legislative bill. The bill will be read for amendment by titles instead

of by sections and, after passage, it shall be in order to take S. 2317 from the Speaker's table and move to strike all after the enacting clause and amend the Senate bill with the House-passed language.

EDA provides Federal financial and technical assistance, in cooperation with the States, for the creation of new jobs.

Grants are authorized for public works and development facilities conducive to the development and operation of private enterprise.

New criteria is established for designating so-called special impact areas which would be eligible for financial assistance and requirements for a long-range program are waived.

Eight hundred million dollars is authorized for grants and supplementary grants for public works and development facilities for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Any unused authorization for which appropriations are not made in 1972 may be appropriated in fiscal year 1973.

Not less than 25 percent nor more than 35 percent of appropriations for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 shall be spent in special impact areas to assist the Secretary in maintaining a proper balance between projects that are necessary for long-term development programs and projects to assist in providing urgently needed employment.

Special impact area projects would include those providing immediate work for unemployed and underemployed persons. In those areas grants-in-aid for local public works involving local cost sharing can be made to cover up to 80 percent of the costs, with a proviso that a 100-percent grant can be made if the State or local government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity for such purposes.

It is my understanding that the bill is \$1½ billion less than S. 575, which was vetoed, and does not include the Public Works Acceleration Act provisions which were in title I of that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 561 which makes in order for consideration of H.R. 9922 with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend for 2 years the Economic Development Act, and to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act for 4 years, and that act's highway program for 5 years.

The bill is a substitute for S. 575, which contained a \$2 billion accelerated public works program as well as the extension of the two acts. That bill was vetoed on June 22 and an effort to override failed.

Title I of the bill extends the Economic Development Act for 2 years and authorizes \$800 million for each of fiscal 1972 and 1973. This is an increase of \$500 million above S. 575 over the 2-year period. Funds would be available for public works construction grants throughout the country. Business loans and technical assistance grants are also available. The bill provides that in each fiscal year not less than 25 percent or more than 35 percent of the funds appropriated shall be expended in special impact areas,

areas defined as those with high unemployment. These earmarked funds are to be used on projects which will quickly provide jobs for the unemployed of the area.

Language in the bill provides that for projects in financially distressed areas 80-percent grants shall be made, and that in communities which have exhausted their taxing and borrowing capacity, 100-percent grants may be made.

Title II extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act for 4 years, through June 30, 1975, and the regional highway program for 5 years. Programs for which grant assistance will be available, in addition to highway construction include, airport improvements, filling of abandoned mines and reclamation of strip mine areas, land acquisition or construction projects for industrial development and expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the original supporters of the Appalachian program when it was initiated in 1965 and I heartily support its continuation. I would like to dwell on some of the accomplishments of the Commission and look to the future, as well as describe one of the Appalachian Regional Commission's projects in my own district in Tennessee.

The Appalachian Regional Commission itself is unique. From the moment of its inception and throughout its 6 years of operation the Federal Government and the Appalachian States have worked in tandem to bring to the people of Appalachia a better way of life and to make the citizens of that area healthy, productive Americans rather than allowing them to be doomed forever to an endless cycle of welfare checks.

One of the finest examples of how the Appalachian Regional Commission serves the people of Appalachia recently occurred in a small community called Big Springs in Hancock County in Tennessee's First District—my home district.

Through the coordinating efforts of the Commission—and I would like to take this opportunity to say that Federal Cochairman Donald W. Whitehead was instrumental in assisting in the Big Springs project and I think he is a credit to the program—the 163 residents of Big Springs now have a direct link to their county seat of Sneedville with the construction of a bridge over the Clinch River. For over 100 years these people were isolated from the outside world and were forced to drive 36 miles out of their way through Virginia to reach their county seat.

The schoolchildren of Big Springs who before the approval of the bridge had to cross the Clinch River in the dead of winter in a leaky wooden boat, now will have a bridge that their school bus can cross. This could not have been done without the fine catalytic effect of the Appalachian Commission's unique mechanism.

This mechanism can be very simply stated—cooperation. Cooperation and coordination at all levels of government, Federal State, and local, has been the hallmark of the Commission's operations. And that model has furnished impetus

for the President's plan to revitalize the rural parts of America.

Each planning and development district and each State in the 13-State Appalachian region prepares and yearly updates an overall development plan. This document serves to structure the development of the region, insuring that all relevant factors such as economic, social, environmental, and geographical problems are fully and adequately considered. From these plans, which areas develop themselves—that is the local governmental and civic and health leaders—that the work of the Commission and the States is organized.

The Commission was instrumental in assisting with construction of the Carter County Memorial Hospital in Elizabethton, Tenn. Unicoi County owes much to the Appalachian program for the splendid assistance, both technical and financial, for the Unicoi County Area Vocational Education School. These are just a few examples of the effectiveness of the Appalachian Regional Commission in my district.

The impact of the Commission's vocational education program has been substantial. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education in its fifth report dated June 21, 1971, stresses the need for career education. This report is also critical of the low budgetary priority that is given to vocational education.

Both of these criticisms do not apply to the Appalachian Regional Commission. In fact, the report's recommendation on what should be done at the national level, is being done in the Appalachian region. Although the vocational education program is limited to construction and equipment purchase, the Commission has insisted that the school systems receiving Appalachian Commission assistance operate only those courses which lead to jobs that currently exist in the job market. As for budget priority, the vocational education program of the Commission has expended more money in vocational education than any other area of its activities with one exception.

The Commission's goal for the region has been to have within the early 1970's facilities to permit 50 percent of the 11th and 12th grade students to enroll in job-relevant vocational education courses. This goal is based on a related objective that the region can attain the national average of 50 percent of high school students going to college. The Commission has come close to meeting this goal and is moving to further improve course offerings and to use its vocational education funds to improve technical and post-high school vocational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation many of my colleagues and myself voted for in 1965 is beginning to become a reality and I feel that the passage of H.R. 9922 will help this dream for Appalachia be fulfilled.

Much yet remains to be accomplished but much has already been done. In his veto message on S. 575, the first extension passed by the Congress, the President indicated in no uncertain terms that his reasons for sending the measure back to the Senate were not related to the Appalachia program. We now have the

opportunity to breathe the new life into this worthwhile program. And, I say worthwhile because the Appalachian Regional Commission uses only 1.25 percent of its total funds in administering the program—the rest of the funds go for improving the lot of the Appalachian people I am pleased to be closely associated with this fine bill and offer it my wholehearted endorsement.

Cost estimates totaling \$3,992,500,000 are as follows:

*Title I.—Economic Development Act*

1972	\$1,222,750,000
1973	1,222,750,000

*Title II.—Appalachian Regional Development Act*

1972	\$152,350,000
1973	162,350,000
1974	338,650,000
1975	343,650,000
1976	185,000,000
1977	185,000,000
1978	180,000,000

This is a committee estimate; no agency or department submitted any figures. The vetoed bill authorized \$5,500,000 over the same time period.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. 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.

Mr. BLATNIK. 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. 9922) to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

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. 9922, with Mr. SLACK in the chair.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

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

Mr. Chairman, I appear before this distinguished body in support of H.R. 9922 as reported by the Committee on Public Works. This bill is substantially titles II and III of S. 575 which the President recently vetoed. Although the President disagreed with title I which contained the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971 he concurred with the titles II and III of S. 575.

I hope that H.R. 9922 will be signed by the President for we have gone a long way in attempting to meet the objections stated in his veto message.

There should be no doubt in anyone's

mind that we need this legislation. It extends the basic authority for two important economic development acts which have demonstrated their value to many of the Nation's distressed areas. It also provides funds for the construction of public facilities in areas especially hard hit by recent unemployment. While the amount of construction grant funds is not as large as some of us believe to be necessary, they will permit a start in providing useful work to some of our unemployed who are now on unemployment compensation or welfare.

I should first like to express my appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their assistance and cooperation in developing the bill now before you. I would particularly like to commend my colleagues BOB JONES of Alabama, and ED EDMONDSON of Oklahoma and the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM H. HARSHA of Ohio. I might say there is complete agreement that H.R. 9922 is vitally needed economic development legislation which will have an important impact on the economy and should be passed promptly.

I would like now to comment briefly on changes proposed in the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1971 amendments—title I—of H.R. 9922 compared with S. 575 passed by this House on June 15, 1971.

Title I will extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 through June 30, 1973. Title II will extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act through June 30, 1975, except in the case of the highway provision which is extended through the fiscal year 1978. These programs were continued beyond their expiration date, June 30, 1971, by a temporary resolution which will terminate upon the enactment of the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce. Because this could occur shortly it is important that the legislation be enacted quickly.

Title I includes additional amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 that go beyond those contained in S. 575 by providing additional authority and funds to assist so-called special impact areas confronted with serious employment and underemployment problems. The major changes are:

First. The authorization for public works grants and supplementary grants is increased from \$550 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 to \$800 million for each year. This means that the bill will make available a total of \$500 million for the 2 year period over that originally proposed.

Second. Provides that at least 25 percent and not more than 35 percent of the public works grants appropriations would be available annually for so-called special impact areas. This is intended to maintain a proper balance between projects that are necessary for long term economic development and projects that are undertaken to assist in providing urgently needed employment.

Special impact areas are communities which are confronted with one of the

following conditions: Have been affected by an actual or threatened abrupt rise in unemployment; are rural in nature, with substantial out-migration; have large concentrations of low-income families, and have substantial unemployment.

The criteria for designating a special impact area are identical to those in S. 575. These areas would not however be required to have an overall economic development program. The waiver of an overall plan should expedite getting this program underway quickly once funds have been appropriated.

Assuming the full amount is appropriated, and I find it hard to believe otherwise because of the severe unemployment problem, somewhere between \$200 and \$280 million could be used in each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 to provide immediately useful work in special impact areas. This would include the type of projects that we expected would be constructed under the Accelerated Public Works Act amendments, had they been approved by the President, such as sewers, water treatment, nursing homes, and other community facilities. However, they would not necessarily be limited to those which are directed toward long-term economic development for the area. The overriding construction requirement is that they must provide useful and immediate work for the unemployed and underemployed persons in the area.

Third. Permits the Secretary to make 100-percent grants in special impact areas where the community is confronted with serious financial problems affecting their ability to raise 20 percent of the funds. This is identical to language used in the Accelerated Public Works Act amendments contained in 575.

This language will correct one of the serious weaknesses revealed by our experience with the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 when we found that some communities that had the greatest need for construction grants were not able to finance their share. Undoubtedly some of the special impact areas may need this type of financial assistance. However, we would expect that it would only be used when there is a demonstrated need and the evidence shows no other recourse to be available.

I should like to emphasize, as the committee report clearly states, that we expect that local contractors will be used to the fullest extent possible and projects selected would be of small and medium size particularly those employing substantial amounts of local labor. This is to insure that such projects would have an immediate effect on areas having high unemployment.

Title II which extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act is identical to that contained in S. 575. I think no further explanation on my part is required.

The total authorizations contained in the bill amount to \$3,992,500,000. I am inserting in the RECORD a statement showing the cost of each section of the bill.

In closing I should like again to call attention to the fact that we have almost 5 million unemployed persons. The \$250 million of additional funds included in this bill for each of the fiscal years 1972

and 1973 for the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 should assist in providing needed construction work in some of our most seriously affected unemployment areas. I sincerely hope that the employment situation will improve. However, if early in the next session of Congress unemployment were to remain at existing levels the House Public Works Committee will reexamine this legislation to determine whether the proposed authorization of \$800 million for public construction grants should be increased. I hope that this will not be necessary but the decision will depend on how successful the administration has been in using the economic tools which the Congress has provided.

I should like to call the Members' attention to certain typographical errors in the committee report accompanying H.R. 9922.

On the first page, second paragraph, under the heading "Background" the second reference to the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971 should have been a reference to the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971.

On page 2, under the heading "Committee Action" on the fifth and sixth lines, the words "retained not redesignation" should read "retained but redesignated".

Under that center heading, any reference to "5575" should be a reference to "S. 575".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF H.R. 9922

[In thousands of dollars]

TITLE I.—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Section of—	Amount
103 Grants and supplementary grants:	
Fiscal year 1972.....	\$800,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	800,000
Total.....	1,600,000
104 Public works and business loans	
Maximum for:	
Fiscal year 1972.....	170,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	170,000
Total.....	340,000
105 Technical assistance and research:	
Fiscal year 1972.....	50,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	50,000
Total.....	100,000
108 Assistance for economic development centers and 10 percent bonus for districts:	
Fiscal year 1972.....	\$50,000
Fiscal year 1973.....	50,000
Total.....	100,000
109 Assistance for title V regions, fiscal year 1972 and 1973.....	305,000
110 Planning, Alaska Federal Field Commission, fiscal year 1972 and 1973.....	500
Total of title I.....	2,445,500

TITLE II—APPALACHIA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

202 Commission expenses:	
Fiscal year 1972 and 1973.....	\$2,700
Fiscal year 1974 and 1975.....	3,300
Total.....	6,000
204 Development highways, access roads:	
Fiscal year 1973.....	110,000
Fiscal year 1974.....	180,000
Fiscal year 1975.....	185,000
Fiscal year 1976.....	185,000
Fiscal year 1977.....	185,000
Fiscal year 1978.....	180,000
Total.....	925,000

Section of—	Amount
205 Appalachian airport safety improvements: Fiscal year 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975.....	40,000
212 Nonhighway programs:	
Fiscal year 1972 and 1973.....	282,000
Fiscal year 1974 and 1975.....	294,000
Total.....	576,000
Total of title II.....	1,547,000
Title I.....	2,445,500
Title II.....	1,547,000
Total authorizations in H.R. 9922.....	3,992,500

↑ Increase.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, whose friendship I have valued for many years, he is a great leader as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. I take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for the perseverance that he has manifested in the handling of this legislation. To my way of thinking, the accelerated public works program was the best program for providing an immediate solution to the problem of hard core unemployment the Congress has ever enacted. I am happy the principle of the program is retained in the bill. On another point this legislation you have brought before this body is necessary if the Appalachian area is ever going to catch up with the rest of the Nation from the standpoint of economic development. It is a great piece of legislation, and I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and again compliment him and the members of his committee for attending to their duties and bringing this bill to the House in this manner.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to extend my compliments to the House Public Works Committee and to its very able chairman (Mr. BLATNIK) for the expeditious manner in which it has acted on the legislation before us here today. I am convinced that the members of this committee recognize, just as I do, the value of the Appalachian program and benefits which will be realized by extending its life.

The congressional district which it has been my privilege to represent in the House for more than a decade is located in the Appalachian section of North Carolina. I have witnessed firsthand the great progress which has already been made and can report that the people of this area have developed great faith in the Appalachian program. We cannot afford to terminate a program which has already demonstrated its ability to lift people out of their economic isolation. Throughout my district, young people and adults by the thousands are enrolled in new technical training institutes built

with the aid of funds from the Appalachian Regional Commission. These must be permitted to move forward if Appalachia is to realize the lofty educational levels which have been envisioned.

From the standpoint of my own observations, the Appalachian program is meeting the special needs which prompted Congress to establish the program in 1965.

Quite frankly, I was alarmed earlier this year when President Nixon recommended that funds currently being allocated to the Appalachian program be folded into his proposed revenue-sharing plan. Certainly, this valuable asset to our Nation should not be engulfed by a program which might tend to overlook the special problems of Appalachia. Too, when Congress established the program, it made a very real commitment to the people of the Appalachian area. The Government has completed only about one-half of the program and bears an obligation and responsibility to carry it to full completion.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, that I wholeheartedly support a 4-year extension of the Appalachian Regional Commission itself and a 5-year extension of the Appalachian highway and local access road program, as recommended by the committee. I am pleased that the President has carefully reconsidered his earlier recommendations and, as I understand it, now favors extension of both the Public Works and Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

I feel that the Appalachian program has made more progress per dollar spent in the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina than any other Federal program.

Out migration from the Appalachian area has been reduced from 2.2 million between 1950 and 1960 to 1.4 million between 1960 and 1970. We want to stop this outflow of young talent from the Appalachian area and ease the problems of our large cities by providing opportunities for work and a good life available right at home. Many of our city problems have been created by people being forced by cruel economic necessity to leave areas such as Appalachia to seek employment in overcrowded urban areas.

This program is one of the Nation's best examples of teamwork by Federal, State, and local units of government. In my opinion, it is the best administered program in Washington. Its strength in part lies in its adaptability from State to State, using it to solve its own problems and to meet its own needs. Improvement programs originate locally, are matched by local funds, are approved by the Governor of the State and brought by the Governor or his representative to the Appalachian Commission for approval.

The Appalachian program has been one of the Nation's best demonstrations of how States and local units of government can make effective use of shared Federal revenue.

The Appalachian program must be extended in order to complete the task for which this State/Federal partnership was created.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is a substantial improvement over S. 575, which the President vetoed. This bill is cosponsored by all the minority members on the committee. We worked this compromise out with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee. Those of us on both the minority side and the majority side are vitally interested in continuing the effective programs provided by the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

We previously continued these programs so that there would be no gap in the service to the people in Appalachia and in the economically depressed regions of the country.

In H.R. 9922, we substantially increased the flexibility of the Economic Development Administration to deal with specific special impact areas where there are instances of high unemployment or underemployment due to present economic conditions.

This is a very acceptable compromise. It continues vitally needed programs, vitally effective and successful programs. It recognizes the economic situation of the country. Those of us who were concerned with the inflationary impact of a \$2 billion accelerated public works program, and those of us who thought a program of that magnitude could not reach the present-day unemployed because of the differences in the unemployed of today as opposed to several years ago, as well as other problems we saw that were commensurate with a vast, accelerated public works program, worked out this compromise bill which recognizes these problems.

On the other hand, there were those who had a very honest difference of opinion. We have something in this bill that will meet their needs. I think I can assure my colleagues the administration will sign this bill.

In this connection, the President, in his veto message on S. 575, with clear foresight, expressed his concern over the inability of title I to accomplish the ends intended. At the same time, he endorsed titles II and III, the extensions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, urging Congress to act immediately "to insure that there is no gap in service to the people in Appalachia and in the economically depressed areas served by EDA."

The committee, in this bill, not only extends these vitally needed economic development programs, but also substantially improves the ability of the Economic Development Administration to deal with emergency-type unemployment problems wherever they exist throughout the Nation.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as stated in the report accompanying that legislation—House Report 539, 89th Congress, first session—was based upon three acts—the

Area Redevelopment Act, the Public Works Acceleration Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which had recently been approved by the Congress. In its report the committee declared that the proposed legislation combined:

The best features of two programs which have already proved to be effective ones and of a program which it believes will be as successful.

If, in the creation of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, any tool which could be used to combat unemployment was inadvertently omitted, it would have to be the flexibility of solving short-term emergency unemployment needs.

The bill before us would add this flexibility. It does so by liberalizing section 401(a) of the act to require that so-called special impact area projects provide "immediate useful work to unemployed and underemployed persons in that area." The amount of \$500 million is added to the EDA authorization over the next 2 fiscal years to enable it to carry out such "special impact" projects. It should be noted, however, that even with this half billion dollar increase, because of the elimination of the \$2 billion accelerated public works program, H.R. 9922 represents a net reduction in authorizations of \$1½ billion.

I understand that the conferees are meeting today on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill which contains an item of \$293,409,000 for all EDA and title V regional programs for fiscal year 1972. This figure itself, is not in conference so it is presumed that this will be the amount appropriated. The legislation before us would authorize for EDA and the title V regions \$2,445,500,000 for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. A prorated authorization for fiscal year 1972 would then be \$1,222,750,000 or \$929 million more than the proposed appropriated amount.

Fortunately, the committee-reported bill contains a provision which, in the case of public works grants and supplementary grants, including those to the "special impact" areas, would allow authorizations unappropriated in fiscal year 1972 to be available for appropriation in fiscal year 1973.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act instituted a regional concept to economic development in this country. The act defined the Appalachian area on the basis of physical and sociological characteristics. Appalachia, with its natural beauty and wealth in natural resources, had long suffered from a declining economy and population outmigration. The objective of the act was to provide a stimulus and give life to this lagging section of the Nation.

The key to the Appalachian Regional Commission work is local involvement. Local people and the States determine where the block grant money will be spent. This requires vigorous participation and a heavy commitment by local citizens to carry out these programs.

Since its inception, the Appalachia Regional Development Act has helped to transform this region from an are

dependent on only a few resource oriented industries to one employing a variety of labor skills and production techniques.

Tied to the objective of expanding the economy of the Appalachian region are programs for health improvement and vocational and technical training. Assistance to 260 vocational and technical educational centers and 231 health facilities to improve the quality of human resources in the area have been approved.

In its implementation, the Appalachian Act has concentrated commercial development investments in areas of high growth potential. Such areas are selected by the individual States themselves. The Appalachian Regional Commission believes that this strategy maximizes the impact and benefits of its economic programs.

I firmly believe that the record of accomplishment of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission proves that State and local governments can and do have the capacity to make the Federal-State-local partnership work.

The programs administered under the Economic Development Administration, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, and the so-called title V regions, are now operating under a continuing resolution. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in voting for the extension of these vitally needed, grass-roots programs.

They are essential to the balanced economic development of our Nation.

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

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I associate myself with his remarks and with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota. In the Upper Great Lakes region I am fully aware of the wonderful work that has been done in this entire area. I wholeheartedly support passage of this bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, a cosponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride and optimism that I rise at this time to urge my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 9922, a bill to extend the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Economic Development Administration and the title V regional commissions.

I speak with pride because I have the honor of cosponsoring this legislation.

I speak with optimism because I know of the great works these programs are capable of producing. Great works have characterized the past endeavors of the Appalachian Commission and its companion programs, and great works are sure to distinguish their future efforts.

I am especially excited by the prospect of extending the Appalachian Regional Commission for another 4 years. As I have often said, in this chamber and elsewhere, I can think of no program,

out of more than 1,100 throughout the Federal Government, in which money is better spent, in which people are more directly benefited or consulted, or in which the Government assistance concept is better applied than the program conducted by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Its influence can be readily seen in the vast array of facilities that have become symbols of progress in the Fifth District of North Carolina, which I am privileged to represent, and throughout the Appalachian region.

One need only look at the ever-growing network of Appalachian development highways, or the primary and secondary access roads throughout the region, or the new hospitals, vocational schools, community colleges, regional health centers, water and sewage treatment plants, airports, and other facilities that have spurred development of this region to see that, in a relatively short time, the Appalachian Commission has distinguished itself as an agent of change and a sorely needed instrument of progress.

And it is for this reason that I am so gratified to see this legislation brought again to the floor for our approval.

The Senate has already voiced its approval for the extension measure, and we at last have the opportunity to join that body in an overwhelming expression of support for this worthwhile program.

After only 6 years' involvement in such a massive venture as that undertaken by the Appalachian Regional Commission, it is hard to say how great an effect its existence has had or will have on the vast Appalachian region.

I believe the program has won the right to be continued, so that we may better see the results of the regional development concept, and so that we may hopefully see more fruits of a great labor.

I urge my colleagues to vote with me for passage of this extension legislation.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, another cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9922. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this new bill because it confines itself to the extension of those programs which have been tested and have proved their worth in pumping new life into those areas of the country where for one good reason or another there has been a slackening of the economic pace.

We all know the circumstances under which this particular legislation comes to the floor for debate. I supported the President's veto of S. 575 because of the provision to revive the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 and commit \$2 billion to WPA-type jobs. There are pockets of unemployment in the country and they need attention, but the kind of jobs provided under the public works umbrella would not help the aerospace jobless or those in defense-oriented industries adversely affected by the winding down of the war.

I commend the wisdom of drafting new legislation which eliminates the objectionable WPA feature and, instead,

extends the Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. Both of these extensions are urgent. We need to keep these programs ongoing and viable.

Mr. Chairman, all 10 counties of the Third Congressional District of Tennessee are in Appalachia. I have seen firsthand what the implementation of these special programs can do to upgrade communities and promote greater economic activity.

Three of the counties of the Third District have qualified for full assistance under the Economic Development Act in the past, and just last month EDA designated a 10-county area of southeast Tennessee as an economic development district of which Chattanooga in Hamilton County and the Cleveland-Athens corridor in Bradley and McMinn Counties will be growth centers.

This is the Southeast Tennessee Development District and encompasses these counties of the congressional district I represent: Bledsoe, Bradley, Hamilton, McMinn, Marion, Meigs, Polk, Rhea, and Sequatchie. Four of these counties—Bledsoe, Meigs, Rhea, and Sequatchie—have been designated as a redevelopment area and are eligible for full EDA assistance, including public works grants and loans, business loans, planning grants, and technical assistance. The most tangible benefit to this area will be 10 percent bonus from EDA to each of the special redevelopment area counties for funding and staffing qualified EDA projects.

It is evident that this area of Tennessee is depending upon the special assistance which can be channeled through these pipelines. Since the inception of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission and the Economic Development Act, the Third District has received \$5.5 million in funds for public facilities such as the Athens State Area Vocational Facility, the Bradley County area vocational educational program, and Chattanooga's new Orange Grove School. These vocational and technical schools are helping meet more than 40 percent of the region's manpower need. A similar contribution is being made through health facilities such as the Meigs County Public Health Center and Bledsoe County Hospital in Pikeville which I recently helped dedicate.

I can be forgiven, I am sure, for concentrating on the benefits to the congressional district I represent, but I am aware of what has gone on in the entire Appalachian region.

When one views the great progress of the Appalachian experiment in the last 5½ years, he can easily be astounded: 233 health facilities; 260 vocational and technical schools; 157 higher education facilities; 185 water pollution control facilities; 85 libraries; 49 airports; 37 grants for school equipment; and 71 other public improvements have benefited from Appalachian program dollars. These accomplishments represent an awesome response by the participating State and local jurisdictions to the opportunities offered by the Appalachian Act. Likewise they represent an enormous commitment of time, energy, and

very scarce resources by those governments and by the districts.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today is necessary to carry on projects in economically depressed areas in many States. Because I am intimately familiar with what it has done in Tennessee and neighboring States, I can make a strong recommendation for the passage of H.R. 9922 so that these extensions can be made. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), another cosponsor of the legislation, such time as he may consume.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my distinguished chairman for the outstanding job he has done in bringing this bill to the floor. I can fully and enthusiastically recommend this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian program has been the most successful and dynamic example of economic development legislation during my 23 years in the Congress. I urge the House to pass this bill by an overwhelming majority in order that its final approval will be assured and so that it will be signed into law at the earliest possible moment.

The Appalachia program has been a grassroots initiative program, Mr. Chairman. And the Appalachia concept is truly "revenue sharing" in action, because local planning has been complemented by Federal financial assistance.

There is a spirit of hope and progress in Appalachia, due in no small part to this dynamic program. The Appalachia program has been responsible for the planning and partial completion of an essential system of development highways, such as the fabulous South Carolina Route 11 which will provide access to the billion-dollar development at Keeoway-Toxaway. Appalachia is truly on the move, with the construction of many new medical and education facilities through assistance of this great program.

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to commend our dynamic leader, Chairman JOHN BLATNIK for the skillful and expeditious manner in which he has handled this legislation and brought it back before the House at the earliest opportunity. In view of the current state of the economy and in view of the long-range necessity of fully developing our economy, this is timely and most urgent legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) another cosponsor of the legislation, such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us today does seem familiar, since in other forms twice this year this House has debated the merits of the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and whether or not they should be extended. On both occasions the House overwhelmingly approved those propos-

als. However, the previous legislation contained a provision calling for an accelerated public works program. This met with disapproval within the Executive, which resulted in a veto, which the other body failed to override.

Today H.R. 9922, which we are now considering, is practically the same bill as S. 575, sans the Accelerated Public Works Act amendments. If the extension of EDA and Appalachia was considered so favorably before then, today it should be approved by even a greater margin, since the conditions we discussed at that time still exist, and in some cases have worsened. Others have discussed just what this bill contains in the way of assistance, grants, loans, and other criteria. Others have made the point that administration did not oppose titles II and III of S. 575, which are now titles I and II of H.R. 9922, with some modifications.

This is urgently required economic development legislation which will assist communities from one end of the Nation to the other. It will bring into being many sorely needed public works projects, while at the same time returning many of the unemployed to gainful employment—employment not of the “make work” type, but that which will show an end product in each case; public health facilities, sewer systems, water treatment systems, improvement of airports, and similar projects. It will be a great boon to those communities suffering extremely severe economic distress and a high percentage of unemployment than others.

I cannot urge you too strongly to stand up for H.R. 9922 and vote it into law today.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, who has played a big role in development of this bill and who is also a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the great and distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, last week I returned from an inspection visit in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Watershed Development, Committee on Public Works. With other members I visited several projects which were constructed under Public Law 83-566. In one area, in my home State of West Virginia, we ran into an interesting economic fact of life. One community had qualified under Public Law 566 for a watershed. At the time this project was approved the community had become economically stagnated. It seemed as if that town was faced with eventual doom, since no adequate municipal or industrial water supplies were available. An economic miracle was wrought when the new watershed made both systems a reality. Since that time that town has grown and today enjoys a booming economy—for the first time in a century. Industries have relocated there and the prosperity of the community is evident in banking statistics for the current year. Placed beside those of 10 years ago, today's financial reports show a remarkable upswing in local wealth.

Now but 9 miles distant is another community which did not benefit from

this nearby watershed since relocation of a section of a Federal highway reduced the benefit-cost ratios below that permitted by law. This small town today is even smaller than a decade ago. Not only does it not have adequate water for industry, it is eventually faced with the depletion of its municipal water supply if something is not done to prevent this from happening. Should the water shortage currently envisioned become a reality that town shall die. I would deeply regret to see Bluefield, W. Va., my hometown—a jewel among towns—wither away as have so many communities in this Nation.

I am just as sympathetic to other areas faced with similar threats to their well-being, rest assured. I use my own hometown as an example because I know what is going to happen, if something is not done for it. Under the provisions of H.R. 9922 this sword hanging over the heads of the people of Bluefield could conceivably be removed, with a municipal water system being authorized for the area. Hopefully, such a system would provide enough water so that small industries would relocate in the area; and others would stay that now are faced with moving away. That is what this bill would do. Parochial as this problem may be, I remind you that others have the same problem staring them in the face.

As a member representing one of the most economically deprived areas in the whole of Appalachia I realize the staggering problems with which we are faced. I know that our problems will not be overcome tomorrow, next month or next year. But I do know that progress is being made. We cannot, for 1 minute, afford to let that progress come to a stop. Now, at long last, those people in an area stretching from the Northeast to the Southeast and elsewhere in this Nation are beginning to see the benefits of the Economic Development Act, as well as those of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. To deprive them at this critical juncture, when those results are offering them the hope they have never had in their lives, of these programs would be cruel indeed. No one would blame them if they accused us of preventing them from receiving the benefits they so justly deserve.

Even though this help should continue, let me remind you that such help is not wasteful. It is not draining the Treasury of funds for boondoggling projects that mean little or nothing to the future. What will be built from these moneys will be necessary public works projects which the communities, were they financially able, would build on their own without outside help. They just cannot possibly do so without our help. And with our help they will be able to re-establish—or in most cases establish for the first time ever—an economic base which will return to the United States many more dollars in tax payments than they will have taken to establish that economic base.

In closing, I feel compelled to bring to your attention that portion of H.R. 9922 which calls for upgrading the safety of Appalachian airports. You all recall, I am sure, the horrible disaster of last

fall when the Marshall University football team, its coaches, and supporters died in a crash that took 82 lives. This was at an airport which does not have adequate safety equipment. Just last week another crash, the cause for which has not been determined, took four more human lives. Under this provision something can be done to make the airport at Huntington, W. Va., more safe. Others are sadly in lack of even minimum equipment to permit them to be operational under the least hint of bad weather. Last week, returning to Washington by air, we had to overfly Pulaski, Va., merely because of a little fog. This, in an era when Apollo 15 is en route to the moon.

This is a most necessary bill. It must pass overwhelmingly if we in the Congress are to continue to fulfill our sacred obligation of public responsibility.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my able and respected colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), also a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as one who has consistently backed both the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act I once again rise in support of the new legislation before us today. I call it “new,” although but for one deletion, and one addition, it is almost the same bill we have been passing in this House since April. On both occasions the legislation passed by wide margins. Similarly the other body has realized the merits of these proposals and has seen fit to put its stamp of approval thereon—the latest vote being 88 to 2. We cannot but do likewise.

All over the country there are pockets of poverty that have existed even through times of plenty for the rest of the Nation. We must eliminate these chronic areas of underemployment and unemployment if all our citizens are to share in the wealth of the United States. No better legislation has yet to come forth than that of 1965 on the two subjects. Studies by the executive agencies charged with the responsibility for the management of the programs have shown that they are working; that progress is being made; communities are beginning to see a brighter economic future.

