

*To be brigadier general*

Col. William Harold Cheeseman, SSAN xxx...  
 xxx-xx-x... Field Artillery.  
 Col. Edgar LeRoy DeGraw, SSAN xxx-xx-x...  
 xxx... Field Artillery.  
 Col. William Porter Marshall, SSAN xxx-xx-x...  
 xxx... Armor.  
 Col. Robert William Steele, SSAN xxx-xx-x...  
 xxx... Infantry.  
 Col. Harry Wellington Thode, SSAN xxx-xx-x...  
 xxx... Finance Corps.  
 Col. William Lawrence Youell, SSAN xxx...  
 xxx-xx-x... Field Artillery.

## IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Charles E. Sibre	John T. Orchard
Joseph G. Milo	Peter A. Tebeau
Robert H. Trainor	Joseph T. Kuchin
Kelly S. Callison	Paul H. Millewich
Kenneth P. Rothhaar	Donald C. Gerber
Alan Gracewski	Gordon D. Marsh
James T. Clarke	Donald B. Gilbert
Charles D. Wurster	Stewart I. Marsh
Ronald H. Frazier	Stephen C. Ploszaj
Thomas M. Gemmell	Richard V. Harding
Kenneth W. Bicknell	Michael M. Leone
Roger W. Coursey	Ronald F. Silva
Charles D. Pike	Daniel E. Kalletta
William R. Phillips	Bo C. Josephson
Charles C. Beck	Robert W. Gulick
William J. Gamble	Robert N. Tabor
John P. Wiese	Jay E. Taylor

James T. Armstrong  
 Larry M. Wilson  
 Wayne E. Varry  
 Stanley J. Norman  
 Charles H. King  
 Laurance H. Howell  
 John G. Hersh  
 William J. Inmon  
 Daniel R. Whicker  
 Kenneth R. Borden  
 Henry P. Libuda  
 Edward F. Murphy  
 Gregory S. Cope  
 Larry H. Gibson  
 David E. Henrickson  
 Bruce W. Platz  
 Gerald G. Kokos  
 James R. Riesz  
 Carl A. Swedberg  
 William E. Willis  
 Alan L. Klingensmith  
 Richard A. Myszka  
 Richard E. Cox  
 Tom R. Wilson  
 Patrick A. Turlo  
 Ralph D. Lewis  
 Donald E. Plake  
 David J. Ramsey  
 Robert C. Foley  
 Stephen J. Decesare  
 Bryant M. Nodine  
 Jonathan K. Waldron  
 Michael A. Conway  
 Charles S. Harris  
 Wynn O. Harper

Ray W. Coye  
 James A. Kinghorn  
 Tony E. Hart  
 Charles D. Kroll  
 Kenneth R. Mass  
 Thomas J. Marhevko  
 Thad W. Allen  
 Dennis W. Cleaveland  
 James A. Sylvester  
 James A. Brokenik  
 Carl R. Schramm  
 Albert F. Sganga  
 Kenneth M. Coffland  
 Paul D. Barlow  
 Fred S. Fox  
 Robert J. Camuccio  
 Gregory D. Mucci  
 Richard D. Phillips  
 Norman L. Sealander  
 Richard X. Engdahl  
 Timothy J. Flanagan  
 Anthony Bordieri  
 Robert F. Gonor  
 Steven A. Wallace  
 David J. Isbell  
 Hallie D. Bohan  
 Peter A. Barrett  
 Norman J. Dufour  
 Charles S. Allen  
 John P. Wood  
 Robert P. Moore  
 Jon E. Rosselle  
 David L. Edwards  
 Steven J. Cornell  
 Brian T. Kingsbury

David F. Wallace  
 Thomas A. Rummel  
 Robert A. Gau  
 Donald T. Wetters  
 Philip C. Volk  
 Michael M. Krystkiewicz  
 Frank J. Kline  
 Paul W. Ljunggren  
 Richard C. Sasse  
 Terry A. Robertson  
 Robert W. Slack  
 Bradley R. Troth  
 Henry R. Przelomski  
 John M. Smith  
 Robert D. Alling  
 Don E. Bumps  
 James B. Willis  
 William M. Miller  
 Gary R. McCaffrey  
 John K. Roberts  
 Philip J. Cappel  
 Robert A. Kasper  
 George E. Bills  
 Bruce E. Lee  
 Rand D. Lyman grover  
 Robert M. Bush  
 Craig D. Eide  
 Alan R. Dujenski  
 Robin A. Wendt  
 James R. McGuinness  
 Daniel F. Shotwell

John R. Walters  
 Albert A. Joens  
 Robert M. Letourneau  
 Donald E. Estes  
 Melvin L. Kankelfritz  
 Perry W. Campbell  
 Robert W. Zimmer  
 Robert E. Carmen  
 Duane E. Sulerud  
 Milton D. Moore  
 Frederick F. Lieder  
 Roger D. Holmes  
 Charles K. Bell  
 William T. Horan  
 Harold B. Morton  
 Edward J. Park  
 William G. Shorter  
 Edson J. Reeves  
 Joseph H. Thompson  
 Jr.  
 Charles T. Winfrey  
 Clyde R. Keller Jr.  
 John G. Witherspoon  
 David C. Nelson  
 Alvin A. Sarra Jr.  
 William J. Seney  
 David L. Robinson  
 Robert C. Dorfler  
 Charles R. Mumford  
 Thomas Heald III  
 John D. Leslie  
 James R. Nagle II

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Rev. Howard R. Peters, Ghent United Methodist Church, Norfolk, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, as we meet here today—the elected Representatives from every part of this great Nation—we acknowledge once more that ours is a nation “under God.” We believe that Thou art the Creator and Source of all our liberties, even as the Founding Fathers affirmed: “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Help us, O God, to deal wisely with the weighty problems which are constantly before us. Grant unto us a spirit of appreciation and respect for each other. Though there may be diversity of opinion, may there be no difference in our aim or purpose to make this Nation the finest country it can be.

This, too, is our prayer, that as a nation we may prove to be a benediction to all the rest of the world, promoting peace and good will among peoples everywhere.

In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-129, appointed Mr. CHILES to the Commission on Government Procurement in lieu of Mr. JACKSON, resigned.

REV. HOWARD PETERS, MINISTER OF GHENT UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, NORFOLK, VA.

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, we have been pleased this morning to have the Reverend Howard Peters, minister of Ghent United Methodist Church in Norfolk, Va., deliver our prayer.

Howard Peters is my pastor. He has been with us at Ghent for almost a year, having served his previous church in Charlottesville for a number of years. His effectiveness from the pulpit has already won wide admiration for him in Norfolk, and I am particularly moved by the close rapport he has achieved with his new congregation in so short a period of time.

It is therefore with great pride that I welcome him as my guest in Washington today and have him offer our daily prayer in this Chamber.

## THE HONORABLE CLIFFARD D. CARLSON

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Illinois, Mr. CLIFFARD D. CARLSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect present himself in the Well of the House to take the oath of office.

Mr. CLIFFARD D. CARLSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY ON U.S. ESCALATION OF ITS COMBAT ROLE IN INDOCHINA

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the American people have made it clear that they want this Nation to stop the bombing and to withdraw—now—from Vietnam.

They want us to set a date for total and complete withdrawal, contingent only upon the return of our prisoners. They want to stop the bombing, to withdraw our support from the Thieu dictatorship, and to get out. Section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 makes this the policy of the United States, and President Nixon is violating the law by his failure to carry it out.

I am today introducing a resolution of inquiry seeking information on the nature and extent of our current involvement in Indochina. It makes 10 specific and detailed requests for information from the President and the Secretary of Defense, for the American people and the

Congress have a right to know why the President is escalating this war instead of taking us out of it.

We want to know the number of military personnel currently in Vietnam.

We want to know the comparative figures for U.S. killed, wounded, and missing in action during the first 10 days of March and the first 10 days of April.

We want to know the number of bombing sorties flown, the tonnage dropped, and the cost of the bombing during the same two periods.

We want to know the target date for the independence of the South Vietnamese Army of U.S. air, ground, and naval support.

We want to know whether the administration has taken any steps to comply with section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 and, if so, what those steps have been.

This information is necessary in order for the Congress to have any integrity in the eyes of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Abzug) has expired.

#### THE CONTINUED BOMBING IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the events in Southeast Asia during the recess should have shattered any illusions of even the most ardent believers in the Nixon Vietnamization policy. It is, and has been, a failure. It has not brought peace. It has brought only more death and destruction. The war has been intensified. Countless more refugees have been driven from their homes. No end is in sight.

The war is not winding down; it is raining down—raining down ton after ton of devastation dropped from American aircraft. This is a tragic and unacceptable regression to the disastrous and discredited bombing policies of the past. The failure of this strategy has been apparent throughout the past 7 years. It has not broken the will of the North Vietnamese to resist, but it has yielded untold death, vast devastation, and millions of refugees.

On April 6, as the administration resumed the bombing of North Vietnam, I sent an urgent telegram to the President urging him "in the strongest possible terms to order an immediate and complete halt to all American air strikes in Southeast Asia," and calling upon him to immediately resume the Paris negotiations.

But Congress cannot shirk its responsibility by leaving the conduct of foreign policy to the whims of the executive branch.

Time and time again the American people have made their steadfast opposition to this war clear—in the public opinion polls, in the voting booths, in the streets. As their Representatives, Congress has a responsibility to carry out their will.

As I have urged for the past 7 years, Congress must take legislative action and

cut off the funds which fuel the expanding air war.

In addition, Congress must demand that the President comply with section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 which declares it to be the policy of the United States to terminate at the earliest practicable date all U.S. military operations in Indochina and to provide for the withdrawal of all U.S. military forces at a date certain subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

It is way past time for the Vietnam war to end, and Congress must end it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), has expired.

#### VIETNAMIZATION IS WORKING

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I came into the House Chamber just as my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) was commenting on the current North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam and saying that this proves that our policy of Vietnamization is not working. Well, Mr. Speaker, the policy of Vietnamization is designed to give the South Vietnamese who, 2 or 3 years ago, were not very good in handling military affairs, the ability to defend themselves.

I just sat in on a briefing by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I cannot comment on what he said, of course, but I will say to you that my own personal impression was that the South Vietnamese are doing a pretty darn good job in a battle in which virtually all of the military forces of North Vietnam are committed in a conventional invasion. And to me that appears to be a pretty good demonstration that Vietnamization is working. If this is not so, then I do not know what we need to convince us.

#### THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Abzug) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) condemning the U.S. Government and the South Vietnamese. I am waiting for the day when they are going to condemn the Communists for invading South Vietnam. That is the problem. If the North Vietnamese would go home, there would not be any need for the bombing.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we ought not to be apologizing for the actions that we are taking to prevent civilians being killed and displaced.

The gentleman from New York referred to refugees. Well, those refugees would still be in their homes if the North Vietnamese stayed behind the demilitarized zone where they belong. That is the problem, and we ought to be making some speeches concerning that factor.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Of course, I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman familiar with section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971, legislation passed by the House and Senate which requires the President to terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations in Southeast Asia and to set a date for the withdrawal of our troops? It also calls upon the President to negotiate a cease-fire.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman from New York that I am aware that the President of the United States is withdrawing our troops, and in doing so, is attempting to protect those troops who are still in South Vietnam.

But let me ask the gentleman from New York, are you going to condemn at any time the actions of the North Vietnamese for invading South Vietnam?

The South Vietnamese are not the ones who are invading, they are the ones who are being invaded.

Mr. RYAN. The situation in Southeast Asia remains what it has been from the beginning—essentially a civil war. As I have said so often, it is not susceptible to a military solution but requires a political solution.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We will see plenty more civilians killed over there if we continue to let the North Vietnamese just keep going. It is interesting that the refugees are moving south rather than to North Vietnam. This indicates they understand that North Vietnam has a history of maltreatment of refugees. They know where their friends are.

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

#### OUR ECONOMIC ADVANCE GAINS MOMENTUM

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, evidence of business improvement is continuing to accumulate. Economic statistics are continuing to show signs of an accelerating economic expansion.

The Federal Reserve's index of industrial production showed a strong advance in February, rising eight-tenths of a point. The output gains were widespread in consumer goods, business equipment and materials. This is the sixth successive increase in this measure since last August, signaling rapid growth in the manufacturing sector.

The index of leading economic indicators also registered significant gains in February. This composite measure of economic statistics which typically precede economic expansions rose five-tenths of 1 percent, the eighth successive monthly advance. This series has not risen 8 months in a row since the 1960-61 period.

As expected, this business improvement has generated substantial increases in employment. Employment has risen by more than 1.1 million workers since December. Over the last 12 months, em-

ployment has grown 2.4 million, an unusually high increase. And in March, seasonally adjusted employment rose by 618,000, the largest increase for any single month in 12 years.

These recent economic indicators give ample cause for optimism, though not complacency. In spite of unusual employment gains, the unemployment rate remains high. The labor force has expanded at an extraordinary rate to keep the unemployment rate from falling in the face of the large increase in employment. However, the outlook for both business expansion and increased employment during the rest of this year remains encouraging.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13955, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13955) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CASEY of Texas, EVANS of Colorado, HATHAWAY, ROUSH, BEVILL, MAHON, BOW, CEDERBERG, RHODES, and WYATT.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 910 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. Res. 910

*Resolved*, That, for the further expenses of conducting investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 115, by the Select Committee on Crime, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$470,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime shall furnish the Committee on House Ad-

ministration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulation established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

##### [Roll No. 102]

Abernethy	Fish	Moorhead
Abourezk	Flood	Morse
Alexander	Gallifanakis	Nix
Aspin	Gallagher	Patman
Badillo	Gialimo	Peyster
Bingham	Gray	Pryor, Ark.
Blatnik	Griffin	Rallsback
Broomfield	Griffiths	Rangel
Byrne, Pa.	Gude	Rhodes
Caffery	Halpern	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Satterfield
Clancy	Hays	Scheuer
Clark	Hébert	Sebellus
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Conyers	Kee	Sikes
Corman	Keith	Stokes
Coughlin	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Crane	Long, La.	Symington
Davis, S.C.	McKay	Teague, Calif.
Dellums	Macdonald,	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mass.	Vigorito
Dorn	Maillard	Widnall
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Wilson,
Dwyer	Mikva	Charles H.
Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.	
Eshleman	Monagan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call I had called up, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 910, and unanimous consent had been granted that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

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

THE JACK ANDERSON COLUMN OF APRIL 11, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Anderson in his column of April 11, 1972, seeks to impute some wrongdoing to

my action in writing a letter to the Department of Defense on behalf of a southern California electronics manufacturer.

My records contain a copy of a letter dated December 19, 1968, which I wrote to Dr. Harold Brown, then Secretary of the Air Force. A perusal of this letter shows that it is of the usual variety asking for fair consideration of a proposal by ITT/Gilfillan, a California company based in Los Angeles. This company was in competition with two other companies for a contract to furnish a ground control radar device.

My letter also refers to a briefing given to Members of the California delegation by the Gilfillan Co. on the proposal to the Air Force.

I find that my letter of December 19, 1968, was written on my office stationery as a Member of Congress, typed by my secretary, and in no way referred to my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations.

In accordance with Advisory Opinion No. 1 issued by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I consider it my duty as a Representative to urge that fair consideration be given to potential Government contractors located in my State. As have other Members of Congress, I have written hundreds of letters on behalf of labor unions, universities, community action programs, and manufacturers during my congressional service—all without compensation of any kind.

In this case, the Secretary of the Air Force merely assured me that the experience and past performance of all competitors would receive consideration in awarding the contract. As Mr. Anderson points out, the Gilfillan Co. did not receive the contract award, which was, in fact, made to Raytheon, a northeastern corporation, on January 24, 1969.

It is ridiculous on the face of it that a routine letter of this sort, written after a briefing with other members of the California delegation, is made to appear as a service rendered for compensation, which, of course, would be illegal under Federal statutes.

If any individual connected with ITT ever made any contribution to my political campaign, I have no recollection or record of having received it. If such a contribution had been made to me, it would have been duly recorded. Mr. Anderson's allegation or suggestion that I received a payoff from an ITT company for writing a letter is absolutely false.

A copy of my letter of December 19, 1968, is attached:

DECEMBER 19, 1968.

DR. HAROLD BROWN,  
Secretary of the Air Force,  
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been advised that the Air Force will momentarily decide on the successful contractor to manufacture the next generation of Ground Control Approach Radar.

With our airways becoming more and more crowded with commercial traffic, the development of modernized flight safety equipment is of concern to all Americans who travel our airways, whether civilian or military.

Some weeks ago I, along with other members of the California Congressional Delegation,

tion, attended a briefing on the ITT/Gilfillan proposal for the USAF AN/TPN-19 contract. It is my understanding that Gilfillan is well experienced in this field. My particular interest is that this work be done in Southern California; there are approximately 2,100 vendors of various components which will be used in this system located in Southern California alone. I trust that those who are evaluating the competitive proposals would give necessary emphasis to the performance and experience which this California firm has developed.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 910 authorizes an amount not to exceed \$470,000 of additional funds for the Select Committee on Crime.

Briefly, the Select Committee on Crime was established by House Resolution No. 17 on May 1, 1969. During the 91st Congress the committee requested a total of \$1,250,000 for its operations. The House reduced that request by authorizing a total of \$975,000 for its operations. The committee actually spent \$932,762 during the 91st Congress.

The Select Committee on Crime was reestablished for the 92d Congress by House Resolution 115, adopted on March 9, 1971.

The request for this year was cut by the committee in the amount of \$74,000.

I refer my distinguished colleagues to the last paragraph of page 2 of the House report, which states—

House Resolution 910 is similar to House Resolution 857, which was introduced by the Hon. Claude Pepper, Chairman of the Select Committee on Crime. However, House Resolution 910 provides \$74,121 less than the amount Chairman Pepper requested. The Committee on House Administration recommends the reduction on the basis that the activities of the Select Committee on Crime do not justify or require an increase over the amount approved by the House of Representatives for 1971. The Select Committee on Crime was authorized to spend \$675,000 during 1971. When added to the unexpended carryover, House Resolution 910 would make \$696,404.06 available to the Select Committee on Crime during 1972. The \$21,000 increase will be adequate to cover the 5.5 percent pay increase for committee employees.

Does the gentleman from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and, apropos the points that he has just made so well, I would say, first, that I appreciate his good offices in not calling this bill up by request on March 29 as it was originally scheduled.

Second, and as I said, apropos his most recent statement, if I recall the debate on the floor of the House at the time of the second continuation or the reestablishment in the 92d Congress of the Select Committee on Crime, the statement was made that there would be a need for lesser funds in the 92d Congress than there were in the 91st.

If I correctly understand the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey at this time, even in spite of the good action of the Committee on House Administration in reducing this year request, we are granting this committee additional funds over and above those used in both ses-

sions of the 91st Congress. Am I to understand that this is completely justifiable in view of my warm friend from New Jersey's committee action, consideration and recommendation?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might say to the gentleman from Missouri, first that the Select Committee on Crime has introduced two requests for funds during the 92d Congress for a total of \$1,294,121. This represents \$44,121 more than requested during the 91st Congress, \$319,121 more than the House authorized the committee to spend during the 91st Congress, and \$361,359 more than the committee spent during the 91st Congress.

By the end of March of this year the Select Committee on Crime had spent a total of \$575,576 for its operations during the 92d Congress. Thus, at the end of the last month the committee had an unexpended balance of about \$99,000 carried over from last year's authorization. If the committee is authorized to spend an additional \$470,000, which the current House resolution provides for, the committee will have available about \$569,000 for its operations during the 9 remaining months of this Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course, we do not plan to operate in the 9 remaining months of the year. I believe the leadership has said we hope to be out of here by the last of July for the various conventions, and certainly in an election year we want to be home campaigning and perpetuating ourselves and doing whatever is necessary for the balance of the year. I, as a "lame duck," would certainly hope we do not have to come back here in one of those infamous lame duck sessions. I am not so naive as to believe the Select Committee on Crime would continue its operations during those remaining months if the Congress is not in session, and I know full well we do not have to spend all the money we authorize, but I also know Parkinson's law.

Apparently answer No. 1 of my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, is "Yes," they are authorized more in spite of the fact they would need less. Second, he would answer that he believes it is justified on the part of his committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes; the subcommittee of which I am chairman, and the full committee, after review and hearing from the chairman and the ranking minority member, does feel the amount is justified.

With respect to adjournment, I might suggest to my dear friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that the leadership hopes its hope, as he expresses it, becomes a reality—and I would make the word HOPE all capitals.

With respect to the gentleman himself, of course, I would gather that he would like to complete his office work in this, his last term with us, not being one of us who has to seek reelection. I might say I think a great majority of us—perhaps just one or two will not—will miss the gentleman tremendously. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for instance, is going to have to get a new personal physician. I do not know whether Dr.

MORGAN from this side of the aisle or Dr. TIM LEE CARTER from the other side will take that place. There is also Dr. MELCHER who might fill in, who is a veterinarian. Then there is Dr. Ray in case some really unique problem arises.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want a lame duck doctor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not blame the gentleman from Iowa. It has been bad enough while his doctor was not a lame duck.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say there is no need to bring the name of our friend, the gentleman from Montana, into this, because he does not specialize in wigetry as some of us do who limit ourselves to practice on genus homo sapiens.

Now if we can get back to the House Resolution 910, I appreciate the surveillance, oversight, and review of the Committee on House Administration. I presume from the remarks that we have reached the point where we have to have faith in the good judgment and this oversight of the committee.

Is there any information available to the committee as to whether this Select Committee on Crime will complete its mission and objectives during this Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. For purposes of answering that question, and those purposes alone, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will say to the able gentleman, as I said to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri when he raised that question at the time our resolution was up for consideration in 1971, that if our committee feels at the end of this session, of this Congress, there is no more useful work for our committee to do, that would have some major impact on the crime problem in our country, we would certainly not ask our colleagues to continue our existence.

Remember that the resolution continuing this committee would have to be reintroduced. It would have to come up before the Rules Committee and would have to be approved by the House.

I can assure the gentleman that ours has been a hard-working committee. If we do not feel there is some real justification for our efforts, we will not ask our colleagues to continue them.

On the other hand, the problem of crime in this country is still a very challenging one. We are having a difficult time trying to find something to do about it. Our 11-member committee, of six Democrats and five Republicans, conscientious and dedicated men, are concerned about this problem. If we should feel there is some contribution of import we can make I am sure we would feel disposed to lay it before our colleagues for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime was created on May 1, 1969. The committee was authorized and directed to investigate and study all aspects of crime in America. This broad mandate allows the select committee to assist and complement the standing committees of this House in meeting their enormous responsibility in combatting crime in America.

The select committee has made a continuous and dedicated effort to meet its responsibilities since it was constituted.

Substantive areas of the national crime problem have been investigated. Public hearings have been conducted in many parts of the country. In all over 19 cities have been the sites of committee hearings or other activity. Numerous reports containing recommendations for remedial legislation have already been submitted to this House for consideration.

The causes of crime are not easily understood. We must know the effect of crime on our society, yet an accurate evaluation of that effect is most difficult. The wisdom of the law and the fair administration of justice must be closely examined and constantly improved. The treatment of individual citizens who violate the law must be enlightened and rehabilitative rather than vengeful and harmful to our society as a whole. Although the problem of crime cannot be quickly or easily solved, I believe that every effort to do so must be made.

The Select Committee on Crime conducted the following public hearings:

LOCATION, CRIME IN AMERICA INQUIRY, AND DATE

Washington, D.C., and Lorton, Va.: The improvement and reform of law enforcement and criminal justice in the United States; July 28-31; Aug. 4, 7, 11, 12; Sept. 17, 18, 1969.

Boston, Mass.: Drug abuse and criminal justice; August 25, 26, 1969.

Omaha and Lincoln, Nebr.: A mid-America view; Oct. 9-11, 1969.

Washington, D.C.: Views on marihuana; Oct. 14, 15, 1969.

San Francisco, Calif.: Illicit and dangerous drugs; Oct. 23-25, 27, 1969.

Washington, D.C.: Why 8 billion amphetamines?; Nov. 18, 1969.

Columbia, S.C.: Response of a mid-south community; Nov. 21, 22, 1969.

Miami, Fla.: Aspects of organized crime, court delay and juvenile justice; Dec. 4-6, 8, 1969.

Washington, D.C., Fairfax, Va., Riverdale, Md.: In the Nation's Capital; Feb. 25-28, 1970.

Baltimore, Md.: Youth in trouble; Mar. 19, 20, 1970.

New York, N.Y.: Heroin importation, distribution, packaging and paraphernalia; June 25-26, 1970.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Youth gang warfare; July 16, 17, 1970.

Washington, D.C.: The heroin paraphernalia trade; Oct. 5, 6, 1970.

Washington, D.C.: Narcotics Research, Rehabilitation and Treatment; April 26, 27, 28; June 2, 3, 4, 23, 1971.

Washington, D.C.: American Prisons in Turmoil (Pt. 1); Nov. 29, 30; Dec. 1, 2, 3, 1971.

Washington, D.C.: Organized Crime Converting Worthless Securities into Cash; Dec. 7, 8, 9, 1971.

New York, N.Y.: American Prisons in Turmoil (Pt. 2); Feb. 25, 1972.

The committee's public hearings initially sought a broad view of the crime problem. Later, the committee's attention was focused on juvenile delinquency and the Nation's tremendous drug problems. Our public hearings were conducted for the purpose of evolving specific legislation to meet the problems of heroin addiction and the heroin paraphernalia trade.

The epidemic increase in heroin addiction is the most tragic and baffling problem facing our Nation today. Ten years ago heroin use was apparently decreasing. Within the past 5 years there has been a dramatic resurgence of heroin addiction, especially among the young. While heroin was once found exclusively in the ghettos, it is now found in every section of the country, and among every segment of the population. The Select Committee on Crime endeavored to ascertain the scope and magnitude of the heroin problem. The committee concluded that unless a massive war is immediately and effectively waged, we will risk losing a generation of Americans to this heroin epidemic.

Heroin can only be made from opium. The sole source of opium is the opium poppy—*papaver somniferum*—which does not readily grow in the United States. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has estimated that more than 80 percent of the heroin used in the United States originated in Turkey. The heroin smuggling routes, from the Middle East to France, and into the United States, are well known. Even so, present Federal law enforcement programs prevent less than 20 percent of the smuggled heroin from reaching American addicts.

There are presently more than 500,000 heroin addicts in the United States. More persons are being addicted each day. New York State's addict population has risen dramatically in the past 5 years, from 50,000 to more than an estimated 200,000 addicts. The dangers and deleterious physical effects of heroin use are well known. However, of all the terrible facts and figures regarding heroin, perhaps the most profoundly shocking is that of the 900 addict deaths in New York City in 1969, 224 were teenagers. In 1970, 48 percent of the cases disposed of in New York City by the Supreme Court of New York involved narcotics violations. Drug related cases account for more than 40 percent of the prison population in the State of New York.

Heroin addiction is no longer just a New York City problem; it is not even just a city problem. Arrest records demonstrate that it has spread like a plague to the suburbs of our great cities and even to rural areas in the Nation. In the last decade our national drug arrests have soared over 700 percent and now number more than 400,000 a year. In Virginia during the 1960's, narcotic addiction jumped 556 percent and Atlanta, Ga., is bracing for a growth in its addict population next year which will double or triple current numbers.

In Detroit, with an estimated 20,000 addict population, arrests soared 442 percent during the last 4 years. Flint, Phila-

delphia, Savannah, and innumerable other towns and cities present a similar picture. A recent study of drug abuse in Florida universities and colleges indicated that well over 2,000 students a year drop out as heroin addicts.

The direct impact of heroin addiction on crime in America is so extensive it defies accurate measure. A confirmed addict may need from \$50 to \$100 a day to support his drug habit. Since legitimate employment is usually impossible, most addicts turn in desperation to crime. It matters little to the addict whether his criminal act be petty larceny, prostitution, or a violent street crime. His need will justify almost any means.

We have developed legislation specifically designed to create a national research program to combat heroin addiction. The committee concluded that a national program for medical research to find a drug to combat heroin addiction is of paramount and overriding importance. No other proposed solution to the problem has such great potential for long-range success in entirely eliminating heroin addiction in this country. The committee recommended a concentrated national effort of emergency priority to find a nonaddictive, safe, long-lasting drug to combat heroin addiction. To initiate an immediate heroin research program, the committee proposed legislation directing the Federal Government to utilize the expertise, experience and laboratory resources of our pharmaceutical manufacturers, by contracting with these firms to conduct intensive research and development of heroin addiction control drugs. Our legislative proposals were cosponsored by 110 Members of the Congress. The legislation has been endorsed and encouraged by 22 State Governors, and numerous attorney generals, mayors of our large cities, district attorneys, and members of the scientific community.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the operative provisions of our bill have been incorporated in the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse legislation recently enacted by this body.

The Director of the President's Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention has recently commended the committee for its contribution in developing this legislation.

In addition to the research report, comprehensive reports relating to nationwide drug rehabilitation efforts are being prepared and edited. We are presently consulting with various administration officials about reconciling proposed legislation in this area.

The committee moreover, found that the heroin trade is not plied by criminals alone. "Legitimate" business plays an essential part. While the substance a drug user introduces into his body may be called heroin, that substance is usually only 10 percent heroin. The remainder is dilutants such as mannite, quinine, or lactose. The heroin street pusher typically sells his product packaged in a No. 5 gelatin capsule or a small glassine envelope. The heroin user often uses needles or syringes. Without question, there are legitimate uses for lactose, sy-

ringes, and gelatin capsules and glassine envelopes of a certain size. However, would anyone expect to find that their neighborhood pharmacy sold 4 tons of mannite, 40,000 ounces of quinine, 47 million glassine envelopes, and 25 million No. 5 gelatin capsules in the past 3 years. The committee located this very drugstore in New York City, and disturbingly this "druggist" had violated no law.

The committee has submitted a report to Congress entitled "Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia." This far-reaching report includes a history of heroin addiction in the United States and in other parts of the world, an analysis of the existing addiction crisis, the detail of international heroin smuggling routes, and an expose of the highly unethical heroin paraphernalia trade. The report sets forth the status of the medical search for substances that may be used to help cure heroin addiction.

The report contains 28 specific recommendations to Congress and the Federal executive branch, including measures regarding international conventions and controls of heroin smuggling, the existing legalized American opium trade, law enforcement procedures regarding heroin, the relationship between drug related crimes, criminal laws dealing with narcotics, and the treatment and rehabilitation of heroin addicts.

In addition, a distinguished member of the committee, Mr. MORGAN MURPHY of Illinois, added substantially to the expertise of the committee by having conducted a special study mission on the world heroin problem. These activities—sponsored by the Foreign Affairs Committee—provided our committee with additional first-hand knowledge of international narcotics trafficking and assisted us in making a number of recommendations for international control of heroin production.

Our proposed model legislation controlling heroin and heroin paraphernalia is presently the subject of hearings before the District Committee of the House of Representatives, which resume tomorrow. H.R. 8569 is a bill designed to assist the District of Columbia government in suppressing the drug paraphernalia trade, namely the materials used to dilute and package heroin for street sales as well as the needles and syringes used to inject heroin into the user's system. By making it more difficult to obtain these materials, street sales of heroin itself will be simultaneously hindered.

In addition, new legislation and regulations were recently adopted in Pennsylvania and Virginia designed to control the heroin paraphernalia trade, in significant respects, as a result of the Select Committee on Crime pioneering hearings, which for the first time drew attention to this aspect of the heroin trade.

The committee's extensive work in the area of narcotics addiction and its effect on crime has been observed throughout the country. We were most pleased last month when our contribution in this field was cited by the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Crime Prevention and Control and

by the Ford Foundation's survey project on drugs.

Also recently, a Special Assistant Attorney General appointed by the President to lead a drive against heroin peddlers throughout the country had occasion to comment on the activities of the committee. The Special Assistant Attorney General noted that he was "personally aware of the pioneering work of the Select Committee on Crime in the drug field. The committee helped alert the Nation to the drug abuse crisis. Among other things, your hearings and reports pointed out the vital need for a better-coordinated approach to the fractionalized efforts in drug abuse treatment and law enforcement."

Of course, our national drug epidemic also involves the abuse and misuse of amphetamine-type drugs.

Regulations promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration and contained in the Federal Register on August 8, 1970, stated that amphetamines may be legitimately prescribed for the treatment of narcolepsy, a rare sleeping sickness, the treatment of hyperkinetic children and in the early stages of weight control. For these few uses, officials at the National Institute of Mental Health have estimated there is annual national need for a few hundred thousand doses of amphetamines. However, legitimate manufacturers have been producing 5 to 8 billion amphetamine doses annually. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimate that more than half of these are diverted into illegal channels. Of the supply remaining within the legal channels, medical authorities state that promiscuous prescribing has led to serious misuse.

The committee solicited the opinions of hundreds of medical authorities and heard testimony from both law enforcement officials and representatives of drug companies. At public hearings, the committee heard terrifying and explicit testimony regarding the physical and psychological consequences of amphetamine addiction among the young. Dependency on amphetamines is not only a significant cause of all types of crime, but it is a deadly destroyer of minds and bodies.

The committee was told that lax laws and regulations have engendered a situation where more than 60 percent of the amphetamines exported to Mexico are smuggled back into the United States and sold in the black market. Though legitimate manufacturers are not the only source of these dangerous drugs, they are the largest single source. The committee learned that little technical expertise or experience is needed to construct and operate a crude laboratory capable of producing these drugs. There is little Federal or State control over the purchase of the immediate precursors of chemical ingredients needed to manufacture amphetamines.

The committee prepared legislation designed to deal with the amphetamine problems exposed by its investigations and hearings. The first bill introduced would have prohibited the manufacture and distribution of methamphetamines—one of the most powerful and widely abused "speed" drugs. The second bill

sought to place strict controls on the manufacture and distribution of all amphetamine-type drugs. Both bills would have imposed stricter limits on the sale of the chemical ingredients of amphetamines.

However, the Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 did not contain adequate controls to prevent the further diversion of legally manufactured amphetamine-type drugs. The members of the select committee believed so strongly in the need for increased controls that they unanimously sponsored an amendment to that act rescheduling amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate, and phenmetrazine, all central nervous system stimulants, from schedule III to schedule II. The committee believed that the increased production controls, registration requirements, and export regulations applied to compounds in schedule II would greatly reduce diversion and abuse of all types of amphetamines. The legislation we proposed has been adopted by administrative action which rescheduled these drugs.

The committee submitted a report to Congress entitled "Amphetamines." The report outlined the history of amphetamine abuse in the United States, the disastrous physical and psychological effects of the misuse and abuse of these drugs and the relationship of this problem to violence and crime. The report details the experiences of Japan and Sweden, both of which have had significant problems with amphetamine-type drugs. The report analyzes the laws and practices which allowed billions of amphetamines to be spewed out annually into the black market.

The report contains specific recommendations for stricter controls of amphetamines and the ingredients of amphetamines, the adoption of the International Psychotropic Drug Protocol, the improvement of international border security procedures, and the prohibition or tighter regulation of mail-order shipments of amphetamines.

As a direct result of our actions the production of additive and deadly amphetamines has been reduced from 8 billion to less than half a million—an 82-percent reduction in annual production. This is a critically significant step in the fight against crime through drug abuse because amphetamine abuse is one of the first steps taken by teenagers along the road to heroin addiction.

Juvenile delinquency is regarded as a major crime problem in the United States. The Federal Bureau of Investigation compiled national crime statistics which showed that approximately 40 percent of those arrested for crimes of violence and 70 percent of those arrested for crimes involving private property were under 21 years of age. The Select Committee on Crime attempted to find out why so many young people are turning to crime.

To further these efforts members of the committee personally inspected juvenile correctional institutions in five States.

The youth corrections system in the United States is, on the whole, a travesty. We have hundred-year-old correctional

institutions which lack proper rehabilitation facilities and, in many instances, do not attempt to institute even the simplest of reforms.

The committee was most impressed, however, with one facility in Red Wing, Minn. The advanced techniques there can and need to be emulated in other institutions throughout the country.

These observations and many more are contained in the committee report entitled "Juvenile Justice and Corrections." As a result of this report, our inspection trip, and hearings we submitted legislation to establish a Juvenile Justice Institute.

The recommendations were merged into legislation offered by the Honorable TOM RAILSBACK of Illinois and retitled to create an "Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice."

That legislation is due to be considered on the floor of this House within the next several weeks and I believe that the prospects are good that it will be approved and sent to the Senate.

In December of last year—after a 4 months' intensive investigation—the committee conducted hearings which related to the treatment and rehabilitation of prisoners in Federal and State prisons. The committee was most gratified when these hearings were described by a leading penologist "as the most comprehensive inquiry ever conducted by the Congress." The first volume of our hearings entitled, "American Prisons in Turmoil," has been distributed to the Congress.

Part of our hearings dealt with events which led up to the tragic circumstances of Attica. One phase of the investigation involving the testimony of a number of inmates has been concluded this year. The committee is now analyzing the facts educed at the hearing and drafting recommendations and proposed legislation for evaluation by the Congress. The analysis, recommendations, and proposed legislation will, of course, be supplied to the entire House of Representatives in the form of a committee report.

Also, in December of last year, the committee held hearings relating to a nationwide apparatus of criminals who use worthless paper to defraud banks, stock brokerage firms, insurance companies, and the public of millions of dollars each year. The investigation revealed that a religious foundation fell into the control of a number of organized criminals who issued more than \$25 million of worthless securities. Those securities were given the facade of respectability by a beautifully printed brochure distributed by the foundation which claimed it had \$20 million of assets. Next, the foundation obtained fraudulent financial statements from corrupt accountants—again giving their securities a facade of value where none actually existed. Finally, the Dun & Bradstreet Co. incorporated the fraudulent financial reports in their publications without a minimal check of the listed assets and disseminated the information to the financial community.

The testimony in relation to this investigation has been completed, but the analysis, legislative recommendations,

and report must be processed during this year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Congress that the committee will utilize the funds provided by this resolution to continue its most resolute efforts in combating the crime problem in the Nation today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime was established by House Resolution 115 adopted March 9, 1971. Reference has been made to Members from Missouri, Dr. HALL being on the floor now. There was at that time a colloquy between our distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and Chairman PEPPER.

I yield for purposes of debate to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) with respect to that.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I would reiterate what I said in effect during the debate on the reestablishment of this select committee.

At one point in the consideration of the matter before the Rules Committee I thought that the matter had been finished. I thought that we were not going to reconstitute the select committee.

I feel as strongly today, despite the good work of the select committee and its members. I feel exactly the same way I did that date some time ago, that we should not have select committees which become perpetual select committees.

I can guarantee to the gentleman from Missouri, whose presence in the next Congress I will miss if I am fortunate enough to be returned here, that if I am returned I will make an effort to see to it that this select committee is not continued and that its jurisdiction—it will obviously need further attention judged by statistics—is taken up by the appropriate standing committee.

I believe it is a very, very poor idea to have select committees that go on and on and on. I believe it should be very clear that an effort is going to be made to see to it that 4 years is the full life of this particular select committee.

I do not say this in any personal way. I do not say it in any criticism of the Members, or even of the select committee. It is merely my view, in a situation where there is a shortage of space, a shortage of money—all kinds of shortages—that if our standing committees are not functioning in a way to carry out their duties there is something very seriously wrong.

On that fundamental principle I want to serve notice that if I am able—in other words, if I am here—as a member of the Rules Committee I intend to oppose that resolution, as I did in this Congress, and also to oppose it on the floor if the majority of the Rules Committee decides to support it.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield, but I wonder if the gentleman would mind, in the light of a commitment which I made earlier, if I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) first, and then we will return to this colloquy, following

which Mr. DICKINSON, the ranking member of the subcommittee, wants to be recognized.

I yield for the purpose of debate only to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of full funding to carry on the work of the Select Committee on Crime and its able chairman, CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida, our esteemed colleague who has devoted his life to the cause of improving the lives of others.

I wish to remind this body today of some of the major accomplishments achieved by the Crime Committee in its relatively brief existence of 3 years.

It is important to remember that the Crime Committee was not given the powers of legislative initiative but was created as a prober, as an investigative body empowered to make recommendations to standing committees.

In its life span, the committee has forwarded more than 120 legislative recommendations, some of which have resulted in legislative action and many of which are under active consideration before various committees of the House.

Just tomorrow, Chairman PEPPER will appear before the House District Committee to urge the passage of a unanimous recommendation of the Crime Committee to make the possession of the "tools of the trade" of heroin pushers prima facie evidence of trafficking in this most evil of dangerous drugs.

It was the Crime Committee that first brought to the attention of the Congress and the country the urgent need for action against those who furnish the bags, the syringes, the equipment to the pusher and who do it without breaking any existing laws.

It was the Crime Committee that more than two and a half years ago called for a reexamination of the marihuana laws and pointed out the inconsistencies from State to State and the uneven application of the law against those found in possession of the drug.

The Crime Committee did the early spadework in this area and it played a part in the administration's decision to reconsider the Federal law as it pertains to simple possession of marihuana and place it in a misdemeanor category.

It was the Crime Committee that a year and a half ago exposed the pittance which the Government and private industry was spending to develop new drugs to combat the national heroin epidemic.

On March 23, President Nixon signed into law a bill establishing the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and, with it, earmarked \$75 million for pharmacological research to develop new drugs to counter the effects of heroin addiction.

It was no coincidence that this section was added to the SAODAP legislation after more than 100 Members of this House and hundreds of public officials, scientists and prosecutors from across the country joined in a call for such research.

It was also the Crime Committee that nearly 3 years ago first threw the public spotlight on the diversion of mil-

lions upon millions of amphetamines—the so-called pep pills—into the illicit markets.

These were the pills which were ruining the lives—and in increasing numbers claiming the lives—of thousands of young people. These were the pills which in the language of the street became known as “speed.”

It was the Crime Committee which relentlessly kept the pressure on the Food and Drug Administration and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to place these pills under quotas and limit their distribution to legitimate medical needs.

There were as many as 8 billion of these pills which rolled out of the drug factories at the time the committee began its inquiry into this pill-popping phenomena.

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are controls on these pills and no more than 470 million will be produced this year—an almost unheard of cutback which can be credited to the good work of CLAUDE PEPPER's committee.

What we are seeking, Mr. Speaker, is the coming to fruition of many of the early initiatives of the Crime Committee.

And there is more work to be done.

The fight against crime in America is not the sole responsibility of the Crime Committee. Many of the standing committees of the House must consider some aspect of crime in the performance of their legislative duties.

The Select Committee on Crime is intended to perform a complementary role.

In a greater sense, the responsibility to curb the rise in crime lies not only with the Congress, but with the entire Federal Government. The executive branch is constantly devising new programs, implementing new projects and perfecting new approaches to improve the enforcement of the laws. The Federal judiciary is constantly striving to improve the administration of justice.

Yet we have heard criticism of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. And we have heard criticism of various Federal agencies responsible for enforcing the drug laws of this country. But this criticism does not mean that we abandon these efforts.

The executive branch has not solved America's crime problem. The standing committees of the House have not solved America's crime problem. And the Select Committee on Crime, alone, will not solve America's crime problem.

It will take all of these agencies and committees, working in concert, to make our streets safe and our homes secure.

The Select Committee on Crime has worked tirelessly toward this objective and it deserves our support and our expression of gratitude for its contributions to date.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish me to yield further to him?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the second time, I appreciate the gentleman asking me if I would like him to yield.

I think insofar as my part in this is concerned I would like simply to reexpress my appreciation for withholding

the action on this resolution from the 29th of March, until today; because, that has given me a chance to research and to study in a probative way the actions of this select committee.

Second, I simply want to say that I agree thoroughly with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) in his determination to limit so-called select or ad hoc committee, and it makes me almost willing to renege on my determination to retire and come back in order to aid, help, and abet him in his plan to forsake these special and select committees.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Why does not the gentleman do that?

Mr. HALL. Mr. BOLLING's interest and mine both comes not out of any personalities involved, but out of our work on the reorganization of the Congress and our conviction that we should do our work through our regularly established committees and subcommittees rather than the so-called select committees and others.

It is for that reason, plus the fact that I am sorely concerned about the fact that the duly constituted committees or the subcommittees responsible have not carried out this function, and as far as our research has indicated, do not plan to carry out this function; including reorganized subcommittees to which the duties, aims, and objectives could be assigned, that I have asked for this delay.

My first concern, naturally, is that there is an overexpenditure of taxpayers' funds for this committee and the mighty “iffy” statement made by the chairman in response to my other question, as contradicted to the very direct statement he made to my colleague from Missouri last year wherein he says:

I will say to my friend it is my purpose as the introducer of the resolution for the Select Committee and the prospective chairman of the committee to try to conclude our work at the end or by the end of the 92d Congress.

Now, he says if in the opinion of the committee they have completed their mission they will not ask for an extension. That is a mighty “iffy” postulate and is about the same as the chairman from Florida saying that they would require less funding in the 92d Congress than they did in the 91st, when we turn around and fund them for an extra \$47,000, and he asked for even more.

Mr. Speaker, these are my concerns, plus the natural tendency that we see in history and by tradition, to continue indefinitely once a committee is established or formed, and that it makes nice headlines but produces no great output that is not duplicative or otherwise cared for by the regular committees. This is the glory road to self-perpetuation.

However, as a part of some of my research I have found—and over the Easter recess have read and studied—not one but five separate reports by the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives. Some of them are most valuable and some of them are in areas where there is no function on the part of the regular standing committee. Therefore, although I came to the conclusion at the time this funding bill

was brought up rather suddenly, that it should be deferred, I have no great personal objection to the continuation of this select committee throughout the balance of this particular year.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to make a few comments.

First, I am glad of the interest of the gentleman from Missouri in this subject and would hope that somehow or other we could draft the gentleman from Missouri so that he would reconsider and seek reelection, because this would be a very happy event for a number of us in the House.

Second, I would like to assure the Members of the House that in each and every instance when the legislative committees have come before us we have reminded them very strongly of their oversight responsibilities.

In a colloquy with the chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), I determined that the select committee has no legislative jurisdiction and that in every instance in which they find an area where legislation is demanded or should be considered they refer it to the appropriate legislative committee.

It is my hope that the Select Committee on Crime will finish its business by the end of this Congress, but, in any event, the House will work its will at the beginning of the next Congress; that is, those of us who will be here at that time, and decide whether to continue it or to discontinue it. If, by chance, it is continued, then I can assure the Members, my colleagues, that if I am occupying the chairmanship of the subcommittee, as I do now, that I shall go into this matter very, very carefully.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) for a question only.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he has any plan or any approach that would encourage the chairmen of our standing committees to set up effective, operating, empowered, and funded subcommittees so that the utilization of the great manpower that is in this House can be made and so that this House can proceed much more broadly in the handling of its responsibilities.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The answer to the question of the gentleman from California is absolutely “Yes.” In each and every instance we have asked the chairman and the ranking member of each of the legislative committees if their subcommittees are functioning, if they are funded properly, and if they are abiding by the oversight responsibility required by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his reply.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON), for the purposes of debate only.



Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to say that, as a member of the subcommittee, I supported the reduction of the \$74,000 if, in fact, I was not the member who originally recommended it.

I, too, share the concerns expressed by the gentlemen from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING and Mr. HALL) and the Members from other States, also, as to the wisdom of authorizing these funds and whether they are in fact needed.

We went into this in some detail, and I have very serious and very grave reservations as to the necessity for the continuation of this select committee. I know that, considering the membership of the select committee, it is a very prestigious group and, as a consequence, we—and I know speaking for myself—have acceded to their requests because we have such great confidence in the complement and make-up of this select committee.

It is also my personal feeling, however, that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is eminently correct that the functions of this select committee should be handled by a standing committee.

As a matter of fact, the chairman of the full Committee on House Administration observed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary when he came before us and asked for only \$400,000 for the Judiciary Committee's annual budget and compared that to his counterpart in the Senate who used \$4 million for his annual budget, that either the Committee on the Judiciary of the House was not doing enough or the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was doing too much, or maybe it was a little of both.

I would like to ask, if I may, of the chairman of the Select Committee on Crime one additional question. I listened to the earlier question and I heard your answer as to the life expectancy of this group.

I would like to ask the gentleman for the record if it is your anticipation that this select committee will conclude the business that is now pending before it during this Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to give the able gentleman an honest answer—I do not know.

The resolution of the House enacted in early 1971 authorized a continuation of this committee for the 92d Congress. This is simply a resolution to provide funding for the second year of the 92d Congress.

Mr. DICKINSON. I know what it is.

Mr. PEPPER. If the gentleman will allow me, next year a new Congress will be in session and by the end of this year we will know what we have been able to accomplish.

I want to tell the gentleman so far as I am personally concerned, I gladly bear the labors that the chairmanship of this committee has imposed upon me because I feel we are making a significant contribution to the reduction of crime, we have 11 members of this committee however and I am not going to preclude what that committee may resolve to ask this House to permit it to do against crime next year by what I say here today.

Mr. DICKINSON. If the gentleman will allow me, I think the gentleman must have missed the thrust of my question. I am not asking you to exercise a judgment for the 11 members of the committee. I am asking the gentleman if, in your opinion, your committee will conclude the work it has.

Mr. PEPPER. The only honest answer I can give the gentleman is I do not know. We are working very hard. We have accomplished much but there is much to be done.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Let me say, I think the committee has served a useful purpose. I voted for it when it was constituted and I would hope that it will conclude its special purpose this year. I would like to serve notice now that I will vote against its being reconstituted in the next Congress and do what I can as a member of the House Administration Committee to deny funds in the next Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. I think all of us can rely on the exercise of the good judgment of the House, if and when that question comes before the House at the beginning of the 93d Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) want me to yield once more?

Mr. HALL. Yes. I realize I have used an undue portion of the time, but I do want to point out indelibly and clearly for all of the Members the paradox that we face once more. This is not against the Select Committee on Crime. If we have to be an "aginner"—this is against the present organization of the subcommittee of the Judiciary.

There are seven of them. It was brought out in the colloquy that there is no apt or appropriate attention being paid to the problems of crime in these various subcommittees—indeed, that function is presumably assigned to subcommittee No. 6 which is entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights." There is no subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary for crime prevention, crime abuses, or the crime on the streets problem or drug abuse et cetera. This is a part of our paradox that I would hope the Committee on House Administration would challenge and not only next year on the continuation of this select committee, but the chairman of the standing committee to see a proper reorganization within the reorganization of the Congress under the act of 1970 is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3054, AMENDING MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report

on the bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 29, 1972.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with inasmuch as it has been printed in the RECORD and has been available since March 29, 1972.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the distinguished chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee whose work and leadership have brought this conference report to the floor for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3054 extends for 1 year title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and authorizes a grace period of 2 years within which school districts which lost Federal property when the U.S. Postal Service was created could continue to receive impact assistance while phasing out of that program.

The MDTA extension is necessary to allow the Department of Labor to continue to fund such ongoing programs as opportunities industrialization centers, on the job training and institutional training programs, and area skill centers. These programs are currently serving 150,000 enrollees and are funded at \$750 million.

Last year the Congress adopted a comprehensive manpower bill that restructured the character of manpower delivery systems. Unfortunately that bill did not become law and we are facing a further reevaluation of the entire manpower program. In order to carry out the necessary comprehensive review of all of these programs we must extend the existing law for at least 1 year.

An amendment was added by the other body to S. 3054 which had the effect of extending for 2 years—one of which is the current fiscal year—the practice of counting postal employees for the purpose of determining entitlement for funds under the Federal impact aid program. This legislation was necessitated by the conversion of the Post Office Department to the Postal Corporation. Identical legislation has also passed the House under suspension of the rules.

Under the present impact aid program school districts having Federal property which is transferred to other ownership during a school year continue to receive their impact aid payments for that school year and for 1 additional year after the transfer has occurred.

When the U.S. Postal Service was created earlier this year and the Gen-

eral Services Administration transferred the post offices under its jurisdiction to this new corporation, over 700 school districts unexpectedly lost property which the Office of Education had considered Federal property for purposes of the impact aid law. And then the general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare compounded the problem by ruling that these particular transfers of Federal property could not qualify for the normal grace period because of a quirk in the definition of Federal property contained in Public Law 81-874.

The simple purpose of this bill is to correct the inequity caused by this opinion and to make these districts eligible for the same kind of grace period as all other impact aid districts. This period will allow them to finish this year with the impact money which they have already budgeted and to continue 1 more year while they make plans to lessen their reliance on impact aid or to eliminate their participation altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report on S. 3054.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, authorization for title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act expires on June 30, 1972. The act also provides that no expenditures for that title can be made after December 30, 1972.

The House bill provided for a 1-year extension of the authorization under title II and also provided that no expenditures pursuant to this new authorization could be made after December 30, 1973.

The Senate bill did not provide for an extension of the authorization under title II of the MDTA. In addition, it deleted altogether the termination date for authority to expend funds.

The conference report provides for another year's authorization for the Manpower Development and Training Act, because it is unrealistic to expect that we can enact new comprehensive manpower legislation before June 30, 1972.

Since its original enactment, the MDTA has contained a proviso limiting expenditures to a period ending 6 months after the end of the authorization. This is a very unusual provision, which was put into the original MDTA because it was a new and untried program. After 10 years of operation, this special proviso probably serves no useful purpose, and the House receded on the Senate provision that deletes it altogether.

The Senate bill also contained a provision to continue treating property of the U.S. Postal Service as though it were Federal property for purposes of the impact aid program. An identical provision was contained in H.R. 11809, which was favorably reported from the Education and Labor Committee and passed the House under suspension of the rules on December 6, 1971.

The House conferees accepted this provision.

I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING SECTION 613 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 914 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 914

*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. 9552) to amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, those who listened to the resolution will understand its purpose. There appeared no opposition to the matter made in order by House Resolution 914, the bill H.R. 9552, and I reserve the balance of my time. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 9552 is to aid the U.S.-flag passenger fleet which has now dwindled to four vessels. Of these four vessels, two sustained large operating losses in 1970. This bill provides greater cruising flexibility and increased opportunity for carriage of cargo and mail in order to improve the financial situation of these carriers.

Existing law provides that the Secretary of Commerce may permit passenger vessels covered by operating differential subsidy contracts to cruise off their essential trade routes for two-thirds of the year. This bill would authorize such cruising for the full year if the Secretary of Commerce finds that the operation of the vessel on its trade route is not required.

The bill would also amend existing

law to permit U.S.-flag passenger vessels to carry mail and cargo between ports not on their regular routes, if this is not in direct competition with a carrier offering U.S.-flag passenger service. If such carriage is in direct competition with a U.S.-flag passenger carrier, then the consent of the next scheduled U.S.-flag carrier must be obtained.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. GARMATZ. 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. 9552) to amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

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

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. 9552, with Mr. CULVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the titles of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9552 would amend the cruise legislation—section 613—of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

At the present time there are only four U.S.-flag passenger vessels operating and they work out of the west coast. The provisions of this bill would apply to any operating U.S.-flag passenger vessel, but as the situation now stands, it would apply to the four U.S.-flag passenger vessels now operating, namely, the SS *Mariposa*, the SS *Monterey*, the SS *President Cleveland*, and the SS *President Wilson*.

Section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 now provides that the Secretary of Commerce may permit passenger vessels with respect to which an operating differential subsidy contract was entered into prior to January 2, 1960, to cruise off their essential trade routes for two-thirds of each year. H.R. 9552 would amend section 613 to authorize cruising for the entire year if the Secretary finds that the operation of the vessel on its trade route is not required.

The bill would also amend section 613 to permit U.S.-flag passenger vessels to carry mail and cargo between ports not on their regular service if such carriage is not in direct competition with one or more carriers offering U.S.-flag berth service between those ports, or, if such carriage is in direct competition with one or more carriers offering U.S.-flag

berth service between such ports with the consent of the next scheduled U.S.-flag carrier. Such consent shall not unreasonably be withheld in the judgment of the Maritime Administrator.

Unfortunately, these four passenger vessels operate, at best, at a marginal profit. Since we would like to keep these few remaining U.S.-flag passenger vessels running, it is hoped that the added cruising flexibility recognized from H.R. 9552, as well as the limited carriage of cargo permitted within the restrictions of the bill would provide some additional financial assistance to the continued operation of these few remaining U.S.-flag passenger vessels.

For the reasons mentioned above, I urge all my colleagues present to support this important cruise measure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 9552 and urge its immediate passage.

A further explanation of the purpose and need for the legislation is amply covered in the report of your committee. Very briefly, section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 now provides that the Secretary of Commerce may permit subsidized passenger vessels to cruise off essential trade routes for two-thirds of each year.

This bill, H.R. 9552, would amend section 613 to authorize cruising for the entire year if the Secretary finds that the operation of the vessel on the trade route is not required.

The bill also would amend section 613 to permit the four remaining U.S.-flag passenger vessels—SS *Mariposa*, SS *Monterey*, SS *President Cleveland*, and SS *President Wilson*—to carry mail and cargo while cruising between ports not on their regular service if such carriage is not in direct competition with other U.S.-flag carriers or, if there is direct competition, with the consent of the next scheduled U.S.-flag carrier. If such consent should be unreasonably withheld, in the opinion of the Maritime Administrator, he may allow such a carriage.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated there are only four active U.S.-flag passenger ships at this time. There are eight U.S.-flag passenger ships laid up. Two of these four passenger vessels sustained large operating losses in 1970. The provisions of H.R. 9552, allowing cruising for the entire year and the carriage of cargo and mail, will be of some assistance to our four active passenger ships, placing them on a more competitive basis with the many foreign-flag ships cruising from our ports.

This legislation is supported by the administration and was reported unanimously by your committee. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA), a member of the committee.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9552.

Chairman GARMATZ just pointed out that the bill in question would aid our

few remaining passenger vessels by giving them greater cruising flexibility and by allowing them to carry cargo and mail with certain restrictions.

As most of my colleagues may realize, there are no longer any U.S.-flag passenger vessels operating out of the east or gulf coasts of the United States, and the only four U.S.-flag passenger vessels now operating run from the west coast.

Just the other day, one of our colleagues wrote us concerning the problem of no American musicians being employed aboard the many cruise ships sailing from Florida to the Caribbean. As we all know, this is a lucrative and very active trade. Unfortunately, all these U.S. passengers going from Florida ports are going on foreign-flag cruise vessels. Thus, there is no way we can force the employment of American workers, musicians, or otherwise, on these vessels.

I just pointed this out as an example of what happens when our U.S.-flag passenger vessels are displaced by foreign-flag vessels. I cannot think of a greater reason for the passage of this bill than that it will help the operation of the four remaining U.S.-flag vessels—the remnants of our once proud U.S.-flag passenger fleet.

I urge all the Members to support H.R. 9552, because it is in the best interest of the U.S. merchant marine, and U.S. industry and labor in general.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend our chairman for the great deal of time he has given to this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9552, a bill which would, first, allow passenger vessels to cruise off their essential trade routes for the entire year and, second, allow those passenger vessels to carry mail and cargo between ports not on their regular service if such carriage is not in direct competition with another U.S.-flag carrier in that trade.

This legislation is designed to give greater flexibility in the operation of passenger ships. It would also provide a means of earning increased revenue from the carriage of mail and cargo.

At the present time, our once proud passenger fleet has shrunk to our operating ships: the SS *Mariposa*, the SS *Monterey*, the SS *President Cleveland*, and the SS *President Wilson*. Of the four ships in operation, only two of them did not sustain large operating losses in 1970.

We also have eight American-flag passenger ships which are currently laid up. The layup costs for the eight vessels currently idle are substantial—currently \$6.3 million a year—and may ultimately affect the ability of the owning companies to operate as cargo carriers.

The provisions of H.R. 9552 which would allow cruising for the entire year and the carrying of cargo and mail may be of some assistance to our financially troubled passenger vessel-owning companies. While it is doubtful that this bill would cause the reactivation of any laid-up ships, it could help those still in operation.

This legislation may very well enhance future earnings of the passenger ships, making it possible to seek out the business where the markets and traffic are most promising. This is exactly the same freedom of operation that all foreign-flag cruise ships, based in the U.S. ports, are permitted. This is to erase another gesture of legislation which hampers U.S.-flag operations while, at the same time, permitting our foreign-flag competitors a trade advantage.

Retaining these American-flag passenger ships, manned by the great work force of American seamen, constitutes an important integral part of our national defense posture.

These ships have provided a source of prestige and productivity for our U.S. maritime industry. With the passage of H.R. 9552, the four American passenger ships in operation will be able to continue to carry the American flag around the world.

This bill is worthy of the support of the entire House of Representatives, and I urge all of my colleagues to cast an affirmative vote for H.R. 9552.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 I was authorized by the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to participate in a congressional delegation which went to Russia and Poland to view the merchant marine activities behind the Iron Curtain. Following that visit my colleague, Mr. ROGERS from Florida, and I wrote a report entitled "The Soviets and the Seas." I would like to take this opportunity to point out a few of the relevant facts included in that report.

Between 1960 and 1966, the Soviet fleet expanded at a phenomenal rate, climbing from 11th place to sixth place among the world's fleets. While we had only 41 merchant ships on order in that year, the Soviets had 464 on order. At the same time, about 70 percent of our fleet was over 20 years old, while, on the other hand, 80 percent of the Soviet merchant fleet was less than 10 year old.

Since that time, now almost 6 years past, our merchant fleet has continued to diminish in size, and, needless to say, the Soviet fleet has continued to expand at an alarming rate. Further, in 1966 the Soviet expenditure for ship construction exceeded \$600 million. Today, your Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is supporting the authorization of \$250 million for the acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships. Although this request calls for an increase of \$20,313,000 over the 1972 appropriation, it is still a far cry from the \$600 million appropriated by the Soviets 6 years ago.

The total request of \$525,860,000 is in furtherance of the administration's commitment to revitalize the American merchant marine and restore this country to its place as a leading maritime power. Every dollar spent in the construction

of merchant shipping generates many more dollars than are indicated in the cost of a particular vessel. More people are employed in the shipyards, more people are employed at sea and on the docks, more people are involved in the intermodal transportation of our Nation's commerce, and, of course, more goods are shipped in American bottoms thus easing our balance of payments.

Our country is on the threshold of an energy crisis. We are also on the threshold, or the ground floor at least, of a completely new transportation system that, hopefully, can serve to meet this crisis. It is projected, for example, that within the next decade scores of liquified natural gas carriers will be constructed for the transportation of this vital gas from the fields all over the world to the largest consumer: the U.S. market. The nations controlling that transportation system will, naturally, be able to greatly influence the cost of the cargo. The ships authorized in this bill before us today will help us to play a lead role in competing in world markets for these fuels that will be required for us to participate in world commerce and industry in the years ahead.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. 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 section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1183), is amended as follows:*

(a) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:  
(A) By striking out "effective before January 2, 1960, is required for at least one-third of each year, but not" and inserting in lieu thereof "effective before January 2, 1960, is not required".

(B) By striking out "(1) on such service, route, or line for such part of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) on such service, route, or line for some part or no part of each year".

(C) By striking out "(2) on cruises for all or part of the remainder of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) on cruises for all or part of each year". (b) Subsection (d) is amended as follows:

(A) By inserting after the numeral "(1)" the words "except as provided in subdivision (4) of this subsection" and a comma.

(B) By inserting a new subsection (4) to read as follows:

"(4) with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, it may carry cargo and mail between ports to the extent such carriage is not in direct competition with a carrier offering United States-flag berth service between those ports, or, if such carriage is in direct competition with one or more carriers offering United States-flag berth service between such ports, with the consent of all such competitive carriers or subject to contractual arrangements with any such competitive carrier."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (e) is amended by inserting after the words "after consideration of all relevant matter presented, shall" the words "approve the proposed cruise" and by striking out the last comma in the sentence and the words "approve the proposed cruise" at the end of the sentence.

## COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, lines 12 through 20, delete all of subsection 4. and insert in lieu thereof the following new subsection 4:

"(4) Any other provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or of the Shipping Act, 1916, to the contrary notwithstanding, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, it may carry cargo and mail between ports to the extent such carriage is not in direct competition with a carrier offering U.S.-flag berth service between those ports, or, if such carriage is in direct competition with one or more carriers offering U.S.-flag berth service between such ports, with the consent of the next scheduled U.S.-flag carrier, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld in the judgment of the Maritime Administrator."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask one question. Will approval of this legislation, liberalizing operation of these vessels open the door to anything in the nature of a hidden subsidy?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I rise in support of H.R. 9552. Mr. Chairman, we had a major battle here in the House last December over a bill to permit the sale to foreign purchasers of certain U.S.-flag passenger ships which have been withdrawn from service prior to the expiration of their 20-year-service contract because it was not economically feasible for their owners to continue to operate them. I opposed that bill, H.R. 11589, because I felt that we had not made a sufficient effort—neither the Government nor the operators had made a sufficient effort—to enable those ships to operate profitably under the American flag. Nevertheless, the bill passed the House on the theory that nothing we could do would make it practical for American-flag operators to continue to operate those ships. That bill is now pending in the other body.

In the meantime, however, we have four U.S.-flag passenger ships continuing to operate off the west coast. The bill now before us, H.R. 9552, would improve the capability of the operators of those ships to keep them in service. It would remove restrictions on their year-around operation as cruise ships, which is the most profitable kind of passenger ship operation today. At present, the owners of those four ships can utilize them in off-route cruise service a maximum of 7 months a year.

In addition to enabling the four ships to cruise all 12 months of the year, H.R. 9552 would enable the operators of these vessels, under limited circumstances, to carry some cargo and mail, subject to reasonable objections by other American-flag carriers. The key point is that any competitors' objections to such cargo and mail service must be reasonable ones.

I urge support for H.R. 9552. The Department of Commerce concedes that

this legislation provides adequate protection against unfair competition by the cruise ships and could help keep in service the four U.S. passenger ships still operating. I feel it may also make possible the reactivation of some of our laid-up passenger ships as well. I feel we should make every effort to keep the American flag on the high seas in the passenger trade. We have not really worked at it. Consequently, we have lost from 5,000 to 7,000 oceangoing jobs previously held by American citizens. This has occurred at the same time that the cruise trade out of American ports—cruising by American citizens—has reached fabulous proportions, with virtually every maritime nation in the world except the United States benefiting greatly from this lucrative activity made possible by American customers.

Except for the four ships sailing out of west coast ports, the SS *Mariposa*, the SS *Monterey*, the SS *President Cleveland*, and the SS *President Wilson*, there are no American-flag ships providing cruise service for American passengers. Certainly, we should encourage their continuation in this service, and the possible reactivation of some of our other fine American-flag passenger ships.

When an American family takes a cruise on a foreign-flag ship, all of the money spent leaves the United States. Virtually none of this money comes back. It helps to pay the wages of foreign seamen, it adds to the profits of foreign operators, and contributes to the American balance-of-payments deficit. Through the concessions made by H.R. 9552, our four operating American-flag passenger ships can better compete for business in the cruise trade, and other American passenger ship owners can perhaps get back in the business of cruise ship operation. All of the money spent on fares in U.S. passenger ships stays in the United States.