While successes have been scored, and in some cases dramatically, during the short 6 years of these programs, we still have much, much more to do if we are to see these matters through. Now, of all times, would be the worst possible moment to halt such remarkable progress. All too many people have lost hope. We cannot possibly permit even others who now feel they are not doomed to poverty for the remainder of their lives—as it was for their fathers before them—to throw up their hands in despair—to be left with the feeling that no one cares. We do care, all of us. Some might feel there are other ways in which our objectives may be met. If there are other ways, I have not seen them nor heard them proposed before this body. Until better solutions are found to the continuing problems of these areas we must go on with these programs. We cannot delay, since the temporary authority

which has permitted them to continue pending extensions may expire at any time. Once an ongoing program comes to a halt history has proved that the results are almost catastrophic. The resulting actions that take place to wind down a particular activity are many—but to attempt to start them up again is costly and time consuming; even self-defeating in some cases.

I will vote for passage. I ask you, each and everyone of you, to do likewise.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. I think it is the kind of compromise that has the support of the full committee. There were no changes under the Appalachian section, wherein I had a partial responsibility along with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation and in support of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, most, if not all of us, are agonizing these days as to what can be done to assist those unfortunate persons and communities suffering from what can only be called perpetual poverty. Daily we read of the distress of even more of our citizens. Just how can we do something for them is a recurring question to me. No one suffers the illusion that solutions are easy; that anything we do will immediately make everything fine once again. But, something must be done—and when matters such as H.R. 9922 come before us we realize that something is being done.

For the past 6 years progress has been made in overcoming the continuing economic woes of various segments of our society. These problems are not those that are besetting the entire Nation today, such as an unusually high unemployment rate, coupled with inflationary factors. Almost everyone who has studied our economic growth since our beginnings considered these to be but passing conditions that will eventually correct themselves, as they have in the past.

No, we are addressing ourselves to people who have never known the security of continuous employment, with retirement plans and fringe benefits. Many have made so little money that even social security seems to be but a myth to them. An example of what I am talking about is not too far from us. It wasn't until Harpers Ferry was revitalized as a national park, and restored to almost what it was in the days of John Brown, that most people in that small West Virginia town ever knew anything but continuing, grinding poverty. Today, as one of the major tourist attractions in America—and a spot that Thomas Jefferson described as one of the most beautiful in the world—Harpers Ferry is enjoying economic liberation. Maybe the trains do not stop there as often as before, but the thousands of automobiles filled with moneyspending tourists certainly do. While the rebuilding project of the town,

which has brought it onto the 20th century economic plane, does not come under this legislation, I use it as an illustration of what can be done when money is wisely placed in a needy area. Other communities are also enjoying similar gains through participation in programs contained in the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Revived areas are income-producing, tax-paying communities which can meet their financial obligations, returning more to the Federal Treasury than we will spend on them.

So while not solving the entire range of domestic problems, we can, by passing this bill, help a large part of the country seek a higher economic level on a continuing basis.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, when the bill extending the economic development program was previously before the House, before the veto, I inquired of the gentleman from Oklahoma whether it included authority to establish the Upper Missouri Basin Regional Economic Development Commission. I was assured that it did. To maintain the record, I want to make note that I have been given the same assurances as to the bill now before us.

All the Governors, Senators, and Representatives from the five Upper Missouri Basin States, from both political parties, have been petitioning for the establishment of such a Commission for nearly 3 years now. We appreciate the support that our colleagues in both parties in the Congress have given us, and continue to give us in the act now pending.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9922, which would extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

While there are many legitimate reasons to support this legislation, I am especially interested in its potential impact in the area of Long Island, N.Y., where my congressional district is located.

Nassau and Suffolk Counties, on Long Island, are in the midst of an unemployment crisis with almost 7 percent of the area working force unemployed at the present time. Moreover, there has been an extended period of high unemployment in the bicounty region.

However, Federal assistance for areas of high unemployment has heretofore been issued on the basis of statistics for standard metropolitan statistical areas. Thus Nassau and Suffolk Counties have been lumped together with all of New York City and surrounding communities. The effect of this has been to disguise the severe unemployment in the two counties and prevent the issuance of urgently needed special Federal assistance.

Now the Public Works Committee, under the vigorous and enlightened leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) has redefined, in H.R. 9922, the eligibility criteria for redevelopment areas.

Under the criteria proposed in H.R. 9922 an area could qualify simply by

the presence of "substantial unemployment" regardless of "political or other subdivisions or boundaries." Clearly Nassau and Suffolk Counties would qualify for designation under the foregoing definition.

It is rewarding to me to realize that Long Island, which has been so hard hit by unemployment, will be eligible for a portion of the \$800 million authorized by this bill for both fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

This is an important piece of legislation for which the Chairman and the Committee deserve to be commended. I intend to vote for it and I urge my colleagues, to do likewise.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9922, to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

In my judgment, this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, represents an excellent compromise position and, in fact, would seem to be superior to that which was recently vetoed by the President.

During the process of hearings on the original bill, I recognized that an expansion of the already proven Economic Development Administration programs and Appalachia could provide the country's depressed areas with the kind of economic revitalization that was needed. To that end, I introduced H.R. 6588, which was designed to expand and enlarge on EDA's program objectives. The legislation we are considering today is quite similar to that which I proposed in March of this year.

The bill now being considered would, in my judgment, due to the language included, provide EDA with the kind of flexibility necessary to handle short-term emergency unemployment needs. With the extension of the programs provided by this legislation, new jobs and new opportunities can be created for millions of Americans.

In addition, the legislation provides for a proper balance between long-term economic development programs and the aforementioned short-term unemployment or underemployment, the latter two of which would include the so-called special impact areas, where sudden and unexpected loss of job opportunities has virtually wiped out the economics of many small- and medium-sized communities.

In these "special impact" areas, the Secretary would have the authority to assist those communities where the borrowing and taxing powers have been exhausted by providing grants-in-aid for local public works projects of up to 100 percent of the project cost. These projects could include, under these special conditions, community facilities not designed to improve the long-term economic development of the area, such as community centers, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, our hearings clearly demonstrated the need for additional employment opportunities, as well as graphically demonstrating the viability of the EDA and Appalachia programs. I, therefore, strongly urge passage of the legislation now before us.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9922.

I would first like to commend our chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) for the leadership he has given to the Congress and his expeditious handling of this legislation.

This legislation has previously been before the House and considered by this body when it considered S. 575 on June 15 of this year. The House vote on this legislation at that time was more than 2 to 1 in favor of its passage. The President subsequently on June 29, vetoed this legislation because of his objections to title I which was a continuation of the accelerated public works program. The U.S. Senate, on July 14, failed to override the Presidential veto on this legislation by five votes. Last week, on July 21, the U.S. Senate passed an almost identical bill to the one being considered today by an overwhelming vote of 88 to 2.

Today, I would like to confine my remarks to title II of H.R. 9922, which contains the amendments to the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. The amendments in this bill are identical to title III of S. 575 previously passed by the House. This title of the bill basically extends the Appalachian development highway and access road program for an additional period of 5 years through fiscal year 1978. The other Appalachian programs have been broadened and extended for a period of 4 years through fiscal year 1975.

The Appalachian program has enjoyed remarkable support during the past 6 years. It has the support and approval of the Governors of the States in Appalachia, both Houses of the Congress, and the President. The reason for this support and success can be attributed to a great extent to the partnership that has been established between the Federal and State Governments. In addition, the enthusiasm demonstrated by the Governors and local authorities and the people themselves has brought about the success of the program.

It is essential to the future of the region that the basic commitments made in the Appalachian Act in 1965 be continued until completed. It is particularly critical that the development highway network as established early in the program be completed. The remarkable efforts which have been started to improve the basic levels of health and education in the region must be carried forward. To stop these efforts in mid-stream would be to waste millions of dollars in unfinished programs.

I would like to highlight and comment briefly on the substance of this legislation and discuss the significant changes recommended as follows.

The 1965 Appalachian Act authorized a development highway system and access road program to open up the region to commerce. Since that time, however, new Federal highway safety standards, new Federal relocation assistance requirements, and continuing inflation have all combined to increase the estimated cost of this system. Appropriations through fiscal year 1971 have totaled \$820 million. Construction on

about 500 miles of the system have been completed and construction is underway on another 367 miles of the little more than 2,500 miles requiring construction. It is now estimated that an additional authorization of \$890 million is needed to complete the construction of this system.

The total new authorization of \$925 million is provided to permit the completion of the system and to provide \$35 million to continue the local access road program. The highway program has been extended for 5 more years through fiscal year 1978.

A new section is added to the Appalachian Act which establishes a program for safety improvements for Appalachian airports. Grants would be made by the Secretary of Transportation and are limited to upgrading safety facilities at existing public airports. Improvements relating to safety would be eligible for funding including removal of hazards, acquisition of safety equipment, navigational aids, and the acquisition of any land, easements, or airspace rights necessary for the project, including site preparation for navigation aids. Federal participation would not exceed 90 percent of the project cost except for navigation aids which are eligible for 100 percent assistance. The Secretary would have obligatory authority to make grants which would later be liquidated by appropriations, up to a total of \$40 million for the fiscal year period ending June 30, 1975.

Under the present demonstration health program the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for planning, constructing, equipping, and operating multicounty demonstration health, nutrition, and child-care projects approved by the Commission, including hospitals, diagnostic and treatment centers, health facilities and services. This legislation amends the health program to allow combining funds for child development services under the Social Security Act without requirements of a statewide program. It also permits a combining of Appalachian funds with other Federal funds for planning grants for projects.

The mining area restoration program has been broadened to permit grants for controlling or abating mine drainage pollution. The section has also been amended to make it clear that the reasonable value of donated land, materials, and services may be included in the computation of the local share of cost in this program. The existing 75-25 Federal-State cost-sharing ratio for restoration projects is continued.

The act provides a program to stimulate the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families of the region by providing seed money, loans and grants for planning and other preliminary expenses of housing projects under sections 221 and 236 of the National Housing Act. This section has been rewritten and amended to permit mortgage payments as provided under section 235 of the National Housing Act and grants up to 10-percent of cost for site development and offsite improvements in order to assist in the high cost of land devel-

opment caused by the Appalachian topography. The Commission has also been given direct authority to provide or contract for technical assistance in the implementation of this section.

The act now authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction of school facilities and for the equipping of existing and new facilities to provide vocational education in areas of the region where it is not presently available. This program is amended to permit planning, construction and operating grants for vocational demonstration projects to public nonprofit institutions.

The act presently authorizes supplemental grants to enable the States, local governments, and other eligible applicants to take full advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs enacted on or before December 31, 1970, which assist in the construction or equipment of facilities, or the acquisition of land. This section has been amended to permit "first money" grants when funds are unavailable under the basic grant-in-aid program. Supplementary grant assistance under this section has now been made available for grant-in-aid programs enacted prior to December 31, 1974.

The act presently authorizes grants for administrative expenses of local development districts and for investigation, research, studies, technical assistance, and demonstration projects in furthering the purposes of the act. This section has been amended to permit the use of funds for construction projects when necessary to carry out research and demonstrations.

No one who visits the Appalachian region can fail to note how the junk cars mar its beautiful landscape, but a 1967 Bureau of Mines report documents the magnitude of this problem. For example, the report estimated that, excluding junk dealer inventories and scrap yards, there was one junk car for every 21 persons in the rural area of Knox County, Tenn.

Some Appalachian States have already started removing abandoned cars and other durable wastes from the roadsides, residential areas, and other places of casual dumping. More effort is needed in this area before the problem can be resolved. Five million dollars is recommended in the general authorization for the purpose of permitting pilot waste clearance demonstration projects for the purpose of developing feasible methods of clearing the countryside of this debris.

The bill authorizes administrative expenses of \$2,700,000 for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 not to exceed \$525,000 for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff. In addition, it authorizes \$3,300,000 for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, not to exceed \$575,000 for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff.

For the programs other than highways, airport safety, and administrative expenses, the bill authorizes \$282,000,000 \$294,000,000 for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Consistent with the extensions provided in the bill, changes are made to extend the authority of the commission to lease office space for 4 additional years and extends the termination date of the

act for other than the highway program for 4 more years.

The total new authorization for the Appalachian programs is \$1,547,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as a coauthor of H.R. 9922, I rise in strong support of this legislation which would aid localities that are especially hard hit by unemployment.

This measure authorizes \$845 million over the next 2 years in order to assist localities through public works, business loans, and technical assistance. In addition, this bill authorizes an additional \$1.6 billion for public works projects—such as hospitals, schools, water and sewage treatment plants, and nursing homes—of which up to \$280 million is to be used for accelerated public works projects in areas of high unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, the Los Angeles area, with unemployment approaching 8 percent, is in desperate need of, first, jobs for the unemployed and, second, funds to begin or continue urgently needed projects.

The bill, H.R. 9922, provides up to 80 percent Federal funds for areas, such as Los Angeles, which have substantial unemployment, so that they may undertake needed projects. Thus, jobs will be created and funds will be provided.

Today, we are spending over half a billion dollars a month on unemployment benefits and close to \$1 billion a month on welfare—public assistance.

It seems to me that it is far more productive to provide Federal funds for areas of substantial unemployment so that they may construct essential facilities, instead of sitting on our hands and letting the unemployment and welfare rolls continue to grow.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my friend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, and the members of the forward-looking Committee on Public Works for bringing before us today H.R. 9922, one of the most important pieces of legislation to be debated in this House during this session. Once again we have the opportunity to show my people in southern Illinois and the United States that we do care about their well-being, in the areas of both health and economics. This bill will result in the construction of badly needed facilities throughout the Nation. Persons who have long since, in despair, given up hope for work will be put to use in a productive manner to create the projects authorized by this act. The committee has carefully studied the veto message of the President and has eliminated those provisions which the administration felt would not serve the purpose or the intent of previously passed bills, thereby putting before us extensions of the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which are considered vital to our Nation by both the legislative and executive branches.

History has shown that these progressive acts have worked as Congress intended. Many communities in the Appalachian area, long suffering from depressed economies, even while the rest of the Nation enjoyed prosperity never dreamed of in this world, are now begin-

ning to realize a revitalization process which promises to give them hope for a brighter future. It would be lamentable if we were to not extend these two titles, extend them as offered today, and continue the programs that have been made so far.

None of the features of H.R. 9922 can be called giveaways. Every dollar expended will go toward construction of highways, airport safety upgrading, sewer systems, water treatment plants, water supplies, public health facilities, and the like. The other body realized the wisdom of this legislation when it passed a similar bill by an 88-to-2 margin. They had previously failed to override the veto, so their latest vote underscores the importance of what we consider today. I urge all my colleagues in the House to support this important proposal and I urge the EDA officials to promptly carry out the provisions by approving the projects that are now pending.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9922, to extend the Appalachian Regional Commission. I speak in favor of the extension of this act, because I have personally seen the impact this program has made on this region of the country and specifically on North Carolina and my congressional district. After watching closely the advances and directions the Commission has taken in the past 5 years, I have been impressed with its efficiency and administration. Today, I want to give my enthusiastic support to this program.

At one time or another, I have represented 11 counties which are included in the designated Appalachian area. In these areas, I have seen Appalachian funds make possible additional construction for a number of hospitals, which had previously been inadequate to meet the health needs of the community. These funds have helped to alleviate the severe shortage of trained medical personnel in this area. The improved medical facilities while making possible a greater degree of medical care for the residents, has also presented brighter opportunities so that better trained professionals might be attracted to this area.

Appalachian funds have been used to expand and to construct new vocational-education facilities in my district. These facilities have made it possible for a large number of young people to acquire marketable skills and to find employment. This training combined with the construction of miles of highways through the mountainous terrain have enabled countless young people to reach new levels of employment; thus providing them and their families with a better standard of living and an improved quality of life.

New libraries, emergency communication systems, and home health programs throughout this region are all identifiable ways to measure the accomplishments of this program. Each of these projects financed, at least in part by Appalachian moneys, have helped to bring a new dimension to the lives of the Appalachian people.

Since the inception of this program,

more than 500 miles of highways have been completed, another 400 are under construction, and an additional 1,000 miles with engineering and right-of-way acquisition are in progress at this time. When completed, the 2,500 mile Appalachian highway system, along with interstate highways, will do much to end the region's crippling isolation.

A closer look at the progress of the Commission over the entire 13-State region indicates that it has been responsible for 233 new health facilities, 312 new vocational and technical education facilities, or 7,071 units of low- and moderate-income housing.

The Commission is to be commended for its role in improving job training, highway construction, medical care, and educational opportunities for the millions of residents of the Appalachian area. This bill would enable it to continue to provide assistance in these areas and it would expand the Commission's authority to provide assistance for the improvement of airport safety and housing.

We are all aware of the critical housing shortage which this Nation faces. Despite the magnitude of this problem on the national level, the degree of substandard and inadequate housing is even greater in this area. Past years of poverty and record unemployment rates have forced residents of this area to live in shacks without water, heat, or, in many cases, shelter from the weather. This bill gives the Commission the authority to work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in making a concerted effort to see that these people have a decent place in which to live. We can afford to offer these people no less.

In addition to these tangible results of the Commission to which I have called your attention, I support the Appalachian Regional Commission because of the gains it has made in fostering a viable program of cooperative government. I have talked with people who have been served by the Commission, as well as county and municipal officials who have played a role in making the Appalachian program work. I have been favorably impressed by their comments indicating an improved attitude toward cooperative government action, as a result of their contact with the Appalachian program.

The Commission has helped to establish a meaningful partnership in government. Federal, State, and local governments are working cooperatively to plan and initiate development of a diversified economy, to provide much needed public facilities, to educate and train young people to become productive members of the labor force, and to alleviate the desperate shortage of health care services. Generating this unique spirit of cooperation among different levels of government is in itself a laudable accomplishment for which the Appalachian Regional Commission deserves credit.

It is for these reasons, that I favor an extension of the Appalachian program. The task that the Commission has undertaken is a difficult one. It has made visible progress toward this task—but the job is not complete and it will require our continued support, if it is to succeed.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9922 which would extend both the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Now that we have before us a clean bill which does not include the Public Works Acceleration Act amendments, vetoed by the President earlier this year, I am hopeful that this necessary legislation will be approved speedily.

As a member of the Maryland Delegation in this Congress, I am particularly concerned with section 204 of title II—the Appalachian Regional Development Act amendments. This provision would increase the 1973 fiscal year authorization for construction of the Appalachian highway and local access roads from \$170 million to \$180 million. It would also extend the program for 5 more years through fiscal year 1978 by authorizing \$180 million for fiscal year 1974, \$185 million for fiscal year 1975, \$185 million for fiscal year 1976, \$185 million for fiscal year 1977, and \$180 million for fiscal year 1978.

I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, whether any of our colleagues here today will quibble with the economic importance attached to completion of this national freeway from the Ohio River Valley to the Port of Baltimore. The Appalachian region is one of the most economically depressed areas in the United States today. While our urban areas have been coping with the influx of thousands of new bodies each year, West Virginia is suffering from a population exodus.

There is no doubt but that completion of this major artery will facilitate the flow of manpower and goods to and from this rural heartland of the Eastern United States.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that West Virginia is making excellent progress on completion of her portion of the highway. In addition, Maryland is in the process of contracting for completion of the highway from Cumberland west. This would leave a major gap in the road between Hancock, Md., and Cumberland, Md. Such a large gap would greatly minimize any of the benefits expected to arise from its use.

The funding schedule in the legislation before us would authorize a sum of money wholly sufficient to fund the Federal share of the construction costs of this highway from Hancock to Cumberland. Thus, the Appalachian region would be assured of having a completed and modern road in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9922.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 9922, extending the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Action is still needed, and additional steps must be taken in the fields of unemployment and Appalachian area development. The bill we are discussing today takes that needed action, not only by extending the existing public

laws, but also by providing new measures to meet the pressing needs.

H.R. 9922 sets new criteria for "special impact" areas so that they can get financial assistance if they need it. This is one of the strong parts of the bill, I think, that it focuses its effects specifically into the areas that need the most assistance. It does this in redevelopment areas by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether or not the communities in question are eligible for aid. The Secretary may authorize assistance to any areas that have—first, a large concentration of low income persons; second, substantial out-migration from the rural regions; third, substantial unemployment; or fourth, an actual or threatened rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of income. This is the approach I have been advocating for some time.

H. R. 9922 also provides for an annual review of eligibility, so that no extra funds will be spent on areas where the economy has been stabilized. Where long-range economic development is not the goal, but a short-range boost is, this bill provides that between 25 percent and 35 percent of Economic Development Act appropriations must go toward assisting "special impact" areas. This gives the Secretary assistance in maintaining a balance between projects for long-term economic planning and projects for short-range economic betterment, such as assisting in unemployment.

St. Clair County, Ill., is eligible under title IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The people of St. Clair County look to this legislation as a means of alleviating the unemployment crisis. I must concur with the committee's belief that emphasis should be shifted to local contractors and a selection of small and medium size projects, so that there is an immediate effect on St. Clair County and other areas having high unemployment. Projects such as sewer, water, and recreational facility work can be used to improve area conditions directly, while at the same time providing economic betterment and employment.

In areas of special need H.R. 9922 allows that the Federal grant-in-aid can cover up to 80 percent of the project's cost, with an added provision that it can cover the entire cost under demonstrated critical conditions where the evidence clearly shows no other reasonable resource available to the State or local government. This gives the needed flexibility to help the depressed communities which might not have the ability to cover even 20 percent of the cost.

H.R. 9922 also deals with the Appalachian area's particular problems through special projects, such as demonstrative health projects, mining area restoration, highway systems development, and assistance for planning and other preliminary expenses of proposed low- and moderate-income housing projects.

This bill authorizes \$800 million per fiscal year for grants and supplementary grants to public works and development programs as compared with \$550 million per year in the old law. Mr. Chairman,

this increase in apportionments and the extension of time through fiscal year 1973 are urgently required. This Congress must do what is necessary to meet the challenges of unemployment and the Appalachian situation. I therefore fully agree with the committee and urge my colleagues in this Chamber to vote in favor of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

**TITLE I—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965**

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 102. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking out the colon at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) in the case of a redevelopment area so designated under section 401(a)(6), the project to be undertaken will provide immediate useful work to unemployed and underemployed persons in that area."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131) is amended by inserting immediately following the first sentence thereof the following: "In the case of any State or political subdivision thereof which the Secretary determines has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity, the Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum or may waive the non-Federal share in the case of such a grant for a project in a redevelopment area designated as such under section 401(a)(6) of this Act."

Sec. 103. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$800,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973. Any amounts authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Not less than 25 per centum nor more than 35 per centum of all appropriations made for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973, under authority of the preceding sentences shall be expended in redevelopment areas designated as such under section 401(a)(6) of this Act."

Sec. 104. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 105. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973".

Sec. 106. Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "40 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum".

(2) Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) those communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which the Secretary determines have one of the following conditions:

"(A) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(B) rural areas having substantial out-migration;

"(C) substantial unemployment; or

"(D) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment. No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be subject to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 101 of this Act. No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 403(a) (1) (B) of this Act:

"(7) those areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding ten-year period for which appropriate statistics are available."

Sec. 107. The first sentence of section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking out "thereof" and all that follows down through and including the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of such reviews shall terminate or modify such designation whenever such an area no longer satisfies the designation requirements of section 401, but in no event shall such a designation of an area be terminated prior to the expiration of the third year after the date such area was so designated."

Sec. 108. Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 109. Subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$305,000,000."

Sec. 110. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended by inserting immediately after "1971," the following: "and \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973."

Sec. 111. Section 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

Sec. 112. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: page 3, line 8, strike out "sentence" and insert in lieu thereof "sentences".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEGICH

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGICH: On page 5, strike out lines 19 through 23 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 110. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 512. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to continue the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska for the purpose of planning economic development programs and projects in Alaska in cooperation with the government of the State of Alaska. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have just sent to the desk has the unanimous support of all the Members of the Committee. The purpose of this amendment is to conform the bill that the House is now considering to the one that the Senate passed. This amendment was adopted on the Senate floor. It makes a minor change dealing with the Alaska Field Committee.

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

Mr. BEGICH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for calling our attention to this amendment in committee and on the floor. The House version the House agreed with the other body on funding for the Alaska Field Committee. We provide \$500,000 for 2 fiscal years for the Alaska Field Committee. The other body added the words "to continue" to the language dealing with the Alaska Field Committee. We can accept this language to expedite action on the bill.

I would like to ask the ranking minority member of the committee if he will agree to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Alaska as a committee amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. I have no objection to that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire, if we accept this amendment, will that preclude us from the necessity of going to conference?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I agree to accept the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. One side believes the amendment is agreeable and accepts it as a committee amendment.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the members of the committee and espe-

cially the distinguished chairman for reporting this valuable bill out.

I rise because I would like to ask a few questions as to how this bill will affect my area.

If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, in certain sections of my area, as the gentleman well knows, since he is a neighbor of mine, there are acutely distressed areas which need a new vocational school facility in order to develop them.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if they will qualify for loans and grants under this program, a vocational school?

Mr. BLATNIK. Under the criteria in the bill they would be required to apply for a grant and could qualify for at least part of a grant for construction of a vocational school.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Another question concerns an area in my district where they need hospital facilities.

Mr. BLATNIK. They would clearly be eligible for the hospital facilities. Under the bill where there is substantial unemployment priority would be given to those projects such as hospitals. This would also include projects which affect our environment such as sewage treatment plants.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman and I again congratulate him for bringing out this very valuable and important piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title I, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 202. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows: "To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$2,700,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973 (of such amount not to exceed \$525,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff), and not to exceed \$3,300,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975 (of such amount not to exceed \$575,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff)."

Sec. 203. Paragraph (7) of section 106 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 106) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 204. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977; and \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978."

Sec. 205. There is inserted after section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Develop-

ment Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) a new section as follows:

**"APPALACHIAN AIRPORT SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS"**

"SEC. 208. (a) In order to provide a system of airports in the Appalachian region which can accommodate a greater number of passengers in safety and thereby increase commerce and communication in areas with developmental potential the Secretary of Transportation (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants to existing airports for the purpose of enhancing the safety of aviation and airport operations.

"(b) Such airport safety improvement projects may include (A) approach clearance, the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, navigation aids, site preparation for navigation aids, and the acquisition of adequate safety equipment (including firefighting and rescue equipment), and (B) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in airspace which is necessary for such projects or to remove or mitigate or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards.

"(c) Grants under this section shall be made solely from funds specifically made available to the President for the purpose of carrying out this Act in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provisions of law.

"(d) Except as context otherwise indicates, words and phrases used in this section shall have the same meaning as in the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

"(e) Federal assistance to any project under this section shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of the project, except for assistance for navigation aids which may be 100 per centum.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to incur obligations to make grants for airport safety improvement projects, in a total amount not to exceed \$40,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1975. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be required for liquidation of the obligations incurred under this section."

Sec. 206. (a) The third sentence of subsection (c) of section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 202) is amended by striking out "health services" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "health and child development services, including title IV, parts A and B, of the Social Security Act. Notwithstanding any provision of the Social Security Act requiring assistance or services on a statewide basis, if a State provides assistance or services under such a program in any area of the region approved by the Commission, such State shall be considered as meeting such requirement".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Federal contribution to such expenses of planning may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by this subsection."

Sec. 207. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) (1) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by inserting before the period at the end: "; and to control or abate mine drainage pollution."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area

restoration project costs carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. For the purposes of this section, such project costs may include the reasonable value (including donations) of planning, engineering, real property acquisition (limited to the reasonable value of the real property in its unclaimed state and costs incidental to its acquisition, as determined by the Commission), and such other materials and services as may be required for such project."

Sec. 208. (a) The catchline for section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) is amended to read: "ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING AND OTHER PRELIMINARY EXPENSES OF PROPOSED LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS".

(b) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of such section are amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to encourage and facilitate the construction or rehabilitation of housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants and loans from the Appalachian Housing Fund established by this section, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations, or public bodies, for planning and obtaining federally insured mortgage financing for housing construction or rehabilitation projects for low- and moderate-income families and individuals, under section 221, 235, or 236 of the National Housing Act, in any area of the Appalachian region determined by the Commission.

"(b) No loan under subsection (a) of this section shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of planning and obtaining financing for a project, including, but not limited to, preliminary surveys and analyses of market needs, preliminary site engineering and architectural fees, site options, application and mortgage commitment fees, legal fees, and construction loan fees and discounts. Such loans shall be made without interest, except that any loan made to an organization established for profit shall bear interest at the prevailing market rate authorized for an insured or guaranteed loan for such project. The Secretary shall require payments of loans made under this section, under such terms and conditions as he may require, upon completion of the project or sooner, and except in the case of a loan to an organization established for profit, may cancel any part or all of such a loan, if he determines that a permanent loan to finance such project cannot be obtained in an amount adequate for repayment of such loan under this section.

"(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no grant under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of those expenses, incident to planning and obtaining financing for a project, which the Secretary considers not to be recoverable from the proceeds of any permanent loan made to finance such project, and no such grant shall be made to an organization established for profit.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and commitments for grants, and may advance funds under such terms and conditions as he may require, to nonprofit organizations and public bodies for reasonable site development costs and necessary offsite improvements, such as sewer and water line extensions, whenever such a grant, commitment, or advance is essential to the economic feasibility of any housing construction or rehabilitation project for low- and moderate-income families and individuals which otherwise meets the requirements for assistance under this section, except that no such grant shall exceed 10 per centum of the cost of such project."

(c) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "The Secretary is further authorized to" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary or the Commission may".

Sec. 209. (a) The catchline for section 211 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 211) is amended by adding at the end "AND VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS".

(b) The first sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by inserting "and operation" after "equipment".

(c) Section (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) In order to assist in the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities and services for the people of the region, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for planning, construction, equipping, and operating vocational and technical educational projects which will serve to demonstrate areawide educational planning, service, and programs. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of this Act and shall not be taken into account in any computation of allotments among the States pursuant to any other law.

"(2) No grant for the construction or equipment of any component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 80 per centum of its costs.

"(3) Grants under this section for operation of components of vocational and technical education demonstration projects, whether or not constructed by funds authorized by this Act, may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning on the first day that such component is in operation as a part of the project. For the next three years of operation, such grants shall not exceed 75 per centum of such costs. No grants for operation of vocational and technical education demonstration projects shall be made after five years following the commencement of the initial grant for operation of the project. Notwithstanding section 104 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3134), an education-related facility constructed under title I of that Act may be a component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project eligible for operating grant assistance under this section.

"(4) No grant for expenses of planning necessary for the development and operation of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 75 per centum of such expenses.

"(5) No grant for planning, construction, operation, or equipment of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall be made unless the facility is publicly owned.

"(6) Any Federal contribution referred to in this section may be provided entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this section, or in combination with funds available under other Federal grant-in-aid programs providing assistance for education-related facilities or services. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such programs, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by the applicable paragraph of this subsection."

Sec. 210. (a) Section 214(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the

required matching share, or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the President is authorized to provide funds to the Federal Cochairman to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs, as hereafter defined, above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets the applicable requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region, will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on areas eligible for assistance or authorizations for appropriation in any other Act. Any findings, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplemental grant for any project under such program."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "December 31, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".

Sec. 211. Subsection (a) (2) of section 302 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to make grants to the Commission for investigation, research, studies, evaluations, and assessments of needs, potentials, or attainments of the people of the region, technical assistance, training programs, demonstrations, and the construction of necessary facilities incident to such activities, which will further purposes of this Act. Grant funds may be provided entirely from appropriations to carry out this section or in combination with funds available under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs or from any other source. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share, as the Commission determines appropriate."

Sec. 212. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 105 for administrative expenses, in section 201 for the Appalachian Development Highway System and Local Access Roads, and in section 208 for Appalachian Airport Safety Improvements, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, to carry out this Act, \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971; \$282,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973; and \$294,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975."

SEC. 213. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by striking "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

SEC. 214. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or actively receiving Federal financial assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 9922, I wish to express my full support of this legislation, which will extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act for 2 years and the Appalachian Regional Development Act for 4 years.

Both acts have served their purposes well and the need for them continues.

In particular, I wish to commend the House Public Works Committee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, for their quick action to bring this measure back to the House following the regrettable veto of similar legislation.

I especially wish to commend Mr. BLATNIK and his committee for inserting in title I, section 103, of the bill, an increase from \$500 million to \$800 million in annual authorizations and a provision that not less than 25 percent or more than 35 percent of the total authorization will be used for short term relief in areas that are experiencing extremely high rates of unemployment.

This wisely proposed increase in title I funds will serve to fill to some limited degree, the vacuum created by the veto of the original bill which contained the accelerated public works proposal.

The Nation still is experiencing a sluggish economy; inflation has not been curbed; and unemployment remains severely high. This measure will aid communities which are stagnating and revitalize public works projects that have been on the shelves for lack of adequate financing.

It is my hope that the Congress will approve the bill and that we will have both the approval and the cooperation of the administration.

I hope that the Congress will move with dispatch to appropriate the necessary funds, so we can move ahead in this effort to curb unemployment and strengthen our Nation's economy.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate my strong support of this bill, especially the economic development section which is so tremendously important to alleviating our unemployment situation. I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee for having so expeditiously brought this bill back to the House for a vote.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise to express my support of this

bill. In a way, of course, I am sorry that it is necessary—we passed an even better bill than this one only 3 months ago, but the President, more concerned with protecting his image as a fiscal conservative than with providing jobs for those whom his economic policies have forced into unemployment, refused to approve it.

This bill extends and improves two important long-range programs attacking poverty and unemployment—the Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. Both programs have been with us for 6 years, and both have proven to be excellent investments.