The bill should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULVER, 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. 9552) to amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, pursuant to House Resolution 914, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 374, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]  
YEAS—374

Abbutt	Coughlin	Harrington
Abourezk	Culver	Harsha
Abzug	Curlin	Harvey
Adams	Daniel, Va.	Hastings
Addabbo	Daniels, N.J.	Hathaway
Anderson,	Danielson	Hawkins
Calif.	Davis, Ga.	Hechler, W. Va.
Anderson, Ill.	Davis, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.
Anderson,	de la Garza	Heinz
Tenn.	Delaney	Helstoski
Andrews, Ala.	Dellenback	Henderson
Andrews,	Dellums	Hicks, Mass.
N. Dak.	Denholm	Hicks, Wash.
Annunzio	Dennis	Hillis
Archer	Dent	Hogan
Arends	Derwinski	Hollifield
Ashbrook	Devine	Horton
Ashley	Dickinson	Hosmer
Aspinall	Dingell	Howard
Badillo	Donohue	Hull
Baker	Dow	Hungate
Baring	Downing	Hunt
Barrett	Drinan	Hutchinson
Begich	Dulski	Ichord
Belcher	Duncan	Jacobs
Bell	du Pont	Jarman
Bennett	Eckhardt	Johnson, Calif.
Bergland	Edmondson	Johnson, Pa.
Betts	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Bevill	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Blaggi	Eilberg	Jones, Tenn.
Blester	Erlenborn	Karth
Blanton	Esch	Kastenmeter
Boggs	Evans, Colo.	Kazen
Boland	Evins, Tenn.	Keating
Bolling	Fascell	Keith
Bow	Findley	Kemp
Brademas	Fisher	King
Brasco	Flood	Kluczynski
Bray	Flowers	Koch
Brinkley	Flynt	Kuykendall
Brooks	Foley	Kyl
Broomfield	Ford, Gerald R.	Kyros
Brotzman	Ford,	Landgrebe
Brown, Mich.	William D.	Landrum
Brown, Ohio	Forsythe	Latta
Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain	Leggett
Broyhill, Va.	Fraser	Lennon
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lent
Burke, Fla.	Frenzel	Link
Burke, Mass.	Frey	Lloyd
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton	Long, Md.
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	Lujan
Burton	Garmatz	McClory
Byrnes, Wis.	Gaydos	McCloskey
Byron	Gettys	McClure
Cabell	Gialmo	McCullister
Camp	Gibbons	McCulloch
Carey, N.Y.	Goldwater	McDade
Carlson	Gonzalez	McDonald,
Carney	Goodling	Mich.
Carter	Grasso	McEwen
Casey, Tex.	Gray	McFall
Cederberg	Green, Oreg.	McKevitt
Celler	Green, Pa.	McKinney
Chamberlain	Gross	McMillan
Chappell	Grover	Madden
Clausen,	Gubser	Mahon
Don H.	Gude	Mallory
Clawson, Del	Hagan	Mann
Clay	Haley	Martin
Cleveland	Hall	Mathis, Ga.
Coller	Hamilton	Matsunaga
Collins, Ill.	Hammer-	Mayne
Collins, Tex.	schmidt	Mazzoli
Colmer	Hanley	Meeds
Conable	Hanna	Metcalfe
Conte	Hansen, Idaho	Michel
Cotter	Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Ohio

Mills, Ark.	Reid
Mills, Md.	Reuss
Minish	Riegle
Mink	Roberts
Minshall	Robinson, Va.
Mitchell	Robison, N.Y.
Mizell	Rodino
Mollohan	Roe
Montgomery	Rogers
Moorhead	Roncalio
Morgan	Rooney, N.Y.
Morse	Rooney, Pa.
Mosher	Rosenthal
Moss	Rostenkowski
Murphy, Ill.	Roush
Murphy, N.Y.	Rousselot
Myers	Roy
Natcher	Roybal
Nedzi	Runnels
Nelsen	Ruppe
Nichols	Ruth
Obey	Ryan
O'Hara	St Germain
O'Konski	Sandman
O'Neill	Sarbanes
Passman	Saylor
Patten	Scherle
Pelly	Schmitz
Pepper	Schneebell
Perkins	Schwengel
Pettis	Scott
Pickle	Sebelius
Plke	Seiberling
Pirnie	Shipley
Poage	Shoup
Podell	Shriver
Poff	Sisk
Powell	Skubitz
Preyer, N.C.	Slack
Price, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Price, Tex.	Smith, N.Y.
Pucinski	Snyder
Purcell	Spence
Quie	Springer
Quillen	Staggers
Randall	Stanton,
Rangel	J. William
Rarick	Steed
Rees	Steele

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—59

Abernethy	Fish	Nix
Alexander	Gallifanakis	Patman
Aspin	Gallagher	Peyster
Bingham	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Blackburn	Griffiths	Rallsback
Blatnik	Halpern	Rhodes
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Satterfield
Caffery	Hébert	Scheuer
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Clancy	Kee	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Long, La.	Stanton,
Conyers	McCormack	James V.
Corman	McKay	Stokes
Crane	Macdonald,	Stubblefield
Davis, S.C.	Mass.	Stuckey
Diggs	Mailliard	Symington
Dorn	Mathias, Calif.	Vigorito
Dowdy	Melcher	Widnall
Dwyer	Mikva	Wilson,
Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Eshleman	Monagan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Smith of California.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Patman.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Griffin.  
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Peyster.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Scheuer.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Vigorito.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Conyers.  
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Abernethy.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Bingham.  
Mr. McKay with Mr. McCormack.  
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Gallifanakis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my name appeared as a coauthor of House Joint Resolution 1138. My name was included as a result of a mistake of fact.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13324, MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 916 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 916

*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. 13324) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know of no objection to this rule and reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize funds for the programs of the Maritime Administration in fiscal year 1973.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries increased the Administration's request of \$525,860,000 by \$30,000,000 so that the total cost of the bill is now \$555,860,000, which breaks down as follows:

First, \$280,000,000 for all expenditures dealing with the acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels;

Second, \$232,000,000 for ship operation subsidies;

Third, \$30,000,000 for research and development;

Fourth, \$3,900,000 for reserve fleet maintenance expenses;

Fifth, \$7,670,000 for marine training at the Merchant Marine Academy at King's Point, and;

Sixth, \$2,290,000 for financial assistance to State marine schools.

The \$30,000,000 added in the committee amendment is for the acquisition of modern break-bulk U.S.-flag vessels for lay up in the national defense reserve fleet.

It is anticipated that this amount will provide for the purchase of about 10 such vessels.

I understand this came out of the committee unanimously and there was no opposition vote in the committee or in the Committee on Rules.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13188, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 915 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 915

*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. 13188) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again I know of no opposition to the resolution. I do understand that it is expected that an amendment will be offered by a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the bill that this resolution will make in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13188 is to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1973.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries increased the original request of \$135,660,000 by \$6,160,000 for a total of \$141,820,000 which is the figure in the committee report. This figure is a technical error. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries also added a new section 3 to the bill which provides for an additional \$12,500,000 for payment to bridge owners to alter bridges to permit free navigation. This brings the total cost of the bill to \$154,320,000.

The amount is broken down as follows: \$81,070,000 for the procurement and maintenance of vessels; \$15,100,000 is for the procurement and maintenance of aircraft; \$45,650,000 is for construction of installations and facilities; and \$12,500,000 is for payments to bridge owners noted above.

The largest single item in the bill is an authorization of \$66,000,000 for the construction of a new polar icebreaker which is to be the most powerful icebreaker in the world.

In addition, this bill authorizes the Coast Guard to maintain an average active duty strength of 39,074 for fiscal year 1973.

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

Mr. BOLLING. 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.

#### MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. GARMATZ. 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. 13324) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

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

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. 13324, with Mr. CULVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 13324, a bill to authorize appropriations for six programs of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1973. In a nutshell, the bill would authorize \$555,860,000 for the third year of operations of that Agency under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which envisions the construction of approximately 300 ships over a 10-year period, substantial improvements in the operating-differential subsidy program, and a number of other provisions to revitalize the U.S.-flag merchant marine.

With respect to the construction program, the Administration requested \$250 million for the funding of about 17 highly productive ships in the third year of phased buildup of the ship construction program in preparation for a full-scale construction effort expected to reach a level of 30 ships per year in 1974. Your committee approved this amount, and approved an additional \$30 million for the purchase of about 10 modern break-bulk U.S.-flag vessels for layup in the national defense reserve fleet.

With respect to the operating subsidy program, the Administration requested and your committee approved, \$232 million to be used primarily for operating subsidies for four passenger vessels, 196 cargo liners and 20 bulk carriers. This will be the first year that operating subsidy is granted to bulk vessels as contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. Generally, it will involve the payment of subsidy rather than the payment of premium freight rates by agencies such as the Department of Agriculture.

With respect to the research and development activities of the Maritime Administration, the Administration requested and your committee approved, \$30 million for the continuation of a program that will continue to serve the needs of the entire maritime complex, including Government, shipbuilders, shipowners, and labor.

With respect to reserve fleet expenses, the administration requested and your committee approved, \$3,900,000 to preserve and maintain ships in three reserve fleet sites to supplement the active fleet in times of national emergency.

Finally, the administration requested and your committee approved \$7,670,000 for maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point; and \$2,290,000 for financial assistance to State marine schools. These funds are used for the training of cadets as officers for the U.S.-flag merchant fleet. With respect to Kings Point, these funds would be for the continued maintenance and operation of the Academy. As to the State schools, the requested funds would assist the six participating schools in performing this function.

The bill was ordered reported unanimously, with one amendment, after full

and careful consideration of the record. I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 13324 so that the Maritime Administration can implement the third year of expanded activities envisioned by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, and we can restore this country to its place as a leading maritime nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the bill I feel that I should mention our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), who as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, guided the program through, under which this country will eventually replace our old and obsolete vessels and the American-flag again will fly over our ships on the seven seas.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) has announced his retirement, and I hope that at some later date we may be able to extend to him proper credit for what he has done, but, in the meanwhile, those of us who are intimately connected with the maritime industry know that we owe him a great debt.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation authorizing funds for the programs of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1973. This is the third annual authorization bill to be considered by the Congress following enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. It represents a continuation of the President's commitment to rebuild the American merchant marine during the decade of the 1970's. As you will recall, the President has established a goal of building 300 highly productive merchant vessels during this decade which will be capable of transporting a substantial percentage of our foreign trade.

Two hundred and fifty million dollars has been requested for 1973, an increase of more than \$20 million over the 1972 appropriation. A substantial number of contracts are under consideration by the Maritime Administration for award during fiscal year 1973. Should all of these contracts be approved, as much as \$175 million in additional funds may be required. The President made it clear in his budget message earlier this year that these additional funds will be requested as a supplement as soon as the number of contracts to be let can be established. The \$250 million now requested will be sufficient to provide the Federal share for the construction of 17 ships at a subsidy rate average of 41 percent.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Chairman, that for many years a subsidy rate of 55 percent was in effect reflecting the much higher cost of constructing ships in the United States as opposed to the low-cost foreign shipyards. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 called for a gradual reduction in the rate of subsidy with a goal of 35 percent to be achieved by 1975. The 1972 goal of 43 percent has been met. The 1973 goal of 41 percent will likewise be met. This is rather dramatic evidence of the ability of our shipyards to achieve greater productivity while at the same time constructing increasingly larger and more complex ships.

Some disappointment has been expressed by a number of my colleagues over the fact that the American merchant marine is still carrying a relatively small percentage of our total waterborne foreign trade. There has indeed been no dramatic increase as yet in the relative volume of our trade carried in U.S.-flag ships. We must remember, however, that until the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the American merchant marine had been allowed to flounder in a sea of bureaucracy and indecision at the highest levels of Government. At the same time, our foreign trade was increasing by millions of tons each year.

The result of decades of indifference cannot be reversed in 1, 2 or even 5 years, but important strides are being made. Perhaps most importantly, we are creating a climate in which private investment in the merchant marine will be encouraged. To illustrate this point, the \$250 million called for in this legislation will be matched by over \$300 million in private capital coming from the shipowners, to some extent, but most importantly from insurance companies, trust funds, and other sources of capital which are being encouraged to invest in the merchant marine. This is where the long-term strength of our program lies as the Federal share of ship construction cost declines each year.

In the important area of operating-differential subsidy, fiscal year 1973 will mark the beginning of our efforts to subsidize directly the operation of bulk carriers and to eliminate the payment of premium freight rates for the carriage of Government-impelled cargoes now financed principally by the Department of Agriculture.

The greatest increases in our foreign trade during the past decades have occurred in the bulk area, the carriage of petroleum, various ores, and agricultural commodities. While the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 authorized for the first time operating subsidy for ships engaged in the carriage of these bulk commodities, the establishment of an equitable payment formula has taken a great deal of time.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been conducting extensive hearings over the past 6 months on the vital question of insuring that the ships we are building will indeed carry an increasing share of our foreign trade with particular emphasis upon the transportation of our essential bulk imports. It is this sector of our foreign trade where we are most heavily dependent upon foreign-flag vessels. The American economy cannot function without these imports, and we cannot afford to be so totally dependent upon foreign interests to insure the steady flow of these raw materials. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the continued support of the President for this program, as evidenced by the bill under consideration, together with the continuing oversight efforts of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, will result in the attainment of the goals which we have established for this decade.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the report that subsidies have been reduced from around 55 percent to—

Mr. PELLY. Forty-one percent in the fiscal year 1973 is estimated.

Mr. GROSS. Forty-one percent to 43 percent; is it not?

Mr. PELLY. It is estimated that it will come down to 41 percent and by 1975 down to 35 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Does this indicate a higher cost of shipbuilding in Japan and other shipbuilding countries?

Mr. PELLY. I think it indicates the wisdom of the administration in asking for a program under which they would build several ships of one class so that a contract would be let for say 10 ships as against one ship, so that the costs are reduced.

Mr. GROSS. None of this reduction is attributed to higher shipbuilding costs in foreign yards?

Mr. PELLY. The costs are based upon the differential between foreign shipyards and our own shipyards, and I am sure that due to inflation, costs in those countries, like in our own, have been going up, in some cases even more than in our own.

Mr. GROSS. Subsidies in the past have been based upon production in Japanese yards, have they not, as being the lowest cost yard?

Mr. PELLY. The lowest cost yard; that is correct. I know of the interest of the gentleman from Iowa in efficiency and economy, and therefore I might mention that we never will have to build as many ships as we have had in the past of the old type vessel. Each one of these modern ships, because it will be larger and faster in its turnaround time and much more efficient, will do normally what three to five of the old conventional ships would do. With these new ships we presume that we will now be able to compete with foreign lower wage ships. I believe the whole picture is one of progress, and certainly reflects very careful study and oversight on the part of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. And the \$555.8 million authorized under this legislation has the approval of the Office of Management and Budget?

Mr. PELLY. No. The committee raised the budget request by \$30 million in order to buy up the old bulk cargo vessels and put them in the defense reserve fleet. Then in turn we will build new, efficient ships which will operate under conditions in commercial service and not like wartime conditions when the military needs the older type of vessel.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is saying that this legislation authorizes \$30 million, an expenditure of \$30 million above the budget?

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman is correct. The committee took that upon itself.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING), a member of the committee, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13324 and urge its adoption by the committee.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for H.R. 13324, maritime authorization for fiscal year 1973, which is now pending before this body. In addition to providing much needed funds for the maintenance and upgrading of our merchant marine fleet, this legislation also authorizes \$7,670,000 for the training of midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y.

Mr. Chairman, I feel a particular interest in this legislation for two reasons: first, the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. is located in the congressional district I represent and over the years I have had a warm working relationship with the Academy as its Congressman. Second, having been elected as chairman of the Merchant Marine Academy Board of Visitors last year, I have come to know both the high quality of training this institution provides for our country's future maritime officers and the areas that are deficient to meet the needs of a first-rate Federal academy.

For example, the classrooms, laboratories, and barracks, which were built in 1942 at the beginning of World War II, are only now beginning to undergo modernization and expansion. Likewise, the athletic facilities are substandard and do not measure up to those of a modern high school. While athletics should not be overemphasized, I do think my colleagues would agree that we cannot attract qualified young men to the Academy to train for careers as merchant marine officers and Naval Reserve officers without the proper facilities. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for recognizing in its deliberations on this legislation the basic needs of the Academy as well as the need for modernization and improvement of athletic facilities at the Academy and for initiating in this authorization a program to modernize athletic facilities at Kings Point.

Mr. Chairman, in urging my respected colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 13324 and voting for its passage today, I would like to point out the enormous service the Merchant Marine Academy has provided to the country. Since its founding in 1942, over 13,000 young men have graduated, with the skills and training necessary to man our merchant fleets and serve as leaders in the maritime transportation industry, and today the Academy continues to serve as the major Federal institution producing qualified officers for the U.S. merchant marine and Naval Reserve.

I would like to add at this point my regrets that my New York colleague, whose congressional district, as a result

of redistricting, has been combined with mine, and therefore now includes the Kings Point home of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, was not present on the floor today to register his support for H.R. 13324 and for the outstanding service the Merchant Marine Academy provides to the Nation. I am certain that he would want to add his voice of support if he were here.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely commend the work that has been done on this committee by our chairman, the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, and by the ranking minority member, the Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY, of the State of Washington. The committee is going to miss these two gentlemen when they retire from the Congress at the end of this session. They have been true leaders in our efforts to revitalize and promote a merchant marine which had sagged down to a muddy bottom. Due to their efforts, I think this country will have a strong, viable, modern merchant marine in the 1980's and I hope that they are around to view that happening when it does occur.

The Nation and this Congress are also going to miss these two gentlemen. But they can always look back and see the contribution they have made to the country in the form of a revitalized merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 1324, a bill that would authorize appropriations for certain programs of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1973. Within this authorization request is \$250 million for the construction of about 17 highly productive ships in 1973, as the third year of phased buildup of the ship construction program in preparation for a full-scale construction effort expected to reach a level of 30 ships a year in 1974.

Your committee made careful inquiry as to the need for these funds as it would appear that construction appropriations for fiscal year 1972 have not been expended to date. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs testified that not only would these funds be committed, but that the demand for new construction may exceed funding availability by as much as \$175 million. Should this occur, there is a provision in the budget of the United States for fiscal year 1973 that provides:

The Administration will seek supplemental funds for additional ships if industry response to the proposed construction program surpasses current estimates.

On balance, your committee concluded that the fiscal year 1973 authorization request should be approved, and unanimously reported the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 13324 so that we can restore the U.S.-flag merchant marine to its rightful place in the world as contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my support of H.R. 13324, authorizing appropriations for programs of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1973. The Maritime

Administration performs an outstanding service to our Nation by administering programs to aid in the development, promotion, and operation of the U.S. merchant marine. It administers subsidy programs which assist greatly in the construction, reconstruction, and reconditioning of ships. The Administration helps industry generate increased business for U.S. ships, and conducts programs to develop ports, facilities, and intermodal transportation systems. It conducts research and develops activities which in turn improve the efficiency and economy of the merchant marine, and it operates the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the main fountainhead of merchant marine officers and specialists. While these are just a few of the many functions of the Maritime Administration, I think they point out the need for this legislation.

The merchant marine makes a definite contribution to the area around Mobile, Ala., in my district, and to the entire Nation. Making the merchant marine a viable contributor to the commerce of our Nation is something which I have worked toward for some 8 years and something which the President of the United States has steadfastly supported. We must continue our shipbuilding and rebuilding programs to provide the merchant marine with the means to perform its important tasks. I urge passage of H.R. 13324 so that the work of the Maritime Administration and the merchant marine can proceed.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 13324, authorizing a total of \$555.7 million to restore America to its rightful place among the shipping nations of the world.

It is a tribute to the outstanding effort by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), and to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

I consider this legislation essential to the national interest in three ways.

First, an adequate, self-sufficient merchant fleet is an economic necessity in the world markets of today and tomorrow. Threatened, and in some cases dominated, as it is in world trade, this country needs to regain its premiere position as a simple matter of economic survival.

One way to make the road back from a trade deficit to a necessary surplus much quicker and easier is to provide a merchant fleet that can deliver American goods economically and on time. Such a fleet, under our direct control and not subject to any foreign whims, places this country in a much more competitive position and creates a solid foundation on which to rebuild our trade advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I see no other way for the United States in the future than to regain and improve its trade position, and I see no other way to do that than to create the best merchant fleet in the world.

Let it suffice to say that Japan is now



the leading shipbuilding nation in the world and probably the leading trading nation as well. That is strong evidence that the two go hand in hand.

Beyond the overall advantages of shipbuilding commensurate with our national need to compete effectively in world trade, there are the even more immediate and more precise advantages of an expanded shipbuilding program.

So, the second benefit of this legislation would be jobs. And in a shipbuilding State like Massachusetts, at a time of little or no shipbuilding and economic malaise otherwise, such a program would have an instant impact.

Under this legislation as many as 12 of the authorized ships could be built at the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass. And believe me, spring would not be any more welcome than that kind of activity which would send tremors of hope and confidence throughout eastern Massachusetts.

Economic recovery is contagious, Mr. Chairman, and after the long, cold winter of recession and discouragement, a revitalized shipbuilding industry could be just the spark to touch off a chain reaction of recuperation. This bill would be an act of direct economic assistance to Massachusetts.

Third, Mr. Chairman regardless of what the world of the future holds for this country's interests abroad, there is going to exist a need for the protection of national security.

Even minimal preparedness requires a fleet capable of keeping open economic lifelines and assuring flexibility and maneuverability on the high seas. We simply cannot afford to do without that.

So, Mr. Chairman, to regain trade advantages, to restore the domestic economy, and to protect our future, I strongly urge approval of this legislation.

I would also like to take this occasion Mr. Chairman, to pay tribute to Mrs. Helen Bentley, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, who is doing such an outstanding job overseeing the Nation's shipping. She is one of the most knowledgeable and effective members of the executive branch and one whose ability requires the challenge of an expanded and updated American shipping industry as provided in this bill.

Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their very kind remarks. I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13324

To authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the appropriation Act may provide for the use of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1973, as follows:*

(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense

features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships \$250,000,000;

(b) payment of obligations incurred for ship operation subsidies, \$232,000,000;

(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities (including reimbursement of the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operation), \$30,000,000;

(d) reserve fleet expenses, \$3,900,000;

(e) maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, \$7,670,000; and

(f) financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,290,000.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 10, strike out "\$250,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof, "\$280,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 is for the purchase of modern break-bulk U.S.-flag vessels for lay-up in the National Defense Reserve Fleet".

Mr. LENNON, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure and privilege to have served on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for a little more than 15 years. During that time I have developed in my own mind and belief a very strong respect for our chairman, the Honorable EDWARD GARMATZ, from the great State of Maryland, and also for the ranking minority member of the committee, the Honorable TOM PELLY, the gentleman from the great State of Washington. I want to take this occasion, since they have both announced their intention not to return to Washington for the 93d Congress, to say the Nation owes them a great debt of gratitude for the dedicated service which they have rendered to this Nation of ours, particularly as it related to our merchant marine.

We must think about the fact that today in all the billions and billions and billions of dollars worth of imports and all the billions and billions and billions of dollars worth of every type of export engaged in by this Nation, we carry in American-flag vessels less than 5 percent of all that cargo which is imported into this country and exported from this country. We have only four American-flag passenger vessels today, and they are operating off the west coast. We tried to help them a few minutes ago with legislation. There is not one vessel operating off the gulf coast or the east coast. I believe this will change with the 1970 act and the authorization act of 1971 and the authorization act and the funding of 1971 and 1972, and now with this 1973 act through which we have endeavored to revitalize that fleet.

I would take this time to respond to the gentleman's comments with respect to \$30 million for the national defense reserve fleet. We have a national defense reserve fleet of approximately 140 vessels, but the average age of those vessels is 27 years. It was the definite and positive conclusion of the Department of the Navy, speaking through the Military Sealift Command, that we had to do something to upgrade our national defense

reserve fleet. So this committee, after consultation with the Navy and with the DOD, and particularly the Sealift Command of the Navy, made the decision that the time had come when we had to acquire at least 10 vessels of recent modern vintage of the break-bulk type in order to meet any contingency or emergency that this Nation might be faced with. That is the reason why the decision was made to add this additional money. I do not think any really true American could differ with the logic of the viewpoint we took.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 13324, the maritime authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman has mentioned that your committee amended the request for so-called construction subsidy to include \$30 million specifically earmarked for the purchase of about 10 modern break-bulk vessels for layup in the national defense reserve fleet.

The condition of vessels in the national defense reserve fleet has been a source of grave concern to your Committee for some time, as they will continue to be a vital national asset until the privately owned U.S.-flag merchant fleet is capable of providing the total commercial shipping capability required to meet defense shipping requirements. This situation is not expected to occur until the late 1970's. It is anticipated that at least for the next decade defense emergency shipping requirement will include a significant volume of break-bulk capacity for the transport of vehicles, ammunition and other supplies in small portable lots. The war-built vessels in the national defense reserve fleet have this capacity, but they are old and their reliability under sustained operations cannot be assured. Your committee concluded that the break-bulk capability of the national defense reserve fleet must be upgraded, and amended the authorization request to include \$30 million for the purchase of suitable vessels.

These break-bulk vessel will be selected by the Maritime Administration for their suitability for military use with respect to heavy lift, refrigerated cargo capacity, speed, and age.

Since the bill was reported, your committee received a letter from the commander of the Military Sealift Command, Department of the Navy, where he said:

The need to modernize the NDRF is critical, and in my opinion is of pressing urgency . . . I greatly appreciate your support of the responsibilities of the Military Sealift Command and the Maritime Administration through this timely and significant legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 13324, as amended and unanimously reported by your committee.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for this fine bill.

Today, the Committee of the Whole House is scheduled to take action on the maritime authorization for fiscal year 1973. While hardly one of the most controversial measures which will be appearing or has already appeared before this body, this year, this should, nevertheless, not detract from the tremendous importance of this measure. The open seas are just too important to any nation in this world, both from the viewpoint of the Nation's security and the Nation's economy for any member here from whatever State to be unconcerned about what this measure is all about. For too long this Nation was willing to sit back and allow other nations to perform what was regarded as the menial task of ferrying goods and people back and forth from one country to another. This Nation deliberately, in administration after administration following World War II, allowed other nations to do the merchant marine job for us. Eventually the folly of such policies, conscious or otherwise, became apparent for all to see. The effect on our balance of payments was unfavorable, the total dependence of our merchants on the availability and the prices charged by the ships of other nations was working to our increasing disadvantage in foreign trade. Furthermore, one of this Nation's vital natural resources was withering on the vine and decaying rapidly. I am referring to this Nation's shipbuilding capacity. Once a yard closes because of lack of orders, it is virtually impossible to reassemble it at a future date. Meanwhile, the shipyards of other nations were filled to overflowing with contracts and orders inspired at least in part by firm commitments from American companies and their needs. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was a public admission of the errors of the past and represented a complete about-face and a total commitment to a massive new marine program, envisioning the construction of probably 300 ships over a 10-year period.

Well, now we come to the question that probably bothers not a few of us today: What have we got to show as a result of the passage of this act? "Very little" is the only honest reply. It just goes to show how impossible it is to legislate action and translate good intentions into fact in government. I would be less than honest if I did not confess to a certain disappointment over the administration of this act to date. Certainly we should have more to show for this program 2 years later than we do. It certainly is not a problem of money. Construction appropriations for fiscal year 1972 have not even been expended to date. And here we are being requested to authorize the expenditure of another \$280 million for fiscal year 1973. This is why I was particularly interested in the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on this authorization proposal. This was obviously going to be the question he had to answer before the testimony was concluded. I want to make it absolutely clear, therefore, that the only justification for voting for this measure today is the word of the Assis-

ant Secretary of Commerce that in this, the third year of the buildup of the ship construction program, we will witness actual contracts being signed and ships under construction. We have had enough promises, enough rosy estimating, enough dreaming about a revitalized merchant marine program to carry us through 1980. What we need in 1972 are ships, ships here and now, ships that will sail, ships that will work, ships that will be built. For 3 years now the workers in our shipyards have been waiting for this work. In a few cases, there is serious question about just how much longer they can wait without closing down. I know firsthand of at least one yard, in my own congressional district, the historic Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., which has been waiting to participate in this program—to offer competitive bids for the past 3 years now. It is still waiting.

What with the Defense Department cutbacks and the general slowdown in our Navy shipbuilding program, the only real long-range hope, and indeed the short-range hope, for the yard has to be the commercial shipbuilding field. This is as it should be. There is, after all, a genuine demonstrated need for a greater merchant marine shipping capacity. This certainly beats artificially high defense budgets just to keep people at work. We all know the Congress is committed to this program. We all know that Congress has on every occasion passed requested authorizations and appropriated huge amounts for this program. We are being asked today to authorize and appropriate a further \$280 million for this program. Yet the delays and the redtape from one Government agency or another are delaying this program to the extent that there is a real possibility that some yards may not be around to compete for the work which will surely come one day.

Therefore, I attach the greatest importance to the information gleaned from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce's testimony and published in the report accompanying H.R. 13324. The major justification it would appear, that the Assistant Secretary of Commerce had to offer for Congress approving the authorization before us today is that contracts will shortly be awarded for the construction of six large tankers for Maritime Dynamics Corp. I know I speak for the whole New England economy when I say that I hope this "shortly" will indeed be short and that work can begin soon on one of the largest commercial orders in the history of this Nation's shipbuilding capabilities. It is also a matter of record that the Commerce Department's principal justification for requesting this authorization today is that within the next 2 or 3 months contracts are expected to be let or finalized for the construction of six liquefied natural gas container vessels at a total cost of about \$520 million with Government participation at about 25 percent. In view of the tremendous crisis facing the American consumers on the east coast as far as natural gas is concerned, this liquefied natural gas import program cannot come about a minute too soon.

As a sign of just how serious the natural gas shortage is, it is no longer just a case of holding the east coast consumer to ransom to higher and higher gas prices.

We have moved to the situation where gas companies all over the east coast have been forced to place an embargo on future installation of gas heating and appliance systems in whole communities because there is just not enough supply of natural gas to go around to the homes already equipped. Congressmen need look no further than the metropolitan Washington area to verify what I am saying. This Nation's energy needs can no longer be satisfied with American sources entirely. It is time those Government agencies with responsibility in this area faced up to the facts and approved the importation, not only of gas, but also of oil in sufficient amounts not only to keep consumer prices down but just to guarantee the availability of the fuels themselves.

So, for me at any rate, and I would argue for the whole Nation, today's bill has a great deal of importance. It ties in directly with vital policies affecting this Nation's future—its merchant marine policy and its energy requirements of the future. For me, representing a coastal shipbuilding district, there are additional future and immediate implications in today's vote—implications for the future economy of the Greater Boston area and indeed that of all New England. My constituents have an immediate interest in the full and immediate implementation of the 1970 Merchant Marine Act. As an area whose demonstrated capabilities in shipbuilding go back to the earliest days of our Republic, we feel we have something to offer to this program. It would indeed be a tragedy, not only for us, but for the Nation as a whole if, because of delays and failure to cut through redtape, we were to, in a manner of speaking, "miss the boat" and not see some of this work spread around this Nation. It would be a very serious mistake to have this Nation totally dependent upon one or two shipyards in the future. More competition is what is needed, not less. In summary, in urging my colleagues to vote for this bill today, I want to make it clear I am urging the administration to get this program moving, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULVER, 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. 13324) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 916, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, nays 13, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—365

Abbitt	Conte	Hammer-
Abourezk	Conyers	schmidt
Abzug	Cotter	Hanley
Adams	Coughlin	Hanna
Addabbo	Culver	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson,	Curlin	Hansen, Wash.
Calif.	Daniel, Va.	Harrington
Anderson,	Daniels, N.J.	Harsha
Tenn.	Danielson	Harvey
Andrews, Ala.	Davis, Ga.	Hastings
Andrews,	Davis, S.C.	Hathaway
N. Dak.	Davis, Wis.	Hawkins
Annunzio	de la Garza	Hechler, W. Va.
Archer	Delaney	Heckler, Mass.
Arends	Dellenback	Heinz
Ashbrook	Dellums	Helstoski
Ashley	Denholm	Henderson
Aspinall	Dennis	Hicks, Mass.
Badillo	Dent	Hicks, Wash.
Baker	Derwinski	Hillis
Baring	Devine	Hogan
Barrett	Dickinson	Hollifield
Begich	Dingell	Horton
Belcher	Donohue	Hosmer
Bell	Dorn	Howard
Bennett	Dow	Hull
Bergland	Downing	Hungate
Betts	Drinan	Hunt
Bevill	Dulski	Hutchinson
Biaggi	Duncan	Ichord
Blester	du Pont	Jarman
Blatnik	Eckhardt	Johnson, Calif.
Boggs	Edmondson	Johnson, Pa.
Boland	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Bolling	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Bow	Ellberg	Jones, Tenn.
Brademas	Erlenborn	Karth
Brasco	Esch	Kazen
Bray	Evans, Colo.	Keating
Brinkley	Evins, Tenn.	Keith
Brooks	Fascell	Kemp
Broomfield	Fisher	King
Brotzman	Flood	Kluczynski
Brown, Mich.	Flowers	Koch
Brown, Ohio	Flynt	Kuykendall
Broyhill, N.C.	Foley	Kyl
Broyhill, Va.	Ford, Gerald R.	Kyros
Buchanan	Ford,	Landgrebe
Burke, Fla.	William D.	Landrum
Burke, Mass.	Forsythe	Latta
Burleson, Tex.	Fountain	Leggett
Burton	Fraser	Lennon
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Lent
Byron	Frenzel	Link
Cabell	Frey	Lloyd
Camp	Fulton	Long, Md.
Carey, N.Y.	Fuqua	McClary
Carlson	Garmatz	McCloskey
Carney	Gaydos	McClure
Carter	Gettys	McCollister
Casey, Tex.	Giaimo	McCormack
Cederberg	Gibbons	McDade
Celler	Goldwater	McDonald,
Chamberlain	Gonzalez	Mich.
Chappell	Goodling	McEwen
Clausen,	Grasso	McFall
Don H.	Gray	McKevitt
Clawson, Del	Green, Oreg.	McKinney
Clay	Green, Pa.	McMillan
Cleveland	Grover	Madden
Collier	Gubser	Mahon
Collins, Ill.	Gude	Mallary
Colmer	Hagan	Mann
Conable	Hailey	Martin

Mathis, Ga.	Quillen	Steele
Matsunaga	Randall	Steiger, Ariz.
Mayne	Rangel	Steiger, Wis.
Mazzoli	Rarick	Stephens
Meeds	Rees	Stratton
Melcher	Reid	Stuckey
Metcalfe	Reuss	Sullivan
Michel	Riegler	Talcott
Miller, Ohio	Robinson, Va.	Taylor
Mills, Ark.	Robison, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Mills, Md.	Rodino	Teague, Tex.
Minish	Roe	Terry
Mink	Rogers	Thompson, N.J.
Minshall	Roncallo	Thompson, Wis.
Mitchell	Rooney, N.Y.	Thone
Mizell	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
Mollohan	Rosenthal	Udall
Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Ullman
Moorhead	Roush	Van Deerin
Morgan	Roy	Vander Jagt
Morse	Roybal	Vanik
Mosher	Runnels	Veysey
Murphy, Ill.	Ruppe	Vigorito
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruth	Waggonner
Myers	Ryan	Waldie
Natcher	St Germain	Wampler
Nedzi	Sandman	Ware
Nelsen	Sarbanes	Whalen
Nichols	Saylor	Whalley
Obey	Scherle	White
O'Hara	Schneebell	Whitehurst
O'Konski	Schwengel	Whitten
O'Neill	Scott	Wiggins
Passman	Sebellius	Williams
Patten	Seiberling	Wilson, Bob
Pelly	Shiple	Winn
Pepper	Shoup	Wolf
Perkins	Shriver	Wright
Pettis	Sisk	Wyatt
Pike	Skubitz	Wyder
Pirnie	Slack	Wyllie
Poage	Smith, Calif.	Wyman
Podell	Smith, Iowa	Yates
Poff	Smith, N.Y.	Yatron
Powell	Snyder	Young, Fla.
Preyer, N.C.	Spence	Young, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Springer	Zablocki
Price, Tex.	Staggers	Zion
Pucinski	Stanton,	Zwach
Purcell	J. William	
Quie	Steed	

NAYS—13

Burlison, Mo.	Hamilton	Roberts
Collins, Tex.	Jacobs	Rousselot
Findley	Kastenmeier	Schmitz
Gross	Lujan	
Hall	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—55

Abernethy	Fish	Moss
Alexander	Gallifanakis	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Gallagher	Patman
Aspin	Griffin	Peyser
Bingham	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Blackburn	Halpern	Railsback
Blanton	Hays	Rhodes
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Satterfield
Caffery	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Chisholm	Kee	Sikes
Clancy	Long, La.	Stanton,
Clark	McCulloch	James V.
Corman	McKay	Stokes
Crane	Macdonald,	Stubblefield
Diggs	Mass.	Symington
Dowdy	Mailliard	Thompson, Ga.
Dwyer	Mathias, Calif.	Widnall
Edwards, La.	Mikva	Wilson,
Eshleman	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
	Monagan	

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mathias of California.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Railsback.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Rhodes.  
Mr. Monagan with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Peyser.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Halpern.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Kee.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Bingham.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Galifanakis.  
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Abernethy.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Scheuer.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Griffin with Mr. McKay.

Messrs. JACOBS and ROBERTS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. LENNON. 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. 13188) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard.

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 consideration of the bill H.R. 13188, with Mr. CULVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my strong support for H.R. 13188, which would authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels, aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore establishments. This bill also authorizes the average annual active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard and authorize an additional sum of money for the alteration of bridges in fiscal year 1973.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee increased the original amount of the bill of \$135,660,000 by \$6,160,000, so that the total authorization in the bill for acquisition, construction, and improvements is \$141,820,000, plus an additional \$12,500,000 for the alteration of bridges. This authorization sum is broken down as follows:

First, \$82,070,000, for procurement and increasing capability of vessels.

Second, \$15,100,000, for procurement and extension of service life of aircraft.

Third, \$45,650,000, for construction of installations and facilities.

Fourth, \$12,500,000, for bridge alterations.

Fifth, 39,074, the average active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1973.

I think it is important to note that the Coast Guard's original preview estimate for the fiscal year 1973 authorization was \$300,000,000, the DOT request to OMB was reduced by \$125,600,000 to \$174,400,000. The amount finally established by OMB was a further reduction of \$38,740,000 to \$135,660,000. These figures clearly show the amount of funding requested by the Coast Guard and how it was cut both by DOT and the Office of Management and Budget.

There are a number of critical projects set forth in this year's Coast Guard authorization. Foremost among these is the authorization of \$66,000,000 for the construction of the second of a series of polar icebreakers to replace the old *Wind* class of icebreakers. It is interesting to note that this is the largest single unit line item in the bill and the main purpose of this program is to begin the replacement of the Coast Guard aging icebreaker fleet which operates in the Arctic, the Antarctic, and the Great Lakes region. The Coast Guard keeps one of its best icebreakers, the CGC *Mackinaw*, on station in Cheboygan, Mich., to service the Great Lakes.

As to aircraft acquisition, H.R. 13188 provides for the procurement of two C-130 long-range search aircraft. One C-130 aircraft will provide long-range search and rescue law enforcement and surveillance capability in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico. The other aircraft will be assigned to Kodiak, Alaska, to service the growing law enforcement requirements there as well as for search and rescue missions. The cost of these two long-range search aircraft in the bill is \$10 million.

Although this year's authorization bill contains the authorization for the hardware items mentioned above, as with last year's bill, H.R. 13188 is generally people oriented. Because of the dip in Coast Guard personnel retention rates in recent years, the Coast Guard is faced with a shortage of experienced personnel and must invest increasing amounts in facilities for the health, comfort, and training of its personnel. Obviously, the most modern and sophisticated equipment is useless without trained and experienced personnel to operate it.

In the important area of pollution abatement there are items to abate pollution from Coast Guard vessels and from Coast Guard shore stations. It should be noted that there is substantial Coast Guard funding for pollution control items via direct appropriations for Coast Guard operations and for R. & D. for pollution control equipment. In this connection, the Commandant testified at the hearings on H.R. 13188 that there is some \$11 million in the President's budget under research and development for

pollution control items. As soon as the kinks in these systems have been worked out and their development completed, we can look for the authorization for these systems in future authorization bills.

I do not want to take any more of the Members' time in pointing out such obvious facts as the vast range of Coast Guard activities, nor do I think it necessary to call your attention to the efficiency and competence of the Coast Guard.

I believe that this bill speaks for itself and the members of our committee strongly urge the House to support this reasonable Coast Guard authorization of appropriations.

There are members of both the majority and minority of our committee who are present and who may wish to speak in behalf of this bill.

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

Mr. LENNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bill H.R. 13188, the Coast Guard authorization. I am particularly concerned about that portion of the bill which provides for the renovation of the Sandy Hook Station in New Jersey.

As my colleagues know, and particularly those from the coastal areas, the presence and capability of the Coast Guard stations is vitally important to the safety of our waterways—for large merchant and passenger ships, private sailors, and fishing vessels. These last two are especially important to my own Third District. Because of our position along the New Jersey shore, a significant portion of our economy is based on fishing and boating. Aside from their economic aspects, they are among the greatest recreational pastimes in the area.

Aside from insuring the general safety of our waterways, the Coast Guard plays a very important role in the care of our environment by watching for oil spills from passing tankers, and other possible human and environmental hazards.

The bill under consideration today will greatly add to the safety of our area by restoring the Sandy Hook Station which, although very important to our area, has been sadly neglected over the years.

Most of the buildings at this station were constructed prior to 1905. Over the years, maintenance of this station has become increasingly difficult because of the age, number and physical separation of these buildings and attendant equipment. The expense of maintaining this station in its present state is almost prohibitive.

As it currently exists, despite its vital importance to the maritime public along the New Jersey shore and in the entrance to the New York Harbor, the berthing facilities are inadequate, the plumbing is defective and its electrical wiring only barely capable of handling the required load.

Under the terms of this legislation, I am pleased to say that the Coast Guard proposes to change all this. Plans call for a consolidation of operations and support facilities, which are now widely spread. Adequate office space and housing facil-

ities will be built to accommodate present and additional personnel, and new dining facilities will be added.

Additionally, the present totally inadequate mooring and maintenance facilities will be modernized and expanded with new moorings and covered boat slips. A new boathouse and maintenance station will better enable the personnel to haul out and repair their assigned boats.

Perhaps most important to the area is the proposed installation of modern navigational aids, monitoring and control facilities, which will greatly enhance the capabilities of this station in their assigned job of protecting the safety of ships in the area, as well as preventing and controlling environmental hazards.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to accept this legislation because of the very important role played by the Coast Guard all along our waterways. Certainly, the authorization for Sandy Hook Station is small when compared to the great benefits which will be derived for the maritime public.

I offer my compliments to the committee for a fine piece of legislation taking into full consideration the needs of this important arm of our Government, as well as the needs of the maritime public.

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

Mr. LENNON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that earlier today during consideration of the maritime authorization bill I referred to the chairman of our committee and how much he will be missed next year when he retires.

I, certainly, had in mind that when the gentleman from North Carolina rose at the appropriate time I wanted to also indicate the loss that I think this body will suffer when as a result of his announced intention to retire. I have served with the gentleman from North Carolina for certainly 15 years. I know as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of his great ability and dedicated service. I watched the gentleman patiently and persistently develop a program to provide this country with a very forward looking program to create an agency to concentrate on measures having to do with the sea and the atmosphere, and now I want to say that no one retiring this body will be missed more than the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON).

So Mr. Chairman, I take this time to pay my respects to the gentleman and also to other Members. It so happens at this time that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) who is handling the bill on this side is retiring. Speaking from my heart I feel that I would like to say that I know firsthand the contributions these Members have made. I hope that in the future our trails will cross so we can continue in other fields to indicate our interest in these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

PELLEY) for his very gracious and kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), a former member of the committee.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in support of H.R. 13188, the authorization of appropriations for the Coast Guard.

An interesting and one of the most important items in the authorization bill is the inclusion of \$2 million to establish a vessel traffic control system in Houston, Tex. This project will provide a communications network with electronic surveillance over limited areas to support a vessel traffic control system.

Houston is the third largest port in the United States, handling over 62 million tons of cargo per year, of which 40 million tons is bulk liquid. Seventy percent of the cargo handled at Houston is classified dangerous, and 90 percent of poison transported by water in the United States moves through Houston. Thus, it is readily apparent that some sort of traffic control is necessary in the Houston port complex.

At the present time, the only traffic control system in existence is an advisory system which the Coast Guard operates in San Francisco Harbor. This system in San Francisco has been in operation for several years, is operated with old equipment, and is not mandatory, but only advisory.

These traffic control systems under consideration can only operate permanently with the passage of basic legislation known as the port and harbor safety bill. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee worked diligently on this basic port and harbor safety legislation over the past several years and the committee's efforts resulted in the passage of its bill, H.R. 8140, on October 18, 1971. Unfortunately, this important legislation has been languishing in the Senate since that time. This comprehensive port and harbor safety legislation would give the Coast Guard permanent authority to establish mandatory traffic control systems where necessary in the harbors and waterways of the United States. There are numerous harbor and waterway areas which may ultimately have waterway traffic systems but studies indicate that New York and New Orleans are the next port areas to receive such traffic control systems.

In light of the increased carriage of cargo and numbers of vessels plying our waters, it is readily apparent that some sort of mandatory traffic control system in these congested areas is necessary. I think the project in the bill argues strongly in support of this authorization bill. I ask all Members to join me in voting for passage of the bill.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield now to the gracious gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN), who I feel sure will be the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the 93d Congress.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) for yielding to me. I

want to join in the statement he has made concerning the needs of our Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today H.R. 13188, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for vessels, aircraft, and shore installations.

It is interesting to note that of the \$81,070,000 set out in this authorization bill for procurement of vessels, \$66 million is allocated for the construction of the second of a series of polar icebreakers to replace the old *Wind*-class breakers. This \$66 million is the largest single unit line item in the bill. The Coast Guard's present fleet of polar icebreakers consists of six *Wind*-class breakers constructed between 1943 and 1947, and the *Glacier*, constructed in 1955. This proposed polar icebreaker will replace the equivalent of almost two of the old *Wind*-class vessels since the new icebreaker will be much more modern with a vastly improved performance capability.

I would like to point out to the Members that the first of this series of replacement icebreakers was authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1971, and that there is a contract for its construction with the Lockheed Co. in Seattle, Wash.

This replacement vessel will embody a new concept in this class of ship and new to the Arctic marine environment. It will have conventional diesel engines for normal cruising and gas turbines for maximum power situations. The Coast Guard indicates that this propulsion system will provide available shaft horsepower which will exceed that of any icebreaker afloat, including Russia's nuclear-powered *Lenin*.

The mission of these replacement icebreakers will be to provide logistic support for U.S. defense units and maritime commerce and U.S. scientific research; for marine transportation research; for scientific research in support of economic development of Arctic Alaska and the Alaskan Continental Shelf; and polar commerce search and rescue.

In approving this expenditure, the members of our committee realized that \$66 million is a considerable amount of money for one vessel and we are fully aware of the many demands on our financial resources and of the necessity of establishing fiscal priorities. However, it must be recognized that we are authorizing the construction of vessels of advanced design, which are highly sophisticated and which embody new and complex technical marine concepts and systems. Thus, I feel this authorization is fully justified and I ask the support of all the Members of this body for the passage of H.R. 13188.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE).

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members present for the passage of H.R. 13188, the authorization of appropriations for vessels, aircraft, and installations for the Coast Guard.

In addition to authorizing appropriations for vessels, aircraft, and installations for the Coast Guard last year, in the fiscal year 1972 bill, we also added

the authorization authority for the average annual active duty personnel strength of the Coast Guard. This authorization authority was transferred from the House Armed Services Committee with the agreement between the two committees that, since the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee already had the authorization authority for hardware and programs and installations, it properly should also have the authorization authority for the personnel which would man and operate the Coast Guard vessels, aircraft and installations. This authorization bill for fiscal year 1973 authorizes an annual average active duty personnel strength of 39,074.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of this old and honored agency through its authorization bill.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING), a member of the committee.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to say how sorry I am that this subcommittee is going to lose the services of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) who has served the committee so faithfully and for so long, and that we are going to lose our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON).

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve with both these gentlemen for the 14 years I have been in the House of Representatives. I do not believe you could find two finer men to serve their constituencies than these two gentlemen. Both have made important contributions to our country, and it is indeed unfortunate, I think, for the country that we will lose their services.

Mr. Chairman, as a long time friend and backer of the Coast Guard, I would urge my colleagues to vote in support of this Coast Guard authorization bill.

As a background to this authorization for Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, construction of installations, alteration of bridges, and active duty personnel strength, I would like to point out to my colleagues that Coast Guard search and rescue operations are projected to increase 5 percent annually. During the past year, the Coast Guard answered 44,000 calls for search and rescue assistance, assisted a quarter of a million people and saved 2,500 lives and an estimated \$4½ billion in property. I think this is an impressive record and one in which both we and the Coast Guard can justifiably take pride. In addition, I cannot think of a better argument for the passage of H.R. 13188. Thus, I urge all Members present to vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and to take this opportunity to ask two questions of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON).

The first question deals with the two aircraft for which authority is being sought, two long-range search aircraft.

Is my understanding correct that this is the aircraft C-130 Hercules?

Mr. LENNON. I will say to the gentleman, I do not have the honor of being the chairman of this particular subcommittee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) is the chairman, but he is out of the city at the time and I am substituting for him.

I am assured by committee counsel that that is so.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's response. Knowing of the excellent capabilities of this particular aircraft which is the workhorse of the Air Force, I am pleased to receive that response and serving with the gentleman with whom I am having this colloquy on the Committee on Armed Services and knowing of his capabilities, I certainly assumed that he was the subcommittee chairman.

The next comment, if the gentleman will yield, deals with section 3 on page 7 of the bill which provides that:

For fiscal year 1973 for the use of the Coast Guard for payments under the Act of June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497), as amended, to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit the free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States, \$12,500,000.

I certainly commend the committee and the Members for this provision which is so important to the prosperity of the section of the country I represent to keep developing rivers unclogged and open to free navigation. I am grateful for the fact of the committee's cognizance of that need and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the bill.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LENNON. I am delighted to yield to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN).

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in support of H.R. 13188, the Coast Guard authorization bill.

In considering this particular piece of authorization legislation, we should bear in mind the Coast Guard's dominant role in attacking oil spills as they occur in our navigable waters. The Coast Guard is really the agency connected with this oil pollution problem that has the equipment and the personnel to reach a spill which occurs in our navigable waters.

In fiscal year 1971, \$1,390,000 was authorized and appropriated for an air deliverable antipollution transfer system. In fiscal year 1972, \$1,600,000 was authorized and appropriated for the same type system, which can be flown to a damaged vessel or one in distress, air dropped, and used to rapidly offload and temporarily store liquid cargo before it spills into the water. Studies have indicated that removing substantial amounts of an oil tanker's cargo soon after it is damaged is considerably more effective than attempting to contain and recover this oil after it has spilled into the water.

There is a sum of \$3,200,000 allocated in this authorization bill for alterations to be made aboard Coast Guard vessels

in order to prevent the dumping of sewage and other effluents into the navigable waters. This is pursuant to the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970—Public Law 91-224, signed on April 3, 1970—which requires vessels to have marine sanitation devices meeting required standards of performance to be issued by the Environmental Protection Agency.

In addition to the vessel abatement pollution project, \$300,000 is set out in H.R. 13188 to abate pollution from Coast Guard shore stations. Executive Order 11507, issued on February 4, 1970, requires all Federal facilities to meet water quality standards and related plans of implementation adopted pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Aside from the equipment and projects mentioned above, it should be recognized that the items in this bill contribute either directly or indirectly to the Coast Guard's oil spill operation when such a disaster occurs. Obviously, Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, communications systems, and personnel all combine into a coordinated network necessary for the control and containment of any spill in the navigable waters of the United States.

It may be noted that the only items for pollution control under H.R. 13188 are the items for vessel and shore installation abatement. However, there is substantial funding via direct appropriations for Coast Guard operations and for R. & D. for pollution control equipment. The following is what the Commandant of the Coast Guard had to say at the hearings on H.R. 13188 on this subject:

I should like to emphasize that our efforts in protecting and enhancing the marine environment are not limited to those coming under the aegis of this authorization. For the Coast Guard, the President's budget provides nearly \$11 million under research and development for this purpose.

Included among the efforts for which these funds will be used are: development of a high-speed delivery technique for our oil-containment system, prototype development of two different oil-recovery systems, evaluation of oil-slick cleanup agents as a backup for mechanical recovery systems and continuation of development of suitable sewage treatment equipment for our vessels.

The costs of operating reactivated aircraft for pollution surveillance and to pay our augmented strike forces are funded from our Operating Expense appropriation, as are some small projects for abating pollution from Coast Guard facilities.

I have gone into these pollution matters because I think it emphasizes my point that the money authorized in this bill is a reasonable and modest price to pay for the maintenance and further development of an effective Coast Guard.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I have asked him to do so in order to clarify the relation of this bill to the President's budget.

As the gentleman knows, the President's budget is about \$25 billion out of balance. I could not determine from the committee report as to whether the bill, as reported, is within the President's

budget request. Could the gentleman clarify that?

Mr. LENNON. The bill is \$6,160,000 above the President's budget. It is, however, about \$126 million less than the Coast Guard said it must have to do a creditable job.

It is about \$39 million less than the Department of Transportation requested.

So we think that we have made a rational and reasonable and happy compromise.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman say that it is approximately 4 percent over the President's budget request?

Mr. LENNON. If you want to sit down and figure it out, it is \$6,150,000 over the President's request of \$135 million.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Of course, the \$12,500,000 for bridges is in the budget. They sent it up as a separate bill by mistake and the Secretary then came up and recognized that it should be in the Coast Guard authorization.

Mr. FINDLEY. I just overheard someone observe that the tolerance here seems to be within the Price Commission's guidelines.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee who would like to respond to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GARMATZ. I would just like to point out for the benefit of the gentleman that the Coast Guard estimate was roughly \$300 million. The Department of Transportation reduced it to \$174,400,000. Then the Bureau of the Budget or the OMD cut it down to \$135,660,000.

I might add it was such that \$66 million was practically itself for half of the overall budget for the Coast Guard.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) such time as he may consume.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13188, a bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels, aircraft, and the construction of installations for the Coast Guard.

This bill would allow the Coast Guard to acquire a needed mix of hardware, personnel projects, communications systems, and pollution equipment in order to continue to meet its worldwide duties and commitments. This bill is really a combination of the following elements: People, plant, pollution, and training. Because of the dip in retention rates in the last several years, the Coast Guard has found it necessary to devote a larger portion of its funds to personnel-oriented projects.

I was especially pleased to note the presence of a large line item amount of \$66 million for the second in a series of polar icebreakers. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been interested over the last several years in getting this replacement icebreaker program underway. This program is especially necessary since the Coast Guard icebreaking fleet is old and becoming obsolescent.

I feel that the amount of \$141,820,000

for authorization of appropriations for acquisition, construction, and improvements, plus an additional \$12,500,000 authorization for bridge alterations is really modest when considered in the context of the varied and far-reaching responsibilities of the Coast Guard and its contributions to the Nation. Thus, I urge the passage of this important authorization bill.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like, first of all, to make it crystal clear, to use a favorite expression of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON), to my colleagues in the Congress, that his service to this Congress and this committee is truly an example for all of us to follow. I have served with Mr. LENNON on this subcommittee for several terms now, and I have found him and his colleague on the Republican side of the aisle (Mr. PELLY) to be extraordinarily well informed on that subject matter before the committee, and to be dedicated to our country and to his constituents, courteous, conscientious, and enlightened conservative people, if he would allow me to so categorize him. I join with others here in this Chamber in wishing him the very happiest years in private life as he goes back to his constituency, whom he knows so well and loves so dearly.

This legislation today is, in my view, needed by our Nation—to an extraordinary degree—and is such that we must enact it unanimously.

It is my understanding that an amendment which provides for a marine traffic control system in Long Island Sound, may be offered by a Member on this side of the aisle. I appreciate the fact that he did not appear before the committee at the proper time, but since the committee held its hearings there has been a very serious accident with an oil tanker on the outskirts of Long Island Sound. This casualty has alerted the people throughout the Northeast to the possible dangers that lie in the years ahead as we have to import more and more of our oil. If this Nation is to have the oil and the liquified natural gas necessary to fuel our economy and to heat our homes, the people must have confidence that it is coming here in an efficient way that will not endanger or disrupt our ecology.

So I hope that when the time for that amendment arrives, it will be favorably considered on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, once again I pay my tributes to Mr. PELLY and Mr. LENNON for their many years of service to this House and to this committee.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman a question on a matter pending before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I shall not oppose this authorization for the Coast Guard. Obviously, we need the authorization and we want to get it through. But a number of the Members of the House, including myself, some time ago introduced a resolution calling upon

the Coast Guard to rename the Coast Guard *Vigilante* the SS *Simas Kudirka*, who was the Lithuanian sailor who escaped from a Soviet ship and sought asylum and sanctuary in the United States, a situation that was thoroughly investigated by the Congress.

You may recall that Kudirka was returned back to the Soviets.

The gentleman may recall that Kudirka was returned to the Soviets, and he is now, as far as we know, in a prison in Russia. We had at that time proposed the *Vigilante* be renamed the *Simas Kudirka* to serve as a constant reminder to all ships at sea that the United States has not abandoned its historic role of providing asylum and sanctuary to those seeking freedom and liberty. That resolution remains before the committee today, and it would be my hope that it could be brought to the floor for action, for, indeed it is as valid today as it was when *Simas Kudirka* was returned to the Soviets.

I wonder if I may have the reaction of the Chairman of the full Committee or of the subcommittee as to the prospects for this legislation and for getting it before the House? I am most hopeful this resolution will indeed be adopted by the Congress.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) for a reply to that question.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I had taken this particular resolution up with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and they had objected to it a great deal, but I assure the gentleman from Illinois we will go back to the Coast Guard to see what can be done and to see if we can have a better understanding with the Commandant of the Coast Guard and perhaps approval. I assure the gentleman that action will be taken in the full Committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the remarks of the chairman, but I might add this footnote: That asking the Coast Guard if they have any objections to this resolution is like asking the fox if he objects to locking the chicken coop, because it was the Coast Guard which handled the situation as tragically as they did. I can assure the gentleman the Coast Guard is not happy to perpetuate the memory of this incident, but we proposed the renaming of that ship so it would be a constant reminder for time eternal that this Nation does have as its basic ethic the seeking of freedom and liberty. So I hope the Committee will take that action on this resolution independently of whatever the Coast Guard says, whether the Coast Guard is for or against it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Coast Guard performs many vital tasks for our Nation. Through the Coast Guard's search and rescue activities, its law enforcement role, its boating safety programs, its efforts toward merchant marine safety, and its many aids to navigation, the welfare of life and property at sea and on

our navigable waterways is insured. This branch of our Armed Forces maintains a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war. The Coast Guard is responsible for port security in our Nation, including the loading and unloading of dangerous cargoes. A full listing of the services rendered our Nation by the Coast Guard, while worthwhile, would simply take too long.

H.R. 13188 authorizes appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1973. Specifically the bill authorizes money for ships, planes, shore facilities, and installations, aids to navigation, bridge alterations, pollution control for fiscal year 1973, and for the average active duty personnel for the year. All of these authorizations will enable the Coast Guard to carry out the important functions I have noted. I urge for the passage of H.R. 13188.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 13188.

The authorization includes \$2.5 million for a much-needed Coast Guard helicopter station at North Bend on the southern Oregon coast.

Because of the distance involved along this stretch of coastline, I am certain Coast Guard funds and personnel can be much more efficiently utilized than is now possible without helicopters.

The versatility of helicopters would allow the Coast Guard not only to conduct search and rescue operations, but also to perform the important tasks of guarding against possible foreign fishermen's violations of U.S. territorial waters and checking for possible pollution along the Oregon coast.

In sum, the station at North Bend would make the Coast Guard better equipped to carry out its responsibilities relating to law enforcement, to search and rescue, and to conservation of fishing resources.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1973 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:*

#### VESSELS

For procurement and increasing capability of vessels, \$81,070,000.

##### A. Procurement—

(1) replace one icebreaker.

##### B. Increasing capability—

(1) renovate and improve selected buoy tenders.

(2) conduct major repairs on cutter (polar icebreaker) *Glacier*.

(3) renovate two Wind class polar icebreakers for interim service.

(4) abate pollution from vessels.

#### AIRCRAFT

For procurement and extension of service life of aircraft, \$15,100,000.

##### A. Procurement

(1) two long range search aircraft.

(2) an administrative aircraft.

## B. Extension of service life

- (1) repair outer wings on nine HC-130 aircraft.

## CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$45,650,000.

- (1) Marshfield and Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: modernize radio station facilities;
- (2) Brooklyn, New York: construct barracks and messing facility at air station;
- (3) Fort Hancock, New Jersey: rebuild Sandy Hook Station;
- (4) Portsmouth, Virginia: construct new base (phase II);
- (5) Islamorada, Florida: construct permanent facilities;
- (6) Monterey, California: rebuild Monterey Station and construct moorings at Santa Cruz;
- (7) Coos Bay, Oregon: construct new air station;
- (8) Cape May, New Jersey: expand electrical capacity at training center;
- (9) Yorktown, Virginia: construct barracks at training center;
- (10) Cocoa Beach, Florida: establish C-130 aircraft facility at Patrick Air Force Base;
- (11) Fort Pierce, Florida: rebuild station;
- (12) Port Isabel, Texas: renovate station;
- (13) Dana, Indiana: renovate barracks at Lorain Station;
- (14) Various locations: abate pollution from stations;
- (15) Washington, District of Columbia: procure and install National Response Center Information System equipment;
- (16) Various locations: aids to navigation projects on selected waterways;
- (17) Various locations: automate light stations;
- (18) Presque Isle, Maine: construction station for Lorain-C development projects;
- (19) Houston, Texas: establish marine traffic control system;
- (20) Various locations: public family quarters;
- (21) Various locations: advance planning, survey, design, and architectural services; project administration costs; acquire sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law;
- (22) Curtis Bay, Maryland: construct supply building at the Coast Guard yard;
- (23) Cheboygan, Michigan: rebuild moorings for Coast Guard Cutter Mackinaw.

Sec. 2. For fiscal year 1973 the Coast Guard is authorized an average active duty personnel strength of 39,074.

Sec. 3. For fiscal year 1973 for the use of the Coast Guard for payments under the Act of June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497), as amended, to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit the free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States, \$12,500,000.

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEELE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEELE: On Page 5, lines 19 and 20 strike \$45,650,000 insert \$48,650,000

On Page 7, line 16, change the period to a semicolon and insert immediately following line 16

"(24) Long Island Sound: establish marine traffic control system."

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, in a special report on oil pollution prepared for President Johnson, it was estimated that a major oil spill off Long Island Sound during summer months might cost as much as \$30 million in lost tourist business alone. This estimate does not include the costs of cleaning up an oil spill or the serious environmental damage that a spill might cause.

Today, I am offering an amendment to H.R. 13188 that will authorize the Coast Guard to spend \$3 million in the development of a marine traffic control system for Long Island Sound. The precedent for this legislation was established in the expenditure for a similar system in Puget Sound and one that will be established for the Houston Waterway.

A marine traffic control system enables the Coast Guard to closely monitor the movement of ships in a given body of water. In the case of Long Island Sound it will allow the Coast Guard for the first time to carefully chart the movement of oil tankers and other dangerous shipping through the shallow and sometimes perilous waters of the sound. It would also make it easier for State and Federal authorities to monitor those ships that are still pumping oily bilge wastes into the Sound. In some respects, the marine traffic control system would enable the Coast Guard to monitor the movement of ships in much the same way that the FAA monitors the movement of aircraft.

For several months now we have talked about cleaning up our waterways and moving against municipal and industrial polluters. Today we have the opportunity to begin protecting a body of water that is a playground for over 12 million people. Over 185,000 pleasure craft are registered in areas surrounding Long Island Sound. Millions of people use Long Island Sound to boat in, to fish, to dig for clams, to relax and swim. In fact, it is probably the most heavily populated and heavily used body of water on either coast.

On March 21, a 240-foot oil tanker ran aground on a reef in the sound and spilled nearly 100,000 gallons of fuel oil into the water. Many of my colleagues may have read about the spill in their local newspapers and may have also seen the picture of the ship as it oozed out a 20-square-mile oil slick. It is unfortunate that many people mistakenly assumed that this type of spill is a rare occurrence, because oil spills in Long Island Sound are becoming more and more frequent.

For instance, in 1970 there were 51 spills reported in the sound. Forty-seven of these spills occurred in Connecticut waters and accounted for nearly 800,000 gallons of various oils being dumped into the sound. In 1970 and 1971 major spills of over 300,000 and 600,000 gallons occurred.

As air pollution statutes are more rigorously enforced requiring heavily refined, clean fuels to replace coal and other cruder fuels, the dangers of oil spills in Long Island Sound will grow.

Both sides of the sound have numerous oil tank farms and refineries and the sound provides perfect shelter for oil tankers and barges. Estimates by energy experts show that the amount of oil required by New England will increase several times over the next 10 years.

In 1970, 22,781,515 short tons of various petroleum and products were recorded for the Connecticut ports of Long Island Sound. When increased tanker traffic is combined with the traffic of pleasure boats and cargo ships the totals are frightening because of the possibility of increased spillage.

The statistics for the decade of the sixties are proof of the extreme danger of oil spills. From data supplied by the American Bureau of Shipping on 488 American tankers of 30,000 tons deadweight or more, it was determined that they were involved in 553 collisions, 17 underwater collisions and three damaging collisions with ice. An official at the Bureau explained that some ships had as many as three or four collisions during the 10-year period, while others had none. These collisions were but a small part played in the nearly 10,000 oil-spill incidents that occurred in 1971 alone throughout the world.

Movement of crude oil or its products now accounts for half of the world's ocean tonnage. More than 4,000 tankers carry over 600 million tons of oil each year.

The extent to which oil pollution has affected the Atlantic Ocean was well illustrated by Dr. Max Blumer, senior scientist, department of chemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, at a Boston symposium on oil pollution. To make this point about the extent of oil pollution, Dr. Blumer read from the record of a research ship from Woods Hole that had towed a special net in the Sargasso Sea to collect certain marine organisms. The quote follows:

The tows, over a distance of 630 miles, brought up oil tar lumps inevitably during every tow up to 3 inches in diameter. After 24 hours of towing, the mesh became so encrusted with oil that it was necessary to clean the net with solvents. It was estimated that there was 3 times as much tar-like material as sargasso weed in the nets.

This quote shows quite clearly that oil spills have a profound effect on the marine aquatic environment and that even the best methods of control and cleanup are inadequate in preventing significant amounts of oil to float freely in the ocean.

A recent article in the Sierra Club bulletin describing conditions in Long Island Sound states that over 75,000 acres of bottom land in the sound is contaminated and closed to shell fishing.

Too often in the past this legislative body has argued about spending small sums for preventive measures against pollution and then later appropriated huge sums to stave off disaster. Long Island Sound may soon turn from the "urban sea" to the "dead sea of the Atlantic."

Many spills have cost more than \$3 million to partially alleviate environmental and other damage caused by the spread of oil. In this last spill most of



the oil dissipated into the sound—the same sound that many of us will want to use for swimming or boating or fishing in the summers ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the Long Island Sound problem has just been brought into sharp focus by the March 21 oil spill, and although the time factor has not permitted hearings on the amendment, there is both solid precedent for the proposal and urgent need. While Long Island Sound does not have as much tanker traffic as some areas and therefore has not been given top priority for a marine traffic control system by the Coast Guard, it is nonetheless clear to all concerned that major oil spills in Long Island Sound have as much or more tragic and costly consequences than oil spills anywhere else in the United States.

Certainly \$3 million for a marine traffic control system is very cheap insurance for the future.

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

Mr. STEELE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take it that the gentleman is aware of the studies being made by the New England River Basins Commission to set up a comprehensive plan for Long Island Sound.

Mr. STEEL. Yes; I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Pelly, Mr. STEELE was allowed to proceed for 1 minute.)

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEELE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE). I have long known of his interest in protecting the waters of Long Island Sound. I do think the traffic control programs in various areas such as Long Island Sound are essential, and I am sure that the time is coming when not only Long Island Sound but other important bodies of water will have the Coast Guard supervising traffic on them. Personally, of course, I would wish that his programs had been presented to the distinguished committee that has authorization over the Coast Guard, but, nevertheless, because of the fact that we in Puget Sound are having such a system developed and I am so sold on it and he has made such a fine and forceful presentation, I wish to state that I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment with a little reluctance and misgiving since I am a member of the committee and we did not have an opportunity to give it a hearing as we did the other projects that were considered priority matters.

However, I am convinced, as one of the New York Congressmen whose district abuts Long Island Sound, that the proposal has great merit.

Long Island Sound, as the gentleman from Connecticut has pointed out, is a large body of water which has some difficult and treacherous navigational problems. In addition to other traffic, we have large and heavy tankers, and we have

had a number of substantial oil spills. A recent dramatic oil spill incident prompted this amendment even at this late date. The body of water composing Long Island Sound is ideally suited and almost unobstructed in its length and breadth for the purposes of suitable radar controlled navigation.

I might point out to those gentlemen present—and it will strike a familiar note to all of you, I am sure—that Long Island Sound at its mouth is now the graveyard of the *Andrea Doria*. Had we had the navigational system that the gentleman from Connecticut is proposing today, the *Andrea Doria* would still have been sailing and so would the tanker with which it had a collision.

I think the gentleman's proposal, even if not considered timely in the sense of orderly process before our committee, does have great merit. The threat to our ecology and the degradation of the water occurring as a result of these insipid oil spills and other pollution problems can be cured or helped to be cured if we adopt his amendment. We do need it very badly at the present time, and in the future it will save a great deal with regard to our environmental problems, and I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) for the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in this and so many other matters of both regional and national import.