The Economic Development Act which is extended for 2 years by title I of the bill, combines public works grants, loans, and technical assistance to our major areas of unemployment. I am pleased to note that it does so at an increased level of funding—250 million more dollars per year than was provided in S. 575, the original bill passed by the House and Senate in April of this year. But more importantly to me—representing as I do the lower east side of Manhattan, one of the most economically needy areas in the Nation—there are two significant changes in H.R. 9922 with regard to "special impact" areas that I wish to call to your attention:

First. The qualifications for designation as a "special impact area" are broadened and simplified to deal more directly with the immediate and urgent problems faced by those areas of the country hit most severely by the mounting crisis in unemployment and economic depression. These areas in applying for such designation, already possessed by the Lower East Side, need not under H.R. 9922 develop projects with long-term economic prospects nor need they spend a long year developing an Overall Economic Development Plan—a struggle which I am most intimately connected—to qualify for funds under this provision of the Economic Development Act. This is a welcome change and will be very significant to those areas containing large numbers of low-income persons or high ratios of unemployment and whose situation is desperate.

Second. The other provision I want to point out, that is a new addition in H.R. 9922, and a very strong point in its favor, is that not less than 25 percent of the funds authorized under title I of the act shall be expended on these special impact areas—these areas most critically affected in this time of increasing economic depression. Not less than 25 percent and not more than 35 percent will be so spent to achieve, as the committee report attached to this bill points out, a "proper balance between projects that are necessary for long-term economic development and projects that are undertaken to assist in providing urgently needed employment."

I would also like to direct your attention to the antisex discrimination provision contained in both titles of this bill. The bill which was vetoed by the President, S. 575, contained several amendments which it had been my privilege to offer when the legislation was considered by our Committee on Public Works.

These amendments prohibited any and all discrimination on account of sex in the administration of these programs.

These amendments have been retained in the bill which is before us. They are needed to give women the same status under these programs—the same right to jobs, employment, and other benefits—as men. They will give women participating, or seeking to participate in these two programs the same protections that minority group members have with respect to all federally assisted programs under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

House Report 92-92, which accompanied the legislation which was vetoed, discussed the enforcement aspects of these amendments as follows:

With respect to the anti-sex discrimination provision of this bill, the Committee expects that enforcement of the provision will be through agency procedures and rules established by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee.

That language appeared on page 11 of the report and referred specifically to title I of that bill. Unfortunately, the report's descriptions of the identical language in the other two titles of that bill—Economic Development and Appalachian titles—erroneously referred to the legal remedies available to "one who discriminates,"—an error which I pointed out in debate on the floor April 21. The language of these antidiscrimination provisions clearly indicates their intent to provide relief for parties against whom discrimination is directed, and I want to make that point crystal clear.

I am especially grateful for the efforts of the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. BLATNIK) in bringing this bill before us so soon after the veto of the original legislation. It is desperately needed, and I urge its passage.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in commending our chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) for his leadership and persistence in getting to the Congress this new bill H.R. 9922. He has reacted promptly to the President's veto of our previously passed bill, S. 575. In an effort to deal with the growing unemployment problem in this country I earnestly hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve this new bill and that the President will sign it and make it possible for us to get on without further delay, with the urgent problem of dealing with massive unemployment in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I support the legislation in H.R. 9922. I would like to comment briefly on the amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as contained in this bill. Except for the changes as stated by our chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, which incorporate some of the features of the accelerated public works program in title I to be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, the amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development

Act have remained the same as they were in the previously passed bill, S. 575.

Generally, the amendments provide for a 2-year extension of the EDA programs. Except for the authorizations for grants and supplementary grants for public works facilities which have been increased to an annual authorization of \$800 million from its existing authorization of \$500 million, the programs administered by the Economic Development Administration have been extended at their existing authorized amounts.

The purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act is to provide Federal assistance, in cooperation with the States, to help communities, areas and regions in the United States which are suffering from excessive unemployment or underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs. The EDA programs emphasize long-range planning and programing for economic development. Its objective is to establish stable and diversified local economies. This is accomplished by developing and expanding new and existing public works, providing loans for businesses, and giving technical assistance necessary to create directly or indirectly new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth.

Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes a grant program for public works and development facilities needed to create a climate conducive to the development and operation of private enterprise. The supplementary grant program enables the States and other entities to take advantage of other grant-in-aid programs which, because of their condition of high unemployment, cannot supply the required matching share.

This bill will authorize the continuation of the grant program for public works and development facilities needed for economic growth. The annual authorization has been increased in this bill to \$800 million for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Not less than 25 percent nor more than 35 percent of the funds appropriated under this section will go to the special impact areas designated by the Secretary as previously discussed by our chairman, Mr. BLATNIK. The remainder of the funds appropriated under this section will be devoted to projects approved under the regular EDA program for long range economic development.

The business loan program under title II of the act authorizes loans up to 100 percent of project cost to assist in financing public works and development facilities and authorizes business development loans up to 65 percent for the purchase and development of land and facilities. Working capital guarantees are authorized up to 90 percent of private working capital loans made in connection with direct loan projects.

Under this bill the public facility loans and industrial and commercial loan programs are extended at the existing annual authorization of \$170 million for fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

Title III of the act provides for a broad range of technical assistance that is use-

ful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment where the Secretary of Commerce finds there is substantial need for such assistance. The program includes a wide variety of projects designed to meet two basic needs: first, to enable a community to find solutions to problems that retard industrial growth and a generation of new jobs; and second, to help pay for the expertise needed to plan, implement, and coordinate local development programs.

This bill extends the technical assistance program at its existing annual authorization of \$50 million for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

The economic development district program as contained in title IV of the act has provided a new approach in creating job opportunities and providing alternatives to the relocation of the unemployed or underemployed to large urban areas. Evaluations conducted by the Economic Development Administration found that the strategy was most effective when growth centers were located within commuting distance or redevelopment areas.

This bill extends the \$50 million annual authorization for grant and loan assistance for economic development centers and the 10 percent bonus for projects in redevelopment areas within designated economic development districts for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

The amendments also provide for a 2-year extension of the regional commissions authorized by title V of the act. Five regional commissions have thus far been established: the Ozarks Regional Commission, New England Regional Commission, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Four Corners Regional Commission, and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

The form and responsibilities of these regional commissions were patterned after those of the Appalachian Commission. Their purpose includes the preparation and coordination of long-range overall economic development programs for such region including the development of a comprehensive long-range economic plan.

Each of the commissions have developed their long-range comprehensive development plans and are now in the process of having them approved and finalized.

In my own area, the Ozarks Regional Commission has been developing a broad-based program which should provide long-range benefits to the people of the region as well as the entire Nation.

A total of \$305 million is authorized for the next 2 fiscal years for these commissions. This is the same authorized amount that was contained in the previously passed bill (S. 575) for these commissions.

This bill also authorizes \$500,000 for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, for the Federal field committee for development planning in Alaska for the purposes of planning economic development programs and projects in Alaska, in cooperation with the government of the State of Alaska.

In addition to those changes in the cri-

teria for "special impact areas", as previously discussed by our Chairman, Mr. Blatnik, the bill liberalizes and adds to the criterion for the designation of redevelopment areas. Presently, areas having a median family income 40 percent or less of the national median, as determined by the most recent available statistics, would qualify for designation. This is amended to increase from 40 percent to 50 percent of the national median, the maximum median family income under which an area can qualify. Available information indicates that there is a close relationship between income levels and outmigration. Thus, by raising the income cutoff level from 40 percent to 50 percent of the national median family income, the Economic Development Administration can deal with more areas experiencing severe outmigration problems.

A new criterion is added which permits areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding 10-year period for which appropriate statistics are available to be eligible for designation. Such areas are not now eligible. The purpose of using the new per capita employment criterion is to expand eligibility to a number of additional counties overlooked by present designation procedures. Unemployment rate statistics are the only criteria now in the act that now attempts to identify structurally declining areas. For certain kinds of places, however, unemployment rates, alone, are an unsatisfactory measure of this condition.

The provision pertaining to the annual review of redevelopment areas has been amended to provide that designated areas may not be terminated in less than 3 years from the date of designation. This amendment avoids the problems resulting from year to year shifts in unemployment rates, which although temporary, can now result in an area being designated and shortly thereafter being redesignated. In addition, the amendment passed in 1970 which provided that no redevelopment area would have its designation terminated or modified after May 1, 1970, and before June 1, 1971, unless the local governing body of the county qualified or requested such action, has been extended for 1 additional year.

The total amount of the authorization for the extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in title I of this bill is \$2,445,500,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and particularly the sections which have been added to give special impact aid to those areas with a sharp rise in unemployment. Our area has suffered with this problem and we are glad that the committee has brought out this bill. We know it will be very helpful to us and we congratulate the committee for having brought it back to the floor for its early and favorable consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair

(Mr. SLACK), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9922) to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 561, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 376, nays 27, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—376

Abernethy	Casey, Tex.	Forsythe
Abouzeck	Cederberg	Fountain
Abzug	Celler	Frelinghuysen
Adams	Chamberlain	Frenzel
Addabbo	Chappell	Frey
Alexander	Chisholm	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson,	Clancy	Fulton, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Clark	Fuqua
Anderson, Ill.	Clausen,	Gallifanakis
Anderson, Tenn.	Don H.	Gallagher
Andrews, Ala.	Clawson, Del	Garmatz
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clay	Gaydos
Annunzio	Cleveland	Gettys
Arends	Collier	Gilmo
Ashley	Collins, Ill.	Gibbons
Aspin	Colmer	Goldwater
Aspinall	Conable	Gonzalez
Badillo	Conte	Goodling
Baker	Corman	Grasso
Baring	Cotter	Gray
Begich	Coughlin	Green, Oreg.
Belcher	Culver	Green, Pa.
Bell	Daniels, N.J.	Griffin
Bennett	Danielson	Griffiths
Bergland	Davis, Ga.	Grover
Betts	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
Bevill	de la Garza	Gude
Biaggi	Delaney	Hagan
Biester	Dellenback	Haley
Bingham	Dellums	Hamilton
Blanton	Denholm	Hammer-
Blatnik	Dent	schmidt
Boggs	Devine	Hanley
Boland	Dickinson	Hanna
Bolling	Dingell	Hansen, Idaho
Bow	Dorn	Hansen, Wash.
Brademas	Dow	Harrington
Brasco	Dowdy	Harsha
Bray	Downing	Harvey
Brinkley	Drinan	Hastings
Brotzman	Dulski	Hathaway
Brown, Mich.	Duncan	Hawkins
Brown, Ohio	du Pont	Hays
Broyhill, N.C.	Dwyer	Hechler, W. Va.
Broyhill, Va.	Eckhardt	Heckler, Mass.
Buchanan	Edmondson	Helstoski
Burke, Fla.	Edwards, Ala.	Henderson
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.	Hicks, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.	Eilberg	Hicks, Wash.
Burlison, Mo.	Eshleman	Hillis
Burton	Evans, Colo.	Hogan
Byrne, Pa.	Evins, Tenn.	Hollifield
Byrnes, Wis.	Fascell	Horton
Byron	Fish	Howard
Cabell	Fisher	Hull
Caffery	Flood	Hunt
Camp	Flowers	Hutchinson
Carey, N.Y.	Flynt	Ichord
Carney	Foley	Jacobs
	Ford, Gerald R.	Jarman
	Ford,	Johnson, Calif.
	William D.	Johnson, Pa.

Jonas	Mosher	Shriver
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Sikes
Jones, N.C.	Murphy, Ill.	Sisk
Karh	Murphy, N.Y.	Skubitz
Kastenmeier	Myers	Slack
Kazen	Natcher	Smith, Calif.
Keating	Nedzi	Smith, Iowa
Kee	Nelsen	Smith, N.Y.
Keith	Nix	Snyder
Kemp	Obey	Spence
King	O'Hara	Springer
Kluczynski	O'Konski	Stafford
Koch	O'Neill	Stanton,
Kuykendall	Passman	J. William
Kyl	Patman	Stanton,
Kyros	Patten	James V.
Landrum	Pelly	Steed
Latta	Pepper	Steele
Leggett	Perkins	Steiger, Ariz.
Lent	Pettis	Steiger, Wis.
Link	Peyster	Stephens
Lloyd	Pirnie	Stokes
Long, Md.	Podell	Stratton
Lujan	Poff	Stubblefield
McClory	Powell	Stuckey
McCloskey	Preyer, N.C.	Sullivan
McClure	Price, Ill.	Symington
McCollister	Price, Tex.	Talcott
McCormack	Pryor, Ark.	Taylor
McDade	Pucinski	Teague, Tex.
McDonald,	Purcell	Terry
Mich.	Quie	Thompson, Ga.
McEwen	Quillen	Thomson, Wis.
McFall	Randall	Thone
McKay	Rangel	Tiernan
McKevitt	Rees	Udall
McKinney	Reid, Ill.	Ullman
McMillan	Reid, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Macdonald,	Reuss	Vanik
Mass.	Rhodes	Veysey
Madden	Roberts	Vigorito
Mahon	Robison, N.Y.	Waggonner
Mailliard	Rodino	Waldie
Mann	Roe	Wampler
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Ware
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	Watts
Matsunaga	Rooney, Pa.	Whalen
Mayne	Rosenthal	Whalley
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	White
Meeds	Roush	Whitehurst
Melcher	Rousselot	Whitten
Metcalfe	Roy	Whitall
Mikva	Roybal	Williams
Miller, Calif.	Runnels	Wilson, Bob
Miller, Ohio	Ruppe	Wilson,
Mills, Ark.	Ruth	Charles H.
Mills, Md.	Ryan	Winn
Minish	St Germain	Wolf
Mink	Sandman	Wright
Minshall	Sarbanes	Wyatt
Mitchell	Scherle	Wylie
Mizell	Scheuer	Wyman
Mollohan	Schneebeli	Yates
Monagan	Schwengel	Young, Tex.
Moorhead	Seiberling	Zablocki
Morgan	Shipley	Zion
Morse	Shoup	Zwach

NAYS—27

Abbitt	Findley	Robinson, Va.
Archer	Gross	Roncallo
Ashbrook	Hall	Satterfield
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Schmitz
Crane	Martin	Scott
Daniel, Va.	Michel	Sebellus
Dennis	Pike	Wiggins
Derwinski	Railsback	Wyder
Erlenborn	Barick	Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—30

Barrett	Fraser	Nichols
Blackburn	Halpern	Pickle
Brooks	Hébert	Poage
Carter	Hosmer	Riegle
Conyers	Hungate	Saylor
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Staggers
Diggs	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Van Deerlin
Esch	Montgomery	Yatron

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Riegle.  
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Yatron.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hosmer.  
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Saylor.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Hungate.  
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Conyers.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. HORTON and Mr. SHOUP changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 561, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2317) to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BLATNIK

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLATNIK moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2317, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9922 as passed, as follows:

TITLE I—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 102. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking out the colon at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) in the case of a redevelopment area so designated under section 401(a) (6), the project to be undertaken will provide immediate useful work to unemployed and underemployed persons in that area."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131) is amended by inserting immediately following the first sentence thereof the following: "In the case of any State or political subdivision thereof which the Secretary determines has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity, the Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum or may waive the non-Federal share in the case of such a grant for a project in a redevelopment area designated as such under section 401 (a) (6) of this Act."

Sec. 103. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$800,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973. Any amounts authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Not less than 25 per centum nor more than 35 per centum of all appropriations made for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973, under authority of the preceding sentences shall be expended in redevelopment areas designated as such under section 401(a) (6) of this Act."

Sec. 104. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 105. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973".

Sec. 106. Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "40 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum".

(2) Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) those communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which the Secretary determines have one of the following conditions:

"(A) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(B) rural areas having substantial out-migration;

"(C) substantial unemployment; or

"(D) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be subject to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 101 of this Act. No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 403(a) (1) (B) of this Act:

"(7) those areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding ten-year period for which appropriate statistics are available."

Sec. 107. The first sentence of section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking out "thereof" and all that follows down through and including the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of such reviews shall terminate or modify such designation whenever such an area no longer satisfies the designation requirements of section 401, but in no event shall such a designation of an area be terminated prior to the expiration of the third year after the date such area was so designated."

Sec. 108. Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 109. Subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$305,000,000."

Sec. 110. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 512. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to continue the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska for the purpose of planning economic development programs and projects in Alaska in cooperation with the government of the State of Alaska. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska."

Sec. 111. Section 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

Sec. 112. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal finan-

cial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 202. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows: "To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$2,700,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973 (of such amount not to exceed \$525,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff), and not to exceed \$3,300,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975 (of such amount not to exceed \$575,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff)."

Sec. 203. Paragraph (7) of section 106 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 106) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 204. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977; and \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978."

Sec. 205. There is inserted after section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) a new section as follows:

"APPALACHIAN AIRPORT SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

"Sec. 208. (a) In order to provide a system of airports in the Appalachian region which can accommodate a greater number of passengers in safety and thereby increase commerce and communication in areas with developmental potential, the Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to existing airports for the purpose of enhancing the safety of aviation and airport operations.

"(b) Such airport safety improvement projects may include (A) approach clearance, the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, navigation aids, site preparation for navigation aids, and the acquisition of adequate safety equipment (including firefighting and rescue equipment), and (B) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in airspace which is necessary for such projects or to remove or mitigate or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards.

"(c) Grants under this section shall be made solely from funds specifically made available to the President for the purpose of carrying out this Act in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provisions of law.

"(d) Except as context otherwise indicates, words and phrases used in this section shall have the same meaning as in the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

"(e) Federal assistance to any project under this section shall not exceed 90 per centum

of the costs of the project, except for assistance for navigation aids which may be 100 per centum.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to incur obligations to make grants for airport safety improvement projects, in a total amount not to exceed \$40,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1975. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be required for liquidation of the obligations incurred under this section."

SEC. 206. (a) The third sentence of subsection (c) of section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 202) is amended by striking out "health services" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "health and child development services, including title IV, parts A and B, of the Social Security Act. Notwithstanding any provision of the Social Security Act requiring assistance or services on a statewide basis, if a State provides assistance or services under such a program in any area of the region approved by the Commission, such State shall be considered as meeting such requirement".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Federal contribution to such expenses of planning may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by this subsection."

SEC. 207. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) (1) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by inserting before the period at the end: "; and to control or abate mine drainage pollution."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration project costs carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. For the purposes of this section, such project costs may include the reasonable value (including donations) of planning, engineering, real property acquisition (limited to the reasonable value of the real property in its unreclaimed state and costs incidental to its acquisition, as determined by the Commission), and such other materials and services as may be required for such project."

SEC. 208. (a) The catchline for section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) is amended to read: "ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING AND OTHER PRELIMINARY EXPENSES OF PROPOSED LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS".

(b) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of such section are amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to encourage and facilitate the construction or rehabilitation of housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants and loans from the Appalachian Housing Fund established by this section, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations, or public bodies, for planning and obtaining federally insured mortgage financing for housing construction or rehabilitation projects for low- and moderate-income families and individuals, under section 221, 235, or 236 of the National Housing Act, in any area of the Appalachian region determined by the Commission.

"(b) No loan under subsection (a) of this

section shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of planning and obtaining financing for a project, including, but not limited to, preliminary surveys and analyses of market needs, preliminary site engineering and architectural fees, site options, application and mortgage commitment fees, legal fees, and construction loan fees and discounts. Such loans shall be made without interest, except that any loan made to an organization established for profit shall bear interest at the prevailing market rate authorized for an insured or guaranteed loan for such project. The Secretary shall require payments of loans made under this section, under such terms and conditions as he may require, upon completion of the project or sooner, and except in the case of a loan to an organization established for profit, may cancel any part or all of such a loan, if he determines that a permanent loan to finance such project cannot be obtained in an amount adequate for repayment of such loan under this section.

"(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no grant under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of those expenses, incident to planning and obtaining financing for a project, which the Secretary considers not to be recoverable from the proceeds of any permanent loan made to finance such project, and no such grant shall be made to an organization established for profit.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and commitments for grants, and may advance funds under such terms and conditions as he may require, to nonprofit organizations and public bodies for reasonable site development costs and necessary offsite improvements, such as sewer and water line extensions, whenever such a grant, commitment, or advance is essential to the economic feasibility of any housing construction or rehabilitation project for low- and moderate-income families and individuals which otherwise meets the requirements for assistance under this section, except that no such grant shall exceed 10 per centum of the cost of such project."

(e) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "The Secretary is further authorized to" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary or the Commission may".

SEC. 209. (a) The catchline for section 211 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 211) is amended by adding at the end "AND VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS".

(b) The first sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by inserting "and operation" after "equipment".

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) In order to assist in the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities and services for the people of the region, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for planning, construction, equipping, and operating vocational and technical educational projects which will serve to demonstrate areawide educational planning, services, and programs. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of this Act and shall not be taken into account in any computation of allotments among the States pursuant to any other law.

"(2) No grant for the construction or equipment of any component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 80 per centum of its costs.

"(3) Grants under this section for operation of components of vocational and technical education demonstration projects, whether or not constructed by funds au-

thorized by this Act, may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning on the first day that such components is in operation as a part of the project. For the next three years of operation, such grants shall not exceed 75 per centum of such costs. No grants for operation of vocational and technical education demonstration projects shall be made after five years following the commencement of the initial grant for operation of the project. Notwithstanding section 104 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3134), an education-related facility constructed under title I of that Act may be a component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project eligible for operating grant assistance under this section.

"(4) No grant for expenses of planning necessary for the development and operation of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 75 per centum of such expenses.

"(5) No grant for planning, construction, operation, or equipment of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall be made unless the facility is publicly owned.

"(6) Any Federal contribution referred to in this section may be provided entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this section, or in combination with funds available under other Federal grant-in-aid programs providing assistance for education-related facilities or services. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such programs, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by the applicable paragraph of this subsection."

SEC. 210. (a) Section 214(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the President is authorized to provide funds to the Federal Cochairman to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs, as hereafter defined, above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets the applicable requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region, will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsec-

tion. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on areas eligible for assistance or authorizations for appropriation in any other Act. Any findings, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplemental grant for any project under such program."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "December 31, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".

Sec. 211. Subsection (a) (2) of section 302 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to make grants to the Commission for investigation, research, studies, evaluations, and assessments of needs, potentials, or attainments of the people of the region, technical assistance, training programs, demonstrations, and the construction of necessary facilities, incident to such activities, which will further the purposes of this Act. Grant funds may be provided entirely from appropriations to carry out this section or in combination with fund available under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs or from any other source. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share, as the Commission determines appropriate."

Sec. 212. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 105 for administrative expenses, in section 201 for the Appalachian Development Highway System and Local Access Roads, and in section 208 for Appalachian Airport Safety Improvements, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, to carry out this Act, \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971; \$282,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1972; and \$294,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973."

Sec. 213. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by striking "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 214. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or actively receiving Federal financial assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9922) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9272, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 9272, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object—in view of my objection yesterday I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), my friend, advising me that the conferees on the part of the House and the other body have met and will be ready to file the report. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-414)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9272) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 14, 18, 28, 29, 30, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$152,864,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$40,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,630,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,917,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$183,067,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$108,215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$29,120,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$23,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,186,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 31),

ROBERT L. F. SIKES,  
JOHN M. SLACK,  
NEAL SMITH,  
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
E. A. CEDERBERG,  
MARK ANDREWS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
HIRAM L. FONG,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9272) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

*Administration of Foreign Affairs**Acquisition, Operation, and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad*

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$18,750,000 instead of \$18,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*International Organizations and Conferences Contributions to International Organizations*

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$152,864,000 instead of \$152,774,000 as proposed by the House and \$160,680,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes language proposed by the House relative to the use of excess foreign currencies.

Funds to provide for payment of dues to the International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property as proposed by the Senate are included.

No funds have been provided for payment of dues to the International Labor Organization. The conferees have not the slightest intention of ever abandoning our membership in the I.L.O.

We do not lose our voting rights until we are two years in arrears. The conferees recommend that no payment at all be made at this time pending further improvement of our position.

*Missions to International Organizations*

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$4,793,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$4,815,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*International Commissions**International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico*

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$6,280,000 for "construction" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

*International Fisheries Commissions*

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,100,000 instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,318,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Educational Exchange**Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities*

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$40,500,000 instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Provides that not less than \$4,500,000 shall be used for payments in excess foreign currencies instead of \$5,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West*

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$5,630,000 instead of \$5,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

*Legal Activities and General Administration**Salaries and Expenses, Community Relations Service*

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$5,917,000 instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,585,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Federal Prison System*

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$59,801,000 for "Buildings and facilities" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$57,842,000 as proposed by the House.

*Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs*

Amendment No. 11: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of one hundred and twenty eight as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Provides for not to exceed \$375,000 for payment for accommodations in the District of Columbia in connection with training facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$65,089,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$57,089,000 as proposed by the House.

## TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

*U.S. Travel Service**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$183,067,000 instead of \$180,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$186,134,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Research, Development and Facilities*

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$108,215,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$116,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Satellite Operations*

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$29,120,000 instead of \$27,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$30,739,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Patent Office**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$59,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$59,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*National Bureau of Standards**Research and Technical Services*

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$47,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$46,000,000 as proposed by the House.

*Maritime Administration**Ship Construction*

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$229,687,000.

*Operating Differential Subsidies**(Liquidation of contract authority)*

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$239,145,000.

*Research and Development*

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$23,750,000.

*Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$22,210,000.

*Maritime Training*

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$7,513,000.

*State Marine Schools*

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$2,200,000.

## TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

*Courts of Appeals, district courts, and other judicial services**Salaries of Supporting Personnel*

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$68,654,000 instead of \$69,296,000 as proposed by the Senate and inserting amended salary limitations. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

*Fees of Jurors*

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for liquidation of obligations incurred in prior years.

*Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses*

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$9,600,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$9,660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

*Commission on American Shipbuilding**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$450,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Equal Employment Opportunity Commission**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 30: Provides not to exceed \$1,500,000 for payments to State and local agencies as proposed by the House instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$23,000,000 instead of \$22,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$27,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$300,000 instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*National Tourism Resources Review Commission**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Small Business Administration**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$22,650,000 instead of \$22,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Subversive Activities Control Board**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate restricting use of funds.

*Tariff Commission**Salaries and Expenses*

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$5,186,000 instead of \$5,036,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,336,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1972 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with com-

parisons to the fiscal year 1971 amount, the 1972 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1972 as follows:

New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971...	\$3,823,352,300
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972...	4,216,802,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972...	3,684,183,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972...	4,098,083,000
Conference agreement.....	4,067,116,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971.....	+243,763,700
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972.....	-149,686,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972.....	+382,933,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972.....	-30,967,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$11,805,000 in budget amendments not considered by the House.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects deletion of \$352,615,000 on House floor due to points of order.

JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 31),

ROBERT L. F. SIKES,  
JOHN M. SLACK,  
NEAL SMITH,  
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.  
GEORGE MAHON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
MARK ANDREWS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
HIRAM L. FONG,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 205, on the motion to table the motion to instruct the House conferees on H.R. 9272 to agree to the Senate amendments regarding additional duties for the Subversives Activities Control Board, I was unavoidably detained in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted against the motion.

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference the "Surface Transportation Act of 1971." This bill will, I believe, begin the process of restoring this country's surface transportation system—a revitalization necessary for a healthy interstate commerce and a strengthened American economy.

Although this bill pertains to surface transportation, I hope that it will serve as a good beginning in the attempt to revive the entire transportation system. I fully understand and expect that its full consideration in the legislative process will lead to modification and alteration, with perhaps pertinent additions for air

transportation. I hope that this bill will launch such consideration.

I have urged the railroads, the truckers, and water carriers to lay aside their differences and to develop a program improving the ability of transportation to carry out its essential public function. Now the Association of American Railroads, the Water Transport Association, and the American Trucking Associations have laid aside those differences and done what I requested they do. This bill is the product of their best efforts.

It is my belief that the present weak transportation system retards economic growth throughout the country, feeds inflation, unnecessarily increases production costs, and handicaps the Nation's ability to compete in foreign markets.

This bill itself contains seven titles affecting various facets of the surface transportation system.

Title I would provide financial assistance to surface transportation companies by creating a new program similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the 1930's and 1940's. Established within the Department of Treasury would be a division authorized to provide a maximum of \$5 billion in outstanding commitments for loans, guarantees, and other kinds of financial assistance. No single company would be eligible for more than 15 percent of the authorized financial assistance.

Title II contains provisions affecting rate standards prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and discriminatory State taxation of transportation property. The latter provision would prohibit the future assessment of such property at a higher ratio of true market value than the ratio used in the assessment of all other property. The State taxation legislation is similar to a bill passed by the Senate in the 91st Congress.

Title III is concerned with extension of ICC regulatory authority concerning the water transportation of dry bulk commodities, the motor transport of livestock and certain agricultural products, and the abandonment of nonproductive facilities. The first provision makes clear that the actual rates at which transportation of dry bulk commodities is performed must be made public by filing with the ICC. The second provision extends regulation of for-hire truck transportation to livestock, processed poultry, imported and cooked fish, and other agricultural commodities. The third provision provides expeditious procedures for the abandonment of light density rail lines.

Title IV, pertaining to grade-crossing safety, would amend existing law so as to require that 5 percent of the total of all Federal funds apportioned to a State for highway purposes shall be used for rail-highway grade-crossing safety purposes.

Title V restores the investment tax credit for surface transportation equipment, expands the 5-year amortization provisions formerly applicable only to railroad rolling stock to other surface transportation equipment, and eliminates the minimum tax on 5-year amortization. The investment credit, in particular, is a proven economic stimulant and results

in greater productivity and more efficient service coupled with expanding business and employment.

Title VI makes the Interstate Commerce Commission independent of the Office of Management and Budget by giving it the budgetary status of other agencies, such as the General Accounting Office and the Supreme Court of the United States. This provision should calm the growing fears both inside and outside of the Congress that the supposedly independent agencies are being subverted by the budgetary ax of the executive branch.

Title VII specifies that the effective date of the act would be the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I am under no illusion that this bill will solve all of our transportation ills. But I believe it will make an effective beginning. I hope that each Member of Congress concerned about the future of our transportation system will have an opportunity to review and consider this legislative proposal.

#### MARINE SANCTUARIES

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

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when we consider the adoption of H.R. 9272, the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1971, I intend to offer an amendment to title III of that bill, which deals with the establishment of marine sanctuaries.

I would like to say first, however, that I believe the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has reported an important measure to control ocean dumping of waste materials which is excellent in nearly every respect and I commend the committee for its fine efforts.

I firmly believe, however, that one significant environmental safeguard must be added to the bill which the committee discussed in its hearings on H.R. 9272 but neglected to address in the legislation as reported.

As my colleagues are aware, H.R. 9272 is basically a bill which will regulate the dumping of harmful substances into our Nation's coastal and other waters.

Title III of the bill, however, authorizes the establishment of a system of marine sanctuaries in our oceans, coastal and other waters designated by the Secretary of Commerce on the basis of preserving or restoring such areas for their conservation, recreational, ecological, or esthetic values. These marine sanctuaries, which would be analogous to the wilderness areas in our national parks system, would be out of bounds to the dumping or disposal of harmful wastes.

One activity which has long been at the forefront of the argument concerning the preservation of our Nation's coastlines, estuaries, wetlands, and beaches is the offshore drilling of oil. Mr. Speaker, oil pollution has numerous times despoiled our beaches and contaminated our near-shore waters which are the key to the survival of most marine animals that are taken for man's food. Over a long period of time, this persistent pollution may in-

terfere with the normal life processes of the organisms—as well as killing them outright at high concentrations.

The result is the progressive disappearance of usually abundant fish, shellfish, birds and assorted creatures of the sea. Surviving organisms of food value to man may be permanently contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons that could be hazardous to health.

Studies undertaken of numerous incidents of oil rig blowouts and tanker spills have underlined the costly and damaging fact that oil slicks unleashed on our coasts are in no way whatever compatible with any of the purposes of this title.

My amendment, Mr. Speaker, will mandate that the Secretary of the Interior impose a moratorium on the issuance of all new leases for extraction of oil in those offshore areas under consideration for designation, or actually designated, as marine sanctuaries.

I want to assure my colleagues that the amendment will in no way affect licensing for ongoing exploration for petroleum reserves off our coasts or the renewal of existing leases for drilling. It will simply bar new drilling operations in those areas designated as marine sanctuaries or under study for possible designation.

I realize that there are going to be those of my colleagues who will be a bit squeamish about the intent of this amendment, and I want to make perfectly clear that my intent is not to impose unreasonable standards upon one industry.

My intent, Mr. Speaker is to prevent the inevitable, yet hopefully isolated, occasions of further contamination of those select areas which the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has seen fit to accord special status in this legislation because of their noteworthy conservation, recreational, ecological and esthetic values.

It does not seem at all unreasonable to me that at this moment, when we have a real opportunity to prevent damage to these special areas from the outset, we should grasp that opportunity now rather than having to come back to this Chamber at some future time, after the mistakes have been made and irreparable damage has been done, to rectify this legislation.