Mr. WOLFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Perhaps I can finish the original question that I was offering to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Would the gentleman say that this amendment would be restricted to a prior review by the New England River Basins Commission?

Mr. STEELE. The answer in a nutshell is "Yes." I have discussed that with the Coast Guard and they would probably use on all work that has already been done in the field.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman and I commend him for offering this amendment.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, basically we cannot help but be in sympathy with the objectives of the gentleman from Connecticut, and all of us realize the necessity of taking measures to obviate tragic and damaging vessel collisions and spills. However, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment for the following reasons:

First of all, the Coast Guard has a priority list. And, further, if I may say this, I can appreciate the gentleman's problem in New York. I as chairman of the committee who represents the Harbor of Baltimore and has done so for the past 25 years. However, we are not included. So, if there was anything we could do about the situation, to take the priority away from the Coast Guard, I surely would have included Baltimore Harbor. I therefore think we cannot be selfish

but that we must stay with the priority system which the Coast Guard is working up.

The basic mandating legislation which would give the Coast Guard permanent authority to establish such systems has not yet passed the Senate, H.R. 8140, the Port and Harbor Safety Act.

The amendment is, thus, inappropriate at this time.

It would interfere with the Coast Guard's order of priority for the establishment of mandatory vessel traffic control systems and the Coast Guard is the administering agency having jurisdiction over these systems.

This matter was not brought up before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee either in the hearings on H.R. 13188, the Coast Guard authorization bill, or in executive session.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the amendment.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE), for offering the amendment.

The problem of oil spills is becoming increasingly serious to the people of Connecticut and all who enjoy the opportunities of Long Island Sound. The recent disaster of the oil spill put into focus the fact that if we have priorities that have been established, those priorities should be reexamined. This waterway is one of our most important waterways and one which provides essential services for commerce and industry as well as pleasure for our people. The area truly deserves consideration which this amendment provides.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment. The Coast Guard Subcommittee considered the priorities that had been presented by the Coast Guard to the Department of Transportation. They had \$126 million worth of projects that had priority over this.

The Department of Transportation cut this amount. When the Department of Transportation went to the Office of Management and Budget, they had about \$40 million worth of priorities and they were all cut.

Mr. Chairman, we would be establishing a very bad precedent in this House when nothing was brought before the subcommittee in its many days of hearings, and then in executive mark-up and then to the full committee. To bring it up to the floor at this time, which is understandable, is in my opinion not the appropriate procedure to follow.

Let me call to the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if I may, the fact that in October of last year the House passed the so-called—and this is a technical legal definition—Port and Harbor Safety Act, H.R. 8140, on October 18. We sent it to the other body and just this week the other body got ready to start to do something about it. They finally got to it. It so happens that on

the Senate side there have been no hearings on the Coast Guard authorization bill by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine which is a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce. No hearings have as yet been held on the Coast Guard authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut—and I must tell you ladies and gentlemen of the House that I am a substitute, frankly, for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) who is the chairman of this subcommittee—I discussed it with our distinguished friend from Connecticut week before last when it looked as if there was a possibility of this bill being considered then.

I discussed it with him again today. I discussed it with the other gentleman also. I suggested to them that I could not speak for the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), nor could I speak for the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), but that I thought that they should take their case to the public hearings being held by the Senate Committee on the Merchant Marine which has comparable jurisdiction to the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. Then if the Senate in their wisdom decides to substitute this project for one of the great number of other projects that the Coast Guard felt there was priority for, that the Department of Transportation thought there was the priority for, and that the Bureau of the Budget thought there was priority for that then they could get it in the Senate bill. And I told them I felt sure that if I were a member of the Committee on Conference, which I may or may not be, that I would certainly look on it with favor, but I would want to know the background.

I can understand the position of the gentleman and the gentlewoman from Connecticut who represent that section of the country. However, I still state that I believe the House of Representatives will be establishing a bad precedent to come in here, after the Coast Guard has said that in their judgment it would be an inequity to have it in here—that is what they said to us—and that is what the Department of Transportation said and that is what the Bureau of the Budget said—to come in here and attempt to handle the matter through this method.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to take this matter before the public hearings of the Senate and further urge that the House vote down this amendment offered by our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

Mr. Chairman, I live in an area that fringes upon Long Island Sound. I have traversed it from end to end and I know of the differences as they exist in its

approaches as compared to the approaches to Baltimore Harbor. They are entirely different and more complex than those at Baltimore Harbor. The waters off Baltimore are not comparable to the area around the Scilly Isles where the *Torrey Canyon* went aground, I believe in 1966—but those at the southern approach to Long Island Sound are similar.

Following my visit to the site of the *Torrey Canyon* disaster and seeing the tragedy that followed, I came back and reported to this House and to the committee the need for a traffic control system such as this amendment provides.

Our Coast Guard moves too slowly. We should have done this back in 1966 or 1967 or 1968.

The winds, the currents, the fog, the volume of shipping and the fragile nature of the shorelines, all argue for our accepting this amendment.

I would also remind the Members of the House that this is only an amendment to an authorization bill and that the gentleman still has to prove his case later before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I think the need is so great that we should support the gentleman from Connecticut on his amendment.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Connecticut, Representative BOB STEELE. The additional \$3 million he calls for to construct a marine traffic control system for Long Island Sound represents a sound investment of public moneys.

Three weeks ago a 240-foot oil tanker ran aground on a reef in the sound and spilled nearly 100,000 gallons of oil into the water. While such an incident generates page 1 headlines and photographs, we all too frequently view such a spill as a rare occurrence.

However, that is far from reality because oil spills in Long Island Sound are becoming increasingly frequent. As marine traffic increases, as it has over the last decade, the possibility of collisions and oil spills rises in direct proportion. The facts and statistics which Representative STEELE offered just a few minutes ago graphically illustrate the potential for irreparable harm to the ecology. One need not reiterate a litany of ecology damages resulting from recent oil spills in Santa Barbara and the Gulf of Mexico, to recognize that the cost to restore the environment after an oil spill is infinitely more expensive than those sums appropriated for preventive measures.

This amendment would establish a system whereby the Coast Guard could closely monitor the movement of ships in the sound. Such a system would for the first time, allow the Coast Guard to chart the movement of oil tankers through the shallow, crowded waters of Long Island Sound.

I view this legislation as an insurance policy for those of us who view Long Island Sound not only as a commercial waterway, but also as a water playground utilized by our 185,000 pleasure craft and millions of residents who flock

to the shore during the summer months.

I would urge your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEELE) there were—ayes 11, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CULVER, 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. 13188) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard, pursuant to House Resolution 915, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 1, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—373

Abbutt	Belcher	Buchanan
Abourezk	Bell	Burke, Fla.
Abzug	Bennett	Burke, Mass.
Adams	Bergland	Burleson, Tex.
Addabbo	Bets	Burlison, Mo.
Anderson,	Bevill	Burton
Calif.	Biaggi	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Ill.	Biester	Byron
Anderson,	Bianton	Cabell
Tenn.	Biatnik	Camp
Andrews, Ala.	Boggs	Carlson
Andrews,	Boland	Carney
N. Dak.	Bolling	Carter
Annunzio	Bow	Casey, Tex.
Archer	Brademas	Cederberg
Arends	Brasco	Celler
Ashbrook	Bray	Chamberlain
Ashley	Brinkley	Chappell
Aspinall	Brooks	Clausen,
Badillo	Brotzman	Don H.
Baker	Brown, Mich.	Clawson, Del.
Baring	Brown, Ohio	Clay
Barrett	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Begich	Broyhill, Va.	Collier

Collins, Ill.	Howard	Quillen
Collins, Tex.	Hull	Randall
Colmer	Hungate	Rangel
Conable	Hunt	Rarick
Conte	Hutchinson	Rees
Conyers	Ichord	Reid
Cotter	Jacobs	Reuss
Coughlin	Jarman	Riegler
Culver	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Curlin	Johnson, Pa.	Robinson, Va.
Daniel, Va.	Jonas	Robison, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Danielson	Jones, Tenn.	Roe
Davis, Ga.	Karh	Rogers
Davis, S.C.	Kastenmeyer	Roncalio
Davis, Wis.	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
de la Garza	Keating	Rooney, Pa.
Delaney	Keith	Rosenthal
Dellenback	Kemp	Rostenkowski
Dellums	King	Roush
Denholm	Kluczynski	Rousselot
Dennis	Koch	Roy
Dent	Kuykendall	Roybal
Derwinski	Kyl	Runnels
Devine	Landgrebe	Ruppe
Dickinson	Landrum	Ruth
Dingell	Latta	Ryan
Donohue	Leggett	St Germain
Dorn	Lennon	Sandman
Dow	Lent	Sarbanes
Downing	Link	Saylor
Drinan	Lloyd	Scherle
Dulski	Long, Md.	Schmitz
Duncan	Lujan	Schneebell
du Pont	McClory	Schwengel
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Scott
Edmondson	McClure	Sebelius
Edwards, Ala.	McCollister	Shibley
Edwards, Calif.	McCormack	Shoup
Eilberg	McCulloch	Shriver
Eriensborn	McDade	Sisk
Esch	McDonald,	Skubitz
Evans, Colo.	Mich.	Slack
Fascell	McEwen	Smith, Calif.
Findley	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Fisher	McKevitt	Smith, N.Y.
Flowers	McKinney	Snyder
Flynt	McMillan	Spence
Foley	Madden	Springer
Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon	Staggers
Ford,	Mallary	Stanton,
William D.	Mann	J. William
Forsythe	Martin	Steed
Fountain	Mathis, Ga.	Steele
Fraser	Matsunaga	Steiger, Ariz.
Frelinghuysen	Mayne	Steiger, Wis.
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Stephens
Frey	Meeds	Stratton
Fulton	Melcher	Stuckey
Fuqua	Metcalfe	Sullivan
Garmatz	Michel	Talcott
Gaydos	Miller, Ohio	Taylor
Gettys	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Calif.
Gialmo	Mills, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Gibbons	Minish	Terry
Goldwater	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Gonzalez	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Goodling	Mitchell	Thomson, Wis.
Grasso	Mizell	Thone
Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Tiernan
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Udall
Gross	Montgomery	Ullman
Grover	Moorhead	Van Deerlin
Gubser	Morgan	Vander Jagt
Gude	Mosher	Vanik
Hagan	Murphy, Ill.	Veysey
Haley	Myers	Vigorito
Hall	Natcher	Waggonner
Hamilton	Nedzi	Walde
Hammer-	Nelsen	Wampler
schmidt	Nichols	Ware
Hanley	Obey	Whalen
Hanna	O'Hara	Whalley
Hansen, Idaho	O'Neill	White
Hansen, Wash.	Passman	Whitehurst
Harrington	Patten	Whitten
Harsha	Pelly	Wiggins
Harvey	Pepper	Williams
Hastings	Perkins	Wilson, Bob
Hathaway	Pettis	Winn
Hawkins	Peyster	Wolff
Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle	Wright
Heckler, Mass.	Pike	Wyatt
Heinz	Pirnie	Wydler
Helstoski	Poage	Wyllie
Henderson	Podell	Wyman
Hicks, Mass.	Poff	Yates
Hicks, Wash.	Powell	Yatron
Hillis	Preyer, N.C.	Young, Fla.
Hogan	Price, Ill.	Young, Tex.
Hollifield	Pucinski	Zablocki
Horton	Purcell	Zion
Hosmer	Quie	Zwach

## NAYS—1

O'Konski

## NOT VOTING—59

Abernethy	Flood	Moss
Alexander	Galifianakis	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspin	Gallagher	Nix
Bingham	Gray	Patman
Blackburn	Griffin	Price, Tex.
Broomfield	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Rallsback
Caffery	Hays	Rhodes
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Satterfield
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Clancy	Kee	Seiberling
Clark	Kyros	Sikes
Corman	Long, La.	Stanton,
Crane	MacKay	James V.
Diggs	Macdonald,	Stokes
Dowdy	Mass.	Stubblefield
Dwyer	Mailliard	Symington
Edwards, La.	Mathias, Calif.	Widnall
Eshleman	Mikva	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Fish	Morse	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Kyros.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mathias of California.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Morse.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Rhodes.  
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Halpern.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Kee.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Bingham.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Galifianakis.  
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Abernethy.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McKay.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Scheuer.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Price of Texas.  
Mr. Flood with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Murphy of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the three Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries bills passed by the House today.

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

There was no objection.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET, 1973—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-215)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting to the Congress the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972.

This budget reflects a careful allocation of limited resources among important services provided by the city government and among high priority public works projects. The Mayor and the City Council have thoroughly examined these budget proposals, effectively carrying out their responsibilities under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967. In addition, the Office of Management and Budget has reviewed these proposals as specified in the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1970.

The budget also reflects the city's actions consistent with the economic and Government personnel policies I established last year for Federal agencies. The District's base of authorized positions has been reduced by 5%, and further steps are being taken to improve the management and efficiency of the local government.

Most significantly, this budget does not request congressional approval of additional revenue proposals. Due to the intensive review by the Mayor and the City Council, the expenditure requests transmitted today can be completely balanced within current congressional revenue authorizations and anticipated revenue increases from local government actions.

Because this budget is not predicated on new congressional revenue action, I anticipate that the Congress should be able to complete action on the District's fiscal year 1973 budget by the beginning of the fiscal year. Such action would greatly facilitate more efficient budget planning by the District government in both the current and future fiscal years.

RICHARD NIXON.

APRIL 11, 1972.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) during today's debate on the bill H.R. 13188.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## REAP AMENDMENT

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide that the rural environmental assistance program—REAP—cost-share ratio for reorganizing irrigation systems, land leveling, and underground drainage systems be on a 50-50 basis.

REAP was authorized by Congress in

1936 and has been in effect continuously since then. Cost-share ratios during this period have generally been established on a 50-50 basis. As a part of the redirection effort for 1972, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has limited the cost-share ratio for some of the irrigation programs to 30 percent of the cost rather than the normal 50 percent. This was done with the feeling that farmers would ordinarily perform the practices of reorganizing irrigation systems, land leveling, and construction of underground drainage systems without cost-share assistance.

However, 523 citizens of my State of Wyoming have taken the time to write me personal letters or to sign petitions stating that a cut in the cost-share ratio is going to impose a hardship upon them, and in many cases my constituents state that without the 50-50 sharing they cannot afford the construction involved. For this reason, I introduce this proposal to reestablish the 50-50 cost-share ratio.

Mr. Speaker, there are three major reasons why I feel Congress should do what it can to reestablish the 50-50 ratio.

First of all, irrigation is of vital importance to Wyoming and to the rest of the arid West. Nearly every ranch in Wyoming does some irrigating, and most people who irrigate have a need for some REAP program. If the cutback is not reversed, we are going to have fewer farmers and ranchers who are able to afford the construction of irrigation systems and the land leveling work. This is going to affect the small towns whose sole purpose is to service surrounding farms and ranches, and we are going to have another group of unemployed in our Nation.

Second, as we all know, irrigation increases production. Given the continued rise in the prices of land, farm equipment, and construction, the only way America's farmers and ranchers can keep an even footing is through increased production. If marginal farmers are unable to afford irrigation systems, they are simply going to be forced off their farms.

Third, Mr. Speaker, land leveling, irrigation pipelines, cement ditches, tile drainage systems, and similar structures all makes a major contribution toward water pollution control, water conservation, and minimal soil erosion. Since the House of Representatives has refused to adopt an amendment to exempt farmers and ranchers from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the least it can do is to provide adequate funding for one of the few avenues farmers and ranchers have to control irrigation runoff pollution.

The 92d Congress has provided a rather generous amount of monetary assistance to many of the environmental-related programs that have come before us. Money has been authorized for the protection of wild horses and burros, an environmental data system, a National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, marine mammal protection, recreational development of fish and wildlife areas, and several wilderness, national park, and national recreation areas.

And now funds have been reduced which are for the purpose of helping our

farmers and ranchers to do their part in helping to clean up our environment. I am hopeful Congress will see fit to restore the cost-sharing ratio to the traditional 50-50 level and thereby encourage agriculture, the largest single employer in this Nation, to do its part in our fight against pollution.

#### GATES OF AMERICA SHOULD BE OPEN TO ONLY VISITORS WHO COME IN PEACE

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am incensed over an incident that took place last Wednesday in my congressional district. Some antiwar individuals demonstrated what were contended to be parts of bombs supposedly dismantled by workers of the American Machine Foundry Co. in York, Pa. One of the demonstrators was Eqbal Ahmad, a Pakistani immigrant and a defendant in the just concluded conspiracy trial of the Harrisburg Seven.

The irony of the case centers in the fact that he is not an American citizen and that he had the gall to castigate our public officials and threaten violence in the event the war in Vietnam was not terminated. He is a menace and a threat to the security of the United States.

As reported, Ahmad informed the demonstrators as follows:

I do promise you that if this war goes on, and if there is no accountability on the part of public officials, the papers will have to be destroyed, buildings will have to be broken, draft boards will have to continue to be raided and discussions about citizen arrests of officials whom we consider guilty or, at the very least deserving of trial for crimes against humanity, will continue to take place.

America is a country that welcomes visitors from abroad, but just as she extends this courtesy to foreigners, so does she expect certain considerations in return.

Ahmad, a Pakistani, does no credit to his country by this kind of sordid performance. In a like manner, those Americans around him who encourage this kind of conduct have little about which they can be proud.

As everyone knows, the trial of the Harrisburg Seven ended on April 5 in a jury deadlock on the key conspiracy charges. It is truly ironic that Ahmed, having just experienced how patient the American system of law can be, failed to reciprocate with a similar display of patience and, instead, threatened a resort to violence if the Vietnam war does not conclude on the schedule he sets forth.

I demand that this ungrateful and dangerous immigrant be deported immediately from the United States. I am communicating today toward this end with both the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, the gates of America must swing open to those who want to visit this country in peace. They must slam shut, however, on those who enter carrying a torch of violence and threaten

to burn down the legal and cultural foundations of this country. Mr. Ahmad is one of these, and he must go.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY ON U.S. ESCALATION OF ITS COMBAT ACTIVITIES IN INDO-CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to say this, but I almost feel as if today could be April 11, 1968, instead of April 11, 1972. Four years ago, candidate Richard Nixon told us that he had a plan to end our involvement in Vietnam, but today U.S. planes and ships are pounding the soil of that beleaguered nation as never before and other U.S. forces are being mobilized for its further and perhaps final devastation.

The American people have made it clear that they want this Nation to withdraw—now—from Vietnam. They want not only the withdrawal of our men, but also of our military hardware and dollars. I believe that although Mr. Nixon may be giving them the first of these desires—and I am not wholly certain of that—he is most certainly not giving them the second and third.

I am today introducing a resolution of inquiry seeking information on the nature and extent of our current involvement in Indochina. It directs the President and the Secretary of Defense, within 10 days after its adoption, to furnish this House with information as to the following:

The number of U.S. military personnel, including combat personnel, presently in South Vietnam;

Figures on the number of bombing sorties flown, the tonnage of bombs and shells dropped, and the cost of this bombing and shelling, in North and South Vietnam for the first 10 days of March 1972 and the first 10 days of April 1972. This comparative information should indicate clearly the degree to which the administration has stepped up the war in recent days as well as the overall level at which it is conducting our military operations;

A similar comparison of U.S. personnel killed, wounded, or reported missing in action;

Whether the Vietnamization policy of our Government really seeks complete independence of U.S. military support for the South Vietnamese Army and, if so, the target date for its full and final realization;

Information as to bombing and shelling activities of our forces in Laos and Cambodia since the beginning of this year, including the same information as to number of sorties, tonnage, and cost;

The degree to which the administration has increased the flow of military equipment and personnel to Southeast Asia in recent days, for this will constitute a clear indication of whether it really is planning to terminate our involvement or merely to move it from the ground to the air and the sea. The newspapers report that an American armada

is sailing to Indochina, troops at state-side military installations have been placed on alert, and rumors of National Guard callups abound. These are hardly the signs of an end to our involvement, and it is important that the Congress know whether these reports are accurate.

Finally, the resolution asks what steps the administration has taken to comply with section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971, also known as the modified Mansfield amendment. This provision declared it to be U.S. policy to terminate all of our military operations in Indochina at the earliest practicable date, and current activity on our part leads me to question whether this policy is being carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the President's assertions that our continuing and devastating air and naval presence in Vietnam is necessary to protect our troops in the South or to speed the return of our prisoners of war in the North.

As far back as 1967, the Jason study of the Pentagon's Institute for Defense Analysis concluded that—

The U.S. bombing of North Vietnam has had no measurable effect on Hanoi's ability to mount and support military operations in the South.

This study is fully discussed at pages 122 to 127 of volume II of book 6 of the Government Printing Office edition of the Pentagon Papers, and I am including it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Insofar as our POW's are concerned, it is apparent that they will not be returned until our military involvement in Vietnam is ended; all that our continuing activity is doing is to place more of our men in North Vietnamese POW camps and to extend the period of internment for those already there.

In addition to passing this resolution, the Congress should be making its own independent inquiry, sending Members and staff to Saigon, Paris, and, if possible, Hanoi to see for themselves the conduct of the United States with regard to Vietnam, and I have already called upon congressional leaders and the national chairman of my party to do this.

The course that we must take is clear. We must withdraw immediately from Vietnam—not only in terms of men, but in terms of machines and money as well—if we are to have our prisoners of war return home and begin the reordering of our priorities to the crying needs here at home.

I include the following:

H. Res. 918

*Resolved*, That the President and the Secretary of Defense be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives, within ten days after the adoption of this resolution, with full and complete information on the following—

1.a. The number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam at the present time;

b. The number of these individuals who are combat personnel;

2.a. The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over North Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972;

b. The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over North Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972;

c. The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over South Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972;

d. The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over South Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972;

3.a. The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into North Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of March 1972;

b. The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into North Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of April 1972;

c. The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into South Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of March 1972;

d. The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into South Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of April 1972;

5.a. The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

b. The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

c. The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over South Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

d. The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over South Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

6. List separately the number of United States military personnel (if any) killed, wounded or reported missing in action during (a) the first ten days of March 1972 and (b) the first ten days of April 1972, specifying how many in each such category were killed, wounded or reported missing in action in or over South Vietnam and how many in each such category were killed, wounded or reported missing in action in or over North Vietnam.

7. Whether there is a target date for the achievement by the Army of the Republic of Vietnam of complete military independ-

ence of United States air, naval and ground support and participation and, if so, what date;

8. Whether there has been any bombing or shelling carried on by the United States in or over Laos or Cambodia since January 1, 1972 and, if so, the number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, the tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped by the United States into or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, and the cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

9. Whether there has been an increase in the movement of military airplanes, military ships, other military equipment, military supplies, or military personnel of the United States to Southeast Asia, including the islands of the South Pacific Ocean, since March 15, 1972 (relative to the 30 day period immediately preceding that date) and, if so, the nature and extent of the increase in each such category;

10. What actions, if any, have been taken to comply with the provisions of section 601 of Public Law 92-156, approved November 17, 1971.

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT TO PRESIDENT NIXON BY REPRESENTATIVES ABZUG, BINGHAM, CHISHOLM, McCLOSKEY, AND SCHEUER, APRIL 4, 1972

Stepup of bombing in Vietnam flaunts the will of the American people who want immediate halt to all repeat all bombing and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops. This escalation of the war proves that Vietnamization policy merely substitutes U.S. bombs for U.S. troops.

We must stop tying the fate of our men and our Nation to the fate of the Thieu dictatorship. The U.S. must stop all repeat all bombing and announce an immediate date for withdrawal of all U.S. troops. Announcement of such a policy would be the best way to assure speedy return of our prisoners.

#### THE JASON STUDY

While DOD was internally examining bombing suspension scenarios, IDA's JASON division had called together many of the people who had participated in the 1966 Summer Study for another look at the effectiveness of the bombing and at various alternatives that might get better results. Their report was submitted in mid-December 1967 and was probably the most categorical rejection of bombing as a tool of our policy in Southeast Asia to be made before or since by an official or semi-official group. The study was done for McNamara and closely held after completion. It was completed after his decision to leave the Pentagon, but it was a powerful confirmation of the positions on the bombing that he had taken in the internal councils of the government over the preceding year.

The study evaluated the bombing in terms of its achievement of the objectives that Secretary McNamara had defined for it:

Secretary McNamara on August 25, 1967 restated the objectives of the bombing campaign in North Vietnam. These objectives are:

1. To reduce the flow and/or to increase the cost of the continued infiltration of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam.

2. To raise the morale of the South Vietnamese people who, at the time the bombing started, were under severe military pressure.

3. To make clear to the North Vietnamese political leadership that so long as they continued their aggression against the South, they would have to pay a price in the North.

Taking up the first of these stated objectives, the Jason study reached an emphatically negative conclusion about the results from Rolling Thunder:

"As of October 1967, the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam has had no measurable effect on Hanoi's ability to mount and support military operations in the South. North Vietnam supports operations in the South mainly by functioning as a logistic funnel and providing a source of manpower, from an economy in which manpower has been widely under-utilized. Most of the essential military supplies that the VC/NVA forces in the South require from external sources are provided by the USSR, Eastern Europe, and Communist China. Furthermore, the volume of such supplies is so low that only a small fraction of the capacity of North Vietnam's flexible transportation network is required to maintain that flow.

"In the face of Rolling Thunder strikes on NVN, the bombing of infiltration routes in Laos, the U.S. naval operations along the Vietnamese coast, and the tactical bombing of South Vietnam, North Vietnam infiltrated over 86,000 men in 1966. At the same time, it has also built up the strength of its armed forces at home, and acquired sufficient confidence in its supply and logistic organization to equip VC/NVA forces in South Vietnam with a modern family of imported 7.62mm weapons which require externally supplied ammunition. Moreover, NVN has the potential to continue building the size of its armed forces, to increase the yearly total of infiltration of individual soldiers and combat units, and to equip and supply even larger forces in South Vietnam for substantially higher rates of combat than those which currently prevail.

"Since the beginning of the Rolling Thunder air strikes on NVN, the flow of men and materiel from NVN to SVN has greatly increased, and present evidence provides no basis for concluding that the damage inflicted on North Vietnam by the bombing program has had any significant effect on this flow. In short, the flow of men and materiel from North Vietnam to the South appears to reflect Hanoi's intentions rather than capabilities even in the face of the bombing.

"NVN's ability to increase the rate of infiltration of men and materiel into SVN is not currently limited by its supply of military manpower, by its LOC capabilities, by the availability of transport carriers, or by its access to materials and supplies. The VC/NVA are effectively limited by constraints of the situation in the South—including the capacity of the VC infrastructure and distribution system to support additional materiel and troops—but even given these constraints could support a larger force in the South. The inference which we have drawn from these findings is that NVN determines and achieves the approximate force levels that they believe are needed to sustain a war of attrition for an extended period of time.

"Despite heavy attacks on NVN's logistic system, manufacturing capabilities, and supply stores, its ability to sustain the war in the South has increased rather than decreased during the Rolling Thunder strikes. It has become increasingly less vulnerable to aerial interdiction aimed at reducing the flow of men and materiel from the North to the South because it has made its transportation system more redundant, reduced the size and increased the number of depots and eliminated choke points.

"The bombing of North Vietnam has in-

flicted heavy costs not so much to North Vietnam's military capability or its infiltration system as to the North Vietnamese economy as a whole. Measurable physical damage now exceeds \$370 million and the regime has had to divert 300,000 to 600,000 people (many on a part-time basis) from agricultural and other tasks to counter the bombing and cope with its effects. The former cost has been more than met by aid from other Communist countries. The latter cost may not be real, since the extra manpower needs have largely been met from what was a considerable amount of slack in NVN's underemployed agricultural labor force. Manpower resources are apparently still adequate to operate the agricultural economy at a tolerable level and to continue simultaneously to support the war in SVN and maintain forces for the defense of the North at current or increased levels.

"Virtually all of the military and economic targets in North Vietnam that can be considered even remotely significant have been struck, except for a few targets in Hanoi and Haiphong. Almost all modern industrial output has been halted and the regime has gone over to decentralized, dispersed, and/or protected modes of producing and handling essential goods, protecting the people, and supporting the war in the South. NVN has shown that it can find alternatives to conventional bridges and they continue to operate trains in the face of air strikes.

"NVN has transmitted many of the material costs imposed by the bombing back to its allies. Since the bombing began, NVN's allies have provided almost \$600 million in economic aid and another \$1 billion in military aid—more than four times what NVN has lost in bombing damage. If economic criteria were the only consideration, NVN would show a substantial net gain from the bombing, primarily in military equipment.

"Because of this aid, and the effectiveness of its countermeasures, NVN's economy continues to function. NVN's adjustments to the physical damage, disruption, and other difficulties brought on by the bombing have been sufficiently effective to maintain living standards, meet transportation requirements, and improve its military capabilities. NVN is now a stronger military power than before the bombing and its remaining economy is more able to withstand bombing. The USSR could furnish NVN with much more sophisticated weapon systems; these could further increase the military strength of NVN and lead to larger U.S. losses."

These conclusions were supported copiously in a separate volume of the study devoted specifically to such analysis. The second objective of the bombing, to raise South Vietnamese morale, had been substantially achieved. There had been an appreciable improvement in South Vietnamese morale immediately after the bombing began and subsequent buoyancy always accompanied major new escalations of the air war. But the effect was always transient, fading as a particular pattern of attack became a part of the routine of the war. There was no indication that bombing could ever constitute a permanent support for South Vietnamese morale if the situation in the South itself was adverse.

The third function of the bombing, as described by McNamara, was psychological—to win the test of wills with Hanoi by showing U.S. determination and intimidating DRV leaders about the future. The failure of the bombing in this area, according to the Jason study, had been as signal as in purely military terms.

"The bombing campaign against NVN has not discernibly weakened the determination of the North Vietnamese leaders to continue to direct and support the insurgency in the South. Shortages of food and clothing, travel restrictions, separations of families, lack of adequate medical and educational facilities,

and heavy work loads have tended to affect adversely civilian morale. However, there are few if any reliable reports on a breakdown of the commitment of the people to support the war. Unlike the situation in the South, there are no reports of marked increases of absenteeism, draft dodging, black market operations or prostitution. There is no evidence that possible war weariness among the people has shaken the leadership's belief that they can continue to endure the bombing and outlast the U.S. and SVN in a protracted war of attrition.

"Long term plans for the economic development have not been abandoned but only set aside for the duration of the war. The regime continues to send thousands of young men and women abroad for higher education and technical training; we consider this evidence of the regime's confidence of the eventual outcome of the war.

"The expectation that bombing would erode the determination of Hanoi and its people clearly overestimated the persuasive and disruptive effects of the bombing and, correspondingly, underestimated the tenacity and recuperative capabilities of the North Vietnamese. That the bombing has not achieved anticipated goals reflects a general failure to appreciate the fact, well-documented in the historical and social scientific literature, that a direct, frontal attack on a society tends to strengthen the social fabric of the nation, to increase popular support of the existing government, to improve the determination of both the leadership and the populace to fight back, to induce a variety of protective measures that reduce the society's vulnerability to future attack and to develop an increased capacity for quick repairs and restoration of essential functions. The great variety of physical and social countermeasures that North Vietnam has taken in response to the bombing is now well documented but the potential effectiveness of these countermeasures has not been adequately considered in previous planning or assessment studies."

The Jason study took a detailed look at alternative means of applying our air power in an effort to determine if some other combination of targets and tactics would achieve better results. Nine different strategies were examined including mining the ports, attacking the dikes and various combinations of attack emphasis on the LOC systems. This was the emphatic conclusion: "We are unable to devise a bombing campaign in the North to reduce the flow of infiltrating personnel into SVN." All that could really be said was that some more optimum employment of U.S. air resources could be devised in terms of target damage and LOC disruption. None could reduce the flow even close to the essential minimum for sustaining the war in the South.

After having requested that some portions of the study be reworked to eliminate errors of logic, Mr. Warnke forwarded the final version to Secretary McNamara on January 3, 1968 with the information copies to Secretary Rusk, the Joint Chiefs and CINCPAC. In his memo he noted the similarity of the conclusions on bombing effectiveness to those reached not long before in the study by the CIA (see above). Specifically, Mr. Warnke noted that, "Together with Sea Cabin, the study supports the proposition that a bombing pause—even for a significant period of time—would not add appreciably to the strength of our adversary in South Vietnam." Thus was laid the analytical groundwork for the President's decision to partially curtail the bombing in March.

[Public Law 92-156, Nov. 17, 1971]

TITLE VI—TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

Sec. 601. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to terminate at

the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces at a date certain, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government and an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held by or known to such Government or such forces. The Congress hereby urges and requests the President to implement the above-expressed policy by initiating immediately the following actions:

(1) Establishing a final date for the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces of the United States contingent upon the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government and an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held by or known to such Government or such forces.

(2) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an immediate cease-fire by all parties to the hostilities in Indochina.

(3) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an agreement which would provide for a series of phased and rapid withdrawals of United States military forces from Indochina in exchange for a corresponding series of phased releases of American prisoners of war, and for the release of any remaining American prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of all remaining military forces of the United States by not later than the date established by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) hereof or by such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the negotiating parties.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 10, 1972]

#### REPORT A U.S. "ARMADA" IS SAILING TO INDOCHINA

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. appears to be preparing new buildups of its air and sea power in Southeast Asia in response to the continuing North Vietnamese offensive in South Vietnam.

Sources said yesterday that two more aircraft carriers, the Midway and Saratoga, were hurriedly preparing for departure to the Far East, and that three or four squadrons of F-4 Phantom fighter-bombers were on alert for possible duty in Southeast Asia.

A group in Cambridge, Mass., calling itself the Ad Hoc Military Buildup Committee, said early today that the 3d Marine Aid Wing at El Toro Marine Station, Cal., had received immediate orders from Vietnam.

The committee also said a minimum of 50 planes had been sent to Indochina during the past few days. And it claimed it had learned that Army troops based at Ft. Hood, Tex., and Ft. Dix, N.J., and a number of transport planes at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J., had been placed on alert.

The Pentagon, following standard procedure regarding information on military maneuvers, refused to discuss reported alerts and movements in connection with the 12-day-old Communist offensive.