I would hope that a majority of my colleagues can readily see the necessity for my amendment if we are to address these environmental dangers realistically rather than in a piecemeal fashion.

I might add that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE), a veteran Member of this body, has seen fit to join in support of my amendment because of his firsthand experience with the tragedy of an oil rig blowout in his own district in Santa Barbara, Calif.

I will certainly welcome any and all support from those of my colleagues who feel as I do about the potential dangers of oil drilling in our marine sanctuaries.

#### NEW MEDICAL-DENTAL MILITARY ACADEMIES: A PROPOSAL TO SUPPLEMENT THE SUPPLY OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, as I began to understand the dimensions of what is termed our health care crisis, I undertook to study some of the complex problems that contribute to our current health dilemma.

One of my major concerns was the current shortage of physicians and dentists. Instead of this situation improving, it is reliably estimated by the National Institute of Public Health that by 1980 we will be short 24,000 physicians and 56,000 dentists.

These figures, I submit indicate one reason why our Nation labors under a very costly medical system, a medical system that has been seriously challenged as inferior to that of other less affluent nations. The best medical indicators confirm this judgment. The United States ranks 13th among industrial nations in infant mortality, 11th in life expectancy for women, and 18th in life expectancy for men.

These figures indicate that much remains to be done in our health care system. These figures can be better understood when we realize that it is virtually impossible to secure a doctor in the inner city or in many rural areas.

The effect of the physician and dentist shortage can be felt by most citizens in the increasing cost of doctor's visits and the increasing refusal of doctors to make house calls because of the demand on the doctor's time, et cetera. The cost of medical care rose 125 percent from 1946 to 1967 and the cost for health care will approach \$200 billion by 1980. Since 1965 physician's fees have averaged a 7-percent increase annually.

Necessary efforts to streamline medical training although imperative, did not appear to fill the physician-dentist shortfalls. The only means to increase medical manpower is to construct new medical schools.

As I studied the problem of new medical-dental schools, I was struck by the costs of construction and initial planning. Of these factors, construction was by far the most prohibitive. Although it is difficult to find an accepted formula for construction costs, the Association of American Medical Colleges estimates that it costs \$250,000 per entering student.

It seemed practical then to use existing facilities to cut down cost. Since again there are no set criteria for establishing medical or dental schools, I reason that access to a large well-equipped hospital facility would be the most cost-effective approach.

There are, fortunately, such facilities existent. The large military hospitals are not being used effectively for teaching hospitals and I am proposing that some of these hospitals be the bases of three new Medical-Dental Military Academies for the Army, Air Force and the Navy.

Although there is no established size for teaching hospitals, the Army alone currently has three 1,000 bed operational hospitals: Walter Reed, 1,355; Brooke, San Antonio, 1,038; Fitzsimmons, Denver, 1,085. The Navy has five medical hospitals with near or over 1,000 beds: Bethesda, 902; Oakland, 1,150; Philadelphia, 1,164; Portsmouth, Va., 1,412; St. Albans, N.Y., 1,208. The Wilford Hall Air Force Hospital at Lackland Air Force Base has over 1,000 beds.

The bill I am introducing today with the support of some of my distinguished colleagues establishes these three new Army, Navy and Air Force Medical-Dental Military Academies.

This bill is specifically designed to serve two inter-related goals: increase the supply of physicians and dentists, and accomplish this in the most cost-effective manner.

This is accomplished by establishing three new medical-dental schools and by using existing military hospitals as the centers of training.

This proposal has other advantages. It will be the first all governmental medical education program. This feature could open the entire field of medicine to socioeconomic groups that have been largely excluded from medicine by the high cost of medical education.

For example, it is estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it costs as much as \$100,000 to educate one medical student for 1 year. For dental students yearly costs are as high as \$15,000 per year. Admittedly, there are Federal and State programs which assist the student, but for the student from modest and low-income families, the cost of a medical or dental education is prohibitive.

This new proposal establishes application procedures similar to those used for West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs. This allows applicants to compete freely and openly for Congressional or Presidential nominations.

Therefore, with the establishment of the new Military Medical-Dental Academies, students will be able to be judged not on their socioeconomic background but on their intellectual capability, the qualities found in every social strata but only too infrequently encouraged in the lower and middle classes.

Finally, this bill provides for alternative service. Should the graduates of these military medical-dental academies not be needed in the armed services, the Secretary of Defense working with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can establish alternative service in medically deprived areas.

As I pointed out, the American medical crisis is caused by a number of factors. In proposing these new Medical-Dental Academies, I believe that they will have a significant effect on a major cause of the current crisis: the shortage of physicians and dentists.

I am proud to be joined in presenting this novel legislation by the Honorable ELLA GRASSO, FRANK HORTON, FRANK BRASCO, JOHN DENT, SEYMOUR HALPERN, and FRED ROONEY.

### TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK ROSENBLATT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take this time during the passage of the 92d Congress to call attention to an event which had an element of tragedy attached to it, in that a man whom we might call a universal citizen was called to his eternal reward at a very early age.

I refer to the recent death, on July 11, of the distinguished member of the New York academic community, Dr. Frank Rosenblatt, who was a most gifted human being. Dr. Rosenblatt had made his entire life a contribution to mankind. Close by to the Capitol here, during a period of recreation, he suffered a boating accident which took his life. In this brief episode, we saw the ending, at least for this time, of a career of dedication and devotion in the field of the academic and in the field of human resources.

Dr. Rosenblatt's career as scientist, inventor, and as a professor and leader at Cornell University in the great State of New York, marked him as a most dedicated citizen, and it brings to mind, as I said, the concept which we always try to understand of the universal man.

Dr. Frank Rosenblatt was known to many communities, including the world of politics. He was strong in his sense of devotion and dedication to mankind, strong in the field on the side of activities for lasting peace, and for more understanding among nations and among people.

Members of Congress in this body who knew him well and worked with him in his various endeavors share, I know, a deep sense of loss.

The memorial services at Cornell University on July 16 were moving and poignant and I think should be widely appreciated.

I therefore include as a part of my remarks some of the comments that were made during the course of that ceremony. I think they represent a most sensitive appraisal of this significant young person whose mind and character we cherish.

Dr. Frank Rosenblatt's spirit will, I hope, endure through others who will be inspired to follow in his footsteps, because throughout his life he gave freely and generously to young people who were in his classes and in his company and, in fact, he made his life a total inspiration to the young people around him.

We all know many of Dr. Rosenblatt's associates in the academic community who have worked in the political arena, and those of us in Washington are, of course, very keenly aware of the many activities carried on by Dr. Rosenblatt's brother, a distinguished citizen of Washington and New York, Mr. Maurice Rosenblatt, and his sister, Mrs. Bernice Evans. Maurice Rosenblatt, who is known to many of us, is one who, in the tradition of that family, a great New York family, has worked very earnestly to improve politics in our country, and

therefore to improve our country through better politics. Maurice Rosenblatt has served as national chairman of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, and I know his sense of loss must be very great in that his young brother has left the field and left it, in a sense, much richer for his major contribution in the field of cognitive systems research programs and in intellectual pursuits in advancing our understanding of the thinking mechanism of man, not being content to confine his research to pure science, but to apply the science of the understanding of man to his everyday activities in the world.

We who are in the world today have lost, indeed, a rich resource in that Dr. Frank Rosenblatt is no longer with us, but I think the articles of eulogy which I shall put in the RECORD at this point particularly and deeply demonstrate the mark he made upon the community in which he lived.

The article and the eulogies referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1971]

DR. FRANK ROSENBLATT DIES AT 43; TAUGHT NEUROBIOLOGY AT CORNELL

EASTON, Md., July 12—Dr. Frank Rosenblatt, associate professor of neurobiology at Cornell University, died here yesterday in a boating accident. It was his 43d birthday. He lived in Brooktondale, N.Y., an Ithaca suburb.

An originator of perceptive theory, he had developed an experimental machine that could be trained to identify automatically objects or patterns such as letters of the alphabet. The instrument was an electro-mechanical device consisting of a sensory unit of photo cells that viewed the pattern shown at the machine, association units that contained the machine's memory and response units that displayed visually its pattern-recognition response.

#### EDUCATED AT CORNELL

The son of the late Dr. Frank Rosenblatt and Katherine Rosenblatt, the scientist was born July 11, 1928, in New Rochelle, N.Y. He obtained his A.B. from Cornell in 1950 and his Ph.D. in 1956. He then went to the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory in Buffalo, where he was successively research psychologist, senior psychologist and chief of the cognitive systems section.

In 1959 Dr. Rosenblatt went to Cornell's Ithaca campus as director of the cognitive systems research program and as lecturer in psychology. Seven years later he joined the section on neurobiology and behavior within the newly formed division of biological sciences and became an associate professor. At his death he was acting chairman of the section.

Dr. Rosenblatt's research interests were broad. One aspect dealt with models of brain function. In 1958 he described what he called a Perceptron, an electronic device constructed on biological principles that showed an ability to learn. He developed the concept in a book, "Principles of Nerodynamics," and gave a course in brain mechanisms and models.

#### STUDIED BEHAVIOR TRANSFER

In 1966, he investigated the transfer of learned behavior from trained to naive rats by the injection of brain extracts and published extensively in this area.

Dr. Rosenblatt was also interested in astronomy. At his death he was trying to develop a new method for the detection of satellites.

He is survived by a sister, Mrs. Bernice

Evans of New York, and a brother, Maurice of Washington.

A memorial service will be held at Cornell in Ithaca at date to be announced.

#### MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR FRANK ROSENBLATT, JULY 16, 1971, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

*Father David Conner:* All of us are here today to share the mourning and also to celebrate the life of a person whom we loved: a colleague, a friend, a brother to anyone who had the privilege to know him. At the request of those who knew him best, and loved him most deeply, the memorial service for Frank Rosenblatt will be simple and honest. Everyone who's here by rights could speak, and should. Because there are many overflowing words and silences that we would like to share with everybody. Those who do speak, will speak from their own personal recollections, and after we've shared this memorial service we will all go to his house if you want to, to talk to each other, to console and to be close with those who loved him. The person who will speak to us first is Dr. O'Brien, head of the Division of Biological Sciences, and a very close friend of Frank.

*Dr. Richard O'Brien:* It was my privilege to know Frank for something like ten years, and when someone who's been close to one for this length of time is suddenly taken from us, it's a time when we look back on that knowledge, that relation. And especially when it's an unusual man, as in Frank's case, we try to ask ourselves what it is that was unusual about him, and about the relationship. And in the last days, in casting my mind back, to try and think why he was a special man, it seemed to me that it comes back to the question of what university professors are all about. Most of us are rather schizoid individuals: we have two kinds of lives. One is that of the scholar, and the teacher, and the seeker after truth, and the sort of person you think of when you think of groves of academe and ivory towers, who is not concerned with self, or with self-interest, or with his own personal rewards, but only with pushing back the understanding of the universe. But most of us also live on a second plane, and a relatively selfish plane, which is concerned with things like rank, and income, and tenure, and promotions, and numbers of square feet of laboratory space, and numbers of grants, and things of this kind. And most of us do a reasonably good balancing act between these two kinds of personality. And I think the strange thing about Frank was that he lived almost exclusively in that first world, and he was always totally unconcerned with his own welfare and with practical things. He didn't care how he dressed, or how he rode in his car, and in the several years in which I had the pleasure of being his Chairman, he never came to speak to me about secretaries and footages, and how to get another grant, but always about science and the discoveries in his laboratory the day before. He was, I would say, not a prudent man, he didn't take advantage of things for himself, nor look out for himself. For instance, it was only a few years ago that he enjoyed hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in research grants, from agencies that thought his work was worth doing, and he was a victim of the Mansfield amendment, and within a few years that money melted like summer snow and soon he had very little left in the last few months.

And yet all these sort of drastic happenings had remarkably little effect upon Frank, he was sorry for his colleagues and for his students, who were put out by these situations, but somehow it didn't impinge on him emotionally, as it would for many people. And this imprudence, which was sort of a lovable character of his, extended in so many different aspects of his life. For instance, I well remember the place when his

tenure came up. As you know, when a university grants tenure, it declares it will support a man for the rest of his life, and for most professors this is a terribly serious time in life, and one they think about a great deal, and try and make sure that the omens are favorable and everything works out well, and when some five to six years ago Frank's tenure came up I found it impossible to move him in prudent directions. I pleaded with him to make sure his research was published in respectable journals, and he couldn't understand me, because it was available in libraries, and people could read it if they wanted it, and what any tenure committee thought about it mattered nothing to him. At the very time when his tenure was about to come up, he came up with an imaginative, and entirely out of place proposal to look for a life from outer space, by studying coherent light, received from the universe. And I begged him not to put such an imprudent proposal at such a delicate time, because I said there were many people . . . your character is disputatious, Frank, there are those who will say this is just another mark of how you're not a solid citizen. And needless to say, Frank couldn't understand me. He said, "But that's nothing to do with it, it's a good idea and it's a good proposal, I'm going to put it forward." And he did. This imprudence extended to his selection of all his research career. He would never do, as prudent professors do, pick out some small aspect of the physical universe which could be studied, and could reasonably be expected to produce solutions in a year or two so that someone could come up with a sensible reputation. Instead, he would reach out and grasp the biggest problems that he could see, and apply himself, throw himself into the study of them, without any recognition of the fact that if he made bad choices, or if he chose, as he usually did, problems which were not likely to yield a solution within ten or twenty years, that this would redound to his disadvantage. He never worked that way.

He built up, in fact, two research reputations. One grew out of his invention, more than ten years ago, of an instrument called a Perceptron, an electronic device that was able to learn the recognition of patterns, and there was a good deal of publicity about it at the time, which stressed the utility of this, and how it had led to the possibility of making machines which could do things like scan radar screens, and do practical useful things like that. And of course the real basis of that research was nothing of the kind, his intention was to find out the fundamentals of how brains work, he wanted to ask himself: what are the minimum number of things that a brain has to have physically in order to perform the amazing things it does, particularly in the area of recognition, and memory and learning, and those related events. And so for years, he wrote and researched in this whole area of artificial intelligence, and we still don't know whether in fact he was on the right track, or whether it was a false track. What we do know is that the years of research there that he and colleagues built up, open up to us, make clear to us, that the understanding of this very important biological phenomena, were things that one could study, one could research for, one could think about, one could analyze. And whether or not brains turned out to be wired up, the way Perceptrons are, is less important than the fact that he lifted the veil and enabled us to examine all these possibilities and see that ideas like this were within human grasp.

And then five years ago, he was also very imprudent in that he became fascinated by a report that if one trained rats in particular tasks, you could transfer some of that training to another rat, by injecting brain extracts of the first. Now we know these days that in fact those early reports were probably wrong,

they made extravagant claims. And yet Frank devoted several years, the last years of his life, to that, and to my mind showed convincingly that whoever allowed the initial reports of larger effects were indeed wrong, there is indeed a small but extremely important effect; and the devotion with which he pursued this, the care and the scientific acumen he brought to pursuing this tremendous task, which couldn't conceivably be finished within a decade or two, were also tributes to the sort of mind he had, and the sort of person that he was. And in this too he was widely recognized, he built a new international reputation in the second area, and only a few months ago was in Budapest giving lectures in international symposium on this work.

Finally, I must say that quite outside these relatively narrow spheres, his mind knew no limits, quite literally, and in February he published, *Neurobiologist* published a proposal for the detection of satellites to stars from outside the solar system. The paper, which I read over again just yesterday I think characterized Frank so clearly, because it showed that sort of great grasp of the greater picture, the looking for events outside this very world, in fact, and then went on coolly and calmly to evaluate the details to describe the precise way that you would go about it: he had a system of three telescopes that would scan 9,000 stars each night to see if they had satellites, and calculated the probability that one might find something useful out of all this data. And it seems to me that that kind of mixture of the astronomically large view that that he had, and the overview of the world, and that ability to bring it down into the realities so that we could grasp it with our own hand really characterized him. And you would have to say that beneath his exceptionally mild and quiet manner there was really a ferociously active intelligence which reached out to grasp great things. We are hoping that we will provide some sort of memorial which will be associated with these sorts of activities of Frank's, which made up such a great part of his life. And yet not all of his life, as other speakers here today will say. There were aspects of his life entirely outside those which I've touched upon, which demonstrated the amazing breadth of his mind and of his sympathy and understanding. The fact that that great intellect and that generous mind has been snatched from us suddenly makes us all very much the poorer. Professor Howland will say something about Frank next.

Professor HOWARD HOWLAND. Frank Rosenblatt was not only a teacher and researcher, but also a man who was deeply concerned with the welfare of the university, its ideals and its reality. In that capacity he also served the Cornell community well. It was part of Frank's genius that he was acutely sensitive to the political events around him, that he grasped their deeper implications more rapidly than other men, and that he responded to them with forthright action. Thus in the Spring of 1969, when Cornell was shaken by great political upheaval, it was not surprising that he actively engaged in attempts to restructure and restore the governance of the university. Frank's was a selfless devotion to rational governance, and because of that selflessness, he was one of its most able defenders. Many of us recall how, in the most emotional of public debates, Frank would rise and in calm and measured tones lay the alternatives before his listeners, and bring the discussion back on the path of constructive action. This same selfless devotion meant for Frank that no task and its defense was too small or menial for his attention. He attended endless meetings, and participated in innumerable discussions. He was a good listener and a good advisor, and

above all he could be counted on to do the next necessary thing no matter how bleak the outlook of success. After playing a major role in guiding the proposal for the constituent assembly both through the university faculty and the Barton Hall meetings, Frank went on to serve on that constituent assembly. He was chairman of the summer research committee, on the relationship of the university to minority groups, and compiled its report on the university and the disadvantaged. In the introduction to that report he summarized his humanitarian view of the obligations of the university. He wrote, "The university has a moral obligation to help provide equality of education, equality of educational opportunity, for those who have been deprived of it by virtue of race, poverty, or social circumstances. This includes making potential students aware of the possibility of a university education, making it possible for them to enter, making it feasible for them to stay, economically and socially, and providing studies relevant to their needs and interests. This applies to foreign students as well as to Americans." Such was his idea of the university. Late in the Fall, long after the excitement of the Spring had passed, when the constituent assembly had almost exhausted its strength in its attempt to provide a viable senate proposal, Frank again lent his full energies to the construction of a successful document which became the constitution of the Cornell Senate. Frank Rosenblatt was no stranger to the thrill of the larger political arenas, or the sweet taste of professional success. The fact that he gave so generously of his abilities to his university when it needed him is a testimony to its embodiment of a dream of a rational and equitable society for which he strove. We are all the richer for his example.

ROD MILLER. I'm Rod Miller. I met Frank when I was a Freshman, and didn't know him very well during that year. At the end of the year I was busted for smoking pot, and I was put off going to see Frank for two or three days because I thought—that was the only faculty member I knew at all—and he'd say, "Tough luck, kid." And I went to him finally, and I was really surprised and shocked to find that I still had a friend in Frank. And in the next years I was a biology student and couldn't understand why Frank didn't have a wife and kids. I was interested in evolution, perpetuating self, and such. And I talked to Frank and he made me see that there's so much more in terms of the culture, ethic, ideals that you can pass on. And I lived at his house and he used to read to us after dinner. We read *Canticle for Liebowitz*, *Alice in Wonderland*, *Through the Looking Glass*, the Ring Trilogy, *The Once and Future King*, and many others. *The Wind in the Willows*. One chapter Frank came to and he said, "This chapter's about me." And it's about Mr. Toad, who had wanted to get a bright shiny red motor car, and he was obsessed with this idea, and Frank identified with Mr. Toad, and he had many shiny red motor cars: projects. At the house, he'd get involved in interstellar communication, painting, sculpture, mountain climbing, and we'd all say, "Frank doesn't know anything about that," and two weeks later, Frank knew something about it, and two months later he knew an awful lot about it. He'd work away at his desk computer, sometimes twenty hours a day, scribbling notes on napkins, on the back of check stubs, anything that was white. And he was a father to all of us, I guess. And in a sense we were a father to him. Frank was an absent-minded professor, I guess. He had to have an appointment made for him at Browning and King to get a suit, because he'd never get around to doing it himself. And he had to be reminded that the stop light had turned green two times now. When we found out at the

house, somebody sort of summed it up . . . said that she thought we'd all be dead from cancer, or something else before Frank, before anything ever happened to Frank, because Frank was the center of so many people's lives, and seemed to be the only stable thing around. And his house was like . . . students flowed through it . . . there'd always be Frank with another shiny red motor car.

FATHER CONNOR. I first got to know Frank during the time of the years of crisis, I guess we could call that '67 until 1971. There were many professors that turned up, but there was never one who was so omnipresent as Frank. When everyone else was exhausted, and the cause seemed lost, Frank would still come to the meeting, and speak his heart, and encourage us. The reputation that he got, that I understood, was as someone who couldn't say no to anyone. I don't think there's probably anyone on campus who's ever had him refuse him anything that he's asked. And because of that particular quality, he had the most incredible groups of friends, associates, people crashing into his apartment, wayward youngsters. And it was always intriguing to me to see a man, who was doing such important work, with such an incredible mind, to have the personal touch, to always take time from his work and turn to someone in need. He was more than a teacher and a professor. He was a man who taught with everything he did, who had his personal life run into his work. He allowed himself to let people get close enough to hurt him, or to heal him. He was a man of deep compassion, and his mind, which showed him how institutions work, which gave him all the reasons the rest of us have for cynicism, also allowed him to be a man who believed. He believed in the individual, he believed in each person who came to him. And that's why so many people are here today who have come back. They've come back because they couldn't do anything else during this period, because the shock which they all felt, whether they read it in the *New York Times*, or someone phoned them, or someone told them, made them stop everything else just as he stopped everything else when they needed it. I can't give any greater tribute to a human being than to say that he was a man who loved, and the faith that he put in people, which more prudent members of the community would say: Frank, you believe too much in them, always brought fruit. The second, the third, the fourth chance that he gave someone let them become that which they could become, let them rise to the stature that he glimpsed in them with his incredible insight. And I guess what he's planted in each one of us, that we might call inspiration, or hope, will never be stifled, it will live and grow. All those who are here today, who would like to, are welcome to come to the house. If you haven't seen the house, it's beautiful. I never knew when I first met Frank that he wasn't married, because he was always talking about his kids. And I understood when I met them that they weren't his kids, and yet they were his kids, in the way that Rod described it. One of the most imprudent things that Frank ever did happened in 1968, when he interrupted his life for three months because he saw a vision, because a man inspired him, gave him a hope, that there could be indeed a moral politics, there could be in the dearth of charismatic and insightful leadership, someone who the people could call to authority and to power. So he set aside his research, his teaching; he set aside many of his own needs, to go from New Hampshire to California and to put his particular insights and talents to use. So that that charismatic man could lead the people of this country away from the death and destruction, the racism and the hatred. The man that inspired Frank and many of

us here is with us today. Senator Eugene McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. I am here today not so much to participate in a memorial to Frank Rosenblatt as to pay testimony and tribute to him. I could say very little of my direct and personal experience with him, or my direct knowledge of what he has done and what he has been to people. I speak of him from what I know of him principally through his influence on other people. And so in my case, as I sense from what some of those who've spoken before me have said, his having died does not so much leave me feeling a loss as it has brought me to realize what a presence he was, and to look forward to a continuation of that presence. I've tried to reflect on what his character was, and I've come to two conclusions, in a way. That it was almost as though he was a different order of being. I hesitate to use the word angelic, as we're inclined to think of angels as rather soft and uncommitted people, but we take some of the harder definitions, and it involves a very firm and complete commitment of intellect, to whatever the problems the angels have to face. And the disposition not to pass moral judgment, as if having made a great moral decision at some point, he was rather free from the obligations which some of us seem to carry through life, making moral judgments on most everyone who passes by. It was as though Frank had decided, that at least as far as he was concerned, that he would try to eliminate all the evil and all the distress that comes from ignorance and from lack of knowledge, and following that decision his commitment was very complete. Along with that, he was if anything, it seems to me, a kind of universal brother, brother to the members of his family, to the members of the faculty who knew him, to the students who have spoken here, and I think in a sense to all of us. The nature of his affection was a brotherly one, and as he became more and more his own person a brother to the land, and a brother to the youth of this nation, a brother to all the simple things of our existence, a brother truly to the universe itself. So in that conception, a man pure in spirit and fully committed in intellect, a brother to all things, I'm here with his own family and his almost universal family to pay tribute and to give testimony to his life and to his influence.

Rabbi MORRIS GOLDFARB. There are times when our own words are inadequate to express all that we feel within, and to bring to fore those emotions, those thoughts which are present in our hearts, and so we look to the past, to the pages written by sages who might bring a word of consolation and hope for us. And these words, from the book of Ecclesiasticus, perhaps might serve in that capacity:

Fear not death, we are all destined to die; we share it with all who ever lived, with all who ever will be; bewail the dead, hide not your grief, do not restrain your mourning, but remember that continuing sorrow is worse than death; when the dead are adrift let their memory rest and be consoled when the soul departs; seek not to understand what is too difficult for you; search not for what is hidden from you; be not over-occupied with what is beyond you: you have been shown more than you can understand; as a drop of water in the sea, as a grain of sand on the shore, are man's few days in eternity; the good things in life last for limited days, but a good name endures forever.

At the graveside, Father Conner read the following poem by Frank Rosenblatt:

COURAGE

Courage is to smile  
When the doctor jabs the needle  
Into frightened flesh, thinking  
(But not saying) "Look, Mother,  
How brave I am!"  
Courage is to see dreams crumble,

And then shaking out the dust,  
To dream again; to apprehend  
The ambush hidden in the path  
And still go forward; to explore  
Within the hidden craters  
Of your own desires; to submit  
The working and creations of your mind  
For public judgment.  
And courage  
Is to hope  
When others have surrendered.  
And courage  
Is to face surrender  
When others hope.

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding, and also thank him for making it possible for some of us who were Dr. Frank Rosenblatt's friends to give expression to that thought. I had not known Frank Rosenblatt long, but he was a man of that intensity of intellect, that warmth of spirit that made me feel I knew him intimately. I was privileged to share his family's response when I first expressed my condolences. The family response, both philosophic and poignant, was—

We had the comfort of having had him for 43 years.

From what I know from friends, and what I have observed from a lamentably short experience, there would have been from year to year a deeper pleasure from being in his company.

The expressions of some of these friends was contained in the memorial services for Frank Rosenblatt on July 16, 1971, at Cornell University, which the gentleman has placed in the RECORD. These express more eloquently than I can, being from those who were close friends, many of whom were of great prominence in the academic and political communities, the feelings which I also share.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for this opportunity.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in this tribute to Dr. Frank Rosenblatt whose untimely death has removed from the scene one of the towering intellects of our time. Others much more qualified than myself will speak of Dr. Rosenblatt's immense contributions to the science of learning, particularly, his research into the function of the brain. I would wish to say just a few words as to his contribution to the university that he served so well during those turbulent days when Cornell University was meeting its most serious challenge.

Those who worked with Dr. Rosenblatt in those trying times have given eloquent testimony to his patience, his concern for the sensibilities of his students and colleagues, and above all, his deep sense of understanding of the issue and emotions involved. We have lost in his passing a gifted humanist and a remarkable scientist. Seldom are such qualities met in one man. I know that I express the sense of all our colleagues when I extend my sympathies to his brother, Maurice, and his sister, Mrs. Bernice Evans.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

## CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR YIDDISH BROADCASTS BY THE VOICE OF AMERICA TO SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, together with my colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN), and 20 additional House cosponsors, today I am reintroducing a resolution urging the Voice of America to undertake broadcasts in the Yiddish language into the Soviet Union. The introduction of this measure brings the total number of House Members sponsoring this resolution to 99.

I am pleased to report, furthermore, that 22 Members of the U.S. Senate have expressed their support for this worthwhile endeavor through sponsorship of identical legislation in that body.

The mounting evidence of discrimination against its Jewish population by the Soviet Government makes this significant demonstration of congressional support for Yiddish broadcasts of particular importance at this time. The Soviet Government's campaign against its Jewish population has aroused considerable indignation and sympathy throughout the world. With Soviet press censorship, however, the 3 million Soviet Jews can only learn of such world reaction through external news sources such as the Voice of America.

According to the latest data available—the 1959 Soviet census—some 2,267,000 persons in the Soviet Union speak Yiddish. While the Voice of America currently broadcasts in 34 foreign languages, however, it does not broadcast in Yiddish. There are, furthermore, several Voice of America target populations smaller than the total of Soviet Jewry. Voice of America broadcasts, for example, are transmitted to the following groups in their native tongues: Estonian, 1.3 million; Slovenian, 1.8 million; Latvian, 1.9 million; Lithuanian, 2.73 million; Albanian, 2.74 million; Georgian, 2.83 million; and Armenian, 2.94 million.

While most Soviet Jews probably understand and speak the Russian language, the small act of recognition which would be provided through Yiddish broadcasts by the Voice of America into the Soviet Union would, in my judgment, provide a tremendous spiritual uplift to the members of this oppressed minority. In this connection it is important to remember that the primary aim of the Soviet Government's campaign of oppression against its Jewish citizens is apparently the destruction of their Jewish cultural and religious identity. VOA

broadcasts in the language which is such an important aspect of this cultural identity would, therefore, be an important symbolic expression of our support.

The resolution which is being reintroduced in the House today and which urges the Voice of America to undertake broadcasts in the Yiddish language to the citizens of the Soviet Union, reads as follows:

## RESOLUTION

Whereas the House of Representatives deeply believes in religious and cultural freedom for all persons and is opposed to infringement of these freedoms anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens and imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands; and

Whereas many of the three million Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union speak the Yiddish language; and

Whereas the Voice of America does not broadcast in the Yiddish language to the peoples in the Soviet Union, although it does broadcast to several population groups in the Soviet Union whose numbers are less than the total Jewish population; and

Whereas the broadcasting by the Voice of America in the Yiddish language would bring to the Soviet Union's Jewish citizens knowledge of the worldwide sympathy for their plight and of the worldwide support for their being allowed religious and cultural freedom, as well as freedom to emigrate; and

Whereas the broadcasting by the Voice of America in the Yiddish language would constitute for the Soviet Union's Jewish citizens an act of great psychological support: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives urges the Voice of America to undertake broadcasts in the Yiddish language to the citizens of the Soviet Union.

In a further effort to obtain Voice of America broadcasts in Yiddish, several sponsors of the above legislation wrote to USIA Director Frank Shakespeare on May 24 urging his favorable consideration of this matter. Unfortunately, however, Director Shakespeare responded on June 14 that the USIA was not at this time prepared to inaugurate such a service.

A meeting to discuss this matter further and to urge reconsideration of the above negative response was subsequently held on July 14 between interested Members of Congress, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Martin Hillenbrand, and Acting Director of the USIA Henry Loomis. That meeting provided an informative exchange of ideas as well as the agreement by Messrs. Hillenbrand and Loomis to meet with the Congressmen again in 60 days to continue the discussion.

It is my profound hope that the significant show of congressional support for the above legislation will result in a reversal of the USIA's expressed position on this matter.

## TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Eighty percent of America's nearly 10,000 newspapers are weeklies serving rural, small town, and suburban "hometown" communities. Less than 4 percent are metropolitan dailies. Three-fourths of the 1,754 dailies are published in cities of less than 25,000 population, keeping Americans informed about local, national, and international events.

## HAS RED CHINA CHANGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the image making process has commenced and is in high gear. Soon we will be lulled into believing that Communist China has given up its brutal, tyrannical ways, and can be counted on to work for peace. It is entirely inappropriate for the White House to ask that criticism of the impending China visit be held back. They have not changed, there is no reason to cease our legitimate criticism of their regime. If Red China has changed in any significant way it would be one thing but there is no indication of this in any way, shape or form.

Any policy regarding Red China should be based on whether that regime seeks to establish justice and insure domestic tranquility and whether it seeks to secure the blessings of liberty for the people of Red China. The answer is obvious: The Red Chinese Government presides over a slave state, just as cruel and brutal as the government of Nazi Germany and any attempt to appease the Red Chinese leaders will eventually result in similar, disastrous consequences.

What many of us fear is the Red Chinese not only have not changed but that they give no real indication of change. In his visit to Red China, President Nixon has all but signalled the fact that the United States will change its policies whether Red China does or not. Let us examine whether or not the Red Chinese have changed and, of course, I am referring to the oppressive leaders when I use the term Red Chinese, not the enslaved people of China.

Here are the slogans which were used on International Labor Day, May 1, 1971—note that, this year—by official Red broadcasts on Radio Peking:

People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!

We warmly congratulate the people of the three countries of Indochina on their great victories in the war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation!

We firmly support the heroic Korean people in their just struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression and for the peaceful unification of the fatherland!

We firmly support the Arab peoples in their struggle against U.S. imperialism and Zionism!

We firmly support the Cuban people in their struggle to oppose U.S. imperialist aggression and safeguard national independence and state sovereignty!

We firmly support the just struggle of the American people against the U.S. Government's policies of aggression and war and racial discrimination!

All right, you say, this is just propaganda. Yes, this is their propaganda line but their government policy line is still one of terror and repression. The ping-pong players who returned a few months ago seemed to be impressed with the China they saw. One of the youths indicated he was impressed by the "austerity and discipline" of the Chinese people. These same Americans will be the first ones to yell about poverty and repression in the United States but call real poverty and real repression "austerity and discipline" in Red China. This is but one of the not-too-subtle propaganda exploitations of the liberal news media in our country which is touting a Red China accommodation.

The murdering of upwards to 20 million Chinese does not seem to put the Red government in bad stead with the liberal community in our country. The Communists' "Three Anti" and "Five Anti" campaigns of the early 1950's, the Hundred Flowers, the Great Leap Forward, the Red Guards, the Cultural Revolution indicate that their policy of repression and extermination was not one limited to the 1949-50 era but has continued up through the present. All of these have been fully documented for anyone who wants to study Red China tyranny. The cult of making a god out of Chairman Mao should be repulsive to Americans who have any sensibilities at all. The murderous background of Chou En-lai must sicken all decent Americans who think of our President sitting down to dinner with him.

One has to be reminded of Chamberlain and others who wrongly assessed tyranny. Has the desire for peace become such an obsession that it is necessary to paint a new picture of our adversaries in order to make peace with the Red Chinese more plausible? What one basic principle have the Red Chinese changed or offered to change to give us any cautious hope they can be trusted? You can search the record and find nary a change. We are changing. We are softening our guard. We are backing away from our position of world leadership of the free world.

#### THE CHINESE DRUG MERCHANTS

The American people have finally become aware of the dangers of narcotic drugs to our young people. While I have seen justifiable press criticism of some of our allies for their failure to regulate the drug traffic, I have not seen any comparable press exposure of the Red Chinese role in the production and distribution of heroin.

On September 13, 1964, radio Moscow, in the course of its criticism of the Red Chinese regime, revealed that Red China was involved in a large-scale production of opium, and the distribution of the opium derivatives, morphine and heroin. According to the Soviets, Red Chinese profits on illegal drug distribution in Japan alone amounts to \$170 million a year.

A secret convention was held in Peking in December 1952, at which it was

decided by the Red Chinese Government to increase its production and distribution of narcotics to help finance worldwide Communist operations. Shortly after the meeting the production of narcotics by Red China increased 400 percent. Part of the work in processing the drugs is done by the inmates of the Red Chinese slave labor camps.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people have a right to know about these activities of Red China. I think that the press has a duty to inform the people. I do not consider the Soviets a good source for criticizing Red China but these charges are adequately borne out in the evidence that our Government has concerning the Red Chinese part in the international drug traffic. They are prime promoters of the illicit drugs which traffic in our Nation. Will the President talk to the Reds about their drug traffic?

#### THE NIXON TRIP

The proposed visit to Red China by President Nixon is a serious blow to the security of the free nations of Asia. The dangers to the freedom of the Chinese on Formosa is obvious, but there are also dangers to the freedom of the South Koreans, the South Vietnamese, Laotians, and Cambodians.

On July 5, 1971, the high-ranking Chinese Communist functionary Kuo Mo-jo granted an interview with two correspondents of the Tokyo newspaper Asahi. The interview was printed on July 8, the day before President Nixon's envoy, Henry Kissinger, arrived in Peking. I have a translation of that newspaper story prepared by the American Embassy in Tokyo, which I obtained from the Library of Congress.

This is the Chinese Red's answer to a question concerning China-United States relations:

The Taiwan question is the key to the U.S.-China question. Since 1955, this question has been discussed at the U.S.-China ambassadorial level talks. At these talks, we have been asserting toward the U.S. side the following points: (1) The United States' recognizing the Peking Government as the sole legitimate government representing China; (2) Its recognizing that Taiwan is one province of China, and that in what form it will be liberated is an internal matter for China; and (3) The withdrawing of U.S. forces from the Taiwan Straits. I am sure you recall what Chairman Mao said to Edgar Snow. Chairman Mao mentioned U.S. President Nixon in his conversation with Snow. Nixon is not satisfied with the Warsaw talks (U.S.-China ambassadorial level talks) alone, and he is saying that he wishes to visit China himself. Nixon has two daughters, and it is said that they want to visit China on their honeymoon. Also, Mrs. Nixon is expressing the wish to visit China. Mrs. Nixon recently attended a gathering of women, on two occasions. She discussed the question of sending a women's delegation to China on that occasion. She even said that "when you send a women's delegation to China, please do not forget me." If that is the situation, then the entire Nixon family will be visiting China.

Chairman Mao says that apart from when and in what form Nixon will visit China, his visit is welcome. It is said that President Nixon has two aspirations. One is to be re-elected. The U.S. Presidential election will be held in November of next year. If he is elected, his term of office will last until 1976.

July 1976 will be the 200th anniversary of the founding of the United States. President Nixon is said to be desiring to have the honor of being the President to celebrate its 200th anniversary.

Nixon's other wish is said to be that he wants to become a President whose name will be recorded in the history of the U.S. by creating opportunities for having dialogues with the world of communist nations.

If he were to visit China, with the hope of becoming a President whose name will be recorded in U.S. history, it will mean that he will come to have talks on important questions. It will not be just to drink a few cups of mao-tai wine in Peking. In that case, the Taiwan question will be the important question. Whether Nixon comes himself, or whether a special envoy comes, there is no difference in the importance of the Taiwan question. However, whether such talks will be successful or not is unknown. If Nixon wants to have his name recorded in history, he will have to make a big decision. We are watching.

Going back to the question of the Japanese Government, the best thing for the Government is to recognize the Komel Party's five principles. Of course, it is too much to expect the Sato Cabinet to ask Nixon to change his policy of occupying Taiwan. However, in the final analysis, you cannot go against the tide of the people's sentiments, and I think the Sato Cabinet will come to a time where it will have to make a big decision. The Sato Cabinet will have to withdraw its ambitions toward Taiwan. At least, it must refrain from putting forward obstructions when the time comes for the U.S. and China to have talks on the Taiwan question. It is said that the business circles' investments in Taiwan amount to as much as 90 million dollars. They should withdraw their hands in this field (investments), too. As for the people of Japan, I think an absolute majority will support the Komel Party's five principles.

It is apparent from this that days before Kissinger's visit to Red China the arrangements had been made to invite President Nixon. It is also apparent that the Chinese Communists expect Taiwan in payment for allowing a United States-Red Chinese rapprochement.

This cynical assessment of President Nixon gives us cause for alarm. If it is generally shared by the Red leaders in Peking, it means that they look upon our President as a man who would sell other people's liberty for the opportunity to be reelected in 1972. No reasonable American could accept this cynical evaluation of President Nixon, but the Red Chinese may be remembering the lessons of the Owen Lattimore, John Peyton Davies, John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent years when the United States failed to preserve freedom in Asia.

The free Chinese on Taiwan have spoken out against the proposed Nixon visit. They know that if America abandons our friends in Asia they will quickly fall victim to Communist aggression.

Kissinger's visit to China was July 9 to 11. On July 4, the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese signed a new agreement on additional military aid from Red China to the North Vietnamese aggressor forces fighting in South Vietnam. Chou En-lai, who cordially received Presidential envoy Kissinger, also cordially received the North Vietnamese Gen. Tran San on July 4. Chou praised the military feats of the North Vietnamese army and reaffirmed Red Chinese

military and political support for the North Vietnamese.

While Kissinger was in Red China on July 10, a North Korean Communist delegation arrived. They were greeted at the airport by an organized group of Chinese Communists who chanted in unison:

U.S. imperialism get out of South Korea!  
Get out of Taiwan! Get out of Indo-China!  
Get out of Asia! The Korean people are sure to triumph in their cause of unification of the fatherland! The Chinese people are determined to liberate Taiwan!

The Korean Communist delegation then attended a banquet with Chou En-lai.

On the same date a letter was sent to Kim Il-Song, the North Korean Communist dictator. It was signed by Mao Tse-tung, Lin Piao, the Red Chinese army leader, and Chou En-lai. The letter said in part:

If the U.S. and Japanese reactionaries dare to impose a war of aggression on the Chinese and Korean people, the Chinese people will, as in the past, resolutely unite with the Korean people, fight shoulder to shoulder with them, and thoroughly defeat the aggressor.

The danger in Korea, of course, is not that anyone will attack North Korea but that North Korea will repeat its 1950 invasion of South Korea. In his report to the November 1970, Korean Communist Congress, Kim Il-Sung boasted that the people of his country "have been placed under arms and the whole country fortified."

A background article on North Korea prepared by the Communist Journalist Wilfred Burchett for *Prensa Latina*, the Castro Cuban press service, revealed that the North Koreans are ready to renew their aggression. Burchett quoted Deputy Prime Minister Pak Chung Sul as saying:

In reality we are in a pre-war situation and we don't know at what moment war may break out.

Burchett concluded from his conversations with the North Korean leadership that the war could take place this year. The North Koreans revealed to their fellow Communist, Burchett, that they expected only to fight South Korean forces on the ground, that the United States would supply only air and naval support to the South Koreans, but would not intervene with ground forces. The North Koreans said that they drew this conclusion from the American operations in support of the South Vietnamese in Laos.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated here what anyone who is knowledgeable on communism knows—the very man that Henry Kissinger met to secure the invitation for President Nixon, Chou En-lai, was directly involved in the supplying of additional arms to the North Vietnamese aggressors in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The same man promised military support to the North Korean Communists should they renew their aggression against South Korea. The same Chou En-lai has a background fitting the leader of the bloodbath that exterminated 20 million of his countrymen, a murderer as shown by such a periodical as *Life* magazine in 1954.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that President

Nixon's planned trip to Red China can serve no useful purpose for the people of the United States or the free people of Asia. It will only serve to encourage the aggressive intentions of the Red Chinese and their client regimes in North Vietnam and North Korea. Like the U.S. diplomats of Russia in the early 1930's, it will give the Red Chinese Communists a respectability that on the record, they do not deserve. The record is clear for anyone who will study it.

#### TWO NEW ALASKA PIPELINE DOCUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ASPIN is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two new Interior Department documents on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline which cast very grave doubt on whether the Interior Department is making an honest attempt to evaluate the environmental effects of the Alaska pipeline. These two documents were the subject of a recent article by Jack Anderson.

As you know, the Interior Department released its draft environmental impact statement on the proposed 800-mile Alaska pipeline in January. Environmental impact statements on projects involving the Federal Government are required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Public hearings were held in Washington and Alaska on the draft impact statement in February. It became quite clear from those hearings that the draft impact statement was deficient in many respects. Since then I have released four secret reports—one from an Interior Department official critical of the pipeline; one from the Alaska Corps of Engineers also critical of the pipeline; one from the Alaska State Housing Authority which concluded that the Alaska pipeline could hurt the economy of Alaska more than it would help; and a report from the Alaska Department of Economic Development that a Canadian pipeline would benefit the economy of Alaska more than would the Alaska pipeline.

The Interior Department is expected to issue the final impact statement on the Alaska pipeline within the next month or two. Every indication is that the Interior Department will approve the permits for the building of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Many groups and individuals, including almost every major conservation group in the country, have argued that the Interior Department should not grant permits for the Alaska line because of unacceptable environmental risks. Many of us have argued that a Canadian pipeline route would be far preferable because, unlike the Alaska route, it would not go through large earthquake zones or require the use of tankers to transport the oil. Oil from the trans-Alaska pipeline would be shipped by tanker to west coast ports. Oil from a Canadian pipeline route would be transported totally overland to a Midwest destination.

Today I am placing in the RECORD a report and a memo written by the Alaska

Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which is part of the Interior Department. The B.S.F. & W. report was written in October 1970 before the Interior Department's draft environmental impact statement on the Alaska pipeline was published. The report was written for the purpose of being included in the draft impact statement. And much of it was. But there were some very important and significant sections, paragraphs and sentences in the Alaska B.S.F. & W. report which were omitted from the Interior Department impact statement—including its conclusion that the proposed Alaska route would cause far more environmental damage than the draft statement later admitted.

The Alaska B.S.F. & W. memo, written after the Interior Department draft statement was published in January, maintained that the draft statement omitted many of the ecological concerns discussed in the October B.S.F. & W. report. "As the statement now stands, it is difficult, if not impossible to defend," Gordon Watson, Alaska Director of the B.S.F. & W. wrote in his memo to Kenneth Roberts, who heads the B.S.F. & W. in Washington.

The Alaska B.S.F. & W. report, written for the draft impact statement, concluded that "from an environmental standpoint, the Alaska-Canadian pipeline would be by far the preferred route." That very important statement did not appear in the draft impact statement.

These two documents are particularly disturbing because they demonstrate in a most graphic fashion, beyond any doubt, that the Interior Department deleted or substantially altered many observations and statements contained in the original Alaska B.S.F. & W. report, not because they were not relevant or important enough or were inaccurate, but because they discussed many of the expected environmental effects of the trans-Alaska pipeline in a much too direct and candid fashion.

Below are just a few excerpts of the October Alaska B.S.F. & W. report, which were not included in the draft impact statement:

The Alaska-Canada pipeline would not require marine transportation with its danger of massive catastrophic oil spills and certainty of persistent and chronic pollution and would remove the threat of extensive loss to the rich fish and wildlife resources of Prince William Sound and the tank ship route to West Coast ports. From an environmental standpoint, the Alaska-Canadian pipeline would be by far the preferred route.

The pipeline project has far greater potential for long term irreversible environmental impact in areas not covered by Interior stipulations than in areas that are.

Irreversible losses can be prevented only by keeping oil out of the water altogether. . . . With the tremendous amounts of oil to be handled in Alaska, tank ship operations under present standards is a commitment of fish and wildlife resources to an inevitable downward trend.

Oil pollution from the pipeline itself would have a tremendous impact on major segments of fish and wildlife resources of tremendous Alaskan significance. Marine pollution from terminals or vessels could be so severe as to have overwhelming, irreversible impact on birds, marine mammals, and fish resources of national and international significance.

The permittee (Aleyeska, the pipeline company) has already demonstrated his willingness to circumvent the stipulations whenever it is advantageous to do so. The same attitude no doubt applies to the transportation of oil.

Mr. Speaker, the question of when and how we should use the huge amount of oil discovered in the North Slope of Alaska is an extremely important one not only for Alaskans but for Americans, and Canadians as well. How we use and transport this oil has significant national implications both ecologically and economically. All indications so far, however, are that the Interior Department will not discuss in its final impact statement the possibility of a Canadian pipeline from the North Slope to some Midwestern point as an alternative to the proposed Alaska pipeline. Incredibly, this seems to be the case even though various Interior officials, Government agencies, almost all conservationists, and many economists have urged the possible Canadian pipeline routes be fully studied before any permits are issued for the Alaska pipeline. What these two Alaska B.S.F. & W. documents demonstrate is that the ecological effects of the Alaska pipeline will be far greater than either the Interior Department or the oil companies have admitted. I urge my colleagues to carefully read these important documents, which follow:

OCTOBER 26, 1970.

To: Director, BFS&W, Washington, D.C.  
From: Area Director, BFS&W, Anchorage, Alaska.  
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement—Pipeline.

This is the rough draft of the fish and wildlife portion of this statement as it was submitted to the State Office of the Bureau of Land Management. A more polished draft will be sent after an interagency review of the whole statement next week.

An additional summary, not part of the draft, and rough drafts of the National Marine Fishery Service's contributions are also included.

GORDON W. WATSON.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Alaska's fish and wildlife resources are together a priceless and irreplaceable national heritage. The destiny of these resources is inextricably bound up in the retention of the quality of Alaska's lands and waters.

*The present and potential value of Alaska's water, land, and fish and wildlife resources, if used wisely, far exceeds that of Alaska's fossil fuels—as valuable as these are.* We must use judgment and balance the value of these renewable resources against that of the oil which, once extracted and used, is gone. If this fact is recognized and preventative measures are developed accordingly, the development of Alaska's oil reserves can be undertaken with a minimum of unnecessary damage to renewable resources.

#### IMPACT

##### 1. Fresh Water Fishery Resources

###### *The resources*

The fishery resources that could be affected by the proposed pipeline are of tremendous magnitude. More than 350 streams will be crossed, the majority of which support resident and/or anadromous fish populations. The species present and their abundance varies with the season, location, and type of stream. Of 103 streams along the route classified on the basis of productivity by the

Alaska Department of Fish and Game, \*39 were rated as having a productivity rating of I, 30 as II, 30 as III, and 4 as II or III depending upon species or time of year.

There are four drainage systems involved—the Sagavanirktok River, Yukon River, and the Copper River as well as the Lowe River and other streams flowing directly into Prince William Sound.

#### Sagavanirktok Drainage

The primary fish species of the Sagavanirktok Drainage are the grayling and Arctic char. Little is known of the life history or population dynamics of either species in these waters. Populations are high in certain areas and in these the angling is excellent. The char range up and down the Sagavanirktok and many congregate at the mouth of the river. Important spawning and rearing areas occur in the drainage. The primary value of the fishery is for sport as there is presently no commercial or subsistence fishing in the area.

The airplane has been the primary means of access to the area and the larger lakes have provided the base for most air operations. The lake trout in these lakes have already been fished heavily enough that fishing quality has deteriorated.

#### Yukon River Drainage

The Yukon River system with a drainage area of 330,000 acres, one-third of which are in Canada, dwarfs all other Alaskan drainages.

The tributaries flowing directly from the Brooks Range contain whitefish and grayling. Those farther to the south have less gradient and generally contain a greater variety of species.

The Tanana River is fairly typical containing whitefish, grayling, northern pike, burbot, inconnu, and chinook, coho and chum salmon. Streams farther to the south in the watershed are generally less suitable for fish. The Delta River though turbid still contains grayling, burbot, and whitefish. Its tributaries are often fed directly by glaciers, have a steep gradient, and contain few if any fish.

In the Fairbanks area many excellent streams are accessible to the angler. The Chena River alone is sport fished approximately 25,000 fisherman-days annually.

Commercial and subsistence fishing on the Yukon has yielded a catch of 392,000 to 620,000 salmon per year during the 1965-to-1969 period. Many more are caught before they enter the Yukon.

Chinook and chum salmon migrate to the headwaters of the Yukon drainage. Chinook have been found more than 2,000 miles upstream from the mouth; coho salmon spawn as far up as Fairbanks. Each of these salmon represent unique and irreplaceable races of their species. Sockeye and pink salmon, smelt and lampreys are important food fishes of the lower Yukon.

#### Copper River Drainage

The Copper River contains some of the most valuable fish producing waters crossed by the pipeline. Resident fish populations include grayling, whitefish, burbot, rainbow trout, lake trout and Dolly Varden; the anadromous fish species sockeye, chinook, and coho salmon and steelhead trout.

Gulkana River is the most important one in the Copper River Basin with good access, clear water, and great natural beauty. An 80-mile section of this stream is part of the Alaska Canoe Trail System.

The Gulkana is the spawning area for approximately 100,000 sockeye and 15,000 chinook salmon. It supports an excellent sport fishery for these salmon and rainbow trout. Paxson and Summit Lakes receive

\* Rating of I indicates low productivity, II indicates fair to moderate productivity, and III indicates good to excellent productivity.

considerable pressure from anglers after grayling and lake trout.

The other tributaries of the Copper River such as the Tazilina, Klutina, and Tonsina support runs of sockeye, chinook, and coho salmon and steelhead trout. Resident fish species are grayling, Dolly Varden, burbot, and lake trout. The Little Tonsina River, an important recreational stream, supports a resident population of Dolly Varden and grayling and a run of chinook and coho salmon.

Sport-fisherman usage is very high in the Copper River system due to its quality and accessibility. The commercial and subsistence fishery consisted of 694,000 to 1,151,000 salmon each year in the 1965-to-1969 period. The commercial clam fishery in the tidal flats of the mouth of the Copper River has declined in recent years due to a toxicity problem, but the harvest was 26,887 pounds in 1969.

#### Lowe River and Other Streams Flowing Directly into Prince William Sound

The Lowe River system has a resident population of Dolly Varden and is important as a producing area for sockeye, pink and chum salmon.

Other streams flowing into Prince William Sound are primarily important as producing areas for pink and chum salmon. These are typically small streams and several are precipitous, which limits upstream movements of fish. The spawning areas are primarily in the lower reaches of these streams or in the gravels in the intertidal zone.

#### *The impact*

The impact of the proposed oil pipeline and road will depend on a number of factors, some of which are unresolved at this time. Unresolved are plans for land development, which would affect homesteading or squatting and the possible posting of lands and waters along the route. Some of the detrimental effects will be of short duration and will cause no permanent damage if proper construction practices and the stipulations are carefully followed. Others will probably happen unless considerable additional studies, foresight and implementation is carried out. Still other effects are unavoidable regardless of precautions taken and will be permanent. Part of these will affect the aesthetic values more than the fishery itself, part will not be noticeable to the casual observer but will have a tremendous impact on the fishery. The gross amount of the construction and operation of the proposed oil pipeline and road will cause four major changes to the fishery resources or their environment.

#### Physical Changes

Erosion and siltation will cause the most widespread physical damage to the aquatic habitat caused by the construction of the pipeline and road. Bank cuts, regardless of slope or protection given, will require a period of time for stabilization. Cuts through permafrost will result in some thawing and bank sluffing. The removal of protective vegetation and cover to build temporary roads is already degrading portions of some watersheds and has in one case progressed to the point of changing natural drainage patterns. No stream or lake that is crossed can avoid at least a temporary increase in silt load and turbidity. Some of the streams carry naturally heavy silt loads periodically but the gradient is sufficient to maintain clean, silt free gravel beds. If the increases in the silt load are not excessive it is probable that no serious damages will result. However, lakes and those streams with a lower gradient and less flushing action, which are generally the best grayling waters, are extremely vulnerable to siltation and serious damages could result to spawning areas, benthos and plankton production would be lowered, and any eggs or larvae in the gravel could be killed.

Gravel removal from stream beds, or any other operation that changes the gradient, channel location, or velocity of the current can have far more than just local effects. Any of these changes will reduce stream bed stability and accelerate erosion and are detrimental to the fish populations.

Temporary or permanent barriers to fish movement could be created unless special precautions are taken. Since all of the major fish species involved perform migrations of some type, any type of barrier is undesirable. Permanent barriers would be created by improper culvert installations or stream crossings where the stipulations are not followed. This type should be eliminated by proper surveillance and enforcement. The majority of the barriers created will exist only for short periods during the construction phase in individual streams. These will not result in serious damages to the fishery unless a migration is in progress. Coordinating construction in key areas with time of fish movement should minimize damages caused by this type of barrier. Another type of barrier that could be formed are chemical ones caused by oil or other pollutants. It is anticipated that this type would occur in case of a massive spill and possibly in the immediate area of a lower level of chronic pollution.

The heated pipeline could cause serious thermal problems. Thawing of the permafrost and thermal erosion are the most dramatic and could have the greatest overall effect, but warming of surface and subsurface waters exposed to the pipe will also occur. All major fish species involved are relatively intolerant of high water temperatures and any significant increase could have serious effects in local areas.

#### Oil and Domestic Pollution

Once the proposed pipeline is in operation, the greatest direct threat to the fishery resources is the possibility of a massive oil spill. The degree of possible damages to the fishery resources would depend on the amount spilled, location and time of year, but there is no location along the route of the proposed pipeline or time of year that a massive oil spill would not be detrimental. Effects could range from slight to the complete elimination of the fish population and the destruction of many of the spawning areas in a watershed. There are several good streams that would be particularly vulnerable to a catastrophe of this kind. Included is the Gulkana River and its annual run of 100,000 sockeye salmon, and its most valuable tributary, Fish Creek, which accommodated over 20,000 sockeye salmon that spawned in Fish Lakes in 1969. There are four major ways to protect the valuable resources such as the Gulkana River: (1) not developing the oil field; (2) rerouting to less valuable areas; (3) reducing the probability of a spill by building in every conceivable precaution and then over designing on these; or (4) using alternative means to transfer the oil (some of which could be more detrimental to the fishery resources than the pipeline).

The large number of construction workers, maintenance personnel and a general increase in the number of people will require some type of sewage and waste treatment. If inadequate, domestic pollution and unsightly garbage dumps will result; if adequate, eutrophication will result. Experience elsewhere has demonstrated that low levels of enrichment will increase production (although not always in the form of desirable sport or commercial fishes), but too much can be very undesirable by increasing plant growth excessively and BOD. The amount of nutrients that can be tolerated without degrading the aquatic habitat in the arctic area is unknown at present.

2. The Habitat—Alaska's lands are vast. The area of the land actually used for the

construction of the pipeline and its appurtenant facilities will be infinitely small by physical comparison. The chains of events set in motion by the construction of the pipeline are, however, vastly out of proportion to the physical size of the project.

Alaska's annual water crop constitutes a third of the nation's output. If this were stated in terms of water of acceptable quality, the proportion would be vastly greater. Of the 800 million acre feet in Alaska's annual output of water (150 million coming from Canada), some portion of 215 million acre feet are in danger of degradation resulting from accidents along the trans-Alaska pipeline. The future of a large portion of Alaska's fishery resources is bound up with the future quality of this water.

The three main river systems affected by the pipeline are the Sagavanirktok drainage, the Yukon basin, and the Copper River basin. Each of these systems has a personality of its own and needs to be given individual attention.

Also affected will be the Beaufort Sea, Lowe River, and Prince William Sound and the numerous salmon producing streams which drain into it.

The pipeline route from Prudhoe Bay to the south foothills of the Brooks Range runs through a zone of perennially frozen ground. In most of this area, with the exception of the beds of larger streams and lakes, the ground never thaws for more than a few inches. This ground is insulated by a relatively thin and easily damaged layer of tundra vegetation. Low shrubs dot the tundra of the coast; and, as the elevations increase, willows and alders appear along the stream courses. Along the larger streams, balsam poplar appear.

The Brooks Range is characterized by rugged topography and much bare rock. The permafrost is often of the dry type and less vulnerable than the wet permafrost of the lowland tundra.

From the southern foothills of the Brooks Range to Prince William Sound, except for the larger river valleys and the mountain passes in the Alaska Range and the Chugach Mountains, the terrain is rolling and vegetated by the spruce-birch interior forest. Along the river valleys the interior forest takes on a more diversified aspect, with more deciduous species included. The mountain passes are similar in aspect to those of the Brooks Range. Areas of discontinuous and sporadic permafrost continue through much of the route and influence the vegetation locally.

The open tundra and the sparser spruce forests are the home of Alaska's great caribou herds. The high mountain passes support the magnificent Dall sheep and, in the south, the mountain goat. The Alaska moose is distributed throughout most of Alaska along the route. He varies from very scarce to abundant, depending on the composition of the vegetation. Bear, wolverine, and many smaller animals have a fairly cosmopolitan distribution along the route as well.

There will be a large amount of damage to the vegetation from the construction of the pipeline, but it is probable that the total damage to the habitat through improved access will be far greater.

Vegetation will be removed with the spoil to clear working areas for the construction of camps, river fords, pipeline, materials sites, the haul road, and the access road. This is damage which can be controlled and mitigated.

The disturbance of ice lenses will result in their degradation. Vegetation on top of these degraded areas will be lost in the resulting slumps and again by the inundation of vegetation downslope from these slumps.

The potential of wildfire occurring in areas along the route of the pipeline is greatly enhanced because of the activity and in-

creased numbers of the people using the adjacent areas. Fire is one of the facets of ecological impact which has positive as well as negative aspects. Wildfire in timber areas will alter the succession and actually benefit moose, while it will alter the species composition of tundra vegetation in less desirable ways.

Construction activity within the active flood plain of streams with braided channels will probably accelerate the changes within these flood plains. Instead of a fairly static base of active movement, the increased hydraulic activity may involve stabilized bars and their vegetation.

The species composition of tundra vegetation is easily altered by changing the texture of the soil. This can be seen along habitually used fox trails. Cross-country travel by all-terrain vehicles will compact the soil and alter the species composition. In many instances, repeated transit will destroy the vegetation by liquifying the soil underneath. The subsequent thaw of permafrost will expand the damage scars.

Channeling caribou migrations will very probably result in trampling and destruction of vegetation in the same way that excessive vehicle traffic will.

3. Big Game—Eleven big game species are found along the proposed route of the pipeline. They provide partial subsistence for native peoples and are extremely valuable for the recreation and meat they provide to sportsmen, and lovers of nature.

If the environmental stipulations are applied adverse effects from the construction should be minimal. There will be unavoidable losses of habitat. Better access will result in increased harvest. Without better regulations and stricter enforcement this increased harvest can be disastrous to some species such as wolves, wolverine, grizzly and polar bear.

The four bear species are attracted to supplies of human food and poorly handled wastes. Where adequate precautions are not taken or where well-intentioned people feed bears, human-bear confrontations cannot be avoided. Polar bear will also be vulnerable to marine oil pollution.

Moose, caribou, and bison will be subjected to the hazard of open ditches during construction of the pipeline. This problem can be avoided if the pipe is laid quickly after the ditch is opened and the excavation backfilled immediately.

Caribou migrations may be disrupted by construction activities and the presence of a hot pipe. Local movements of bison, caribou and moose will be affected. The channelizing of these movements may cause alteration of the plant species and considerable erosion in local areas.

Disturbance due to construction and maintenance activities will cause most animals to move out of the immediate area of the pipeline thus placing additional pressure on their remaining range. Caribou have traditional calving areas which may be the focal point of the range of each herd. Disturbance near these areas may affect the use of their entire range. Human activities may be very disturbing to Dall sheep, especially during the lambing period in areas such as Atigun Canyon. Construction in these critical areas must be properly timed.

Without proper precautions the presence of a hot pipe in certain areas may result in the entrapment of moose, bison or caribou in quagmires of melting permafrost.

4. Small Game and Furbearers—Small game mammal, upland game bird, and furbearer populations are relatively resilient and as a general rule they will adjust to the impact despite an increased harvest. Directly adjacent to the pipeline their numbers will decrease in direct proportion to the habitat lost.

Red fox and arctic fox will be affected by

man's presence. Direct conflicts with man will develop around field camps where waste disposal is inadequate or where animals are fed by the uninformed. Concentrations of these animals brought together in this way will be destroyed during rabies scares.

The biggest single disruptive factor affecting the fox is the pre-emption and destruction of their denning areas. The vegetative cover is being removed from the sand dunes where the fox build their dens and these are rapidly eroding away.

The present and potential value of the animals and birds in this broad group is great.

5. Migratory Birds—Alaska's avifauna is rich, including some 321 species attracted from a third of the earth's surface, and numbered in the millions. In the upper latitudes waterbirds are far more numerous than the land forms. The water areas of the Arctic are numerous and support a large breeding population of many species of waterfowl, shorebirds, and other waterbirds. The cold marine waters produce, in season, a greater biomass of plankton quart per quart than do warmer seas thus attracting and supporting a greater quantity of bird life. The Gulf of Alaska and the southern edge of the Beauford Sea are areas where large numbers of waterbirds, marine mammals and fish concentrate. Many of these species have a high commercial, sport or subsistence value. All have intrinsic values in their unique gene pools that would be impossible to replace and could well be beneficial to future generations of mankind. The tragedy of the loss of the dodos and passenger pigeons and the rehabilitation of the buffalo and sea otter are cases in point.

The area of major concern for birds is the inevitable spillage of oil. Uncontained oil and birds are not, and never will be, compatible. Oil floating on water almost invariably dooms any birds that come in contact with it and man's efforts to help have always failed. Oil has toxic inclusions which, though not apparent, continue to kill even when visual fractions are not visible.

We do not yet have adequate information on the relationship of birds to oil polluted waters, nor can the individual vulnerability of each of the 321 separate species be predicted.

Numerous instances have been cited of heavy mortality of sea birds resulting from oil spills. Many North American populations are declining, probably as a result of repeated spills. The history of oil transportation is replete with examples of disasters resulting in massive oil spills. It is realized that improvement in equipment and procedures are being made and will continue with a resultant cut in accident rates.

As many as 40 percent of the continent's swans and a like percent of the game ducks that winter in California pass through Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska during migration and could also be eligible for extermination in Alaskan waters.

Numerous other possibilities could be cited but all are speculative until a break or spill occurs and we can answer the questions—where, when, and how much.

6. Raptors—Eagles, hawks, falcons, and owls are important in the avifauna along the proposed pipeline route. Bald eagles, rough-legged hawks and peregrines nest in the cliffs along stream courses—the eagles in areas with a good supply of fish and the peregrines with a good supply of birds. Peregrines and rough-legs will be most vulnerable during the initial construction period where blasting and helicopter use are common in their nesting areas. Bald eagles are common in Prince William Sound and they concentrate along the Lowe River during salmon runs and it is then that they will be most vulnerable.

Gyrfalcons and golden eagles nest in the high mountain passes and their actual con-

tact with the pipeline will be limited. The biggest impact on the gyrfalcons will be as it will be with the peregrines from the improved access to their breeding areas. Egg collectors and falconers are a far greater threat than construction activities.

The hawks, accipters, and owls which nest in the interior forest will be affected only to the extent that their habitat and food is disturbed. In most cases they will simply move back from the construction areas.

7. Human Use—In the minds of many people, a most distressing aspect of the impact of the pipeline on northern Alaska is the loss of wilderness quality. This quality has been under great stress since the use of the aircraft became commonplace. The improved access by all terrain vehicles and snowmobiles which will accompany the construction of the pipeline will assure its complete loss from all but the most remote areas of the Brooks Range since the route will cut in half the largest remaining semi-wilderness in the United States.