However, an officer aboard the U.S.S. Saratoga at Mayport Naval Station in Florida said crewmen of the giant carrier had been informed yesterday that it would sail tomorrow for an unexpected eight-month tour off the coast of Vietnam.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported that the guided-missile destroyer Somers and the destroyers Eversole and Ozburn were to sail for Vietnam waters today from Long Beach, Cal. The newspaper said nuclear-powered cruiser Long Beach, which left California March 28, was canceling a planned week-long visit to Japan as it rushed to the Gulf of Tonkin off North Vietnam.

#### FURTHER SAILINGS

Four other ships were reported sailing from San Diego, headquarters of the 11th Naval

District and Pacific Destroyer Fleet, but they were not identified.

In Honolulu, the local Vietnam Veterans Against the War said three destroyers and a dozen support craft are set to leave for Southeast Asia today and a squadron of Marine F-4's already has left Kaneoche Marine Air Station in Hawaii bound for Japan. The Pacific Naval Command refused comment on the report.

Within the past week, about 75 Air Force and Marine aircraft, including B52 bombers and F105 and F4 fighter-bombers, have been ordered to Southeast Asia from the U.S. and Japan. The buildup has marshaled more than 700 American warplanes within striking range of North and South Vietnam.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 11, 1972]

#### ARMADA GATHERS OFF VIET

(By James Wieghart)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is positioning the greatest naval fighting force assembled since World War II off the coast of Vietnam in an effort to help turn back the massive 12-day-old North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, Pentagon sources said today.

The U.S. Naval buildup was under way as Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said today that more air and naval forces are being dispatched "as additional needed insurance" for American troops being withdrawn from South Vietnam and to prevent the North Vietnamese from overrunning the South.

#### TWO MORE CARRIERS

Laird declined to give details of the buildup, but Pentagon sources said the Southeast Asian Naval Task Force, already strengthened by the addition of a fourth aircraft carrier last week, will be joined soon by two more attack carriers—the Midway, ready to leave from the West Coast, and the Saratoga, being diverted from the East Coast and its planned assignment in the Mediterranean.

Both of the supercarriers are being accompanied by powerful flotillas of destroyers and cruisers, sources said.

Pentagon sources said that Laird has also ordered into the Southeast Asia theater more land-based supersonic jet fighter-bombers and B-52 bombers, which have begun raiding targets in North Vietnam for the first time in four years.

#### HUNDREDS MORE PLANES

In the last two weeks the B-52 bomber force, operating from bases in Guam and Thailand, have been increased 25%, from about 80 to 100 aircraft.

At the same time, the tactical fighter-bomber force for Vietnam has been increased by 50%, from about 400 to 600 aircraft.

Although Laird would not spell out what additional forces were on the way to Vietnam in his discussion of the matter in a speech to the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, he said they involved air and sea forces and not ground combat troops.

"These augmented forces will be available to Gen. Abrams (Gen. Creighton Abrams, U.S. commander in Vietnam) and the Southeast Asian Command later this week," Laird said. "They are the additional needed insurance showing the determination of the United States as this massive violation, not only of the 1954 (Geneva) Accords, but also the 1968 understanding (to halt U.S. bombing of North Vietnam), has been undertaken by the enemy."

Laird added, in some of the strongest language he has used thus far, "We have been patient and we have been restrained, but our restraint and our patience have been answered by provocation, by propaganda, and by this invasion."

He said the South Vietnamese "are performing well in the face of the three-

pronged attack across the demilitarized zone in the north; the tri-border area of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam on the west; and the area around Au Loc, only 60 miles north of Saigon.

Regarding what Pentagon planners consider the most serious front—in the north, across the border—Laird said the South Vietnamese strategy "of holding along the Cua Viet River is working out very well." The Cua Viet River is the first natural barrier crossed by the North Vietnamese 11 days ago in their drive over the supposedly demilitarized border zone.

#### NO TALKS IN PARIS

Meanwhile, the State Department and the White House made it clear that the United States has no intention of resuming the Paris peace talks, suspended by the U.S., under pressure of the military attacks.

President Nixon was in touch with his top-level strategists on the Vietnam war today and met with the chief U.S. negotiator at the Paris talks, Ambassador William J. Porter.

Deputy White House Press Secretary Gerald Warren said there was no time set for Porter's return to Paris, where the talks were suspended at Nixon's request.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 11, 1972]

#### B-52'S STRIKE THEIR DEEPEST INTO THE NORTH

(By Joseph Fried)

SAIGON.—United States B-52 bombers making their deepest strike of the war inside North Vietnam bombed petroleum storage tanks and other supply targets near the city of Vinh today in the American air campaign to crush the Communist offensive in South Vietnam.

Military sources said about 40 more Air Force Phantom jets were being rushed to Indochina bases as part of the U.S. buildup.

Heavy South Vietnamese losses were reported in an ambush 72 miles northwest of Saigon as the enemy campaign broadened along South Vietnam's central coast.

A brigade of 5,000 South Vietnamese paratroopers leading a counteroffensive to relieve pressure on the provincial capital of An Loc, 60 miles north of Saigon pushed to within 20 miles of the city. It is surrounded by North Vietnamese forces.

Headquarters said the B-52s raiding targets near Vinh, a coastal city 140 miles north of the demilitarized zone, were trying to stop the flow of supplies feeding the enemy offensive in South Vietnam.

#### FIRST STRIKE AT HEARTLAND

Sources said the Vinh raid was part of a series of B-52 strikes against major transportation points in the supply line south. The decision to use the eight-engine Stratofortresses stemmed directly from the North Vietnamese invasion across the demilitarized zone, they said.

The Vinh mission was the first by B-52s into North Vietnam's heartland. In the previous B-52 strikes against North Vietnam in 1966 and 1967, the bombers struck periphery areas such as the Mu Gia Pass which skirts the Laotian border just above the buffer zone.

The Hanoi radio claimed that U.S. Navy warplanes carried out heavy raids against Vinh and that two of the jets were shot down. Sources in Saigon said the Communists were probably confused about the type of attacking aircraft. Headquarters said there was no U.S. report on B-52s lost in the Vinh mission.

#### FOURTEEN RAIDS OVER SOUTH

In addition B-52 bombers continued attacks against Red troops concentrations in South Vietnam with 14 raids late tonight.

Viet Cong sappers, meanwhile, blew up a big ammunition dump barely 11 miles east of Saigon today. The Reds penetrated defenses to get into the dump and set off a

charge which destroyed 35% of the stores and shook the capital. One sapper was killed and two guards wounded.

The U.S. buildup in air power continued with military sources reporting two more squadrons of Phantom fighter-bombers on the way to bases in South Vietnam and Thailand to bring existing squadrons up to full strength. A squadron numbers 18 to 20 aircraft.

**MARINES SENT EARLIER**

Previously, two Marine Phantom squadrons and an Air Force Thunderchief squadron were sent to help South Vietnamese ground units repulse the enemy offensive that began March 30. An additional B-52 squadron was moved to the war zone from the U.S. last week.

South Vietnamese headquarters claimed 1,082 enemy soldiers slain and 47 tanks destroyed in a day of heavy fighting in north ermost Quang Tri Province. A communique said this was a better than 100-1 "kill ratio" for government forces. The South Vietnamese commander on the northern front said North Vietnam's invasion across the demilitarized zone had been stopped.

**RELIEF FORCE SHATTERED**

Military sources said the ambush was sprung on a South Vietnamese force trying to reach Fire Base Thien Ngon 72 miles northwest of Saigon in Tay Ninh Province. Sources said Communist forces destroyed five U.S. artillery pieces, including four 155-mm. howitzers, 10 armored personnel carriers, two tanks and 11 trucks and shattered the South Vietnamese relief unit of more than 500 men.

**RESULTS OF 1972 QUESTIONNAIRE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just tabulated the answers to my questionnaire sent to residents of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. The results show that President Nixon's pro-

grams and policies have the solid backing of the people in my district.

The poll showed that President Nixon's effort to reduce our commitment in Vietnam has the approval of 72 percent of the people of the 18th District. His reduction of troop levels from 590,000 to 69,000 has indicated that he has done everything within reason to end the war as far as active U.S. participation in ground warfare is concerned. And the President's efforts to stabilize and normalize relations with Red China won the approval of 70 percent of Peoria area residents answering the survey.

The wage-price policies drew a 77-percent approval rate, with that percentage wanting the present system of controls continued as a keystone in the war on inflation.

School busing was decisively turned down by 73 percent of those answering the questionnaire, following a pattern that has developed nationwide against forced busing as a means of attempting racial balance in education.

The farm program drew the only disapproving percentage for the Nixon administration in the 12-question poll, with 49 percent unsatisfied with the present farm program, 36 percent approving and 15 percent reserving judgment.

Showing their concern for the environment, 18th District citizens approved by an overwhelming 81 percent majority the idea of subjecting industry to large fines for air and water pollution if found guilty of violations after a 1975 cutoff date.

Using food stamps to help break strikes was opposed by a whopping 87 percent of those answering the poll, who believe that striking workers should not be eligible for Federal food stamps.

Deficit financing is not popular in my congressional district, even if intended

to drive the unemployment rate below the 5-percent level. Some 60 percent opposed the use of Federal debt for this purpose.

Day care centers for working mothers were turned down by 62 percent of the people.

Increasing social security taxes to fund a national health insurance program was opposed by 59 percent, the identical figure as last year's questionnaire.

A national sales tax was also voted down by 70 percent of the pollees as an alternative plan for financing education from the Federal level.

The space program drew 58 percent general support for continuance of the present pace of space exploration.

I was most impressed by the small percentage of "no response" answers on this poll. This indicates to me that the people in my district are following closely the activities of the President, both at home and abroad, and are watching the Congress and its performance in meeting the current problems that need solution.

Because of damaged IBM cards, we were only able to tabulate 11,631 out of more than 14,000 returned questionnaires, and I want to thank all who took the time to answer this poll. It will prove valuable to me in consideration of the bills yet to come before this Congress. Our Nation has had many problems build to crisis levels over the past decade. The poll indicates that the people in my congressional district, who I believe reflect nationwide sentiment on most issues, want progress, they want action, and they want sound and practical answers. I believe this poll was most worthwhile, and herewith present the results of its tabulation for comparison by my colleagues in Congress with similar polls conducted in their own district.

The tabulation follows:

**REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT H. MICHEL—1972 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS**

Question and answer	Responses	Percent	Question and answer	Responses	Percent
1. Do you feel the President is doing everything within reason to end the war in Vietnam?			7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting busing of school children to achieve racial balance?		
Yes.....	8,389	72.3	Yes.....	8,481	73.3
No.....	2,920	25.2	No.....	2,797	24.2
No response.....	296	2.6	No response.....	285	2.5
Total.....	11,605		Total.....	11,563	
2. Do you favor formal U.S. recognition of Communist China?			8. Do you favor a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic illnesses for everyone, financed by an increase in social security taxes?		
Yes.....	8,119	70.0	Yes.....	4,159	35.9
No.....	2,889	24.9	No.....	6,873	59.3
No response.....	583	5.0	No response.....	556	4.8
Total.....	11,591		Total.....	11,588	
3. Do you favor continuation of wage and price controls?			9. Do you think industry should be subject to large fines if found guilty of polluting the air or water after 1975?		
Yes.....	8,951	77.2	Yes.....	9,332	80.6
No.....	2,234	19.3	No.....	1,841	15.9
No response.....	404	3.5	No response.....	412	3.6
Total.....	11,589		Total.....	11,585	
4. Do you feel Federal deficits are justifiable in times when unemployment exceeds 5 percent?			10. Do you favor a national sales tax to finance education?		
Yes.....	3,345	28.8	Yes.....	3,017	26.0
No.....	6,986	60.2	No.....	8,108	70.0
No response.....	1,265	10.9	No response.....	464	4.0
Total.....	11,596		Total.....	11,589	
5. Should workers going out on strike automatically become eligible to receive food stamps?			11. Are you satisfied with the current farm program?		
Yes.....	1,197	10.3	Yes.....	4,112	35.5
No.....	10,061	86.8	No.....	5,658	48.8
No response.....	336	2.9	No response.....	1,821	15.7
Total.....	11,594		Total.....	11,591	
6. Should the Federal Government establish free day care centers for the children of working mothers with incomes under \$4000?			12. Do you generally support our space program?		
Yes.....	3,995	34.4	Yes.....	6,768	58.3
No.....	7,081	61.1	No.....	4,431	36.2
No response.....	521	4.5	No response.....	414	3.6
Total.....	11,597		Total.....	11,605	



**GOV. GEORGE WALLACE—FRIEND OF THE WORKINGMAN?**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with George Wallace today attracting crowds around the country on a platform of building up our National Defense while we cut out 50 percent of our wasteful Federal tax payments to Washington, his believers should be advised of the facts.

Let's look at the past 10 years. Where have we collected the taxes and where have we spent the money.

If we compartmentalize our thinking it will help our understanding. Let's look at the Treasury Department's budget in brief.

Our national receipts for individual Federal income taxes over the 10-year period 1963-73 completed by the pending budget period are listed to total \$775.6 billion.

Total defense spending in the same period is listed as totaling \$758.5 billion. The budget defense figures do not include supportive assistance a defense item that pays for guns, and so forth in foreign countries, but is included in the foreign affairs budget—so add another estimated \$5 billion—total \$763.5. Restated, 98.4 percent of our individual Federal income taxes over the past 10 years have been "cookie jarred" directly into national defense.

Governor Wallace might say that I am forgetting the fat cat taxes that we should be collecting from corporations?

Again, let us look at the little budget document of the Treasury and aggregate the corporate taxes paid over the same past 10 years—a whopping \$325.4 billion. Did these go into domestic programs? Not quite.

These funds just happen to have been needed to pay in large part our past war debts. The 10-year tag alone for veterans benefits totals \$76 billion.

Interest on the national debt now bursting through the \$430 billion barrier also must be considered as a past war expense. This is true mainly because we had no debt before World War I, have had no substantial debt expansion between our wars and our growth in the national debt has a 90-percent correlation factor with World War I, World War II, Korean war, cold war, and, finally, the interminable Vietnam war. The total interest bill is \$162 billion—or a total 10-year past war bill of \$238 billion.

While our 10-year past war costs only eat up 73 percent of our 10-year past collected corporate taxes, let us look at what happens in 1973 according to the budget document. On page 77 the Bureau of the Budget projects corporate taxes as bulging next year from \$30.1 to \$35.7 billion. Our past war debt, however, of debt interest and veterans benefits is catching up fast, totaling \$32.9 billion next year. Restated, if we do not have a slow year next year and everything goes as planned, 93 percent of corporate taxes will be needed to satisfy past war debts.

Where Mr. Wallace intends to effect

the economies remains a mystery to many economists in Washington today.

Of course, Wallace might say that I have ignored the other Federal income? Bananas—there's no other legitimate Federal income that amounts to a hoot.

Certainly no legitimate economist or honest politician would count on continuing to steal from the highway, medicare, social security, and retirement trust funds. Past Presidents have already swiped \$128 billion from these sources—and that ain't hay.

There are the paltry excise, estate, and tariff taxes remaining—about \$16 billion of collections are expected from these sources this year—these funds grow at an annual rate of 1 percent per year—well behind our annual 4- to 6-percent inflation rate.

Things are expected to get a lot worse before they get better. Take military retirement pay as an example. When Lyndon Johnson took office in 1963, we were paying \$1.015 billion in retirement benefits. This has increased steadily over the past 10 years to the point where the 1973 budget calls for \$4.326 billion. But this is only the beginning; we have been merely sitting on the apron revving up our engines; the takeoff is yet to come. Assuming a 6-percent average annual increase in military pay, and a 4.5 percent average Consumer Price Index increase, by the year 2000 we will be paying \$36.8 billion per year in retirement benefits. Add in one-time recomputation and we will pay \$43.1 billion—60 percent of our current defense budget.

We cannot continue to accept the comfortable assertion that military spending is stabilizing at 7 or 8 percent of the gross national product. Seven or 8 percent sounds small, but the blunt fact is we cannot afford it.

Governor Wallace might ask the question—well if all of our tax money has gone for defense and war costs, where did we get the money to waste on poverty, education, health, and manpower training programs?

That answer is simple—we simply charged it. Over the past 4 years we have the Nixon deficits again according to the budget document \$12 billion for 1970, \$30 billion for 1971, \$45 billion for the current fiscal 1972, and \$37 billion projected for next year, totaling \$124 billion for a 4-year period if everything goes right next year. The debt is projected to go through the roof this year at \$480 billion.

Governor Wallace wants to cut out this national debt without cutting national defense and wants to cut taxes in half to boot.

The Governor forces reasonable economists to conclude that he will soon after his election totally terminate all health, education, training, agriculture, pollution, transportation, housing, and space programs.

What else can we conclude from the Budget Bureau's figures—and Wallace is the friend of the working man?

**A BREAK FOR THE HOMEOWNER**

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. HALPERN), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we gave a break to the homeowner—the backbone of our Nation. For far too long, the homeowner has been the forgotten man on the American scene, and the one hardest hit by the tax collector.

The American homeowner—the pillar of our communities—has no organized pressure group for massed demands upon the Congress. His basic rights and needs have a way of being lost in the turmoil of behests and pleas which always swirls about this Hill.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House to remember that we are the spokesmen for the American homeowner, and he depends upon us to be aware of his burdens and needs, and to act for the fulfillment of those needs.

One of these needs, and one of the most important, is a meaningful measure of tax relief. I have pressed for such relief in previous sessions of this House, and I shall strive for this goal again in this Congress.

For that reason, I am introducing today two bills aimed at assisting homeowners, and helping to fortify American communities against the spreading blight which results from lack of repairs and improvements to homes.

The first bill would provide depreciation allowances to make up for wear, and tear on a home. We have ample precedent for this in the depreciation allowances enjoyed by the owners of business and commercial property.

Homes are the stock in trade of American communities, providing the taxes which form a major part of local tax income. If they are kept in good repair, the locality's tax resources remain strong.

The general economic health of cities, towns, and villages reflects the condition of their homes. The money spent for upkeep and repairs goes into the tills of local businessmen. Furthermore, the businessmen of a well-kept home area are always more prosperous—and let us not forget that their income taxes swell the Federal Treasury.

Even more basic than that, we must never lose sight of the fact that the construction industry is the bellwether of the overall economy in urban areas. When the construction industry thrives and its mechanics are earning steady incomes, local industry and commerce also thrive.

My proposals can provide the incentive to homeowners to maintain the condition of their homes and to improve them, providing a tremendous shot-in-the-arm to the construction industry, and helping it to help the economy.

The second bill I am introducing today would provide for a deduction of up to \$750 in the owner's income tax return for expenses incurred by the taxpayer on improvements and repairs to his residence. This is the heart of my program. It is a forceful incentive to home beautification and continuing upkeep.

I am certain that many of us have observed increasing signs of general depreciation in many communities. This is especially evident in lower income communities, and that is understandable in

the light of the soaring costs of materials and skilled labor.

Home depreciation is a progressive blight. A repair that goes undone one year may cost twice as much to correct in the second year, and four times as much in the third year.

Eventually, if the regular, periodic maintenance work has not been carried out, there comes a point where the cost of repairs becomes so prohibitive as to be impossible. From that point on, creeping blight becomes rampaging blight.

The Bureau of the Census in 1960 reported that only 74 percent of all the housing in America could be deemed to be in sound condition. Since then, there has been a steady increase in the costs of home maintenance. We can hardly hope that the rate of deterioration had decreased. In fact, we can safely assume that dilapidation has spread.

We must do everything in our power to encourage the physical preservation of the American home, for it is the foundation of the American community.

Enactment of the two laws I have introduced today will go a long way toward making that preservation more possible.

#### U.S. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has formally recognized the independent State of Bangladesh, it may be well to attempt to separate fact from fiction regarding the U.S. humanitarian effort in South Asia.

There has been much understandable confusion on this score and some misinformation. One popular misconception has been that relief and humanitarian assistance to Bangladesh could not be provided in the absence of formal diplomatic recognition. Another charge has been that the administration has been "dragging its feet" in supplying relief aid to the Mujib regime for essentially political reasons. The record shows both of these allegations to be false.

At the same time, it must be conceded that the "record" has been a confusing one—statistically. A major source of this confusion has been the cancellation of contracts between the Governments of the United States and Pakistan as a result of the December hostilities and the subsequent loss of control by Pakistan over its former Eastern Province. For instance, some \$97 million of the original \$158 million "commitment to the 60 to 70 million people in East Pakistan," mentioned by President Nixon in his state of the world address on February 9, had to be "deobligated" and "reprogrammed"—a process which is still going on.

From an accounting standpoint, at least, an already confused situation—involving the enforced diversion of shipments from East Pakistan to other South and Southeast Asian ports during the December war—has become a bureaucratic nightmare leading to charges and counterclaims about exactly how much

food and other relief supplies actually reached their destination. Unfortunately, this controversy has tended to obscure the very real efforts undertaken by the U.S. Government, in cooperation with the United Nations, to meet an emergency of immense proportions.

In this connection, I should like to share with my colleagues a very detailed and informative report which I have just received from Mr. Maurice Williams, Deputy AID Administrator and Coordinator of U.S. Disaster Relief Assistance for South Asia.

This report summarizes the specific actions being undertaken at the present time to speed the movement of food to Bangladesh to avert famine in 1972. It also calls attention to the U.S. record of relief accomplishment last year—a record which many critics of our South Asian policy seem to have overlooked. For instance, Mr. Williams notes:

In the critical year from the November 1970 cyclone to the (December, 1971) war, the U.S. put on the high seas over a million tons of food—1,049,000 to be exact—valued at \$104 million. Of this total, 699,570 tons were actually delivered at what is now Bangladesh—enough food for four million people for the entire year—a dramatic way of depicting our relief accomplishments. . . .

It should be added that the U.S. contribution in humanitarian relief assistance to South Asia has not been surpassed by any other nation on earth.

When viewed in this perspective, the "tilt" we have heard so much about in recent months appears to have been very much in favor of the people of Bangladesh.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this time Mr. Williams' letter to me, dated April 7, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1972.

HON. PETER H. FRELINGHUYSEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: We are very concerned with reports of food shortages in Bangladesh, particularly reports of low public stocks and actual or potential food riots. I want to assure you that we are doing all we can to address food needs and to speed the movement of food into Bangladesh.

A.I.D. announced last week a further grant of 75 thousand tons of rice. This brings to 500,000 tons the total of wheat, rice and vegetable oil authorized by the U.S. in response to UN requests during the past six weeks. Deliveries of this food are being rushed. 23,000 tons have already sailed. 48,000 tons are now being loaded. We are also redirecting to Bangladesh food on the high seas from less critical areas as it is needed. The balance will be shipped as rapidly as possible.

The UN Mission in Dacca now estimates food deliveries from abroad of 80,000 tons for April (20,000 of this from the U.S.) and 165,000 tons for May (of which about half is from the U.S.)

A factor of importance is that India, favorably situated to move grain over land and possessing an historically high level of stocks, has agreed to provide 500,000 tons of wheat and rice to Bangladesh in addition to the above imports, and is working to move this total by summer. It is now moving at the rate of 7,000 tons a day.

In addition, protein food for children granted by the U.S. last year is being made available as needed. Some 25,000 tons of this

nutritious food recently arrived in Bangladesh, enough to give vital food supplement to 3 million children for three months.

Without minimizing in any way our concern, we need to understand that the total food situation in Bangladesh has—from the best accounts available—both positive and negative aspects. As you know, there are problems of internal distribution which the Bangladesh authorities and the UN are working on. The internal food distribution is complicated—in fact worsened—by stories of shortages which tend to encourage speculative hoarding and create artificial shortages. Also both the Indian and Bangladesh authorities are attempting to stop speculators from moving Bangladesh rice to Indian markets. The problem of purchasing power makes it urgent to get industry working again and for the authorities to move on employment-creating public works. A start has been made on this. On the positive side the major rice crop in December and the one now being harvested total—by the most pessimistic of reports—at least 7 million tons or 6 to 7 months total supply into July 1972 without any imports, if these availabilities could be properly distributed. The major need for imported food is to break speculative hoarding and build government stocks for the serious overall food deficit which occurs in the Fall months.

You will recall that in addition to requests for food, the UN provided us with a broad range of requirements, in cash and in kind. In response A.I.D. made a grant of \$35 million: \$31 million of this total has now been turned over to the UN in cash and the balance of \$4 million is being used by the U.S. Government to procure American trucks, requested by the UN.

The UN will be using this grant money for many purposes including the charter of aircraft, minibulkers, tugs, and barges, the procurement of vacuators and other cargo handling equipment, local costs involved in the repair of port facilities, the paying of stevedores, as well as the procurement of a wide range of relief commodities such as roofing materials, cement, fuel, fertilizer, power tillers, irrigation pumps, high yield variety rice seeds, etc. In short, I believe this \$35 million grant along with the contributions of other nations gives the UN Relief Operation in Dacca the resources and flexibility it needs to get on with the job.

International commitments from all sources to the relief effort in Bangladesh now total over \$400 million, of which \$115 million is from the U.S.

I was favorably impressed by Sir Robert Jackson as the newly designated head of the UN relief operations. He will provide the leadership and vitality which is sorely needed. Sir Robert sees the UN role in Bangladesh as essentially one of supporting the efforts of a sovereign government, marshaling world-wide contributions, and coordinating the myriad activities of voluntary agencies.

Our support of the voluntary agencies program in Bangladesh now exceeds \$7 million in grants. The first of these was a \$3 million grant to the Catholic Relief Service (CRS) for purchase and transport of metal roofing sheets. The roofing is part of a program to house an estimated 200,000 returned refugee and displaced families.

A \$650,000 grant for housing has also been made to CARE. The grant will assist CARE in implementing a 62-village housing demonstration project using "cinva ram" construction techniques.

To aid 9,000 former college students made destitute by the recent fighting, many of whom were Mukti Bahini guerrillas, a \$1.7 million grant was made to the International Rescue Committee (IRC) for college scholarships. This will enable 9,000 students to resume their studies for at least one year.

A grant of \$450,000 was made to IRC for

emergency financing of the local costs of the Cholera Research Laboratory, which operates a hospital in Dacca and another in Matlab Bazaar. In addition, the grant funds will provide emergency preventative and therapeutic health services.

Also in the field of health, a \$1.5 million grant to the American Red Cross will help the International Committee of the Red Cross carry out a program of nutritional and medical assistance for an estimated two million persons, including minorities.

To bring food and other emergency relief supplies to "pockets of distress" within Bangladesh, a grant for \$1.5 million is being made to the Foundation for Airborne Relief which will airdrop supplies of food to communities unreachable by surface transport, using two Boeing C97G Stratofreighters, two light helicopters and two light Cessna amphibians. Using doubled, internal explodable bag techniques approximately 4,400,000 lbs. of food a month will be distributed.

UN and World Bank experts are now completing an assessment of the needs and costs of the longer-term tasks, such as rehabilitation of educational institutions, drilling tubewells and taking other water supply measures, dredging waterways and constructing canals, rebuilding rural health clinics, restoring telecommunications, and reviving the jute and other industries. We expect to receive these rehabilitation findings of the World Bank team by late April. In response to their findings, we expect that the bulk of the \$200 million appropriated for FY 72 will be committed during this fiscal year.

Recognition of Bangladesh by the U.S. Tuesday will not change our basic policy of supporting in every way possible a broad international effort coordinated by the UN and World Bank. Recognition is a constructive political move which, among other things, should relieve emotional feelings and attacks which previously focussed on the recognition issue and spilled over on the U.S. relief effort.

At the risk of seeming defensive, I think it is important that we keep in mind the record of U.S. relief prior to the Indo-Pakistani war last December. The U.S. played a major part in averting the famine which many feared as a result of the civil disturbances and fighting last year. The critical relief need was—as it currently is—food and food transport. You know of the lead we took in chartering river boats which before the December fighting were carrying half the total food tonnage which moved from the ports. In the critical year from the November 1970 cyclone to the war, the U.S. put on the high seas over a million tons of food—1,049,000 to be exact—valued at \$104 million. Of this total, 699,570 tons was actually delivered at what is now Bangladesh—enough food for four million people for the entire year—a dramatic way of depicting our relief accomplishment. And in the months after March 1971 this accomplishment involved the delicate task of persuading the warring parties to let the food pass on "above the battle" humanitarian grounds.

Substantial tonnage of food was on the high seas enroute at the time the war broke out. Many ships' masters turned back from the naval blockade and bombings and strafing, others naturally requested safe haven ports and alternative destinations and we rescheduled this food for PL 480 programs in other countries—rather than pay extensive demurrage charges or return it to the U.S.

In addition to the million tons actually shipped from the U.S. a further 700,000 plus tons had been authorized for what had been East Pakistan but had not been shipped by the time hostilities prevented further delivery. We are transferring this food to new commitments for Bangladesh as the UN calls it forward. Critics have made much of these

so-called "cancellations" and "diversions" at sea to other destinations last December, but our purpose was to reprogram needed food under the revised circumstances, as the UN called it forward.

We believe the record of relief accomplishment in averting famine in 1971 stands. The task is to repeat the performance of avoiding famine in 1972 and to get on with the job of reconstruction.

Sincerely,

MAURICE J. WILLIAMS,  
Coordinator of U.S. Disaster Relief  
Assistance for South Asia.

#### REPUBLIC OF ITALY HONORS HENRY FALCHER, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE OFFICIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1972, Henry Falcher, District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—Rome, Italy—an outstanding U.S. Government official, and my longtime friend, was awarded "Commandatore del Ordine della Repubblica Italiana." This award was presented to Mr. Falcher in Rome by Senator Lodovico Montini, older brother of Pope Paul and head of the International Aid Administration of Italy, a close personal friend of Mr. Falcher.

The award is for outstanding activities promoting and strengthening the ties of friendship between the United States and Italy and was signed by the President of the Republic of Italy, Giovanni Leone.

Senator Montini, in presenting the award, said that it displayed the great interest and importance of good relations between Italy and the United States. Furthermore, he said the commendation displayed symbolically a declaration of close relationship on this problem of resettling refugees from throughout Europe.

At the presentation ceremonies were the Honorable Graham Martin, U.S. Ambassador to Italy, Bishop Paul Marcinkus, head of the Vatican Treasury; Mark Antinucci, publisher and president of the Rome Daily American; and director general of immigration for Italy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hon. Penna Cabone.

I am proud to bring to the attention of the House this honor bestowed upon Henry Falcher. He is a credit to the Department of Justice and to the United States. His ability as an immigration officer and his fairness and understanding as an individual have well served the interests of the United States and our relationship with Italy.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the House this session, the Higher Education Amendments of 1971,

is now in conference with the Senate. Our esteemed colleague, Representative HUGH CAREY, delivered a most informative address on the purpose of this vital legislation to the National Catholic Education Association in Philadelphia on April 5. His presentation provides a comprehensive history of the great achievements of the Congress in the 1960's in Federal aid to higher education.

I want to place his address in the RECORD and recommend to all my colleagues that they read and study this significant report.

Mr. CAREY served for 10 years on the Higher Education Subcommittee and was one of the legislative architects of Federal aid to higher education during the decade of the 1960's, the greatest period of growth in this program in the history of our country.

The address follows:

#### NATIONAL PRIORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION—THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

I am really delighted to have the opportunity this morning to meet with the Presidents, Administrators, and Trustees of the Catholic colleges and universities of the United States.

My remarks today, will be very much "all in the family" because I received both my Bachelor's and Law degrees from one of your member universities, am a trustee of others, and have had sons and daughters enrolled in four different and I might add differing institutions.

As if the burden of my education were not enough to test the ingenuity of the private sector, Mrs. Carey and I have compounded the burden into this and I hope the next generation.

In brief, if you have the places and program, we have the people—let us both hope a benign Uncle Sam is inclined to join us in pluralistic "burden sharing."

The key word today for me is "pluralism"—what it is, what it is worth—whether it can survive. Pluralism has many different meanings.

To Monsignor Baroni in Washington it may mean the value of our ethnic watersheds.

To the political observers like Fred Dutton it is the newest political movement substituting people, issues and cause for the parties and organizational patterns.

To Father Reinert in his splendid work "Turn the Tide" it is potential—potential for change, for innovation—for choices.

Even to my young son, 8 year old Paul who saw it scribbled over and over in my notes it had meaning as I explained it.

He said, "I guess it's a lot of different people doing many things all together."

On the theme of pluralism I want to speak frankly to you about both the philosophy and some of the specifics of our priorities in Federal aid to higher education. Your officers have also asked me to discuss the problem of how you and your institutions relate to the Federal legislative process. How do you communicate with the Congress on this crucial matter of a pluralism of priorities?

First, I want to assure you that I and the majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives recognize the enormous importance of the contributions made to higher education in the United States by the private and church-sponsored colleges. The fact of a dual and pluralistic system of higher education in the United States is a most unique and precious asset. No other people in the world support such a system which I believe maximizes real educational opportunity for the student, academic freedom for the University, and educational quality in the broadest sense.

So I say at the outset—our most important national priority should be to maintain this system intact and strengthened—not weakened!

In the ten years that I served on the Higher Education Subcommittee of the House, every major federal aid to Higher Education enactment was designed to treat both private and public institutions equitably.

Three major federal aid laws were passed. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; The NDEA Amendments of 1964; The Higher Education Act of 1965—with amendments in 1967 and 1968.

I believe that I can say that every single institution represented here this morning benefited from these programs. New classrooms, laboratories, and libraries were erected with both grants and loans. Hundreds of thousands of your students were assisted in paying rising tuition with direct and subsidized loans, equal opportunity and work-study grants. Hundreds of your junior faculty were assisted in completing their Ph.D. with NDEA Fellowships.

Indeed, the 1960's was the greatest decade of development of federal support for higher education in the history of this nation.

But in my opinion, ladies and gentlemen, these legislative landmarks were just the beginning of the structure of Federal support. Their scope and impact should not be viewed as a ceiling. They were not meant to encounter ceilings when we drafted them. None of the titles of Higher Education Act of 1965 have been fully funded up to their statutory authorizations. Furthermore, these direct forms of categorical federal aid must be analyzed in the context of the total federal support to colleges and universities from all sources.

Access to post-secondary education in the U.S. is at an all-time high. In 1940, we had 1.5 mil. students attending our colleges and universities; in 1970, 8.5 million. In the 1940's we were spending \$678 mil. or 0.74% of G.N.P. and in 1970, \$16.5 bil. or 2.8% of the G.N.P. on higher education. In other words, as was pointed out by Rep. Edith Green in opening the hearing on the Higher Education Amendment of 1971, "in 30 years the dollar expenditure for higher education has multiplied 23 times and the percentage of G.N.P. devoted to higher education has almost tripled." I believe that this nation has responded dramatically to its higher education needs—more than any other developed country.