One man's loss is another's gain in this instance because there are people who welcome the opening of the Arctic. It means greater utilization of caribou from the two large Arctic herds for example. There will be increased revenues resulting from increased use of the area for recreation.

Long established patterns of use will be disrupted and new ones will be developed.

In addition to the recreationist who comes to enjoy the area there will be "pioneers" who come to hold segments of this land for themselves. These squatters will attempt to inhibit the use of "their" area by other people. Miners and prospectors will increase in number also.

The larger lakes have always been, and will continue to be, foci for access to the north. Further eutrophication of these lakes is inevitable. Debris and litter will collect in these areas of heavy use unless strong "take it with you" regulations are developed and enforced.

Cross-country travel will tend to concentrate in certain areas and open sores of disrupted vegetation and degraded permafrost will result. Oil drums, abandoned equipment, and trash already painfully evident will accumulate at an accelerated rate.

Game species such as bear, moose, wolf, and wolverine are extremely vulnerable to hunting in the open country of the Arctic. Easier access will affect the Dall sheep and caribou as well. Harassment of these game animals by aircraft is already commonplace. Only the caribou is sufficiently numerous to resist this impact for any length of time. The immediate implementation of better regulations and increased law enforcement are absolutely essential.

#### UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS

If the environmental and technical stipulations are followed meticulously, few major unavoidable adverse effects need result from the construction of the pipeline and its appurtenant facilities. However, along the segment of road already constructed a number of things have occurred which the environmental stipulations were designed to eliminate. This construction has been on state selected land and it points out the Achilles heel in the safeguards. The permittee has already demonstrated his willingness to circumvent the stipulations wherever it is advantageous to do so.

The same attitude no doubt applies to the transportation of oil.

Any relaxation of attention to safeguards will result in the spillage of oil. As has been pointed out above the history of the transport of oil has been a history of disastrous oil spillage.

The foreseeable results of carelessness have been detailed above in relation to fish and birds.

Even if a massive spill never occurs, a certain level of oil pollution is inevitable.

Sources include the careless draining of oil from equipment, procedures at the oil wells themselves, and the ballast treatment facilities at the Valdez terminal. It is estimated that 50 barrels of oil per day will be released into Prince William Sound after ballast treatment when the line is operating at its anticipated full capacity. This amount of chronic pollution will have a number of detrimental effects on all aquatic organisms in Valdez Arm and perhaps to the entire Prince William Sound. Of direct concern to the fish will be the effect on food organisms, intertidal spawning areas and an oily taste imparted to the fishes in the area that would lower their food value.

Tundra vegetation will be destroyed by vehicular traffic. The removal of this insulation will result in permafrost degradation.

The destruction of Atigun Canyon bottom will result from pipeline construction through it. This will destroy to a large extent its usefulness as a Dall sheep lambing area.

Construction of the road and pipeline will cause most birds and animals to move out of the immediate area. The altered terrain and presence of pumping stations and the pipe itself will keep some from returning. This reaction will cause a loss of utilization of habitat near the route and greater pressure on the remaining range. Species near their carrying capacity may actually decline in number.

#### ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives to the pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez have been proposed:

1. Humble Oil developed an experimental icebreaking tanker, the "Manhattan", which run tests on the feasibility of surface transport of oil from Herschel Island across the Canadian Arctic to east coast ports.

2. An alternate pipeline route running east to Canada and southeastward to Central U.S. and Canadian markets.

3. Rail transportation along the Alyeska pipeline route, or elsewhere.

4. Submarine transportation under the ice. Surface marine transportation of oil has a history of pollution, even in temperate seas. Although the "Manhattan" tests were considered successful by some, the vessel encountered severe ice problems and sustained hull damage. Although the behavior of oil spilled on Arctic seas is unknown, it is believed that it would drift in and under the ice for extended periods.

A major spill along the "Manhattan's" route would decimate major populations of sea ducks which provide subsistence to natives at Barrow and along the coasts of western Alaska and the Canadian Arctic, as well as the north Atlantic coast. Large numbers of brant, Canada geese, blue and snow geese, pintails, whistling swan and other waterfowl would be subject to heavy mortality as would countless other water birds. Seals, whales, and polar bears would also be disastrously affected. The distribution of such fishes as char and whitefish in Alaska and Canada and the Atlantic salmon in Canada is poorly known as is the effect of oil on them. A large spill, however, would decimate populations of these species which have actual or potential subsistence, sports, and commercial value.

With the anticipated slow breakdown of oil in Arctic seas, even the relatively small spills commonly associated with tankship operation would have catastrophic cumulative effects. By the time their effects became known, they would probably be irreversible.

Shipment of oil across the Arctic would cause extensive damage by routine spills. The strong possibility of major disasters spread across the Arctic coast of Alaska and Canada and into the north Atlantic make the environmental impact far greater than that of the Alyeska Pipeline. The strong possibility that some species of North American birds may be eliminated and others severely

reduced along with important fish and mammal populations make this alternative most undesirable from an environmental standpoint.

The second alternative that has been proposed would be a pipeline route, to lead eastward to the Mackenzie River and thence to Central U.S. markets. Assuming equal controls, and neglecting problems of international agreement, this line would have essentially the same environmental impact as the overland portion of the Alyeska pipeline proposal.

An important difference lies in its effect on the Arctic National Wildlife Range. One version of this proposal would cut across the northern lowland portion of the Range, using the rationale that this is not a scenic area. This, however, does not consider the major objective of the Range which is to preserve intact a representative example of Arctic Alaska. The lowland portion is no less essential to this objective and to the ecologic integrity of the Range than the more scenic mountain areas. Construction and operation of a major pipeline would be entirely incompatible with the objectives for which the Range was established.

Another version of this proposal would lead the line eastward towards Canada skirting south of the Wildlife Range and would avoid this major conflict.

The Alaska-Canada pipeline would not require marine transportation with its danger of massive catastrophic oil spills and certainty of persistent and chronic pollution and would remove the threat of extensive loss to the rich fish and wildlife resources of Prince William Sound and the tankship route to west coast ports. From an environmental standpoint the Alaska-Canadian pipeline would be by far the preferred route.

Yet another version of this proposal involves an offshore pipeline from Prudhoe Bay east to a point where it would continue south through Canada. Not enough is known at this time to evaluate possible hazards of such an offshore buried pipeline.

The third alternative proposal of rail transportation along the route of the Alyeska pipeline would, if economically feasible, require a constantly moving line of rail cars to match the capacity of the 48-inch pipe. Although this method might reduce the number of catastrophic spills, it would appear certain to have repeated major and minor accidents and incidents which would be cumulatively more damaging than spills from a well constructed pipeline.

If rail crossings were elevated, the impact on streams would be less. The need for gravel would, however, probably be greater and would probably deplete streams. The train could be periodically interrupted to provide big game crossings.

Scenic impact would certainly be greater than even an elevated pipeline.

A properly constructed pipeline would certainly be preferable to rail transportation from an environmental standpoint.

A fourth proposal would be submarine transport. This could conceivably reduce some of the ice and collision problems encountered by ice breaking tankers, but would almost certainly be beset by others. Because General Dynamics feasibility studies of undersea oil transport are unavailable, no evaluable can be made. The comments regarding the "Manhattan" proposal could, however, probably be applied to submarines.

#### RELATIONSHIPS OF SHORT-TERM USE TO LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The critical relationship to be considered is the relatively short-term production and use of Prudhoe Bay oil to the long-term values of the environment.

Historically, production and transportation of oil have been generally incompatible with maintenance of the environment in its optimum condition. Recent experience in Cook Inlet, where oil operations are only loosely

regulated, has demonstrated the validity of this statement. Operations on the Kenai National Moose Range, however, are more stringently regulated and indicate that there is hope that at least some degree of compatibility can be achieved.

Three levels of decision-making will determine the impact of the Trans Alaska Pipeline on the environment. The first—that the oil will be produced and transported to market, has already been made. The second—that this will be done with minimum impact on the environment, has been made also. The third—the extent to which equipment, procedures, land use laws, regulations and enforcement procedures will be modified to meet the present challenge, has yet to be made.

The pipeline project has far greater potential for long-term irreversible environmental impact in areas not covered by Interior's stipulations than in areas that are. For instance, Government's involvement with the technology, engineering and performance standards for pipeline construction can be only partial under present laws and regulations.

Industry still makes many of the design decisions. The greatest stakes of all are held by those who plan to load and transport oil on salt water. Except at the Valdez terminal itself, no special regulations, procedures, or equipment are anticipated that would provide extra safeguards for the massive amounts of oil that are to be moved. This movement provides the greatest threat to the environment in the area where the most important fish and wildlife resources and their habitat are at stake. For example, decisions made by Government must consider such far reaching problems as:

1. Decisions on methods of transportation—should the oil go aboard tankers, or should it be shipped to market entirely by pipeline?

2. If tankers are used, will they be completely redesigned to provide maximum pollution protection?

3. Will industry be required to meet criteria of training and equipment established to provide maximum protection?

4. Will land use laws be re-examined and necessary measures taken to make best use of lands "opened up" by the project—or will they be allowed to go the way of other unmanaged lands?

Until such decisions are made and implemented the relationship will not have been established that will provide adequate protection for the environment.

History has shown that persistent pollution can be expected at loading terminals. Illegal pumping of ballast will be a continuous problem and major catastrophic accidents will occur from time to time. The rate of occurrence of these incidents will depend on the volume of oil to be moved and on the care with which it is handled. The volume of oil to be moved from Alaska is such that if handled according to presently acceptable standards, fish and wildlife losses will be immense for a few years—until their numbers dwindle. When the animals are gone, of course, oil can be spilled all over without additional killing.

Irreversible losses can be prevented only by keeping oil out of the water altogether. The design of facilities, operating procedures, laws and regulations and enforcement procedures should all be directed at complete elimination of all oil pollution. Any decision to permit pumping of oily ballast in any form whatsoever in any place, any failure to achieve less than 100% cleanup is a decision to sacrifice fish and wildlife resources. With the tremendous amounts of oil to be handled in Alaska, tankship operation under present standards is a commitment of fish and wildlife resources to an inevitable downward trend. Marine shipment of oil has a potential for irreversible impact on fish and wildlife and their habitats far greater than any other

operations connected with the transportation of oil from Prudhoe Bay.

Complete elimination of oil pollution in marine habitats could be achieved only by drastic action including, but not limited to, the following: 1. Oil should, whenever possible, be transported in securely constructed pipelines. 2. Where tankships must be used, only double hulled vessels must be permitted in Alaskan waters—all ballast waters must be stored separately from cargo tanks. 3. Cargo tanks must be sealed so that they cannot be pumped at sea. 4. Navigation aids must be improved. 5. All tankships must be required to carry a specified minimum of navigational equipment and their crews to meet minimum standards of competence. 6. Loading areas must be separated from open water by oil impervious booms.

In terms of overall impact to resources in Alaska, the effects of construction and operation of the pipeline "per se" are minor. The impact of unplanned land use on lands affected by the pipeline north of the Yukon River is of major importance to human enjoyment and use of a major area of the United States. Oil pollution from the pipeline itself would have a tremendous impact on major segments of fish and wildlife resources of tremendous Alaskan significance. Marine pollution from terminals or vessels could be so severe as to have overwhelming irreversible impact on birds, marine mammals and fish resources of national and international significance. The impact may be felt not only in the immediate area of Valdez arm, Prince William Sound, or an arctic terminal in the Beaufort Sea but could be exerted throughout the sea lanes from the point of loading to the point of unloading and in the enormous areas used by species that migrate through the shipping lanes.

#### IRREVERSIBLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Oil is not a renewable resource. Once it has been extracted from the oil bearing strata of the Arctic it cannot be replaced there.

The loss of wilderness quality is a definite commitment of a resource which cannot be reclaimed.

The Arctic Ocean is slowly pushing back its low lying southern shore by degradation of the permafrost and erosion of the released soil materials. The fragile nature of the tundra surface near the sea insures that it is going to be damaged by increased traffic and use. Human initiated degradation close to the shore could accelerate the natural process. Even if it occurs in only minor increments there will be a definite irreversible loss.

The habitat losses through destruction of a major portion of the Atigun Canyon floor cannot be compensated for.

The aesthetic values will be lowered along the entire route in the immediate area of the proposed pipeline, in the oil fields, and at the terminal site. The natural setting is usually preferable to one altered by man's activity. Of particular concern to the fisherman from the aesthetic standpoint will be stream crossings, gravel or borrow pits, areas where the pipeline is in or adjacent to streams or lakes, erosion and siltation, and pollution. Special care must be taken to minimize change, restore the natural appearance, and to minimize, or preferably eliminate, oil pollution.

There are many subtle commitments of resources which will not be appreciated except from the vantage of hindsight.

FEBRUARY 5, 1971.

To: Director, BSF&W, Washington, D.C.  
Attn: Mr. Kenneth Roberts.  
From: Area Director, BSF&W, Anchorage, Alaska.  
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement—Trans Alaska Pipeline.

Our staff has reviewed the January draft of the Environmental Impact Statement on the pipeline and have compared it closely

with the draft of December 18. We have a number of comments to make. Specific comments in this memorandum relate to the January draft unless otherwise designated.

Page 116. This section discusses impacts on fish and wildlife resources. These impacts will not be limited to the vicinity of the pipeline right-of-way, as stated in the new draft. They could effect entire water sheds or entire ranges of such species as caribou and will have their greatest effects in marine areas. Reference made in the December draft to the relationship between fish and wildlife resources and wilderness also has been deleted from this section. The statement made by our Bureau in the December draft that stipulations would not alleviate all problems does not appear in the January draft and should be reinserted. The discussion in the December draft concerning the disturbance of wildlife on the Beaufort Sea has been deleted also. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife statement that widespread occurrence of local losses of oil over the North Slope fields would have cumulative impacts on fish and wildlife of the coastal waters of the Beaufort Sea has been deleted. There remains in the January draft no discussion of the attraction to garbage of bears and other animals and the adverse effects thereof. The effects of increased harvest of fish and wildlife, as well as effects of sewage pollution, are treated inadequately in the new draft. This entire section on impacts has been weakened unrealistically.

The section that treats effects of possible oil pollution on page 121 of the January draft has been reworded and differs significantly from the December draft. It no longer treats in detail the possibilities for major spills. For instance, we referred in the December draft to the fact that block valves were to be placed in unspecified intervals. This has been deleted. In actual fact these valves would not be operable from a remote source and would not have a significant function during period of severe weather conditions.

The top paragraph on page III-B7 of the December draft contains a reference to large populations of migratory waterfowl and other birds, as well as marine mammals, in the Beaufort Sea that would be vulnerable to oil spills. This has been replaced by a statement that some oil losses could occur on federal lands on the North Slope, but that it seems questionable that they would reach the Beaufort Sea. This might be a true statement if the state selects all oil-producing lands, but does not reflect the impacts of the project on fish and wildlife.

The third paragraph of page III-B7 of the December draft discussed the effects of oil pollution in Prince William Sound. Some of this has been deleted, but the item with which we are most concerned is the statement on page 146 of the January draft that effects will be minimized by the rigorous control measures to be required of the operator. We know of no such measures except that effluent from ballast treatment facilities may contain as much as 10 parts per million of oil. In actual fact, we don't believe that significant control measures would be required for tankers, which we believe will be the source of most of our pollution problems. We suggest that such measures should be required and should include as a minimum:

1. The requirement that tankers to be loaded at Valdez must meet certain minimum standards such as:
  - a. Construction that would not permit ballasting in cargo tanks (they possibly should be doubled hulled).
  - b. Competence requirements for officers and crews.
  - c. Navigational equipment which must be aboard in operable condition.
2. Special navigation equipment in Prince

William Sound, Valdez Arm, and Port Valdez that would minimize such navigational accidents as occurred recently in San Francisco Bay.

3. Requirements for tugs to assist with navigation in Valdez Arm and Port Valdez.

4. Requirements that tankers cease operations when conditions become adverse, such as during periods when winds exceed a certain velocity. At the present time (January and February 1971) tankships are being encouraged to operate in Cook Inlet in hazardous ice conditions in order to keep the oil (and the dollars) moving. We believe this movement demonstrates lack of regard for pollution problems.

5. Removal of obstacles that constitute a hazard to navigation.

Page 169 of the January draft contains a section on land use patterns similar to the discussion in the December draft, except that references in wilderness values that would be lost and to the reduction of esthetic values that would occur have been deleted. We are happy with the deletion of the last sentence of this paragraph from the December draft, however, which stated that wilderness in Alaska is not lacking.

Page 169 contains a statement on commitment of fish and wildlife resources that has been weakened by the claim that the commitment would occur only in the immediate vicinity of the pipeline—an untrue statement. The rewrite of the last paragraph of this section has become much too optimistic and we do not agree that the activity would have little impact.

Page 174 contains a discussion of irreversible and irretrievable commitments. The discussion in the December draft of the effects of a pipeline break has been eliminated, however, as have the last four lines of that page where long-term effects were discussed. The elimination of the first paragraph is a substantial change and we believe it should be reinserted. The last paragraph of III-E3 of the December draft that discussed the effects of stipulations has been eliminated also. Although this is not a serious loss, the entire section on irretrievable impacts has been weakened by the rewrite.

In summary, the January draft appears somewhat more smoothly written, but where fish and wildlife resources are concerned, we should much prefer to go back to the December draft, which, in itself, was much too weak, having been written under the unrealistic assumption that all applicable stipulations and regulations would be 100% effective. For the most part, the rewrite has obscured the perspective of the impact of the pipeline on fish and wildlife resources and the relative importance of the Beaufort Sea, the pipeline route and Prince William Sound. Numerous other comments have been made and appear on the enclosed pages of the January draft.

We are particularly concerned that the public, as well as members of other Federal and state agencies, hold the Bureau responsible for the material in this impact statement that relates to fish and wildlife. As the statement now stands, it is difficult, if not impossible to defend. We hope that every possible action will be taken to restore the balance of impacts on fish and wildlife that is completely lacking in the January draft.

GORDON D. WATSON.

#### THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XXII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that if the Department of Justice were to bring charges against Frank

Sharp for all his crimes, that gentleman would be facing trial and possible sentences in the hundreds of years. In fact, the Justice Department has brought a 44-count indictment against a small-time banker out in Waco, and that gentleman, if he is convicted might be assessed sentences totaling 145 years. By contrast, Sharp was allowed to confess guilt on two little charges that could have brought him a maximum of 10 years in jail—and the sentence of course was for a 3-year suspended sentence. Now there is a world of difference between the actions of the Justice Department on these two cases, though the crimes involved are remarkably similar. I am intrigued at the difference between the zeal displayed in one case and the astonishing inaction in the Sharp case, even though Sharp's empire managed to harm numerous banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, and other businesses, not to mention subvert and besmirch a good part of the whole government of Texas.

Of course one defendant, the one facing charges bearing 145 years in penalties, never had Will Wilson for a lawyer. Frank Sharp did. Now that Wilson has a high position the Government seems hugely disinterested in seeing that justice is done in the Sharp case, though the public has an immense stake in the matter. After all, people are not blind. They can see that the Justice Department is not doing its job in this matter. They have every right to believe that the Department of Justice is not too terribly interested in seeking out justice when that might embarrass its own high officials.

I have detailed how Wilson, acting for Sharp, arranged the purchase of the National Bankers Life Insurance Co.

Well, that was not the only insurance company that Wilson arranged for Sharp to buy.

In the spring of 1968 the Olympic Life Insurance Co., headquartered at Fort Worth, Tex., came into the control of W. D. Haden II. Mr. Haden bought 54 percent of the Olympic stock at a total consideration of \$2.6 million. Will Wilson handled the legal details for Haden.

W. D. Haden is Frank Sharp's son-in-law.

The money that Haden used to acquire Olympic Life came from the Sharpstown State Bank.

In truth, Olympic became through this deal just another satellite in the galaxy of Sharp companies.

Just as he was to do later on, Will Wilson handled the details for Sharp. In this case, as in so many others, Sharp was taking money from his bank to buy himself another toy. As he did in so many other cases, he looted the company and played games with its stocks.

Wilson played a key role in the acquisition of Olympic. Part of the deal involved placing Wilson's law partner, Joe Osborn, on the board of Olympic. When Osborn resigned a few months later, Wilson's other law partner, Joe Ridings, became a member of the board.

Although Wilson seems not to have been the general counsel of Olympic, as he was for Sharp's realty company, his bank, and his National Bankers Life Insurance Co., his junior law partner, Rid-

ings, was retained by the company for its legal representation. So the old pattern holds true: Sharp buys himself a company, using as money funds borrowed from his bank. Wilson sets up the deal, and Wilson's firm gets the handsome legal retainer plus a seat on the company board.

When one considers how close Will Wilson was to the wheeling and dealing of Frank Sharp, and the role that he played in those deals, it is reasonable enough to conclude that Wilson might today be embarrassed to have all this known. Maybe that accounts for the odd situation we find, wherein Wilson's prosecutors are all zeal and fire in one case, and in fact in any number of other bank cases, but strangely paralyzed in the Sharp case.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE AN EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HAGAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing crime problems across the Nation and the problems of recruiting law enforcement personnel, I am again introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exclusion from gross income for State and local law enforcement officers which I believe will be one way of helping in our recruitment efforts.

This measure calls for a total Federal tax exemption for all officers who earn at the rate of \$6,000 or less a year or \$200 per month exemption for those who earn more than \$6,000 per year. This bill would apply to full-time law enforcement officers in all States, the District of Columbia, and U.S. possessions.

Our law enforcement men work long, hard hours and often under very difficult circumstances. They are not among the well paid public servants and because of this we have an increasing number of vacancies in our country's police departments today. Recruiting for this increasingly dangerous work is not easy and I believe an incentive such as the one in my bill would be helpful in attracting qualified personnel.

There is no getting around the fact that we cannot hope to make even a dent in the rising crime rate until our law enforcement departments are well staffed and on the job. Realistic salary incentives can help find qualified men who can give full time to their work and not have the pressure of seeking second jobs to supplement their income. We are all aware of the need for law and order, it is time we stopped talking about it and do something about it.

#### THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement of the \$23.2 billion deficit today confirms the fears of those who worry about the direction of American economic policy. Up to the present time, the 1971 deficit has been one of the most highly guarded secrets of the administration.

The unreliability of Federal revenue estimates creates a serious handicap in Federal operations. The Congress and the American people must not be misled on this vital issue. In this age of computerization, it is incredible that this Nation should be operated on sheer prophecy.

At the time we considered the debt ceiling in the Ways and Means Committee, I raised the issue of the revenue shortfall and the likelihood of substantial refinancing of the Federal debt above the administration's request. At that time, it was indicated that adequate revenue would be available and that refinancing would not be necessary. If there is as much error in this fiscal year's estimate of the Federal accounts as there were in the estimates of 1971, there is a great probability that the debt ceiling must again be increased in this fiscal year.

The deficit is already incurred; the money has been spent. It is now incumbent upon the American people to determine the wisdom of those public expenditures and the resulting expansion of the public debt.

The President is in a dreadful dilemma in regard to the economy. In my opinion, the path and direction he has chosen to solve the dual problems of inflation and unemployment have been wrong. The declared policy of solving inflation through unemployment over the past 18 months has been a disaster. Unemployment snowballed, decreasing demand for consumer goods—creating severe additional unemployment. Reduced demand, created higher unit costs and fueled inflation.

At the same time, the President announced that Federal spending would proceed as though there was full employment. The \$23.8 billion deficit for fiscal year 1971 which resulted did not create jobs. The President established priorities of Federal spending which did not stimulate employment—or recovery.

The President froze expenditure of almost \$13 billion in job-creating public works projects, health, education, and pollution control. In addition, he vetoed congressional legislation to create jobs in vital sectors of the economy. It can only be concluded that the "freeze" and "vetoes" were designed to carry these job-creating funds into 1972—a political vintage year.

Instead of stimulating employment, the administration used its fiscal strength to "prop-up" badly managed companies with billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. With a single stroke of his pen and in defiance of Congress, the President granted corporations over \$3 billion in tax concessions to reward lethargy in business management. Instead of stimulating consumer demand by accelerated tax relief for the average taxpayer, the accelerated depreciation range

created new billions of cash flow for acquisitions and foreign investments.

As a result, billions of dollars of American capital are flowing overseas, drying up American enterprise. The Okinawa Transfer Treaty is a prime example. The conditions for transfer were apparently conditions on investment opportunities for American automobile manufacturers in Japanese automobile companies. This expanded opportunity for American capital investment. Exports of American capital abroad reduced American employment opportunities at home.

On the inflation front, the administration's priorities are not much wiser. Neither business nor labor have ever been convinced or concerned about the President's intention to hold the line. While I applaud his efforts in the steel industry, the power of the Presidency has not been brought to bear generally on the issue of wages and prices. Wage and price authority has already been granted by the Congress for the second time. A conscientious White House effort at jawboning would appear to be a necessary step—it is long overdue.

#### UNITED STATES-ISRAELI DESALINATION 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, 30 Members of Congress have now joined me in sponsoring legislation funding the construction of a prototype water desalination plant in Israel. I have previously introduced this legislation as H.R. 9666, H.R. 9963 and H.R. 9964.

The construction of such a plant is authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, Public Law 91-175. Section 104 of that act, which creates 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, no such agreement has been reached. Yet, the construction of the 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.

In economic and technological terms, the construction of this plant would also be most beneficial to the United States. This was made clear by then Assistant Secretary of Interior Max N. Edwards, who stated in a letter to the Congress on January 17, 1969:

While 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.

By virtue of legislative language, the United States would bear costs of no

more than \$20 million or 50 percent of total costs, whichever is less.

Israel's need for the prototype plant is obvious. By 1980, her fresh water supply will be almost completely developed. The 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.

An added factor which makes participation in this joint project particularly worthwhile is the opportunity to demonstrate to Israel's hostile neighbors the benefits which our foreign aid program—given a peaceful setting—could achieve.

The 30 Members who have joined me in introduction of legislation appropriating funds for the joint United States-Israeli desalting plant are Mrs. ABZUG, MESSRS. ADAMS, ANDERSON of Illinois, BADILLO, BELL, BRASCO, CLEVELAND, CORMAN, COLLINS of Illinois, DELLUMS, DRINAN, EILBERG, FRENZEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRASSO, MESSRS. HALPERN, HARRINGTON, HATHAWAY, KOCH, KYROS, LENT, MIKVA, PODELL, RANGEL, REES, ROSENTHAL, SARBANES, SCHEUER, VANIK, and WALDIE.

#### PCB'S AND POULTRY CONTAMINATION

(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, on Monday I brought to the attention of this body the fact that a significant proportion of poultry in a 12-State area have been contaminated with a potentially deadly chemical—polychlorinated biphenyl—PCB.

The results of that contamination are now becoming tragically apparent. A report in this afternoon's Washington Evening Star states that one of the Nation's largest chicken producers—Holly Farms of Wilkesboro, N.C.—has already had to destroy 77,000 chickens due to PCB contamination, and that millions of other chickens have been contaminated.

At this time there is no way of fully knowing the extent of this contamination nor the total number of poultry and hogs that have been subjected to it. But the potential danger is staggering.

The real tragedy of this occurrence, however, is that it was totally preventable. For the past 2 years I have been attempting to get the appropriate Federal agencies to take the necessary steps to protect the public from the hazards of PCB's. Yet, in an almost unprecedented display of disregard for the public health and welfare, that administrative action has not been forthcoming.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 10085—to insure that our health and welfare are safeguarded from the menace of this dangerous chemical. That legislation would prohibit the distribution or introduction for distribution of interstate commerce of PCB.

Hopefully, the Congress will now act to

prevent a recurrence of the present tragedy inflicted by PCB's. Given the unconscionable failure of Federal agencies to live up to their responsibilities to protect the health of our citizens, we have no other choice.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article from the July 28 Washington Evening Star, detailing the necessary slaughter of PCB-contaminated chickens in North Carolina:

MILLIONS OF CHICKENS ARE TAINTED—FEED RECALLED—U.S. CHECKING HOGS, TURKEYS  
(By James Welsh and John Flalka)

Because of one leaky piece of equipment at a processing plant in North Carolina, millions of chickens raised and marketed in the Eastern United States apparently have been contaminated by an industrial chemical.

Department of Agriculture officials are hurrying tests at chicken slaughter houses in the Southeast that regularly process to the market some 35 million broilers a week.

They are conducting the same kind of tests at 25 to 30 swine slaughter houses suspected of marketing animals raised on food that was contaminated. And they are afraid that other fowl, such as turkeys, may also be affected.

The chemical is polychlorinated biphenyl, called PCB. Similar in some respects to DDT, it carries no immediate danger to human beings. But, in experiments on mice, repeated dosage has shown PCB to cause birth defects and liver damage.

Fish meal, used in chicken feed and containing high levels of PCB, was distributed over a period of 2½ months to some 65 firms throughout the Southeast, including Virginia.

These firms, and the tests now being conducted, are confined to a 10-state area. But Agriculture officials are aware that some of the contaminated fish meal may have been retailed beyond that area and that the animals raised on food made with the meal were marketed and sold well beyond that.

Under supervision of the Food and Drug Administration, much of this fish meal is now being recalled.

Up to 800,000 tons of chicken feed could be affected.

If half of it was used, it would be enough to feed 350 million chickens through their entire growing period.

But according to FDA and Department of Agriculture officials, hundreds of thousands of tons of chicken feed including the contaminated fish meal probably already has been used for chickens and apparently swine.

#### KILLED 77,000

Holly Farms, the nation's largest chicken producer, destroyed 77,000 broilers after finding higher than tolerable levels of PCB in its chickens.

USDA is trying to mount a testing program at dozens of other chicken-producing firms in addition to the swine slaughter houses.

"Chances are that the (chicken) contamination is very widespread," Dr. Clayton Yeutter, chief of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Survey, said today.

The number of chickens affected, he said, "is bound to be in the millions."

He said that no chickens are now being sent to market without first being tested.

But no one is able to assess the extent of contamination of chickens sold and consumed in recent weeks, he said.

#### CONSUMERS NOT TOLD

The Agriculture Department has known of the problem for at least a week. It decided not to warn consumers to avoid buying chicken.

This would have been "unfair" and would have been "a quick way to invite lawsuits," said Yeutter.

He noted the quick turnover of poultry in stores and supermarkets, adding that it would have been impossible to determine quickly which stores were handling chicken suspected of contamination.

Agriculture officials were told of the problem by FDA, which learned of it late on Friday, July 16, from Monsanto Chemical Co., the nation's sole producer of PCB.

FDA ran tests that weekend at the processing plant, East Coast Terminal, in Wilmington, N.C.

It discovered that the fish meal ready to be shipped contained 15 to 20 parts per million of PCB. The FDA level of safe consumption for the chemical is 5 parts per million.

The plant then was closed down. The next week, officials of its parent firm, South Pacific Proteins, of Darien, Conn., began recalling shipments.

#### SIXTEEN TONS GOT OUT

According to R. E. Duggan, deputy assistant commissioner for compliance at FDA, the industrial chemical had been leaking from a heat exchanger into the processed fishmeal at East Coast Terminal during a period from April 30 to mid-July.

During that time, he said, some 16,000 tons of the meal, which is imported from Peru, had been processed and shipped.

Generally, said Duggan, fish meal comprises 2 percent of chicken feed.

This means that the contaminated product could have become part of some 800,000 tons of chicken feed.

Exactly how much of the meal went into chicken feed and how much of this chicken feed was used is still under study, said Duggan.

The fish meal went to firms, some of them big poultry producers like Holly Farms. Other customers for the fish meal were feed mills and brokers who in turn retailed it to other customers.

"It's a very complex situation," said Duggan.

"One of the unknowns is the amount of leakage over the 2½-month period. We don't know whether it was continuous.

"The contamination could have been much lower, or much higher, than what we found in the fish meal ready for shipment 10 days ago."

The extent of possible contamination in the Washington area was not clear.

Holly Farms, which turns out more than 1 million chickens a week, is the supplier for both Safeway and Consumers supermarkets in the Washington area.

These stores may well have sold chicken containing higher than advised levels of PCB. But Agriculture staffers said today that because of stringent measures taken in recent days by Holly Farms, the poultry now sold in these stores is safe for consumption.

Most of the chickens shipped to the Washington area come from either Maryland's Eastern Shore, or producing areas in Southern Virginia and North Carolina.

A spokesman for Perdue Foods, Inc., of Salisbury, Md., one of the shore's larger producers, said that most of the Maryland firms get their fish meal from a Baltimore plant and not from the Wilmington plant where the PCB leakage occurred.

#### WE WERE LUCKY

George Heitz, general manager of the Rockingham Poultry Marketing Cooperative in Broadway, Va., said that his firm received one shipment of the tainted feed before switching to another feed outlet.

"Our problem was that some of the eggs didn't hatch, that's all. In some of our flocks it knocked the hatchability 5 or 10 percent, in some it was a little more than that. But that was all the damage we had. We were pretty lucky," Heitz said.

His problem—egg production—is what led others to discover the PCB.