There are some new disturbing facts, however. In the last 10–15 years, the proportion of students enrolled in our private institutions has declined from 50 to 25% of total enrollment. Current projection see this percentage going to 20% by 1980. Furthermore, there are now over 250 private institutions with serious financial deficits that could lead to bankruptcy and closures.

Across the pluralistic map of higher education we mark a dichotomy—we see growth and decline side by side.

In a decade of record support for students numbering over 8 million with grants, loans and work study aid in hand we see doors about to close. The closing of these doors must mean narrowing of choice and possible narrowing of perspective.

The closing of these doors may mean the survival not necessarily of the best—but rather the biggest public institutions.

How do we explain the growth of student demand and the reduction of the supply of institutions to serve that demand.

In brief it is because while we endowed the student with his three legged stool—grant, loan or work study aid, we did not give sufficient support to the institution of his choice in terms of the cost above tuition. It was as though we paid a heavy stipend for interest in education and failed to recognize the need to make payments on the principal—to the institution itself.

In the words of Colman McCarthy in the Washington Post OpEd article entitled "Up Against the Ivy Wall" it is now a question of "How to Save Spring Hill."

Mr. McCarthy's comments are found in a review of Father Reimert's book "To Turn the Tide." His analysis of current conditions and their cause is cogent and I quote:

"Many of the schools operating on deficit budgets, or soon facing them, fell into their depression following years of fast growth and steady solvency. The decade from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s was golden. Enrollments grew, new buildings popped up and government-foundation money was secure. Some of the present bankruptcies were caused by management mis-judgments (a polite phrase for stupid decisions made by college presidents), but these were the exceptions. More devastating were the uncontrollable, the economic slump that brought not only a recession but an inflation, the reluctance of donors to give money to schools that were falling behind, not moving ahead, the reductions of federal aid to education. In addition, the customers were going elsewhere: While state schools attracted students because of low tuition, fewer students went to the private schools and thereby forced tuition rates even higher. William Jellema of the American Association of Colleges wrote in his report, "The Red and the Black," that if the present trend continues, the average tuition charge at typical independent colleges and universities by 1985 will be \$17,324. Even then, this sum is less than half of what the average cost to the institution will be for educating the student for one year; \$36,859."

Between fiscal years 1967 and 1970–71, Federal funds to universities and colleges declined by \$227 million or nearly 7%, to a level of \$3.2 billion. This represents the lowest level of funding since 1966, and the first decline, in actual dollars, in direct Federal support since 1963.

In the Federal student financial aid picture, we see some interesting developments. A national survey of black and white college students for the academic year of 1969–70, has shown that 29% of black students received scholarships and 21% received loans, compared with about 10% from each source for white students. Black students consistently received 70% higher amounts than whites.

This survey by College Scholarship Services of CEEB revealed that 41% of the black students receiving all forms of Federal and institutional financial aid, were enrolled in higher tuition private colleges, compared with 27% of white students. This fact was explained by the policy of the private institutions generally offering a greater amount of packaged aid—including their own funds—to these students.

Hence it is quite clear that our private institutions have strained and struggled to provide educational opportunity to the disadvantaged. In New York State, the combined 1971 deficit of the 5 largest private institutions—over 20 mil.—is exactly the same amount as the institutional funds awarded by these universities for student aid. Something has to give!

The new Federal support structure must take account of the critical situation of our private institutions. That is why the House of Representatives has passed the Higher Education Amendments of 1971 with a new provision of direct assistance grants to colleges and universities. As you know in Title VIII, Higher Education General Assistance, grants to colleges are based both on total enrollment and enrollment of Federally assisted students.

I believe it is imperative at this time to maintain, in conference with the Senate, the principle and fact of General Assistance. We in the House, after the most extensive hearings, and after consultation with you

and your associations, are convinced that this is absolutely necessary to assist in bringing financial stability to our private institutions. Secondly, only general assistance can begin to bring some equity to the total Federal support program. *It is simply not wise or just Federal policy to concentrate 71% of all Federal aid in 100 institutions!*

The second new priority is to provide Federal student financial aid programs that assist the sons and daughters of middle-income families; these families that are now excluded from benefits of most social programs financed by the Federal government.

We have already seen that the Federal student aid program—as they were intended—are presently aiding three times as many blacks and whites. We must now broaden, not narrow, the eligibility guidelines, so that more middle-income students can benefit. This will give them the option to attend a private as well as public institution.

I have myself, introduced H.R. 11424 entitled the STP or Shared Tuition Plan which would work as follows: The parent, or taxpayer financially responsible for the tuition of any student enrolled in an institution of higher education, would be allowed a tax credit of an amount equal to the lesser of either 50% of the educational expenses paid during any given year or \$1500. To be eligible for this credit, the parent and student would enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury under which the student would agree to repay the amount of the tax credit granted to the parent. The repayment would include interest incurred from the date of the allowance of the credit for the account of the taxpayer. A reasonable limit on the total amount of borrowing would be set in order to regulate the deferred revenue and prevent borrowers from incurring inordinate obligations.

I cite this bill of mine as a sign of action on the tax credit front and mine is not unique.

As you know tuition tax credits carried in the Senate last October but failed to survive in Conference. Most recently however there have been significant new sponsorship.

Chairman Mills and others have introduced a bipartisan approach to tax credit beginning at the elementary and secondary level. Mr. Burke of Massachusetts has a well developed plan of deferred income credit supported and designed by the senior Life Underwriters.

I mention these to indicate that your policy considerations should extend to other committees in Congress besides those specifically charged with Education bills.

This is especially true as we hear more of tax reform every day from leading candidates for Federal office. Any such reform should certainly attend to the problem of financing a full Federal share of educating our young citizens.

Finally, we must reform the Veterans education benefit legislation. The present benefit of a flat \$175 a month, discriminates severely against the Viet Nam veteran's option to attend the college best suited to his needs. Obviously, most must enroll at a low-tuition public institution. Slightly more than 50% of all World War II veterans enrolled at private institutions; but only 20% of Viet Nam veterans have been enabled to attend the private colleges.

As one who received his post graduate education under the G.I. Bill, I am disturbed to admit that we are not treating our veterans, disabled, dependent and otherwise as well as I was treated after World War II.

I would like to see veterans committees formed on every campus with administration and faculty participation to end a short changing of the students who have served their country in recent years.

Now for some friendly advice on your participation in the legislative process. I merely want to sketch an approach here,

because I expect we can be more concrete in the discussion to follow this presentation.

I would like to propose that one of your primary responsibilities as Presidents, is as chief federal relations officer for your institution. In the large institutions, you should have a knowledgeable vice-president or special assistant who does the staff work and manages the process for you. But the legislative process from which Federal priorities in higher education is the outcome, will not meet the needs of your institution or the country, if your participation has not been effective. What precisely, can higher education do to communicate its needs to the Congress?

We need to hear from students, faculty, parents, and trustees, as well as the Presidents.

Occasionally, I get a call from a parent about a student loan or grant case. When some NSF or ACC research program, is being developed, we hear from your academic specialists who will directly benefit. But we need to hear more from the total university community about Federal educational policy.

Complete and frank disclosure of your financial needs is by now an accepted expectation. I recommend that you imitate the techniques of Mayors and county officials. They did it and would probably pass revenue sharing!

Publish budgets—not just financial reports!

Provide your congressional representative and the Education Committees with copies.

Define needs; explain gaps, if available funds are not adequate.

Make Members of Congress, including those who are your alumni, feel like really important and highly regarded alumni. Put them on your 'special' and 'executive' mailing lists. Invite them to really important functions. I am not suggesting that I and my colleagues are looking for flattery, or honorary degrees or snowjobs either. But how would you treat a trustee or alumnus who was annually responsible for your institution getting \$200,000, or 2 mil., or 10 mil. dollars in gifts or grants.

Perhaps one kindness would be to avoid having the Congressman as a commencement speaker in even years with all those new 18 year old voters in the audience.

Another would be to actually invite a member of Congress to come and live with you and not just your associations and their Washington staff—as useful and indispensable as they are.

The Farm bloc and the urban delegation are now exchanging information visits.

I know of no better way to update Congress than have visitations to your institutions. Such visitations by Congressional Boards have annually brought increases of comfortable size to the Army, Air Force, Naval and Merchant Marine Academies. I say join the parade. Most of my colleagues are not hard to live with.

Members of the House, particularly the Congressman from the district in which your institution is located, want to hear from you and not just your associations and their Washington staff—as useful and indispensable as they are.

I have often been asked, "Did the campus unrest and turmoil in 1968-70 damage the higher education support in Congress? Let me give you my reaction.

Not since the 13th Century was there such a crisis in academic freedom in the University, as we had in recent years, not only in the United States but throughout the world.

Militant students and militant minority and political groups literally closed down many of our great universities. The U.S. Congress had invested billions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars in your institutions. These dollars came from citizens, many of whom, could not afford to enroll their children and get the draft deferment that accompanied enrollment.

The U.S. Congress could have been tempted to withdraw or cut-off funds. We received thousands of letters suggesting this. But not once did we legislate a significant cut-off. I and other colleagues such as Rep. Brademas, O'Hara, and Reid, consistently and successfully resisted all proposals of limiting legislation in our committee.

The U.S. Congress is the object of a continuous stream of academic criticism. The professors charge that the House of Representatives is outmoded in structure, and unresponsive to the valid needs of the nation. The committees are dominated by reactionary and unrepresentative chairmen, and the House, itself, by inept leadership.

I submit that our performance in support of academic freedom when confronted by outrageous provocation was cool and responsible. What I am calling for here, is a new spirit of cooperation and sympathetic understanding between the members of Congress and the leaders of higher education. We will stand or fall together, in the crisis of confidence that still besets our country.

Finally, what can the Congress look to from the colleges, in order to justify the financial support for higher education as a national priority?—besides a well-educated graduate.

What can you do to help us solve national problems? I am more concerned here about attitudes than about specific public service from institutions of higher education.

I speak to many intellectuals, and professional people, graduates of our better colleges, who are political illiterates or at best, political snobs.

Public and political service is still rated below banking, the ministry, law, and medicine, as a vocational aspiration. Lately, however, I have noticed that the career educator now ranks somewhere down below—with us in politics—as a vocational choice of American youth.

I am confident, my friends, that both our universities and our federal government, are basically sound structures. Together, we can preserve this Republic. We can show new courses of educational opportunity and genuine political freedom, without compromising the necessary autonomy of either institution.

The government cannot perform its public policy formation responsibilities without a truly free and responsible university system, pluralistic, public, and private; church-sponsored and independent.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to share my thoughts with you this morning.

I welcome your comments and questions.

#### INCOME TAX INEQUITY FOR SINGLE TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, our House Ways and Means Committee currently is holding hearings on our Federal income tax structure as it effects unmarried taxpayers.

There is, most recognize, a degree of inequity in the rates which single persons have to pay today simply because they pay more. There was considerable adjustment made in the Tax Reform Act of 1969 to reduce this inequity but the demand persists for further adjustment.

Testifying before our committee this morning was Miss Osta Underwood, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. Osta Underwood is a resident of my community, Nashville, Tenn., and I have been privileged to know her for many

years. She is one of the most competent and dynamic women in America and her testimony this morning attests to this fact.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include Miss Underwood's testimony to our Ways and Means Committee in the RECORD at this point and highly commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED ON THE PART OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

(By Osta Underwood)

Mr. Chairman, I am Osta Underwood. It is my honor and privilege to address this Committee concerning H.R. 850 and H.R. 14193, legislation which will extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns, and which will remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed.

As President of The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., I represent working women in all of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, who are vitally interested in the future of these bills. Our members are lawyers, clerks, saleswomen, secretaries, teachers, managers, and Ph. D.'s. They suffer the inequities of current tax laws in all income brackets. Among our members are women who are married, single, divorced, and widowed; women who are mothers and grandmothers; women who have in the past and are now, even after their unswerving efforts at tax reform, paying inequitable amounts of income tax vis-a-vis each other and vis-a-vis the rest of the taxpaying public.

We approach you now to urge your prompt approval of the legislation before you which will deal with us uniformly and fairly and will eliminate the inequities I will describe.

Across the nation our membership has come into contact with individuals uniting to defeat the continuation of the unreasonable tax classifications reflected in the rate schedules. From Minnesota, where the State Legislature adopted a Resolution urging the Congress to pass legislation comparable to that presently before you,<sup>1</sup> to Connecticut where Vivian Kellems' long-suffering efforts against the "penalty" tax for unmarried individuals began,<sup>2</sup> to here in the metropolitan Washington area where the Committee of Single Taxpayers (COST), sponsored by former Senators McCarthy and Murphy among others, is flourishing,<sup>3</sup> our membership has seen the attention of the nation turn to the cause we have long supported.

Consider the history upon which we base our position here today.

As you know, the income splitting procedure may be thought of as a product of historical accident. Before World War II, eight states had community property laws which treated income as divided equally between husband and wife. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that married couples in these states could divide their income and file separate U.S. tax returns.<sup>4</sup> With this in mind, several other states soon passed laws giving their citizens similar tax advantages. In an effort to restore tax equality and to prevent wholesale disruption of local tax and property laws, Congress in 1948 made income splitting a national procedure. While solving the problem for married couples, this legislation increased the relative tax burden on single citizens. Attention was given to this inequity when, in 1951, the heads-of-households provision was enacted giving one-half of the income splitting benefits of married couples to widows, widowers, and certain other single persons with dependents in their households. In 1954 surviving spouses with dependent children were permitted to use the joint return tax rates with full income split-

Footnotes at end of article.

ting for two years following the death of the husband or wife.

Prior to the 1969 Tax Reform Act, a single person's tax bill could have been as much as 40.9 percent higher than the tax bill due on a joint return with the same amount of income. The 1969 Act provided a new rate schedule for single taxpayers which reduced this gap to a still staggering 20 percent. The schedule is designed to provide tax liability for single persons which is 17 to 20 percent above that of married couples for taxable incomes between \$14,000 and \$100,000, with the maximum differential of 20 percent being reached at \$20,000. Below \$14,000, where income splitting is less beneficial, the excess of the single person's rates over those of married couples gradually decreases. This is also true above \$100,000, again where the benefits of income splitting becomes less significant.<sup>5</sup>

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 also set up a new head-of-household tax rate schedule conveying tax benefits half way between the schedule applicable to joint returns and the new schedule applicable to single persons, and extended the head-of-household tax rates to certain married individuals living apart from their spouses.<sup>6</sup>

That is the history which has given birth to the two inequities which we seek to rectify today:

1. A single person making \$8,000 a year pays \$210 more in Federal income taxes than a married person making the same salary. A single person making \$12,000 annually pays \$370 more than a married person making the same salary. The penalties for being unmarried range from a difference of \$10 yearly (with an income of \$1,500) to \$12,110 (with an income of \$200,000).<sup>7</sup>

2. A married person making \$14,000 a year, whose spouse also earns \$14,000 a year, pays \$680 more in Federal income taxes, if both spouses file jointly, than two singles who each earn \$14,000 a year and file separate returns using the unmarried individual's tax schedule.<sup>8</sup>

To deal with the inequity perpetrated upon the single individual by the current law, H.R. 850 and H.R. 14193 would establish a uniform rate structure for all taxpayers and end the tax penalty imposed on the unmarried taxpayer.

As to the inequity perpetrated upon married individuals filing jointly, the establishment, under H.R. 850 and H.R. 14193, of a uniform rate structure for all taxpayers would end the tax penalties imposed on married persons where both are employed.

Because of its effectiveness in remedying the two problems we set forth earlier, and in establishing an equitable system of income taxation for all citizens, we strongly urge your support of this legislation.

We feel it our duty to deal with those criticisms of the legislation of which we are aware.

In support of leaving a 20 percent gap between the tax paid by single and that paid by marrieds filing jointly, the Report of the Senate Finance Committee on the 1969 Tax Reform Act says:

"... some difference between the rate of tax paid by single persons and joint returns is appropriate to reflect the additional living expenses of married taxpayers..."<sup>9</sup> and, in support of leaving a 10 percent gap between single and heads-of-households, the Report says:

"... there is good reason for maintaining a tax differential between single persons and heads-of-household who in fact maintain a household for a dependent."<sup>10</sup>

To these statements we offer, first the words of Senator Ribicoff:

"The income tax should reflect differences in condition and responsibilities by allowing reasonable deductions. However, once the taxable income is determined the same rate

should apply to all who have the same income, regardless of whether they are married or single.

Many people attempt to explain the present system by saying that single persons do not bear the costs and responsibilities of raising children. But income splitting under present law does not differentiate among (married) taxpayers in this respect, since the benefit is the same whether or not they have children."<sup>11</sup>

It cannot be stressed too strongly that differences in the responsibilities of individuals should not, and cannot continue to be reflected in the rate of tax they pay on their base income after deductions and exemptions. These responsibilities, which surely must be recognized from an income tax standpoint, should be brought home to those who have them in the form of beneficial deductions and exemptions. (To the end that this may be a meaningful benefit, we support legislation to increase the exemption for dependents.)

If this policy change does not take place, the misplaced good intentions of prior Congresses will cause the anomalous situation to persist in which widows and divorcees supporting one or more children will pay a higher tax based on their adjusted income than that of a married couple which is childless.

Although the Senate Report does not explain why it chose the rate adjustment route instead of the deduction and exemption method of reflecting the peculiar responsibilities of taxpayers, if that choice is based on any statistical data intended to be reflected in the rate differentials set, surely that data can be converted into a system of deduction and exemptions, just as fairly reflecting the differing costs of the responsibilities involved, and allowing adjusted incomes to be taxed at a uniform rate.

If the rate differentials set are not based on such data, they represent an arbitrary method of taxation, inherently inequitable, and surely deserving of re-examination.

In support of allowing marrieds filing jointly to pay a greater tax than two singles filing separately, the Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation explains:

"This is a necessary result of changing the income splitting relationship between single and joint returns. Moreover, it is justified on the grounds that although a married couple has greater living expenses than a single person and hence should pay less tax, the couple's living expenses are likely to be less than those of two single persons, and therefore the couple's tax should be higher than that of two single persons."<sup>12</sup>

This, of course, would be the case only if the two single persons were not living together. Without seriously believing that the legislation was intended to encourage the promiscuity, contrary to our public policy, which it seems to reward, we think it too is susceptible to the argument that any provable relationship between costs of living as a married couple and tax benefits conferred to offset these expenses can be more equitably translated into deductions and exemptions than they can into rate differentials on adjusted income.

Therefore, based on the sincerely held belief that incomes should be taxed at an equal rate, allowing each citizen tax benefit for the responsibilities he or she assumes in our society before adjusted income is determined, The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. strongly urges you to report favorably on H.R. 850 and H.R. 14193.

Thank you.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 32, p. 42193.

<sup>2</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 3,

pp. 3037-38; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 6, pp. 6884-87; Grider, "Miss Kellems Bugs IRS Again," *The Washington Post*, October 19, 1971, at A6, col. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *The Washington Daily News*, August 7, 1971, "Potomac Patter," col. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Poe v. Seaborn*, 282 U.S. 101 (1930).

<sup>5</sup> Senate Committee on Finance, Tax Reform Act of 1969, S. Rep. No. 91-552, 91st Congress, 1st Sess., 260-261 (1969).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> Int. Rev. Code of 1954, 1 (a) and (c).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Supra*, note 5, at 260.

<sup>10</sup> *Supra*, note 5, at 262.

<sup>11</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 3, pp. 3037-38.

<sup>12</sup> Staff of The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, 91st Congress, 1st Sess., General Explanation of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (December 3, 1970).

#### LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.—THE AMERICAN FRONTIER CELEBRATION CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present to the Congress an aggressive, far-reaching plan which has been developed by the citizens of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to help commemorate the U.S. Bicentennial Celebration starting in 1976.

An all-out effort is being made to make this historic city in southern New Mexico the American Frontier Celebration Center for the 200th anniversary celebration of our Nation.

As proposed today by the "10-25 Task Force" of the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce, the plan was instigated because of concern the community has over the impact that the bypass of two interstate highways, I-10 and I-25, will have on the economy of the city.

The community leaders, hoping to help alleviate the immediate problem caused when these two highways bypass Las Cruces, have been exploring several ways to strengthen Las Cruces as a national and international tourist community.

In the words of the Task Force Chairman, Mr. Paul Rader:

Las Cruces is the logical claimant for the Frontier Bicentennial celebration. All the elements of the Western Frontier are at hand, and the Gadsden Purchase, which was acknowledged in the Mesilla Plaza near Las Cruces, finished putting together the continental United States.

As visualized by the task force, the American frontier center could include an all-tribal Indian trading post operated and controlled by the Tribal Council of New Mexico. It would be the only such center in America.

Also visualized is a western frontier village, complete with riding stables and an authentic reproduction of a Wells Fargo stagecoach station. A colorful event for the 1976 Bicentennial would be a ceremonial stagecoach trip from Philadelphia to Las Cruces, symbolizing the drama of the opening of the American frontier.

Another attraction, planned by the task force, would be authentic Indian and western frontier museums, as well

as a game refuge along the Rio Grande River. This game refuge would be visible from the interstate highways and feature standing heads of buffalo and other animals identified with the frontier.

The far-sighted plan of the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce would expand an already existing tourist pattern for the area by emphasizing present strengths and adding new dimensions.

I applaud the efforts of the citizens of Las Cruces on this progressive plan and will work with other members of the New Mexico congressional delegation to coordinate the Las Cruces proposal with the Presidential American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, recently established by President Nixon.

The Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce anticipates 100 percent cooperation from its community and the entire State of New Mexico in helping to make their dream a reality.

It is foreseen by these aggressive-minded citizens that the efforts to make Las Cruces the American frontier center will result in a permanent position on the national and international tourism scene.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to present to you this plan which I feel encompasses the true American spirit—a community with a dream and determination to make it a reality.

#### DYER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL BAND, NEWBERN, TENN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 8, 1972, was a cold and uncomfortably raw day. But the Dyer County High School Band from Newbern, Tenn., met the challenge of the competition and the cold, and carried away the honors of the 1972 Cherry Blossom Festival's Parade of Princesses.

The Dyer County Band took first place honors for bands of under 75 pieces. I managed to reach the band shortly after they were informed of their first place standing. There was still plenty of time for another band to beat their score, but each member was bubbling with joy.

For the next few hours the band waited in anticipation of the final results. As time passed, they became more and more confident. Their confidence was not self-indulgence, but a product of their talent and hard work. It was a confidence well earned through many hours of practice.

To win in the tough competition of the Parade of Princesses is indeed an honor. However, it is especially an honor for a band that has been organized for only 5 years and in competition for only 3.

Band director Bobby Baker is an unusually talented and able leader. He displays his natural leadership throughout the band program at Dyer County High School. Band members have tremendous admiration for him. They glory in his words of praise while living in fear of his reprimands. Each one is convinced that Mr. Baker catches every wrong note or missed beat in every performance. And from all indications they are correct.

Much of the credit must go to the Band Booster Club and area leaders who made the trip possible. It is no easy task to raise the funds for a trip of this type. It took the cooperation and contributions of band parents, school leaders, merchants, city officials, newspapers, and the entire community to turn this dream into a reality.

I am pleased with the support this band has received. Dozens of adults made the trip to Washington and joined the week's festivities. Those I talked with all seemed impressed with their Nation's Capital.

The band itself enjoyed several tours of the city in addition to giving a sterling performance at the parade. Young people such as these, who sacrifice hours of freedom for hours of practice deserve respect from us all. They are learning the lessons of life—that worthwhile things can be accomplished through hard work. All during the visit they displayed their maturity as well as their talent. I am proud to be their Representative.

#### YOM HASHOA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today is Yom Hashoa, Holocaust Remembrance Day, observed by people of conscience all over the world in memory of the 6 million Jews and the millions of non-Jews butchered by the Nazis before and during World War II.

These millions of innocent men, women, and children were guilty of only one thing—being. Most died for simply being what they were—Jew, Gypsy, or any other unfavored non-aryan life form. Others had the good fortune of dying for their principles—democracy, equal rights, and opposition to inhuman acts of torture, repression or anti-semitism.

But what can be said of millions of people, degraded, labeled, numbered, shipped, sorted, then gassed, cremated, shot or just ripped apart, whose remains were processed into byproducts such as soap, candles and the like?

Historians, theologians, sociologists, psychologists and just ordinary people have puzzled ever since—how does such a thing happen? How does a civilized nation harness technology for sadism and destruction so mind-boggling?

In our own times, when purposeless violence has become the fashion, and apathy the vogue, it is a question we would all do well to explore.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a moment's silence for remembrance of those innocent millions and for contemplation.

#### MASS TRANSIT AND THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to testify before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Roads on a proposal to put some flexibility in the highway trust fund. I have

been working with my friend and colleague from Connecticut, LOWELL WEICKER, on this proposal.

I was delighted to see that after our initial efforts, Secretary of Transportation Volpe adopted a similar, but not identical approach.

For my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD, I will insert a copy of my statement before the subcommittee.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. COTTER BEFORE THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, ON H.R. 12654, THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND MASS TRANSIT, MARCH 1, 1972

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, it gives me great pleasure to appear before you today.

I am testifying on behalf of my legislation, H.R. 12654. This bill is designed to open a portion of the Highway Trust Fund to needed mass transit programs. This bill was introduced in the Senate by my friend, Lowell Weicker, and represents a bipartisan effort to provide funds to continue necessary highway construction while simultaneously upgrading and expanding vital mass transit systems. The proposed legislation, I believe, serves each of these goals. It also retains essential local control, with appropriate Federal participation, in the allocation of these funds.

This is permissive and voluntary legislation. It does not tell the States how to use their own transportation funds or Federal matching funds, but allows each State to make its own decision on how to most effectively use transportation money.

For too many years there has been a seemingly insurmountable problem in developing efficient mass transit systems. Out of all the rhetoric and, yes, even name calling, there have emerged two schools of thought on the Highway Trust Fund. There are those who believe that the Highway Trust Fund has almost a divine mandate and that mandate runs to roads alone. On the other hand, the opponents of the Highway Trust Fund scorn the real contributions of the Federal highway program and call for its abolition. As with many polar positions, the Truth falls somewhere in between. I believe that both positions miss one essential point; that the main goal of the Trust Fund is to move people efficiently and safely. My bill attempts to further increase the effectiveness of the Highway Trust Fund, providing increased flexibility in the use of the Trust Fund revenues.

I know each Member realizes the need for mass transit systems and highway construction. Debate in the past years, as I pointed out, has been clouded by an unnecessary and harmful dichotomy: either highways or mass transit. The issue should be stated in a different manner. The question is: how can we have both necessary highways and effective mass transit, and, further, how can the Federal Government reasonably participate in achieving these interdependent goals.

The answer, I believe, rests in opening the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit programs without endangering the completion of the Interstate System. My legislation assures completion of the Interstate System.

Over 32,392 of the 42,000 miles of the Interstate Highway System are now completed. The latest projection from the Department of Transportation indicates that of the remaining roads, 4,115 miles are under construction, 4,386 miles are in planning and only 1,600 miles are not allocated. The remaining cost is anticipated to be \$30.9 billion. The cost of the whole Interstate System has increased from \$41 billion in 1956 to its present estimated level of approximately \$76.3 billion.

I am informed that the remaining 9,000 miles are among the most difficult. There-

fore, it is not unreasonable to expect that there might be some delay in finishing the final miles.

On the other hand, it has become painfully apparent that the inter- and intracity surface traffic has not reached a crisis condition affecting both the physiological and psychological health of the driver and the pedestrian.

I am not joking about psychological aspects of traffic congestion. I believe that the daily grind of driving to work not only lowers productivity but increases anxiety.

The other factor, one in which this Public Works Committee is intimately involved, is the physiological aspect of driving. According to the Second Annual Report of the Presidential Council on Environmental Quality, at least 39% of the Nation's air pollution is caused by auto traffic, and up to 80% of air pollution in major cities is caused by auto emissions. This report goes on to state that the EPA estimates that the economic loss because of air pollution, to which automobiles contribute significantly, is over 316 billion per year. Even with the necessary Clean Air Amendments of 1970, for which this Committee was largely responsible, the problem of air pollution created by cars will continue. The plight of city air pollution can be alleviated by effective mass transit. If there were effective mass transit, the sight of millions of workers driving alone to work could be eliminated.

There is another factor that must be considered. The automobile contributes directly to our energy crisis. Just recently the Department of the Interior released a study that suggests that U.S. oil refining capacity will not be equal to needs by 1975. More devastating are reports from the Interior suggesting that the U.S. will be increasingly dependent on foreign oil in the future.

I mention these conditions not to downgrade automobile transportation, but just to place the problems in perspective. Our Nation is a nation on wheels. For the foreseeable future the family car and an upgraded highway system are not a luxury but a necessity! What I am arguing for today is that we plan, or more accurately, allow the States to plan for alternative modes of effective mass transportation.

What my proposal does is to allow a portion of the Highway Trust Fund to be used for mass transit. It does not require that the Fund be used for mass transit. It just makes this money available for this use. Again, it allows the States, working with the Federal Government, to choose the means to best handle their transportation problems.

To ensure that needed highway funds are provided, my proposal would take only a portion of the Highway Trust Fund for mass transit, the bulk of the funds would remain for needed highway construction. Of the approximately \$5 billion available in the Trust Fund in any year only \$2 billion could be used for mass transit. This year the Trust Fund is expected to be \$5.4 billion.

Specifically, here is what H.R. 12654 does—

First, my proposal requires completion of the Interstate System. However, it expands the time for completion and reduces the yearly expenditure from \$4 billion to \$3 billion. This is not unrealistic since expenditures for the last several years have averaged approximately \$3 billion. As this system approaches completion there are increased delays caused by planning, legal and environmental obstacles. Delays are inherent in an effort of this size. Some towns and regions are reasonably objecting to certain routes. These problems must be resolved in a manner to satisfy local concerns.

Therefore, I believe this new figure of \$3 billion per year is a realistic allocation for completion of the Interstate System.

The remaining \$1 billion will be available for mass transportation programs and will be placed in the Federal Aid Urban System

which in my bill is authorized at \$1 billion for FY 73. These funds can be used to upgrade deteriorating mass transit systems, to buy new buses, new railroad cars, or to help build an entirely new mass transit system using such novel experiments as Turbotrain and dial-a-bus concepts.

The point to be stressed again is that these funds will be available for mass transit only if the States, working with the Federal and local governments, give mass transit a higher priority than their highway construction. This, again, gives the States flexibility.

Further, the bill also permits the \$1.1 billion authorized for primary and secondary roads to be used for mass transit if the States so decide. Thus, under the proposal it would be possible to have \$2 billion available for mass transit development.

While it is understandable that most concerned people focus on the level of funding for both highway construction and mass transit, one central provision in the bill is the reassertion and, I believe, strengthening of the requirements of State governments to plan comprehensively for intra- and interstate transit systems. This legislation correctly maintains a judicious balance between state-local responsibility and Federal oversight. It specifically provides for local participation and provides an effective and realistic funding mechanism for both highway construction and mass transit through use of the Trust Fund.

In summary, this proposal, unlike others, assures the Interstate System will be completed and other necessary highway construction will continue.

It gives flexibility and responsibility to State and local governments to plan and act on transportation needs, but does not restrict them solely to highway construction. It leaves the choice up to the States. To accomplish this flexibility over \$2 billion from the Trust Fund is earmarked either for highway or mass transit use.

The bill maintains the role of the Federal government in assuring that Federal tax dollars are used effectively to solve transportation problems.

In conclusion, this bill represents a reasonable and realistic position. It does not pick up the entire Trust Fund and earmark it for mass transit. On the other hand, it does not maintain the current rigidity of the Fund which excludes mass transit.

It does introduce a new flexibility to State and Federal planning for our Nation's transportation needs. I am hopeful that the Subcommittee will act upon this proposal.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

#### ALASKA LAND DEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House two articles by Mr. Al Delugach, staff writer for the Los Angeles Times, which appeared in that newspaper on December 6 and December 26, 1971.

ALASKA MYSTERY—WHO FINANCED BIG LAND DEALS?—L.A. MAN WHO ACQUIRED PROPERTY ALONG PIPELINE ROUTE WON'T TALK ABOUT IT

(By Al Delugach)

VALDEZ, ALASKA.—Philip J. Matthew of Los Angeles went on an Alaskan land buying spree three years ago. A short time later the route of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline was announced.

The bulk of some 200 parcels of land Matthew had bought in central and southern Alaska turned out to be along the pipeline route.

And here in Valdez, selected over three other cities as terminus of the pipeline, Matthews had acquired much of the town's undeveloped land, including a waterfront site for possible docking facilities.

The pipeline, yet to be constructed, is to bring oil out of Prudhoe Bay on the North Slope. In 1968 drillers struck what is believed to be the biggest oil find in North America.

#### \$1 MILLION VALUE CLAIMED

The land—totaling about 500 acres—was purchased for an estimated \$300,000. Conservative estimates place its value today at more than \$600,000. Matthew, himself, has said that it is worth \$1 million.

Who is Philip J. Matthew?

That same question has been asked by the federal government and by people in Alaska. Still a question is who may be associated with him in his Alaskan land deals.

While he has remained out of the news, Matthew, who is 49, had a meteoric rise in the world of finance about 10 years ago. His ventures included savings and loan associations in Los Angeles, Baltimore and Honolulu.

Key financing was provided through a little known but rich Caribbean entity called the Bank of World Commerce, Ltd., Nassau, Bahamas.

The list of his associates at that time included:

Clifford A. Jones, former Nevada lieutenant governor, friend of Bobby Baker and one-time casino owner in Las Vegas and the Caribbean.

Edward A. Levinson, a big-time Las Vegas gambler who was fined in a gambling profits "skimming" case involving the Fremont Hotel.

Meyer (Mike) Singer, now dead, an ex-Teamsters official widely considered as the West Coast representative of James R. Hoffa.

#### NO INDICTMENTS RETURNED

Alvin Malnik, Miami lawyer, a key figure in the 1966 federal grand jury investigation of suspected underworld involvement in the multimillion-dollar stock promotion of Scopitone, a movie-jukebox invention. People from coast-to-coast were subpoenaed as witnesses. No indictments were returned.

Other assorted Las Vegas gamblers, including Irving (Niggy) Devine, G. C. Blaine, Charles Turner, Ben Siegelbaum and Charles (Kewpie) Rich, as well as James (Jake) Gottlieb, casino owner and friend of Hoffa.