According to Agriculture's Yeutter, the

problem still might be going, and growing, were it not for tests conducted by Holly Farms.

"They're the good guys in this story," he said.

Yeutter said Holly Farms, located in Wilkesboro, N.C., discovered something wrong with the way its chickens were hatching.

The firm's researchers traced the problem to the feed and eventually to the fish-meal plant.

Monsanto, the PCB supplier, was then consulted, after which the giant chemical firm notified FDA.

So far, said FDA officials, about 1,000 tons of the fish meal has been returned to the North Carolina plant, and more is on its way.

But they estimated that probably most of the 16,000 tons of contaminated fish meal shipped out over the ten-week period, less than half will be found unused.

One large customer of the plant reported that of 15 rail carloads of the meal he had purchased during that period, only two remained for recall.

### AMERICA IS A GROWING COUNTRY

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Fred Smith, an associate of Laurance Rockefeller, is a well known and effective worker in the fields of conservation and outdoor recreation. He has given of his many talents and served on Presidential, legislative, conservation boards, and commissions. Recently he has released an article which is so meaningful in its treatments of the needs of our country and its people in today's world that I recommend its ready and careful study to my colleagues.

P. I. Prentice, former president and publisher of Time, director of the National Pollution Control Foundation, and many other well-known organizations dedicated to the well-being of our citizens, has this to say of Fred Smith, the author of "America Is a Growing Country":

Long before environmentalism became fashionable and long before the ecology became a household word Fred Smith earned wide recognition as a pioneer in the war for conservation.

His long leadership in the crusade to end pollution makes this eloquent plea for a little more caution and a lot more common sense doubly significant.

Protecting the ecology requires realism as well as enthusiasm, intelligence as well as devotion. No people can live on air, water, and scenery alone; no nation ever grew great by not making good use of its natural resources.

Today's problems are tomorrow's opportunities. Protecting the environment and minimizing the enormous waste caused by pollution brings us far more than the burden of enormous costs; it brings us also the challenge to meet those costs in a way that will create savings even greater than the costs.

This is the challenge Fred Smith presents on the pages that follow—a challenge to make our response relevant to the realities of America's unstoppable growth.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smith's article follows:

### AMERICA IS A GROWING COUNTRY

Twenty years ago Harold J. Laski, the famous British political scientist wrote a book about America and the Americans.

He described us as an ambitious, determined, optimistic clan. "They might be poor," he wrote, "they would not remain poor. They might be out of work; a job was waiting around the corner. They might be half-literate; their children would go to college. They might be foreign-born; in the fullest sense of the term their children born in America would inherit the tradition in all its amplitude." Laski epitomized us by referring to "the majestic figure of Abraham Lincoln, lonely, aloof, tragic, who grows from the illiteracy of a home where there is little but failure and poverty to impose himself not merely on the mind of America, but on the mind of all civilization."

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist, who is as able an authority on Americans as anyone, says the average American is "a believer and a defender of the faith in humanity . . . It is a relatively important matter to him to be true to his own ideas and carry them out in actual life."

The Philosopher George Santayana suggested that "to be an American is of itself almost a moral condition, an education and a career."

William James, the most American of Americans, was convinced that Americans can work together effectively to solve any problem, to eliminate war, pestilence, ugliness, and all the other evils humanity has permitted to develop. Three other thorough and wise observers—Tocqueville, Bryce and Brogan—each delineating the American character at fifty-year intervals, arrived at essentially the same general description.

It is founded upon a philosophy that there will always be a better tomorrow, that progress is inevitable and eminently to be desired, that achievement is in our blood, that in strength there is freedom, that teamwork solves everything, that prejudice is sinful, that all people are created equal, and anybody can grow up to be President—either of the United States or of a corporation like General Motors. It is a dream of sorts, etched deeply by time and tradition into the consciousness of every generation. More important, it represents the ultimate in Common Sense as the American sees it, and, as William James has said, "Only the minds debauched by learning . . . ever suspect common sense of not being absolutely true."

At various times and in many places, there have been mavericks, to be sure, and sometimes the mavericks temporarily take over. Cataclysmic events and passing public passions have caused men to lose faith in the Dream and inspired them to look elsewhere for something to cling to. But these are temporary aberrations.

We had such a time in the late 20's and early 30's, as many will recall. The great economic machine that monumentalized the American Dream collapsed without warning. Visions of financial security for every family, which seemed so close to realization, lay broken, smashed, and smelling of infamy.

This exploded the Dream, as well it might. There was no place to turn—except to those who had always discounted the validity of the Dream; and for a long stretch of years they, the contemporary infidels, had a field day, led by the propagandists and advisers of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"None of Roosevelt's speeches caught up more poignantly the intellectual moods of the early depression," Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., reported, "than the one made to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. After a brilliant historical account of the background of American democracy, Roosevelt suggested that the age of expansion had come to an end."

John Dewey, the nation's leading intellectual, was quick to jump aboard. Private enterprise, he insisted, never could be "responsible," because social responsibility and "an exclusively pecuniary-profit industry" are incompatible. Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent theologian, announced categorically that capitalism was dead, and it was good riddance. He saw no hope for the future. "There is nothing," he said, "to support the thesis that a dominant class ever yields its position or its privileges in society because its rule has been convicted of ineptness or injustices."

Roosevelt added fuel to the fire:

"Our industrial plant is built;" he said, "the problem now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached . . ."

Certainly this would sound reasonable enough to those disillusioned men who had no jobs, those whose pay had been cut to five dollars a week, those who sold apples on the street, those who saw nothing, nothing at all up ahead.

"Our task now is . . . the soberer and less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand," Roosevelt continued, "of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting the existing economic organization to the service of the people."

"Prosperity," Mr. Hoover announced from the White House, "is just around the corner." Nobody believed him. He had become a living monument to ruptured ambitions and spent hopes. In his final broadcast appeal before the election he warned against "false gods arrayed in the rainbow colors of promises." He denounced the fragmentation of society which the group action and sectionalism inspired by Roosevelt's propagandists was creating. Nobody listened. Roosevelt had caught the whole population on the rebound, victimized by unrequited love for the dream that had saturated their souls from Day One of the nation. "I have looked into the faces of thousands of Americans," Roosevelt confided to a friend, "they have the frightened look of lost children."

The old American philosophy of stubborn self-determination was in full retreat. Nobody ever said, anymore, that America was a great, growing country filled with opportunity for the alert; that its best years lay ahead of it. Any real inspiration for the future had been undermined; all hope for individual achievement was expunged. The moving, growing, aspiring environment had been washed away in a sea of words.

### II

Today we are relying that old experience: we've been this way before.

Our system has let us down, we are hearing; industry is wrong-headed, worthless, and endlessly damaging to society; and we need to shift gears. Do away with growth, curb technology, they say, or our world will self-destruct in two generations. Obscure scientists bask in front-page publicity by describing disasters that might occur; politicians hail themselves as defenders of the environment against industrial polluters and crafty consumer exploiters, even while the government in their charge remains one of the most pervasive and most immovable polluters of all; and the consumer, as taxpayer, is horrendously exploited. Lawyers, acting in what they choose to call the public interest, indulge in a kind of publicity-rich legal guerilla warfare to put a stop to anything anybody doesn't like, anything that makes a profit and smells of progress. As a result, the confused public is once again ready to believe anything that sounds reasonably logical, especially if it also sounds frightening.

We are scared again. But this time our

fears seem to have grown out of a distrust of our affluence, not the threat of starvation. Our consciences rather than our stomachs are giving us a hard time. We are dusting off all the old villains—condemning them this time for giving us what we demanded—more goods, more services, more conveniences at the minimum cost.

It gallops across our destiny on a black horse, a hired killer with a big notch in his gun to memorialize the murder of the unspooled world we once had.

It is widely held these days by environmentalists and by many frightened by environmentalists, that we've "got to get off this growth kick"—that's the new cliché—*get off this growth kick* if we are to survive. We are told we've got to put a stop to "progress." No more power plants, especially nuclear power plants. No SST. No increase in the Gross National Product. No more great technological advances. Curtail the use of energy. If industrial plants pollute, shut them down. If they might present a problem, don't build them. If this throws men out of work, let them find other jobs. Let single-minded officials set ultimate anti-pollution standards and demand instant adherence, whether or not there are yet practical ways to do it. Put a stop to the mining of coal, prevent the drilling of oil wells, curtail highway construction. Go to court and delay anything that purports to be essential to growth of any description. This, they say, is the only way to preserve the world we live in.

But at what cost?

A substantial factor of growth and a continuing need for technological advance is built into our system, just as surely as a progressive increase in our population is inescapable. Being necessary does not make progress desirable—it only makes it unavoidable, and no amount of rhetoric can change this fact of life.

It is difficult—even impossible—at this point to estimate the cost of stopping growth—or even seriously delaying it—in money, in unemployment, in energy shortages, in essential government programs that cannot be funded because of income depletions and decimated tax receipts. What the emotional extremists are really demanding is a curtailment in the generating of wealth and an increase in its expenditure. This obviously is a self-defeating process.

And who has considered the plight of the disadvantaged, who will wind up, as they generally do, paying the highest cost of all?

Not long ago I was in a meeting where a highly respected citizen was discoursing on the subject of progress, suggesting (we often hear it these days) that too much attention to material progress is bad for the human race: it diverts them from more important things. "It isn't good for people," he was saying.

Next to me sat an elderly colored woman, a delightfully intelligent human being. Quietly, almost inaudibly, she protested: "But how about the poor people? Are they to be locked into poverty? Is progress so bad for them?"

She was scarcely heard, much less answered. If she had been, the answer no doubt would have been that "the poor would be taken care of." For one thing, if progress stops and wealth isn't generated, there will be no resources to take care of the poor. For another—and most important—the poor don't want to be taken care of—they want that chance the American tradition promised them, a promise they often cherish more deeply even than the affluent who have made it. As Myrdal pointed out:

"With one part of themselves they actually believe that the creed [of equal opportunity] is ruling America."

It grew out of the affluence of the great middle-income group, swollen in our time to incredible size. Millions who are well fed and well housed and have a minimum of one automobile seem to have discovered that all

this was not enough, that they lacked some important element in their lives, and whatever it was, it could not be bought at the corner store with a credit card.

At precisely the right time, along came the popular myth that their world had once been pristine and beautiful, and a rewarding place in which to live, and it isn't any longer, and that was what was wrong. They began to believe that the old refreshing earth could be recreated if only all those *other people* would let it alone. This "*other people*" complex is important. The environmental thrust has thrived mightily on an all-too-human desire to pass the buck, to point the finger, to find a culprit. And the media have not helped: they have sought out controversy and nourished it at every turn. It makes news. It captures readers and fascinates listeners. It sells papers and increases audiences. *But it doesn't help solve anything.*

Some of us who were pioneers in the war for conservation, the early environmentalists, have a horrible premonition that this lovely little lady can't, for long, be ignored. The answer will come with such vehemence that environmental progress can be set back ten years. The extremists, the exploiters and the opportunists who now hold the center stage seem intent upon hammering it up beyond all reason. The play will bomb out, the show will close, and the restless audience will go looking for some other intellectual diversion. The great point—the absolutely essential conviction—that we must preserve the Quality of Life at every possible juncture can get lost in the shuffle. Nothing is quite so repugnant as yesterday's passion.

All environmentalists are not unreasonable transcendentalists with incurable tunnel vision—nor is every industrialist a stereotype profit-monger with disdain for the public interest. It is the *extremists* who are dangerous; the environmentalists who demand instant cures, and the industrialists who won't budge.

I have had a considerable amount of firsthand experience with industry and industrialists during this environmental era, and by and large I would give them good marks. Most of them are as much concerned about pollution, for example, as the most adamant environmentalists. Most want to move as fast as technology and economic feasibility permit. But because their destinies are determined by consumers, they are more sensitive to the effects of cost than the affluent environmental enthusiast who says, "Do as I say, whatever it costs, and raise your prices if necessary. The people will pay!"

But will they? *Should* they have no choice?

The typical industrialist spends his life developing technologies and perfecting methods to bring down the cost of what he makes to the point where more and more people can afford to buy, and in buying contribute to the flow of funds that creates more jobs and makes higher pay levels possible. Whether anybody likes it or not, that is what our economy is all about. That is why the number of poverty-level people has shrunk from 350 per thousand population in Roosevelt's time to about 125 today. That is how poor people get bailed out. In the end, it is the only way. And they know it. They will be heard from; and when this happens, our politicians will start talking out of the other side of their mouths—some already are. They will run in the other direction—too fast and probably too far.

### III

Is it already too late to establish ground rules that can save us from backlash?

*How can we insure that we can retain the good that has already come from the recognition that we need more quality in our lives?* Isn't there some way that extremists can be curbed and cooperation encouraged? Can't we demonstrate that the American tradition of progress, of moving ahead, of aspiring, is not really all that incompat-

ible with the protection and enhancement of the environment?

It is immensely difficult, of course, to effectively counsel thought and cooperation and teamwork in the storm center of an emotional upheaval. In times like these there is a distrust of all the old faces and all the old words. It would appear that only the pallbearers of the apparently expired American Dream can get a responsive audience.

Yet in 1939, while the faithless were still riding high, there did burst upon the scene a man with a different message who found a massive audience and made an immense impression. It was a new face, but the message was as old as America.

"You have told us that our day is finished," he said, "that we can grow no more, and that the future cannot be the equal of the past. But We, the People, do not believe this, and we say to you: give up the vested interest you have in depression, open your eyes to the future, help us build a new world."

Now these were fine words, as fine as those used by Roosevelt himself, and the media and the world-oriented leadership took hold of them eagerly, and the dispirited business community pricked up its ears. Hope was not really dead after all, it was only moribund, deep in a ten-year sleep, like the fairy tale princess awaiting the prince to bring her back to life.

Willkie gathered together in one brief, eloquent statement all the traditional convictions that had been distorted by propaganda and circumstances. He repaired them, reconstituted them, and soon they rained down on the citizenry in a torrent, providing solace to the America which Myrdal explains "is continually struggling for its soul."

In the few months before the confusion of politics swallowed up the voice, Wendell Willkie inspired a very large section of jaded people, including Roosevelt, who himself learned a new way of getting at things. It was, of course, simply the old way of doing things. New frontiers were sighted, new resources developed, plants expanded, and the free enterprise system was back in business at the old stand. The economy spurred ahead, and the poor and discouraged began again to move up the economic ladder under their own steam. Hope was reborn. *The clouds blew away, and there again was the future, bulging with promise.*

The \$100 billion GNP of Roosevelt's day mounted ten-fold, and our new frontiers extended all the way to the moon. The resilience of our supposedly defunct system enabled us to win the most extensive and sophisticated war in history and to rescue a war-scarred world from the aftermath.

Willkie accused the New Dealers of nurturing a static philosophy of defeat. "We need a new outlook, a new way of getting at things," he said, reminding them that in America there is always an opportunity for a constructive approach.

Such an opportunity is open to us today, too.

We can set up machinery—preferably at the state level—to investigate thoroughly all major environmental controversies, consider all the positions and claims, and then settle controversies out of court, with full power to enforce the decision. We can discourage resorting to the already overburdened courts to resolve problems that can be far more constructively resolved by negotiation. We can encourage the media and politicians to spend less time fanning the fires of controversy and more time assessing the economic, social, and long-range ramifications of important environmental questions. We can encourage opinion leaders and activists generally to develop the assets of our society, which are many, instead of embellishing and exploiting its weaknesses, which also are many. We can and certainly *should* oppose the very considerable efforts that are in vogue to discourage technological advances on the

basis that there might be in them some hidden or latent danger.

... yet this illustrates the current trend. We can be conscientious about investigating the economic ramifications of environmental action—and vice versa, because the environment and the economy both are too important to be used either to promote actions that shouldn't be taken, or to excuse non-action when action should be taken.

In short, we can work together intelligently, constructively, effectively, and systematically to solve the environmental problems that we all know must be solved; and we can do it without, in the process, fatally wounding the Goose that Lays the Golden Eggs.

Industry, commerce, technology—these are our tools, as well as our problems—and proper use of them is the only possible means by which a Quality of Life can be built in a nation of 200 million people—and growing. We can be assured that the era of quantity at any environmental cost is past; that the era of reverence for the environment is here to stay. Under these circumstances, to echo Roosevelt's 1932 admonition that the time has come for the nation to stop growing and learn to live on what it has is to doom society to eventual extinction for no particular purpose.

What Americans hungered for and needed in 1939 and what they hunger for and need now is inspiration. They want to feel confidence coursing through their veins. And this won't be easy to provide. It will be difficult to fire up enthusiasm in the face of all the frustrations, doubts, distrust, and disbeliefs that have accumulated. It will be difficult to restore to the battered American a faith in the future. He won't be easy to convince that in this best of all currently possible worlds he has a good chance of living a full life and getting his money's worth. And, on a broader perspective, it will be difficult to make him see that in spite of the dozen or more popular crises the world is supposed to be facing, there will, in all likelihood, be a tomorrow, and it won't be nearly as bad as it looks.

It will be easier to get this message across when the American spirit returns, and that day will come as it always has. Laski wrote: "The power of a tradition to endure depends upon its capacity to command a continuing faith; and this, in its turn, depends upon its power to evoke hope and exhilaration from the masses." The spark still lives in the minds of most Americans. What we have known in our hearts for nearly three hundred years, we still know, and we are not likely to forget for long. The American character, as I said in the beginning, at its deepest roots is as fixed and predictable as the tides. It ebbs and flows.

*It will flow again, and soon, and in the meantime, we will have achieved some very badly needed reforms on the environmental front and on several other fronts in the bargain. Society will have taken a few important but difficult steps forward.*

In the long run, these upheavals are good. In the short run, they are murder.

#### UNFULFILLED PROMISES: MEDICAL SERVICES FOR MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

(Mr. BADILLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues another program which is supposed to benefit migrant farmworkers, but which has failed to achieve its objectives.

The Migrant Health Act of 1961 has been in operation for nearly 10 years, yet

migrant farm workers and their families still do not enjoy adequate medical services and they suffer the consequences in terms of poor health and physical deterioration. The statistics are truly shocking:

Migrant life expectancy is 25 years less than the national average.

Infant and maternal mortality is 125 percent higher than the average.

The death rate from influenza and pneumonia is 200 percent higher.

The death rate from TB is 250 percent higher.

The accident rate is 300 percent higher.

Hospital care for acute illness and accident victims is often unavailable to migrants. The New York Times recently reported that in August 1970 two men having compound fractures with bones protruding and three men suffering from pneumonia with very high fevers were denied access to six hospitals even for out-patient treatment.

As of fiscal 1971, 36 States and Puerto Rico had funded projects under the Migrant Health Act. These projects supposedly provided general medical care, immunization, prenatal care, nursing services, dental services, sanitation services, health education, and evening health service clinics in some migrant camps. Most of these projects have been entrusted to State and local health departments which are neither inclined, equipped, nor technically capable of delivering comprehensive medical care to migrant farmworkers. A 1970 amendment requires migrant participation in planning and implementing projects, but little has been done to put this into operation.

Why has this program failed in its goal of insuring that "migrant workers and their children . . . share the health protection and services generally available to other U.S. citizens?" In the first place, far too little money has been invested in the program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has spent an average of \$15 per migrant per year compared to the national average of \$300 per person per year on medical expenses.

Second, the very limited funds that are available are spread too thinly by supporting too many individual county projects. The result is that many migrants receive inferior medical services rather than a few receiving comprehensive health services. Ironically, even given the propensity to fund several small projects instead of a few large ones, the migrant health program reaches on a temporary basis only about one-third of the total migrant population.

Thirdly, the local health departments or allied agencies that run these projects are not very eager or lack the necessary resources—in terms of facilities, personnel, and funds—to serve migrants who reside in the area only a short time each year and who have a different cultural and ethnic background from the area's residents.

Finally, the failure of the program also results from the absence of program standards and evaluation mechanisms. Without objective standards by which to judge individual programs, it becomes virtually impossible to defend or ter-

minate any project. This has been the pattern since the outset of the program.

A more detailed example, presented in testimony last year before the Senate Migrant Labor Subcommittee by Migrant Legal Action, Inc., may illustrate some of the problems with this program.

Another instance where local opposition has prevented a substantial improvement in migrant health care programs is that of Hidalgo County, Texas (a county in the lower Rio Grande Valley with an estimated migrant population of 40,000). For the past five years, the local health department of Hidalgo County has operated a migrant health project that even it admits is totally inadequate. Not only is the program underfunded, but the health department lacks the technical capability to deliver good quality health care. It has neither sufficient manpower nor equipment, and has no direct ties to the migrant population.

Dr. Ramiro Casso, a doctor in general practice in McAllen, Texas, described the public health activities in Hidalgo County as follows:

"At present, these activities are limited to tuberculosis detection, follow-up on contagious diseases, and immunization of children. The inadequacy of our immunization program was pointed out during the past two months when in Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, we (uncovered) suspected (cases of) poliomyelitis."

(In carrying out an evacuation of the adequacy of the Migrant Health Program in Hidalgo County) doctors found that: "These people are hungry for care. They are dying for want of it." Yet the Dallas regional office of HEW has been content to let the migrant health program in Hidalgo County continue to operate at its present level.

A few facts about health conditions in the Valley should suffice to illustrate the total inadequacy of the present migrant health program. Hidalgo County has more cases of tuberculosis than any other county in the country. It also presently has a polio epidemic, in which 3 children have died, and at least 11 more are suspected of having contracted the disease. Dr. John Copenhaver, Director of the migrant health projects for Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, criticized the (evaluation team's) reports as inaccurate because of their shock over uncovering a case of leprosy. The local newspapers have reported Dr. Copenhaver as asking "What's wrong with one case of leprosy? I know there are at least a hundred in the Valley."

Although Valley-wide inoculation efforts have been undertaken by the public health authorities in an effort to halt the spread of polio, outreach efforts are proving ineffective in reaching the persons who most need the vaccine, many of whom live in outlying areas and neither own radios nor read the newspaper.

This past year, there was an opportunity to dramatically increase migrant health services to this area. Major efforts were initiated by the Washington office. It sought to develop ties with a local community organization (Colonias del Valle), to bring together community and provider groups, and to provide them with sufficient money to operate a comprehensive health care center. HEW had reserved the funds and actively encouraged the funding of such a project; the consumers were interested; the health department was prepared to cooperate; and Dr. Love, the newly elected president of the local medical society, was prepared to cooperate.

It should have been the task of the regional office to develop and cement a program in this depressed area. Rather than aiding or participating in any of these efforts, the regional office simply sat back to await proposals and made no affirmative efforts to coalesce a program. It ultimately selected the

health department proposals, which it acknowledged to be completely inadequate. Finally, rather than accepting a \$400,000 grant for one project, the regional administrators persuaded HEW to divide the money in two \$200,000 grants and later halved it again. In effect, through lack of interest, uninspired leadership, responsiveness to local political pressures and general bureaucratic inertia, the regional administrators induced HEW to reproduce the traditional inadequate and nonresponsive health project in the place of what had been a promising beginning for comprehensive, consumer-oriented health care.

This program can be made to work by doing the following things: Develop objective standards for program evaluation; rigidly apply these standards; fund the program at a more realistic level; redesign the program to emphasize a smaller number of projects, but ones providing comprehensive medical services to all migrants within a given radius, including the provision of transportation to and from the clinic for those without their own means; and implement the 1970 amendment specifying migrant input in program planning and execution.

#### DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF UTAH'S STATEHOOD

(Mr. McKAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Congress was not in session on July 24, I have waited until today to give my speech commemorating 1971 as the diamond anniversary year of Utah's statehood and July 24 which is Pioneer Day.

One hundred and twenty-four years ago on July 24, Brigham Young led the first company of Mormon pioneers into the Salt Lake Valley. Standing on a mountain ridge above the valley floor, the pioneer leader declared, "This is the place." This day and this declaration signify the beginning of a great pioneer heritage for the State of Utah. Today I am reminded of this humble, yet noble heritage and its great contribution to the spiritual and political origins of our State.

In thinking about the accomplishments of Utah, I remembered that when the pioneers entered Salt Lake Valley it was totally barren. In 1847 only a few trees dotted the valley which was otherwise devoid of vegetation. By way of contrast in 1971 you can stand at the "This is the Place Monument" and look out across a valley which is now a monument to the industry of those early pioneers and their posterity. Homes, churches, schools, parks, roads, businesses, and even trees all indicate the changes and the progress which have occurred since 1847. This scene is a tribute to the men and women who made this "desert valley blossom like a rose." Suddenly I realized how important the physical qualities of Utah actually were. Therefore, I would like to discuss briefly a few of these unique qualities.

Utah's excellence in the field of education heads the list of important characteristics about the State. For Utah is second to none by many standards of educational strength. Utah spends more

per capita than any other State on education. It also has more college graduates per citizen than any other State. It has nine colleges and universities including the Nation's largest private university.

The number of tourists attracted to Utah each year is indicative of the State's natural appeal. From her majestic mountains and clear streams to the stark beauties of her deserts, Utah contains as much natural beauty as any other State in the Nation. Each year, millions of visitors journey to Utah to see the famous Temple Square. Utah also is unique in that it contains the largest inland salt sea in the world.

Utah's achievements in the arts cannot be overlooked. The Mormon settlers established theaters and musical organizations almost before they had built their own cabins. Today, the Utah Symphony Orchestra, recently returned from a successful tour of Latin America, is one of the 10 best in the Nation and the Mormon Tabernacle Choir is perhaps the most famous choir in the world.

Unlimited opportunities in both spectator and participation sports exist in Utah. Utah is world renowned for its fine powder skiing and is a fishing and hunting paradise.

Utah is also the home of the Utah Stars, the 1971 ABA basketball champion, as well as the Golden Eagles professional hockey team. Its many colleges and universities continue to produce some of the most exciting spectator sports in this country. Utah is perhaps unexcelled in the availability of outdoor recreational facilities. With lakes, mountains, wild game, and a varied climate, the opportunity for every kind of outdoor recreation is unlimited.

Finally, I would like to extol the wonders of Utah's vast stores of natural resources which abound in Utah. Utah produces 20 percent of the Nation's copper and development in oil shale research may reveal that Utah has virtually untapped petroleum sources.

But these physical features tell only half of Utah's story. There are certain human qualities of the people themselves which have given Utah a firm foundation on which to develop its physical and human resources. It is more difficult to dwell on this subject because it is abstract and a little elusive—but nonetheless real. It is the spirit of Utah. When those Mormon pioneers entered Salt Lake Valley on the 24th of July in 1847, they brought with them more than just their meager belongings and a desire to forge for themselves a new life. They brought with them an attitude about themselves and their relationship to their Government which has continued to prevail. And now, after 75 years of statehood and 124 years since the first pioneers entered Utah, I still recognize this as the source of Utah's greatness.

This spirit has several aspects to it. One thing it has to do with is the idea that man creates his government and is not a creature of it. The Mormon pioneers even believed that government was instituted by God for the benefit of man. Thus, Utahans have never been satisfied to sit back and let public affairs run their course contrary to the will of the people.

Moreover, Utahans have always had a great respect for government. I am confident that the absence of any serious riots over the last 10 years when most parts of the Nation have faced numerous disruptions, is due in part to the pattern set by that early Mormon pioneer belief that they should be "subject to Kings, president, rulers, and magistrates," and should obey and sustain and uphold the respective governments in which they reside, while protected in their inherent and unalienable rights by the laws of such governments.

An interesting corollary to this fundamental attitude toward government is that these early settlers earnestly believed in self-reliance. Men were expected to do all in their own power to improve their personal lot in life and to rely on their own individual resources to do so. The function of government was to protect man's natural right to pursue "the good life," not to provide it for him. In this sense, the concepts of self-reliance and individual responsibility run deep in the political philosophy of Utah's citizens.

A second pioneer virtue that has left its beneficial mark on Utah is the notion that political success cannot be separated from private virtue. Certainly this principle was not unique to the pioneers. Toqueville recognized that the greatness of America was related to the quality of her citizens and George Washington stated that "foundations of our national policy \* \* \* are laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality." But though not unique to the pioneers, this principle has remained alive in Utah perhaps more than most other States due to the strength of the pioneer heritage.

A third portion of that heritage has to do with relations between nations. Utah has always been international in her outlook. Utah churches, Mormon, Protestant, and Catholic, are responsible for sending thousands of missionaries into foreign lands each year. There are, as one of the results of that, more Utahans per capita with native skill in foreign languages than in any other State. Utah has sent hundreds of her citizens to foreign countries to share their technical knowledge about irrigation, land management, dairy production, forage crops, animal husbandry as well as a host of other scientific and technical subjects. Somewhat related to this is the still prevailing belief among Utahans that all international relations ought to be founded on the principles of good faith, justice, and benevolence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a fourth characteristic of the spirit of Utah which was instituted by those pioneers whom we recall on Pioneer Day and which, though not as widespread in Utah nor in the Nation as it should be, was still responsible for many of the qualities of Utah life. This final principle has to do with the place of religion and mortality in political life. The Mormon pioneers believed that America was a special land destined for leadership and greatness. But that destiny depended on the righteousness of the inhabitants of the land. These early settlers, themselves the victims self-serving and ambitious political

leaders in other States, believed that righteous leaders marked by humility and dependence on divine guidance were the only solutions to political ills. It may be one of the great tragedies of American political development that we have tended to think that a man's personal, moral, and ethical qualities were not too great importance as long as he could "get the job done." Just last month a former presidential advisor published an article in a national magazine calling for "amorality in foreign affairs." The pioneer tradition would reject both this attitude and the other extreme of zealotisms and substitute for both the pragmatic and persistent efforts of righteous political leaders.

In conclusion, these four aspects of the heritage of Utah could well be remembered by all who desire sound political progress. The Utah experience suggests that people who, motivated by proper goals, were willing to sacrifice all of their material possessions, leave established communities where they were certain of a good life, and forge for themselves a new State in the desolate deserts of Western America have left us more than a heritage which can be identified on a map. They have left America and the world some ideals and beliefs which are widely accepted and may lead us out of some of the national dilemmas in which America finds herself in the 1970's.

#### NEW CHALLENGE OF LATIN AMERICAN INVESTMENT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of our colleagues a most informative and deeply thoughtful address by the distinguished director of the University of Miami's Institute for Inter-American Legal Studies, Dr. Rafael C. Benitez.

In a speech entitled "The Challenge of International Trade and Investment in the Seventies," which Dr. Benitez delivered to the third annual international business symposium sponsored by the South Florida Regional Export Expansion Council in Miami, this outstanding observer of the business climate of the Western Hemisphere emphasized the changing investment picture in Latin America. He discusses both the rising tide of state intervention in the economies of Latin American countries and the "aloofness" which characterizes the current policy of our own Government toward U.S. investment in this vital part of the world.

I strongly recommend this address to my colleagues and request that the text be printed in the RECORD at this point:

THE CHALLENGE TO UNITED STATES INVESTMENT IN LATIN AMERICA—PROSPECTS FOR THE '70'S

(By R. C. Benitez)

The subject of United States investment in Latin America is the current favorite of speakers in inter-American affairs. Conferences, symposia, and institutes have probed at depth the problems of the United States

investor in Latin America and yet, the subject continues to present a perplexing economic problem with significant social and political overtones.

It is regretful, but nevertheless true that United States investment in Latin America has become a major issue in inter-American affairs. If not resolved, it can precipitate another hemispheric crisis, and leave in its wake a negative and lasting impact on the economic, social and political future of this hemisphere.

As more than interested parties in the future of Latin America we have a personal stake in the matter. But, our concern should be of a more fundamental nature for more than business and personal interests are at play.

I submit to you that the fundamental challenge is to our basic economic and political institutions. In issue, therefore, is not only the future of United States enterprises in Latin America, but our economic and political orders which—in spite of their imperfections—offer the greatest hope to the peoples of this hemisphere.

A brief review of the scope and impact of United States investment in Latin America is in order. The present book value of U.S. direct investments in Latin America approximates \$14 billion dollars. U.S. business reportedly pays one fifth of all taxes, produces one third of all exports, and employs directly over one and a half million persons in Latin America. One billion dollars is often cited as the profits repatriated yearly to the United States.

These indicators reflect the magnitude of the forces at play, and it is obvious that economic factors of such scope can influence—positively or negatively—the future of Latin America.

And, the United States can not ignore the future of Latin America in spite of serious domestic preoccupations with social conflicts, urban growth, and law and order, nor, in spite of other grave international concerns such as Vietnam, the Middle East, and its relations with Soviet Russia.

Mr. Rockefeller expressed it this way:

"Our national interest requires the maintenance of our special relationship which should have as its goal the creation of a community of self-reliant, independent nations linked in a mutually beneficial regional system, and seeking to improve the efficiency of their societies and the quality of life of their peoples."

I submit that in recent times the U.S. investor has done his share to accomplish Mr. Rockefeller's objective in Latin America. Leaving aside the unscrupulous promoter—found in every society—the U.S. businessman has been conscious of his social responsibilities when entering into a Latin American venture. His recent record can stand scrutiny provided such scrutiny is carried out objectively, dispassionately and by the fair minded. American business habits abroad have undergone a marked change, and it serves little purpose—at this stage—to inquire why the change came about. The undisputable fact is that American companies today are generally sensitive to local conditions, and have become "responsible citizens" of those states which have granted them operating privileges.

This responsible citizenship, when taken together with the obvious benefits of foreign investment such as increased employment, purchasing power, tax revenues and improved standards of living should have resulted in an improved climate for U.S. investment in Latin America. Regrettably, such has not been the case. On the contrary, recent events manifest a deterioration in the investment climate which—in the long run—could dash the hopes for successful economic and social development in Latin America.

Beginning with the Cuban confiscations in

the early 1960s, the U.S. investor has experienced—directly or indirectly—an undeserved hostility not in tune with his willingness to behave responsibly and to abide by the conditions under which he undertook his Latin American operation.

It is true that changed circumstances in a dynamic environment call for new approaches, but new governmental concepts and directions should benefit the body politic and not one segment of a society at the expense of the others.

The recent events in Peru, Bolivia and Chile are of serious concern to U.S. investors in all Latin American countries. The ultimate objective of these nations—social justice and the improvement in the quality of the lives of their peoples—cannot be challenged, but the manner in which the objective is being pursued is, in my opinion, open to question. I ask you to consider if in the long run the means being used to achieve a most laudable and humanitarian objective are in the best interests of Latin America.

In addition to the events in Peru, Bolivia and Chile two other developments have given the United States investor cause for alarm. I refer to the foreign investment rules of the Andean Subregional Common Market, and, and to the most recent Venezuelan legislation on banking and on taxes relating to the oil industry.

First, the Andean Foreign Investment Code. I shall not deal with the specifics of the Code as I am sure that this particular subject will be covered repeatedly during the day. I merely wish to emphasize that regardless of the feelings of its proponents, the Code has put a damper on U.S. investment in Latin America. The Council of the Americas conducted a survey among its members early in the year and the results revealed that eighty-four U.S. private investments were being held in abeyance in the five countries of the Andean bloc because of the fear generated by the Code. Subsequently, representatives from 240 North American companies met in South America and announced the suspension of investment in the Andean countries. This apprehension on the part of the U.S. investor should be a cause for concern, if, in fact, there is need for foreign private capital in Latin America.

Secondly, the Venezuelan legislation. In December 1970, Venezuela stunned the foreign business community with a new Banking Reform Law and a rise in petroleum profits taxes. Promises to seek additional controls on other industrial sectors added to the concern of the foreign businessman.

The Banking Law provides for at least 80% Venezuelan ownership of all foreign banks, limits the amount of their deposits, their dealings in foreign exchange and their loans to foreign corporations. Additional restrictive measures affect the issuance of certificates of deposit and of saving accounts.

With regard to the petroleum industry, the basic tax was raised from 52 to 60% which, together with royalties and other taxes raised the effective governmental share of profits from 70 to 80%. Of equal, if not more concern, was the pronouncement that henceforth the Government would set "reference prices" on which taxes are based. In essence, the Government now controls the profits of foreign oil companies.

Rumblings concerning nationalization of the natural gas industry and to "reform" foreign automobile investments also served to rock the boat. The above took place with dramatic suddenness in a country which until a few months ago openly welcomed the foreign investor and offered an investment climate second to none in Latin America.

The two developments just mentioned reflect the mood for change and the desire to transform, in a very short period of time, the economic structure of Latin America. In some of the countries the change is deep and

radical, and the clear objective is transformation into a socialist society in which the State will predominate—overwhelmingly—in the economy of the country concerned. This position is at one end of the spectrum; that other positions reveal more muted shadings but their hues are sufficiently discordant to upset and repel the foreign investor.

What is the meaning of the above? What in essence is it that Latin America is no longer whispering but shouting to the foreign investor? The message is unmistakably clear—Latin America wishes to shake off economic dependence and to control its own economic destiny.

A point previously made bears repeating. It has been stated, to the point of boredom, that Latin America is not a homogenous unit, i.e., that in spite of the fact that all but a few of the countries share a common language, history and culture, there are fundamental differences between the individual countries, and even between regions in the Hemisphere. Thus, different countries are following different policies in the area of foreign investments. Let me cite the case of Mexico as an example.

In December, 1970, President Echeverria met with a group of prominent Mexican and foreign businessmen and among, other things, stated that Mexico did not have an expropriation mentality and that the country welcomed those foreign investments prepared to associate with Mexican enterprises in joint ventures oriented to produce goods for the Mexican market and for export. He added that Mexico has a need for advanced technology and for substantial investments—both local and foreign—and he recognized the need for a return on capital invested and the repatriation of dividends and interest. The Mexican President pledged free convertibility and no restrictions on the flows of capital or profit remittances; he affirmed that his would be a regime of guarantees.

But it is not the economic philosophy of nations like Mexico which seriously concern the U.S. investor, but the philosophy of those countries which attempt—through the revolutionary process—to resolve overnight the many contradictions which exist in their societies. These contradictions should be resolved, but I respectfully submit that the solution to the grave social problems faced by the Latin American governments should not be one which will inevitably lead to the destruction of a vital segment of their societies, nor put to flight those who, in my opinion, have a key role to play in the attainment of true social justice in this hemisphere. I refer specifically in my last statement to the private sector, but particularly to the foreign investor and his role in the process of economic development.

A caveat is here in order. We in the developed nations are inclined to think that foreign investment *per se* is a good thing, and we may be right. We believe that foreign investment has played a significant role in the growth of modern society, and that its "commitment and imagination can be harnessed to formulate and implement programs dedicated to human progress." We can, without too much trouble defend our position with some very convincing arguments, but we tend to overlook that there are many who feel that foreign investment has been detrimental to the developing nations. Weighty arguments are also advanced to support this point of view, and the issue has been joined frequently on the relative merits of technology, managerial know how, exports, substitute imports, controlling interest, monopolies, and marketing techniques, among others.

It appears, advisable, therefore, to undertake in-depth economics studies to determine the merits, or the lack thereof of foreign investment. Freed from political pas-

sions and nationalistic urgings, impartial economists—if necessary on an individual country basis—should be able to put to rest many of the misconceptions which now surround the subject. This, in my opinion, is essential if we are to reason together and to establish the climate in which meaningful decisions will be reached.

But, vital as the result of these studies may be to the future, they are not essential to the decision making process of the present. The reason is that almost without exception the nations of Latin America have stated that they need substantial inputs of foreign capital to promote their economic development. The warmth with which foreign investment is received, and the conditions under which it is allowed to come in vary, but I believe that it is well to establish that the Latin American nations—willingly or unwillingly—have expressed the need for foreign investment.

Admitting the need for foreign investment on the part of the Latin American nations, is the U.S. investor willing to assume the risks inherent in a Latin American operation? In the past the answer was in the affirmative and the reasons given were not very different from those which prompted investment in the United States and other areas of the world.

These reasons are still valid today, but the enthusiasm of the U.S. investor has been greatly dampened by the economic and social policies of some Latin American governments. In his search for an answer how best to proceed under present day circumstances, the U.S. investor has naturally sought the position of his own government. It is well to consider what that position is.

The euphoria generated by the Alliance for Progress has dissipated. I do not believe that we should strike off the Alliance as an exercise in futility, as advocated by its detractors. Much has been accomplished under this program and today the lot of many in the Americas is better because of it. The consensus is not of total failure, but of a failure to meet overoptimistic and unreal expectations in an unrealistic short period of time. It is said that the Alliance has lost its way . . . that it is a shattered dream. This may or may not be the case, but there is no denying that the U.S. Government's involvement in Latin America contemplated under previous administrations is not the involvement of the present administration.

The present approach is one of low profile. The mood is one of disengagement based on the premise that the United States cannot undertake—in the measure once anticipated—the correction of the existing social and economic ills of Latin America. The new policy affects indirectly the U.S. investor because if the trend is to disengage he will also feel its effects. For this reason the United States businessman operating or intending to operate in Latin America will do well to face reality and accept the fact that in a large measure he is now on his own in Latin America.

It is of interest to note, however, that within the context of its official position, the United States Government advocates a greater role for private investment in the development process. This is to be accomplished through the newly established Overseas Private Investment Corporation which is charged under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 to expand previous AID incentive programs so as to stimulate United States private enterprise in development projects abroad.

Yet, in spite of the encouragement to the private sector to invest abroad, the U.S. Government's position to play it cool in Latin America appears firm at this time. To the U.S. investor the message is clear—do not rely too much in the protection of the U.S. government. I submit that this is not altogether bad.

Self reliance is a desirable trait and a strong point in the character of North Americans. Perhaps this new chill of loneliness may lead the U.S. businessman to face up to the new realities, to formulate new concepts, and to advance new ideas on which to base the solutions to the problems which now face him in Latin America. For the good old days—if they ever existed—are gone, and the regenerative process calls for the abandonment of old formulas in favor of new mixes whose ingredients must be found in the fertile and imaginative minds of the U.S. investor.

Thus, the issue is clear, and so is the present attitudes of the U.S. government and of the governments of Latin America. Accordingly, I believe it would be naive on the part of the U.S. investor—in spite of an existing favorable investment climate in any country of Latin America—to venture forth believing that the situation could not change to his detriment. The winds of change are blowing too strongly for him to believe otherwise, and the question to me is not whether there will be more restrictions, but their timing and their extent. For the foreseeable future I see an irreversible trend in favor of economic nationalism; a trend of varying strength and duration depending upon the degree of political maturity and economic independence of the countries of Latin America.

The risks are great, and the future, at best, cloudy. Whether in any particular instance the return is worth the risk must, of necessity, be a subjective decision reached by individual North American corporations. The decisions to be made are of major import, but perhaps not so difficult now that the elements entering into the decisionmaking process are—although unfavorable—at least clearer.

And unfavorable as the climate appears to be now and in the foreseeable future, I predict that the U.S. investor will continue to seek a modus operandi in Latin America. I base my prediction on his character and on his history which is not one of timidity but of courage, not one of passivity but of resourcefulness, not one of pessimism but of optimism.

His flexibility under trying conditions is already in evidence. In Colombia he has "associated" with the Government's Petroleum Corporation and other foreign oil companies for the exploration of oil in that country. The "association" is a far cry from the business ventures of the past, but it is a new way of doing business and of preserving an economic interest in Colombia. Similar associations or variants thereof, I predict will be surfacing in the near future as the U.S. investor, aware of the business dangers which await him, sharpens his business and diplomatic skills to meet a challenge he can no longer ignore.

Now, given the necessity for foreign investments on the part of Latin America, and the desirability of continuing investments on the part of the U.S. investor—what should be done to bring opposing factions closer to each other.

There is no pat answer, but I submit that if there is to be a future it lies in a change in the attitudes of all the interested parties. This change of attitudes, is to me essential.

The attitude of the U.S. investor must, above all, be realistic. Want it or not he must accept the fact that the rules of the game have been radically changed. The intervention of the State in the economic area and its creeping incursion in areas long the province of the private sector are now firmly established. The basis for such intervention is the sovereign right of states to control their economic destinies and this right cannot be challenged as long as the nation state remains the cornerstone of our international order. This change of direction on the part of Latin American government is at the root

of the problem and the conflicting economic philosophies are self evident.

It is a fact, however, that conflicting points of view can be reconciled through compromise, and in relation to our particular problem, the parties involved must look upon compromise not as a sign of weakness, but as a necessary accommodation to achieve an objective which transcends individual gain. In this connection, I believe the burden is more on foreign governments than on the U.S. investor because upon the former falls the choice of setting forth the conditions under which foreign investment will take place.

It is naive, of course, to ignore the political and social pressures upon governments, but I submit that it is not too much for the foreign investors to ask that foreign investment guidelines be clearly established, that obligations once undertaken be observed and that just compensation be given for property expropriated.

In this area, Senator Javits of New York has made an interesting proposal. He has urged the formation of an international body such as GATT to assure fair treatment of foreign investment. The Senator's proposal has merit and should not be ignored by those earnestly and sincerely seeking a solution to the foreign investment problem.

A sincere desire to reach compromise does not, in my opinion, constitute any loss of sovereignty or diminution of the stature of governments, but a realization that in this highly interdependent world in which we live, nations should exercise their sovereign powers in a non-discriminatory manner so as to protect and encourage all the elements of their societies—domestic and foreign—to contribute effectively to the commonwealth.

And . . . isn't this what the foreign investor is really seeking, and is this too much to ask from responsible and full fledged members of the family of nations? The fulfillment of treaty obligations (*pacta sunt servanda*) is a basic principle of international law which governs the conduct between States, but its underlying philosophy of abiding by agreements made in good faith, is no less applicable between States and individuals.

And, if in the history of a nation it becomes necessary in the interests of its people to modify agreements with other states or with individuals, impartial tribunals should be called upon to determine the equities absent a satisfactory understanding between the parties in conflict. Sovereign rights are not weakened, but strengthened by the rule of law. Thus the desirability of a hemispheric tribunal to settle investment disputes for which precedent already exists in the Center for the Settlement of International Investment Disputes of the World Bank.

The U.S. investor, in the difficult and tortuous path which lies ahead should not have to travel alone. In his quest for a new way of life in Latin America, I believe he has a right to seek the understanding and aid of the Latin American businessman who, in many instances, has remained aloof to the plight of his brother investor. The winds of competition may be chilling, but the freeze imposed by a pervasive, omnipresent and powerful government—deadly. The Latin American private investor should understand that his long range destiny is linked to that of the foreign investor, and that the fate of the latter today may well be his fate in the future.

The U.S. Government also has a responsibility towards its nationals investing in Latin America which may best be discharged, not by aloofness but by involvement and by positive contributions to the solution of a problem in which the national interest is involved. This calls for the most skillful diplomatic tight rope walking to avoid the charge

of "Yankee influence", but is there anyone here who believes that the solution to the problem does not call for the highest statesmanship, both at the business and governmental levels. In the U.S. governmental area the desirability of expanding the Guarantee Programs should not be overlooked but the foreign investor should keep a watchful eye on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to determine if, in truth, there is now a new agency, or if we have merely added another floor to our ever growing bureaucratic structure.

Not one, therefore, but all the parties concerned must seek the climate of understanding within which meaningful investment relations can be established. Consequently, no opportunity can be missed to promote the interchange of ideas between governments, between investors, and between governments and the private sector. The process of education must be continuous in order to avoid the provincial thinking which has existed for so long in the field of foreign investment. Conferences such as this one are obviously important. Likewise, educational institutions have a major role to play in this area, and governments and private industry should support those educational efforts which seek to explore, research, and find solutions to the problems resulting from investment in the developing nations.

Raul Prebisch had this to say on the subject:

"Complete mutual understanding has not been reached as yet in Latin America. To achieve it, dialogue is a pressing and indispensable requirement. A dialogue must be maintained with men concerned in politics, economics and trade union organizations, with men who move in other spheres of thought and action, especially those who belong to the new generations. Dialogue of this kind can and must lead to the discovery of a common ground, to a pragmatic consensus of opinion conducive to the action that will accept no further delay."

Understanding begets wisdom and wisdom of the highest order is called for in the troubled days that lie ahead for the U.S. investor in Latin America. But in spite of the troubled waters in which he must navigate, I am hopeful that he will reach port safely, battered and weather beaten perhaps, but so much stronger for having sailed in a wild and stormy sea.

#### SOVIET UNION IN CUBA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very relevant address by Dr. Manolo Reyes, Latin American news editor of television station WTVJ in Miami, which he gave before the Key West Council of the Naval League of the United States.

Dr. Reyes is a distinguished journalist and commentator on events in Cuba. I have personally found him extremely knowledgeable on the activities of the Soviet Union in regard to Cuba, and I wish to afford the other Members of this Congress an opportunity to read his account of the efforts of the Soviet Union to make Cuba a military stronghold in the Caribbean.

The address follows:

#### SPEECH BY DR. MANOLO REYES

In this the Twentieth Century, man has made his greatest technological and scientific

discoveries and advancements. At the same time, civilization has created its greatest means of self-destruction.

The Second World War was an irrefutable example of how great devastation by naval and aerial power can be. In the last decade with the marvels of technology and precision, man has reached the Moon. Also during this decade, the unsuspectable limits of nuclear power have increased, incrementing the possibility of self-destruction with the development of the intercontinental offensive missile system.

I believe that the decade which is beginning with this year 1971, will have as a common denominator, man's submarine power. To support this theory is the fact that the United States, always in search of world peace, is trying to achieve on the highest level, a treaty to ban "submarine weapons."

By submarine weapons, I understand them to include the fixed nuclear missile silos on the ocean floor as well as the nuclear submarines themselves.

Perhaps to those who do not fully comprehend this matter, it might sound illogical to place nuclear weapons on the ocean floor, but this does present several high-low ranges. At 160 to 200 feet of depth a nuclear missile silo could be placed on a submarine platform without being detected by reconnaissance planes.

Precisely a few months ago on the 26th of February of this year, I read something which caught my attention. The prestigious newspaper "La Prensa" of Buenos Aires on page three, printed a cable received from United Press International, stating:

"In Mexico the Soviet Union announced that they are helping Cuba in their search for petroleum in the Caribbean. The announcement made in a news bulletin of the Russian Embassy in Mexico states that a group of specialists of this nationality are building a platform to be used in primary exploratory experiments in Cuban waters. A representative of the Russian Embassy declined to point out the exact location where these experiments will be carried out, or how many technicians are taking part in said affair."

This has filled me with doubt. It is apparently submarine work and the decade which is beginning is one to be dominated by those with submarine power. And Cuba (well-named the key to the Americas) is now more than ever the key to submarine power for the present and future of the Western Hemisphere.

Lamentably, Cuba is today the first colony of the Soviet Union in the American Continent. But, I trust that it will be the first and last. It is inconceivably threatening to imagine a collective Soviet force in the heart of the Americas.

On the 7th of August, 1962, we were the first to alert of the presence of 5,000 Russian soldiers in Cuba. At first we were not believed. Twelve weeks later the missile crisis of October 1962 occurred.

The 28th of April, 1969, we again announced the Russian military buildups in Cuba. Three months later, July 26th, a Soviet naval squadron visited Cuba for the first time in the history of Cuba and the American Continents.

During the last year we have personally gone on four occasions to the floor of the Congress of the United States and once to the Special Commission for the Security of the Organization of American States to denounce the Russian military presence in Cuba.

This month, only a few days ago, we went before this Commission of the Organization of American States to denounce the presence of Russian nuclear submarines in Cuban waters.

I would like to make clear . . . as I have always . . . that I am not an expert, much

less a technician on naval or military matters. But I have received, and continue to receive, many reports from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance whose members risk their lives so that the free world may know the true situation inside the martyr island of Cuba.

They were my source of information when I reported the presence of a Russian nuclear submarine, displacing 5,000 tons and approximately 390-feet long, in Cuban waters last May. This type of nuclear submarine, the analysis indicated, was equipped with eight rockets or missiles called "Shaddock", (with a range of 500 miles). These rockets are surface-to-surface type.

Precisely one of the modern weapons which is of greatest expense is the nuclear submarine. There are those who have estimated their cost of construction at approximately eighty-million dollars. Hence, care and maintenance are very important.

In this sense, essential to the care of the nuclear submarine is a change of crews. We have learned that the training of a nuclear submarine crew lasts no less than three years. The selected personnel are hand picked for particular traits. It appears that if hostilities break loose among the men, the nuclear submarine rarely will come to surface. Thus the importance of a change and rest for the crew of a nuclear submarine is great.

The United States has three known bases in the world for their nuclear submarines. Officially, the Soviet Union has none. I maintain my opinion that, according to the reports from my fellow patriots, the Russians do now have a base in Cuba.

Their base is in a Russian naval complex on the southern part of the island of Cuba, bounded by the Bay of Cienfuegos, Key Largo, Playa Giron and the Island of Pines.

The Bay of Cienfuegos, or Jagua Bay, discovered by Christopher Columbus in 1494, is 370 miles from the Bay of Guantanamo. Admiral Mahan, one of the greatest strategists of the United States, noted in a statement published in "Commercial Cuba" in New York in 1898, that the Bay of Cienfuegos was the most important strategic point in the Caribbean.

Alcatraz Key, in the southeast portion of the Bay of Cienfuegos, is small, but larger than an aircraft carrier. The Russians have diligently been building for the last few months on its surface. The Cuban Resistance informed us that much of the material used in Alcatraz Key was pre-fabricated and brought from Russia.

Six Russian naval squadrons have been in Cuba since July of 1969. Many of the units of these squadrons have been to Cienfuegos, mainly at Alcatraz Key.

Precisely there were two large barges stationed there for quite a while. The Cuban Patriotic Resistance reported that in September 1970, there was a small leak of radioactive contaminated water from one of the Russian barges which caused the death of thousands of fish.

The area of Alcatraz Key has been taken-over totally by the Russians. Almost three-quarters of Cienfuegos Bay is in Russian hands and the Cubans have been removed from there. They are not even allowed to visit or fish in the area.

The buildings built in Alcatraz Key in the last months are two very long barracks and the Resistance reports that Russian sailors and military personnel are lodged there. There is also an area for the Russian officers to live.

In the center of Alcatraz Key there is a great recreation field, probably for playing football or soccer. The Resistance calculates the field as about one hundred meters long.

According to information received from the Resistance, Alcatraz Key has an enormous dock situated to aid in the unloading

of nuclear submarines. In the surrounding area, there are storage warehouses for rockets or missiles. These warehouses are close to the northern coast of Alcatraz Key. It is common knowledge that submarines must have calm water for loading or unloading missiles. The calm waters of the Bay of Cienfuegos are exceptionally suited for this.

Alcatraz Key is not the Russian naval base. Alcatraz Key is for logistic support of the Russian nuclear submarines and the Soviet Navy. It is there, according to Cuban Resistance reports, that the submarine units undergo mechanical checks and repair, and the Soviet crews can be based for change or rest and relaxation.

The true Russian Naval Base is located in the southeast of Cienfuegos, in Key Largo. Since 1960, Key Largo has been in Russian hands. The presence of Cubans, or their sailing nearby, is prohibited.

Over there is a Russian Naval High Command. The northern coast of Key Largo was dredged a few years ago by the Russians and readied for nuclear submarines. On the Eastern Coast, running water installations have been built. A large road crosses Key Largo from one side to the other. There is a vast airport on the western section and great installations used for the embarking and disembarking of the Russians at the Key. The Caribbean waters surrounding Key Largo are very deep and the Resistance states that submarines can enter and leave, and it is very difficult to be detected there.

To end this exposition, I wish to publicly announce two reports received from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance.

First, it is very probable that the Fidel Castro Regime is awaiting the arrival in Cuba of a new Russian naval squadron—apparently larger than the former ones—for a display of naval force on the 26th of July.

We understand this second report to be of greater importance too. The Resistance states that the Russian military and naval presence in Cuba continues to increase. The Russians are penetrating all levels of life. Previously, their presence was felt only in the national order. But during the year of 1971, they have been appearing in groups in local life in the villages and small towns on the island.

Work especially directed for submarine base by the Russians continues throughout the island. The most recent activity being on the northern coast of Oriente, in a place known as Saetia, near Nipe Bay and in the province of Pinar del Rio on the peninsula of Guanacabibes.

All of this has led the Resistance to believe that if there were a confrontation in Cuba (on the exterior or interior), it is probable that the Russians would retreat as they did in the missile crisis of October 1962.

But the Resistance leads us to understand that if a year and a half more were to pass without a confrontation, and the Russians continue to become militarily and navally strong particularly with their submarine installations—then they might not back down.

Therefore, the time for dramatic balance is now!

#### DISTINGUISHED PROTECTOR OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from North Caro-

lina (Mr. ERVIN) has been a longtime defender against the invasion of personal privacy. Extensive hearings before his Constitutional Rights Subcommittee have documented violations of individual privacy, and his reputation is so well established in this area that he receives complaints and statements from individuals on this subject every day.

Senator ERVIN is the author of a comprehensive bill, S. 1438, the Federal employee bill of rights, which has 50 Senate cosponsors. Today's Christian Science Monitor presents compelling evidence of the need for such a bill. Statements received by Senator ERVIN from Government employees describe coercion to attend a program of "training sessions." The sessions often included mandatory, person-to-person revelations on a number of subjects of a deeply personal and private nature. After examining these complaints, Senator ERVIN stated:

The scope of this program and the techniques used in it amount to economic coercion of the individual to submit to official attempts to control his thoughts and emotions in ways completely uncalled for in the employment relationship.

I want to pay special tribute to this distinguished Member's tireless efforts to protect the privacy of all Americans.

The article from the Christian Science Monitor appears below:

#### U.S. STAFF FEELS PINCH ON PRIVACY

(By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—Widespread series of training sessions for government employees have brought charges here of grave invasions of employees' privacy.

The sessions have a worthy aim—rooting out discrimination within federal agencies, to ensure that equal opportunity exists for all employees, especially minority-group members. They are being conducted for employees of numerous federal agencies; at this point no one knows how many. But it is known that some 2,000 employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and another 2,000 from the Department of Agriculture have attended various sessions.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D) of North Carolina, long known as a protector of government employees' rights, for the past few months has been receiving complaints from government employees. Several have protested that they were required to attend sessions against their wishes.

#### COERCION CHARGED

Others have complained that during their sessions they were required to reveal to all present—including fellow supervisors—their innermost thoughts on themselves, loneliness, and sex—in addition to race relations.

Senator Ervin, who is investigating the dimensions and content of the sessions, charges that from what he already has found out "the scope of this program and techniques used in it amount to economic coercion of the individual to submit to official attempts to control his thoughts and emotions in ways completely uncalled for in the employment relationship."

The complaints of privacy invasion and required attendance dribbled in to Senator Ervin's office early this year. Many of them have been from HEW employees, which led the Senator to write a concerned letter to Secretary Elliot L. Richardson this spring.

In it the Senator said that "even the soundest professional supporters of such techniques have emphasized the need for voluntary, enthusiastic participation by the

individual. From the reports received by the subcommittee, it appears that there is not even a gesture toward voluntarism in the government program.

Senator Ervin gave an indication of the scope of the program by quoting from a Nov. 2, 1970, directive of the Public Health Service:

"All headquarters, regional, and field program managers and supervisors shall participate in intensive training and working conferences designed to develop the racial and cultural awareness and skills necessary in applying EEO [equal employment opportunity] policies, goals, and practices to their own immediate circumstances. All designated staff shall have participated in such training programs by the end of the fiscal year."

Senator Ervin also alluded to other complaints that several letter writers voiced: that in some sessions leaders took "great glee" in provoking racial confrontations between races, rather than conducting the sessions dispassionately; and that some leaders refused to cite their qualifications when asked by participants, instead accusing their questioners of showing race prejudice by asking the question.

The Senator now is about to ask each government and agency for a full report on all its equal-opportunity training sessions: whether they're mandatory, how they're conducted, and so on. He expects that on this issue, as so often in the past on other issues, the mere existence of congressional scrutiny will result in closer high-level department control over the programs.

The Senator's probe comes at a time when numerous psychologists and psychiatrists are having serious doubts about the value of many group encounter sessions, similar to some that have been conducted for federal employees.

In answer to the Ervin questions HEW Secretary Richardson has had his department's equal-opportunity program reviewed. He wrote the Senator in response that in the past conferences have been voluntary for nonsupervisory personnel, but mandatory for managers and supervisors. In the future, he wrote, they will be voluntary.

"MY WEAKEST POINT IS . . ."

Secretary Richardson said in his letter that his department's training sessions "cannot reasonably be considered 'sensitivity training.'"

The most shocking complaint came to Senator Ervin from a federal employee in Chicago (not in the Department of HEW). He told of a session in February, "compulsory for all supervisors," in which people were paired off, and sat facing each other. They were given a list of 58 partial sentences to complete, to reveal their feelings. These included:

"The emotion I find most difficult to control is . . ."

"My weakest point is . . ."

"I love . . ."

"Right now I'm feeling . . ."

"I believe in . . ."

"I am most ashamed of . . ."

"Interracial dating and/or marriage make me feel . . ."

"Premarital or extramarital sex . . ."

"Right now this experience is making me feel . . ."

Senator Ervin wants to find out how many similar sessions federal employees have been subjected to.

Most of all, he wants such sessions stopped.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of a death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, August 5.

Mr. MIZELL, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, August 5.

Mr. MIZELL, for 1 hour, on Monday, August 2.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. HAGAN, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include a magazine article.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CAREY of New York) to extend his remarks on the subject of Mr. CAREY of New York's special order.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROBISON of New York in three instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. McCLORY in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in five instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.

Mr. ROY in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. DOW in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. DELLUMS in five instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. COTTER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in four instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.

Mr. DULSKI in six instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Dennis Ylantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1939. An act for the relief of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District, Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4762. An act to amend section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to establish and carry out a program of exchange of medical information.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 29, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

998. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Commission on Railroad Retirement, transmitting the interim report of the Commission as of July 15, 1971, pursuant to section 7(g) of Public Law 91-377, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### 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. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 751. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond crushing bort from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 752. An act to authorize the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile (Rept. 92-388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 753. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 755. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 756. An act to authorize the disposal of quartz crystals from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 757. An act to authorize the disposal of iridium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 758. An act to authorize the disposal of mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 759. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical-grade manganese from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 760. An act to authorize the disposal of manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide from the national stockpile (Rept. 92-395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 761. An act to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile (Rept. 92-396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 762. An act to authorize the disposal of chromium metal from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 763. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 765. An act to authorize the disposal of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 767. An act to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 92-400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 768. An act to authorize the disposal of chemical-grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 769. An act to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 770. An act to authorize the disposal of columbium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 771. An act to authorize the disposal of selenium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 772. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 775. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 776. An act to authorize the disposal of abaca from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 777. An act to authorize the disposal of sisal from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 778. An act to authorize the disposal of kyanite-mullite from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 92-410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. 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 (Rept. No. 92-411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 7960. (Rept. No. 92-412). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 566. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8432. A bill to authorize emergency loan guarantees to major business enterprises (Rept. No. 92-413). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 9272. (Rept. No. 92-414). Ordered to be printed.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 10146. A bill to restore and maintain a healthy transportation system, to provide financial assistance, to encourage investment, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 10147. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10148. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10149. A bill to help prevent pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink, beer, and alcohol containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter, by imposing a tax on such containers (subject to refund in certain cases) when they are filled and sold on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 10150. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10151. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to suspend in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10152. 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. KARTH:

H.R. 10153. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10154. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California,

Mr. BELL, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SISK, Mr. Talcott, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. VETSEY):

H.R. 10155. A bill to provide for the establishment of the California Desert National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California (for himself, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIGGINS,

Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 10156. A bill to provide for the establishment of the California Desert National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 10157. A bill: Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10158. A bill to limit recovery in State and Federal courts under judgments rendered by courts in certain foreign countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10159. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a conquest of cancer agency in order to conquer cancer at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 10161. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation for the modification of Seminole Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10162. A bill to provide for a study and evaluation of the ethical, social, and legal implications of advances in biomedical research and technology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 10163. A bill making appropriations to the President for the development of a prototype desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. St GERMAIN:

H.R. 10164. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require reduced-rate air transportation for elderly people; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10165. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide medical and hospital care to the widows and children of persons who died of service-connected disabilities and to wives and children of persons who have service-connected disabilities rated as total; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10166. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to permit eligible wives and widows to pursue a program of education through correspondence courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10167. A bill to amend chapter 23, United States Code, so as to provide that where death occurs in a State home, the Administrator shall pay the actual cost (not to exceed \$250) of the burial and funeral, and transport the body to the place of burial in the same or any other State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10168. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the educational assistance allowance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10169. A bill to amend chapter 31, United States Code, so as to increase the monthly subsistence allowance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10170. A bill to amend title 38, United

States Code, to repeal the restrictions on dependency and indemnity compensation payments in cases involving inservice waiver of Government life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments made to a hospitalized incompetent veteran will not be terminated unless his estate exceeds \$2,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10172. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require employees of certain Federal contractors and concessionaires to observe the minimum wage and overtime provisions of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. ELBERG):

H.R. 10173. A bill to provide localities with financial assistance to meet their responsibilities and increasing fiscal problems by providing for a general grant of Federal revenue which shall be allocated on the basis of need; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 10174. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 10175. A bill to facilitate voting in the District of Columbia by persons who have been convicted of a felony and have been pardoned or have served their sentence imposed for that felony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COTTER (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 10176. A bill to establish three Medical and Dental Military Academies for the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Army, and the U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10177. 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. HAGAN:

H.R. 10178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exclusion from gross income for States and local law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 10179. 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.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 10180. A bill to provide for the management, protection, and development of the national resources lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 10181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to investigate, plan, and construct projects for the control of stream-bank erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10182. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Desert Pupfish National Monument in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUNNELS (for himself, Mrs. CHRISHOLM, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr.

BURTON, Mr. FISHER, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 10183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 10184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for social security paid by employees and by the self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution providing for creation of a joint committee to study and make recommendations concerning establishment of a national college student congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 815. 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.

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 819. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the election of the President and Vice President and the nomination of candidates for the Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 567. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H. Res. 568. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that administration pursuit of current proposals at peace talks in Paris is a matter of utmost urgency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ERLENBORN):

H. Res. 569. Resolution to provide additional funds to the Committee on Education and Labor to study welfare and pension plan programs; to the Committee on House Administration.