None of these names appears in the public record as being associated with the Alaskan ventures.

Nor is there any public record on who owns the more than 600,000 shares of stock issued in Matthew's firm—Financial Land Investment Corp.—in whose name the Valdez properties are held.

Records he has filed in Juneau show the corporation was incorporated in Delaware in February, 1969, the month he bought the Valdez properties. He is listed as president and treasurer. The vice president is a retired Los Angeles intelligence agent for the Internal Revenue Service, Walter E. Schlick.

The corporation secretary is Eugene Hettleman, a lawyer of Baltimore, which is listed as the corporation's principal place of business. Directors are Matthew, his wife Elayne and Hettleman.

One year after Matthew bought the Valdez land, Mel Personett, then Alaska commissioner of public safety, appeared before the state Senate Judiciary Committee.

While answering questions about Alaskan law enforcement problems, he voiced concern about the entry of associates of organized crime figures into legitimate business.

Personett then told of a man operating in the Valdez area who he said had associates who are underworld figures or who associate with them. Under further questioning, Personett named Matthew as the man he was talking about.



## WITNESS CRITICIZED

Several senators at the hearing criticized Personett for naming in public hearing a man who had not been charged with any crime in Alaska.

Sen. Terry Miller (R-Fairbanks), who was committee chairman and now is Senate majority leader, says he later wrote a letter to Matthew inviting him to appear before the committee "in case he wanted to rebut anything anybody said about him at the hearing." Matthew didn't answer the letter, Miller says.

The subject was not pursued. "We felt the least said the better for everybody," says Miller. Personett was replaced as department head when a Democratic administration was elected last year.

## INTERVIEW DENIED

Matthew, a wiry man with a moustache who wears lumberjack shirts at his handsome home in Tarzana, doesn't care to answer questions about his Alaska activities or associates.

Several weeks ago, in declining an interview, he said deprecatingly: "We don't have very much up there now."

After a review of his holdings in public records in Alaska, a reporter again sought to talk to Matthew.

"Write what you want," he snapped. "I have nothing to say."

Matthew is known by acquaintances in Alaska to have a more expansive side. They have heard him talk of his bank in the Bahamas, the savings and loan associations, the right hand man who is an ex-IRS agent.

Matthew showed up at the state land office in Anchorage in January, 1969, and proceeded to snap up most of the nonhomestead land available for sale by the state.

Contrary to an impression widely held by outsiders, Alaska is not a place where unlimited land is available for purchase. The federal government still owns most of it, and the state presently has a "minuscule" amount for sale to the public.

Matthew appeared to have considerable financial resources, and thus attracted unusual interest in the land office.

Although nearly three years have gone by, a veteran state employe clearly recalled Matthew's wholesale land purchases. In two visits about a week apart, she said, he bought in his and his wife's name almost all the residential and commercial lots available in a number of scattered cities and towns in central and southern Alaska.

## CHECKS FOR 10 PERCENT

He put up cashier's checks for the 10% down payment (balance payable at 10% a year) on each parcel. The sales prices totaled \$175,000.

This was before even the tentative pipeline route was generally known. The state land on sale over the counter on a first-come-first-served basis was considered cheap by experts.

Then Matthew turned up in the southern part of Valdez (pop. 1,008) on Prince William Sound. Making friends with the city administration at the time, he bought up much of the remaining property in the new townsite (adjacent to the one destroyed by the 1964 earthquake).

When the oil industry filed its proposed pipeline route several months later, the terminus selected was Valdez.

A land developer recently recalled meeting Matthew in Valdez in February, 1969.

"I had figured out the pipeline had to end there," Jerry McCutcheon said.

How had Matthew figured it out? He was accompanied by a financial writer, the developer recalls. Matthew may have found out some information about the pipeline route from this man, who presumably learned it from his sources, McCutcheon theorizes.

Even now Matthew's name is little known in Alaska except in Valdez, where he visits a couple of times a year.

## HELPED TEAM

He has the image here of an outsider with money to invest, a high pressure style and a lot of business savvy.

His admirers, generally the town's old establishment, recall that Matthew once laid out \$500 to help send a boy's basketball team to a distant playoff game.

"I don't know who his backers are—that's his business," says Ed Walker, a motel man who was on the Valdez city council that cooperated with Matthew after his arrival.

It is the attitude Alaskans have traditionally taken. There is a widely observed convention that one does not nose into a newcomer's life prior to his arrival in what is aptly called the nation's Last Frontier.

Matthew's name is no better known in Los Angeles than in Alaska, though it is there he lives.

He resigned from the California Department of Savings and Loan in the late 1950s to go to work for Empire Savings and Loan in the San Fernando Valley, where he became executive vice president.

In 1961 Matthew emerged as a business investor on his own—to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars. One of his first associates was an old acquaintance, Teamster business agent Singer.

This was followed by a surge of well-financed business ventures that kept them busy on a circuit that included Honolulu, Los Angeles, Las Vegas and Miami.

Key to the ventures was the formation in June, 1961, of the Bank of World Commerce at Nassau with Miami lawyer Alvin Malnik.

Matthew, who had also formed a Bahamian bank for his former S&L employe, was the biggest shareholder in Bank of World Commerce with a listed investment of \$230,000. Jones, Levinson and Devine, were among the early investors.

## LANSKY ASSOCIATE

Another, who became president, was John Pullman. He is known to federal investigators as a long-time associate of gambling kingpin Meyer Lansky. Pullman is said by government sources to have been a courier between Las Vegas and Switzerland and in recent years has handled investments for American organized crime figures in Swiss banks.

The Bank of World Commerce, whose address was reportedly only an office with one employe, has been described by government sources as organized to finance a financial empire.

One of the bank's first acts, under directors that included Matthew and Malnik, was to make an unsecured loan of \$250,000 to Allied Empire, Inc., Beverly Hills. Matthew and Singer, having bought about 19% of Allied's stock in the several months preceding, were turning the former television cartoon producing firm into an S&L holding company.

Matthew, who had become Allied's president, used the \$250,000 toward purchase of San Geronio S&L, in Banning, for \$1.5 million.

The \$250,000 loan was just for openers for the Bank of World Commerce, which lent a lot more to Allied. Between July, 1961, and September, 1962, the average unpaid balance on the loans reportedly ranged from \$250,000 to \$750,000.

A sidelight on the Allied venture was that Hoffa and his daughter reportedly got in on the ground floor of a tremendous market rise in Allied's stock.

About June 1, 1961, the Hoffas bought 1,100 shares at prices ranging from \$4.75 to \$3.75 per share and sold 600 shares six months later at \$50.50 to \$53.50 per share. At its peak, Nov. 24, 1961, Allied's stock hit \$76 per share.

## HONOLULU VENTURE

Busy as they were, Matthew and Singer found time in September, 1961, to launch the Waikiki Savings and Loan Assn. in Honolulu.

Matthew was the biggest original shareholder of record, as well as president. Other original subscribers included Levinson, Devine and other Las Vegas gamblers, as well as Jones and Pullman.

A later investor was Robert (Bobby) Baker, once secretary to the Senate Democratic majority. Baker, who was sold 2,500 shares by Matthew, later went to prison for his role in financial scandals unrelated to the Hawaiian venture.

(It was disclosed in 1963 that Baker endorsed Jones and Levinson for gambling casino concessions in hotels of a Pan American World Airways subsidiary in the Caribbean. Baker was quoted as saying he was doing a political favor.)

## ISLAND PLANTATION

By December, 1961, Matthew was spearheading a takeover attempt in the big Ewa Plantation in Honolulu through his bases in Waikiki S&L, Allied Empire and the Bank of World Commerce.

The attempt was beaten down by major Hawaiian interests. But the price of Ewa stock was driven up in the process—greatly enhancing the value of the minority holdings.

Matthew's base at Allied Empire crumbled in January, 1963, when he resigned as president. Minority stockholders reportedly forced a change in management.

A long legal battle began between Matthew and his successor at the helm of Allied, Philip Nasser. While maintaining his family residence in Tarzana, Matthew spent the next couple of years in Israel.

Matthew and Nasser accused one another of fraud in civil suits which dragged out for years.

Nasser tried to attach Matthew's 43,476 shares in Allied Empire, which had changed its name to Riverside Financial Corp. But, in a key ruling, the Los Angeles Superior Court held that Matthew had previously transferred his interest in the stock to Clifford Jones on behalf of some 40 persons.

## GAP IN RECORD

These included gamblers Levinson, Devine, Blaine, Turner, Seigelbaum and Rich, as well as Gottlieb.

There is a gap in the public record as to Matthew's business activities in the two or three years preceding his arrival in Alaska in January, 1969.

In Valdez he found a city administration receptive to selling him commercial and residential tracts remaining for development.

The present city management, however, views as a mistake the leniency toward Matthew and a few others who signed up as "developers" under an urban redevelopment program for the land in the new townsite.

By promising to develop the property in specified ways, Matthew and the others got lots for as low as \$400. Such lots would cost perhaps 10 times the amount they paid if bought in another Alaskan city.

The new city council in Valdez has recently begun legal action to declare some of the development contracts in default.

Matthew avoided the situation by selling back to the city about 50% of his holdings after a dispute over which side was responsible for failure to develop the land.

Matthew has not built anything whatever on any of his Valdez properties, says city manager Herbert Lehfeldt, former Southern Californian who was city manager of Bell Gardens and Palmdale in the 1960s.

For many months, he said, the previous council granted one time extension after another to the developers.

"The council never forced the issue until now," added Lehfeldt. "We've got to break it open. People who move to and want to build a house in Valdez can't even buy a piece of land here."

"The city is strangling as a result of these redevelopment contracts."

In addition to the purchases from the city, Matthew bought a seafood processing plant in Valdez in 1969 from the Small Business Administration.

An SBA official in Anchorage refused to give the figures, commenting that "the media has not always been kind to the SBA."

However, it is reported by others familiar with the deal that Matthew bought the plant from the SBA for about half the original cost—and on easy terms—after the SBA's original deal went sour.

The federal agency had foreclosed in 1967 a loan reported at around \$100,000 to a local group in Valdez. Last spring, Matthew finally was able to lease the plant to a major seafood processor.

Matthew writes long and frequent letters to city and state officials and to the local newspaper to air his grievances.

One is the city's refusal to sell him some land near the seafood plant which he said he was promised and which the processor needs.

Another is rejection of his \$100,000 bid for a tract that was sold for half that amount to a Montana developer.

In contrast to the earlier honeymoon mood, Matthew and the attorney for his corporation have threatened to sue the city.

The new city council and Lehfeldt have established the policy of dealing firmly with Matthew.

Lehfeldt described the attitude previously as one in which councilmen were "overpowered and perhaps a little frightened" at Matthew's high-powered style.

A long Matthew letter of complaint directed to Lehfeldt and the council last Aug. 30 concluded with the typical flourish:

"I refuse to believe that the answer lies in going back in history and not having law and order in the City of Valdez. Maybe 100 years ago there was not law and order in Alaska or the Far West. But we are civilized today and we should be thankful for that.

"We cannot advise our children to live the golden rule and then act in hypocritical fashion by breaking the law just because we are mature in age. . . Will the City of Valdez act in a just and honorable way in its dealings with redevelopers, regardless of whether they are so-called outsiders or not?"

#### ALASKA SPENDS ITSELF INTO DEBT PREPARING FOR "DELAYED" RICHES

(By Al Delugach)

VALDEZ, ALASKA.—A thin, weathered, middle-aged truck driver glances out of the cafe window at his tractor-trailer rig parked amid the drifts of the four-foot, early winter snowfall.

He gets up to start on his routine: A 360-mile drive to Fairbanks on an ice-covered road that goes through treacherous mountain passes and across uninhabited stretches of the interior where it is 20 below zero in November and much colder in full winter.

"All I do all day is drive and talk to myself," he muses. "By night, I'm starting to answer."

The truck driver and his lonely ordeal are symbolic of the Last Frontier where prospects for great industrial growth appear like so much daydreaming in the face of a land and climate so hostile.

Alaska, which has many of the characteristics of an underdeveloped nation, is like an island in a sea of fabulously-valuable oil. And the thinly-populated state (300,000 persons, including 60,000 natives, most of whom live in deep poverty) is suffering the pangs of growth—even before the growth is a reality.

First, with riches from oil production in sight (but not in hand) the state government has embarked on large-scale spending programs that will keep it in the red even when and if the oil starts to flow.

Moreover, Alaska has many of the earmarks of a one-industry town. The oil industry is the undisputed giant of this state, which is twice as big as Texas, and the common attitude toward it is deference.

Many of the establishment people identify their economic interests with the desires of the oilmen—especially for the proposed pipeline to take out the oil. And average citizens, for the most part go along.

There are signs in the early going that the public's elected representatives have tumbled over themselves in a desire to accommodate the oil industry. Some decisions have been a case of acting in haste, perhaps to repent at leisure.

Valdez is a case in point.

The oil industry has designated this ice-free, deep-water port as the terminus of the proposed pipeline to be built from Prudhoe Bay on the North Slope. For some, the pipeline signifies more business, higher land prices. For others it means jobs.

Like the rest of the state, Valdez is still waiting for it to happen.

Valdez is a little off the beaten path. Though it is accessible by highway from both Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as by small aircraft and the state-operated ferry boats that ply Prince William Sound, winter travel by road and air is hazardous. On a day when it snowed 24 inches and planes were grounded, this visitor made it by a six-hour ferry trip from Cordova 85 miles across the sound.

It has 1,000 permanent residents and another 300 temporary ones, many of them working at the town's pride: the plant where the pipeline pipe is being coated.

Prospects at mid-1969 were for an early start on the pipeline. The oil industry was confident. Without waiting for federal right-of-way permits, it bought \$100 million worth of 48-inch pipe from Japan for the 789-mile line.

By September, 1969, the first pipe was stacked in Valdez. By October, 1971, the last pipe was stacked in Valdez. Still no permit for a start on pipeline construction in the fragile environment of tundra and permafrost.

One obstacle has been cleared, a big one. It is the settlement of Alaskan native land claims by Congress on Dec. 14.

Another key to opening the way to the pipeline is an environmental impact statement by the Interior Department. It is expected to go to the White House and to the Council on Environmental Quality soon.

The local Establishment in Valdez went all-out in 1969 to get the nod over three other contestants as the oil industry's choice for the terminus.

City Manager Herbert Lehfeldt, as well as his predecessor, Dale Cutler, told The Times, however, that they feel the former mayor and city council gave unnecessary generous terms to the pipeline on pipe storage facilities and tariff for the use of the dock.

Cutler, the town's first professional city manager, said when he arrived in October, 1969, he found that the late Mayor George Gilson had leased for \$1 a year a large city-owned tract to the pipeline company for storage of the pipe.

The city then spent \$25,000 or more to clear the land, which is in the old townsite destroyed by the 1964 earthquake and accompanying tidal wave. Cutler said he found the lease had not been signed. He renegotiated the lease on terms that included prepayment by the pipeline company in the amount spent by the city, Cutler said.

However, he said, he couldn't talk the city council out of reducing to 10 cents a ton from \$1.50 a ton the pipeline company's payment for unloading the pipe on the city dock.

Although the oil industry spent \$250,000 to beef up the city dock to handle the heavy pipe, Cutler's successor as city manager, Leh-

feldt, said the city would have gotten much more than that under the old tariff. He called it a "fantastic" deal for the pipeline company.

Cutler says he "fought that like hell," but didn't prevail. Mayor Gilson died last year, but Ed Walker, a businessman who was on the council until recently, stoutly defends the dealings with Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., owned by the consortium of oil companies that will own the pipeline.

Walker, a tall rough-hewn, middle-aged man, and his wife, Frances, operate a new motel financed by a \$100,000 Small Business Administration loan. The motel is kept filled, largely with business from the pipeline company and the pipe-coating plant. He also is one of the redevelopers with contracts for purchase of bargain-priced city land, as was the late Mayor Gilson.

Walker speaks proudly of the way the Gilson administration went after the oil companies to get the pipeline terminus. He frankly says they were prepared to give everything free to the industry and credits the selection of Valdez to such inducements.

Meanwhile, looking beyond Valdez, the old question is once more raised: Is Alaska viable as a state?

During Alaska's territorial status, preceding statehood in 1959, the economy was heavily underpinned by federal expenditures, including those for military and for assistance to the native Eskimo, Indian and Aleut population.

The first decade of statehood was one of austere budgets for the state government. Then, in 1968, came the discovery of what may be the biggest oil deposits in the United States.

People started talking about the state's getting a good share of the riches. The first installment was \$900 million paid in September, 1969, by oil companies for additional North Slope leases.

Expecting royalties to begin flowing by 1973, the state began spending its patrimony hand over fist.

Now, with oil production set back at least two years, the state is faced with the specter of running into the red by 1977 with a deeper descent each succeeding year. Projections now are for a deficit of anywhere from \$425 million to \$670 million by 1981.

#### SPENDING BEGINS

The big spending began in the 1969-71 fiscal year, when Republican Keith Miller was governor. State legislators upped the budget by 32% to \$169 million. The next year, with pipeline hopes still rampant, the ante was boosted by another 77% to \$300 million. However, the budget enacted by the 1971 Legislature for the current fiscal year reduced the \$300 million to \$292.1 million.

Much of the increased spending appears to have been for genuine needs, such as more welfare for impoverished natives, and better schools, roads and public utilities.

The premature honeymoon has been called off. Gov. William Egan, a Democrat elected last year, has his departments working overtime on ways to hold down the budget.

He also has them tolling over the feasibility of the state's buying and owning the pipeline itself—a recent suggestion of his that startled a lot of people and started a lot of arguments among Alaskans nervous about the delay.

Egan spoke of netting \$100 million a year or more, in addition to oil royalties, from state ownership. Some opponents wonder where he got the pencil to figure that.

The oil industry played it close to the vest in reacting to Egan's proposal. Except for Humble Oil & Refining Co., which quickly cried that it would lead to more delay in the pipe-line construction, major firms have tended to wait and see what the state would come up with in a full study of feasibility of state ownership.

Airline, trucking and construction firms

that plunged for huge amounts of equipment in anticipation of a financial killing were severely hurt—some to the point of bankruptcy.

These operators were largely in Fairbanks, jumping off place for freight shipment and road construction to the North Slope. Some were in Anchorage, the state's largest city.

Despite the blows to some Alaska entrepreneurs by the failure of the boom, the state's general economy is on a fairly even keel—to the surprise of some observers.

This is relative, however, since unemployment in the state has been constantly high for some time (10% or more) and the aboriginal native groups live in rural poverty that experts agree is worse than any other section of the United States.

One of the bright spots has been construction, with increases over last year in both residential and commercial building. This is especially true in Anchorage, the main population center (130,000 persons).

"There have been some problems, but it's no disaster—that's for sure," says James N. Tveit, FHA deputy director in Anchorage.

Eric Wohlforth, state revenue commissioner, points out that the state has embarked on a public works program to provide jobs. This effort to soften the impact of the pipeline delay has included issuance of \$15 million in general obligation bonds.

According to Richard Eakins, the state's acting director of industrial development, Alyeska, the pipeline company, eased the burden on some contractors who were held up in building the big pipeline service road.

It bought out some of the contractors. Others had contractual provisions for payment on a retainer basis for equipment obtained for the project.

Eakins expresses hope the settlement of land claims of the state's 50,000 natives by Congress will provide a start on the great problem of developing a viable economy in the rural areas, where most of the Eskimo and Indians live. A bill passed by Congress provides about \$1 billion in addition to land.

There is no question, however, that the state government depends for solvency on oil production. To get that, there must be a way to take it out of the frozen desert that is the north slope.

"Oil lease sales have bailed us out in the past," says Eakins. Once the \$900 million plus from the 1960 sale is eaten up, and if the pipeline is not bringing in revenue, the state will be in real trouble by 1976."

When North Slope oil is produced, the state expects to get \$128 million royalties the first year, \$180 million the second, \$198 million the third and \$234 million a year thereafter.

At least \$400 million would be spent in the state during pipeline construction, it is estimated in a book-sized examination of the impact, good and bad, of the pipeline. But the study by the state law department states:

"Alaska is not deluded into believing that the pipeline construction with its jobs and money will be a social and economic panacea."

#### NATIONAL EMERGENCY REAL ESTATE TAX RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the National Emergency Real Estate Tax Relief Act which is designed to meet the crises facing local taxpayers all over America in the wake of mounting real estate taxes which have

reached a confiscatory level in many communities.

This is emergency legislation for 1-year only and follows the historic pattern of our Nation in providing emergency relief during natural or man-made disasters.

Funds for this emergency measure could come from the \$5.3 billion already budgeted by the administration for revenue sharing this year.

I believe a direct rebate to taxpayers is the most effective method of revenue sharing.

The rebated money will ultimately find its way back into the Nation's economic stream and help stimulate the economy so that local governments can increase their income from a stepped-up economy.

The staggering real estate tax increase for 1971 being felt by local homeowners and farmers throughout the Nation is tantamount to an economic disaster. I fear that unless we provide this emergency relief from Federal resources, we will witness a wave of foreclosures paralleled only by the tragedy of the early 1930's.

My bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall rebate from the Federal Treasury whatever local real estate taxes a homeowner or farmer has paid which are in excess of 6 percent of the family's income for 1971.

In other words, a family with a \$10,000 income would spend 6 percent of that gross income on real estate taxes and if the local real estate tax falls below \$600 for 1971, there would be no rebate.

But if the real estate tax exceeds \$600 on this family's property, the Treasury would rebate to that family the difference.

If the real estate tax on the family home was \$1,000 for 1971, the Treasury would rebate that family \$400 to help meet this rising cost of local real estate taxes.

I have selected 6 percent because that is the figure most economists agree should be the "circuit breaker" in excessive real estate taxes.

The bill provides that social security, veteran's benefits, or widow's benefits would not be included in computing the annual income for 1971.

In the case of renters, the bill provides a presumption that 30 percent of the annual rent paid to a landlord goes for real estate taxes. The renter would compute 30 percent of the total rent paid for 1971 and if this 30 percent exceeds 6 percent of the family income, the renter would be entitled to a similar pro rata rebate from the Federal Treasury.

This bill should be enacted by Congress as a 1-year emergency measure.

Statistics show that real estate taxes in the United States yield \$40 billion annually.

I believe local taxpayers are carrying a disproportionate burden in providing police, fire, health, education, and sanitation to local communities.

I am also firmly convinced that rising real estate taxes tend to discourage new home buyers, and everyone knows that any setback to the building industry has an adverse effect on the entire economy.

It is for this reason that I hope Congress will enact this legislation as an emergency measure so that the Treasury can start immediately refunding checks to hard-pressed taxpayers all over the country.

Failure by Congress to recognize this emergency can have disastrous consequences on local communities throughout America. We are already faced with critical shortages in our school system.

But if there is a wholesale inability by local taxpayers to meet their real estate obligations for 1971 which are coming due this and next month, I can foresee local communities being forced to severely curtail even further essential services, and in some instances local communities conceivably could come to a complete standstill.

I do not believe I exaggerate the severity of the situation, and the Congress must face up to this responsibility.

I believe one argument in support of this proposal is that the Federal Government now collects 64 cents out of every dollar in taxes collected in the United States. But the Federal Government pays only 6 percent of the cost of education, with local and State communities picking up the rest.

This emergency bill is in effect a one-shot revenue-sharing proposal to bring immediate relief to the Nation's homeowners and renters.

It would be my hope that Congress will find a more durable formula of aid to local communities and taxpayers in a permanent tax reform bill.

I know the Ways and Means Committee is now working on a comprehensive tax reform bill, but I am sure that that approach is going to be long and tedious. The thousands upon thousands of local real estate tax bills cannot wait for a major overhaul of the Nation's economic structure. These people need help now and enactment of this bill would bring them such help without undue delay.

The Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations has advised me that this act would probably cost \$2 billion.

#### WHEN WILL THE POLICE FIND THE MURDERER OF PETER DETMOLD?

(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, since last Friday when a mobster, Joey Gallo, was killed in New York City, much of the media of this country have made that the No. 1 story.

A very decent man by the name of Peter Detmold was killed on January 6, 1972. He was stabbed to death in the lobby of his building on East 48th Street in New York City. He was one of the most active and able of community leaders. I suspect, and I hope I am not being unfair to the Police Department of the City of New York, that they have assigned more men to find the killer of Joey Gallo than they have to find the killer of Peter Detmold. His murder still remains unsolved.

The citizens of New York City have

had it in terms of street crime, running the gamut of purse snatching from elderly ladies to muggings and to the ultimate crime—murder. The fascination which our society has for the members of organized crime is incredible. It is about time that we paid more attention to the ordinary law-abiding citizen who does the best he or she can in a society that sometimes seems "gone amok." Instead of giving so much attention to the destroyers of our society and romanticizing some of the most despicable of their actions, let us pay attention to the needs of the decent law-abiding people in our country. They are the ones requiring the Government's protection and help.

#### TAX EQUALITY

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining over 100 of my colleagues in supporting legislation which would extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married persons filing joint returns.

In the Revenue Act of 1948, Congress began the practice of permitting married couples who file a joint return to divide their total income for tax purposes. Because of our graduated income tax system, this generally means that married persons using the income splitting procedure fall within a lower tax bracket than would otherwise be the case. Since single persons have not had income splitting privileges, they usually end up paying higher taxes than married couples at the same income levels.

Congress has made initial steps in the last few years to help relieve the tax burden from single persons. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 sets a limit that tax on single persons can be no more than 20 percent of what is paid on a joint return with the same amount of taxable income. The Tax Reform Act also established the much needed head-of-household tax rate schedule halfway between the joint return and the single person schedules.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the head-of-household rate should be 20 percent above the joint single schedules, and there is no reason why the new single taxpayer schedule should be 20 percent above the joint schedule. These should be purely and simply equal.

#### SOVIETS ENTHUSIASTIC OVER U.S. EXHIBIT

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, last September I had an unusual opportunity to view firsthand the effectiveness of the American exhibit on Educational Technology in Yugoslavia. As the President's representative, I officially opened the exhibit in Zagreb and escorted President Tito through it. This was one of a number

of major exhibits which included young bilingual Americans as guides sent by our Government to countries in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Having personally experienced the effectiveness of that exhibit, I am convinced of their great value in reaching people in that part of the world.

A recent issue of the Washington Post printed an item from the Christian Science Monitor News Service by Miss Charlotte Saikowski describing our Government's latest exhibit now in Moscow on Research and Development in the United States. It illustrates most clearly not only the value of this program but also the effectiveness of the Voice of America in reaching the people of the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the RECORD.

#### SOVIETS ENTHUSIASTIC OVER U.S. EXHIBIT

(By Charlotte Saikowski)

Moscow.—The youthful American with long sideburns and moustache was surrounded by a throng of Russians like some matinee idol.

"Olya, it's he," an auburn-haired girl whispered in excited tones, nudging a friend. "It's Nikita Barsky. I recognized him by his voice." The girls giggled and pressed closer into the crowd.

The scene at the American research and development exhibit at Sokolniki Park, was vivid proof that Russians listen to the Voice of America, for Nikita Barsky is a broadcaster for VOA and one of 22 American guides working at the fair. Far from evidencing any hostility, crowds burst into knowing smiles when they learn who he is.

There is enthusiasm generally for the American show, which is the 12th to be held in the Soviet Union, and an anniversary of sorts. It was at the first U.S. exhibit in 1959 that then Vice-President Richard M. Nixon and Soviet leader Nikita S. Khrushchev made world headlines with their "kitchen debate."

Mr. Nixon is to come soon to Moscow again, this time as President. And while it is unlikely there will be a kitchen debate (no kitchen, for one thing), Americans here wonder if the "debater" might not fly to Volgograd, where the exhibit will be running during his Soviet visit.

In any case, a visit to Sokolniki Park provides some insights into how informed Soviet citizens have or have not become in the intervening 13 years.

True, perhaps 80 percent of the thousands of questions fired at the Russian-speaking guides still concern the U.S. standard of living. At the General Electric stand, within a few short minutes one hears Russians ask, "How does an unemployed worker live?" "Is he allowed to keep his car?" "How long do benefits last?" "What does a teacher earn?" "What do you pay for a higher education?" "How much does a chicken cost?" a man asked.

But the remaining 20 percent disclose a higher level of sophistication and a greater awareness of the world outside than in 1959, a fact probably attributable to the Khrushchev thaw, repeated exhibits, the growing number of tourists, and foreign broadcasts.

It is standard, for instance, to hear: "Why is Angela Davis being persecuted?" But one knowledgeable Russian asked, "We understand that Angela Davis belongs to the American Communist Party, which adheres to the Soviet line. Yet she is a follower of Marcuse and he does not accept the Soviet position. How do you explain that?"

Levels of sophistication vary from city to city, of course. In Tbilisi, the Georgian capital where the exhibit opened in Janu-

ary, the questions tended to be simpler and focused on the gadgetry.

"The Georgians seldom asked about the United States," says Carolyn Smith, a guide from Washington, D.C. "Mostly they wanted to know about the products and what they cost. And tell them about the Lincoln Continental and they were ready to give you rubles for it!"

Not surprisingly, the young Americans are getting many questions about the President's visit to Peking, which clearly overshadows his upcoming trip here. There is no hiding Russians' disappointment that the President will not have touched down in Moscow first, and their suspicion that deals were struck in Peking.

Aside from the popular guides, Muscovites are enjoying such attractions as the Univac 9300 computer, laser devices, consumer appliances, and other items in the exhibit. The racy Javelin, one of three cars on display, has been stripped of its windshield wipers and chrome fittings—by "zealous souvenir hunters," as exhibit officials put it.

Except for a few posters about town, the Soviet Government has given little publicity to the exhibit. Muscovites hear by word of mouth, however. Attendance is strong, and the questions keep pouring forth.

"How did you learn Russian?" a stout, elderly gentleman asked Nikita Barsky.

"A little in the kitchen, a little at the university," he replied. "You see, my grandparents were from Kiev..."

A smile crept over the faces of the listeners.

#### ENDING THE WAR

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution designed to force an end to our involvement in the fighting in Vietnam within 60 days after enactment.

Although I stand behind every word of this resolution, I frankly doubt its efficacy. The way to get us out of this miserable war is by simply cutting off appropriations and authorizations for waging it. Despite his campaign pledges of nearly 4 years ago, President Nixon and his administration seem reluctant to get us all the way out; if anything, the recent escalation of U.S. air actions would indicate we are again becoming bogged down in the Vietnam quagmire.

In the past year, I have attempted to help hasten an end to the U.S. presence in this endless war through support of "date certain" withdrawal amendments offered by colleagues such as Congressmen NEDZI and WHALEN, and in the other body, by Senator MANSFIELD. In general, these proposals, which are soundly rooted in political, military, and moral reality, have attracted more support than any of the end-the-war plans offered in Congress. Also, these amendments, particularly that offered last June by Messrs. NEDZI and WHALEN, have served as rallying points for Common Cause and other groups working with Members of Congress to get us out of Vietnam.

The antiwar resolution which I introduce today merely formalizes an antiwar position well known to my constituents.

Had it not been for certain pressures directed at some of us, I probably would

not have introduced it all—not because I do not fully subscribe to the sentiments it expresses but because I regard the resolution as superfluous to the many more significant opportunities for action to end the war.

The pressure was applied, in the form of threatened newspaper ads, by a coalition of southern California peace groups known as "Set the Date." The mere fact I am proposing this resolution today would indicate that to some extent their campaign was successful, but I think I can demonstrate that the opposite is true, that this well-intended lobbying in the long run is bound to be self-defeating.

The Set the Date leaders have talked blithely of an electoral revolution to oust incumbent Congressmen who fail to meet the coalition's own litmus test of unthinking acceptance of any antiwar proposal to come before the House, regardless of merit.

In the first version of the ad, which was subsequently modified, "dis-election" was urged for 21 of the 25 House Members from southern California. As all of our colleagues would know, Mr. Speaker, these 21—comprising 84 percent of the entire southern California delegation—would naturally champion a wide range of views on Vietnam and every other substantive issue. Yet, for the simplistic purposes of Set the Date, they were lumped together, at least in that initial version.

The main result of such a campaign would be to undermine congressmen who were sympathetic to the goals of the coalition, by helping opponents misrepresent their basically antiwar records.

Clearly, the time has come for a more concerted effort, in and outside Congress, to liquidate our investment in the Vietnam mess, once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I myself remain totally wedded to the concept of a mandated end to U.S. involvement in the hostilities in Vietnam, but I also must insist that any such orders be conditioned on the release of U.S. prisoners of war. Just as Congress shares responsibility for sending these men to Vietnam in the first place, so now we are obligated to assure their return.

Text of my resolution follows:

H. RES. 1153

Joint resolution to improve the foreign relations of the United States and enhance the prospects of peace

Whereas the Congress of the United States wishes to improve the foreign relations of the United States and enhance the prospects of peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war who are being held captive by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and other adversary forces in Indochina, the President shall terminate all United States Armed Forces ground, naval, and air operations within Southeast Asia and shall remove all military forces actively engaged in offensive military operations, including military advisers and intelligence personnel, from Southeast Asia within sixty days of the enactment of this joint resolution.*

SEC. 2. No funds will be available or appropriated for the continuation of United States Armed Forces ground, naval, and air operations or for the assignment of military advisers, and intelligence personnel in South-

east Asia after sixty days of the enactment of this joint resolution, without a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States.

#### AMERICAN REESCALATION IN VIETNAM—A MOCKERY OF DEMOCRACY

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are confronted by an appalling reescalation of the Nation's military involvement in the Vietnam war, in violation of common sense, common morality, and the public pledges of the President of the United States.

My office is being flooded with calls from servicemen and families of servicemen who have had their leaves cancelled, wedding plans called off and their personal lives uprooted again so that they can be shipped off to the bottomless pit of Indochina.

Already new destruction and death is hailing down onto the shattered landscape and mutilated people of Vietnam from the ships and planes of the United States, acting under the orders of the President who 4 years ago promised a plan to end our Nation's military involvement in Vietnam.

The President has talked about "a generation of peace," but has acted to cause more bomb tonnage to be dropped than any other man in history. How many more people must die, how much more of the resources so desperately needed by the American people must be wasted before the administration's false sense of "honor" will be satisfied?

The will of the American people is unmistakably clear. Every national opinion survey shows that the American people, by an overwhelming margin, demand an end to this tragic nonsense. In my own congressional district, we have just completed tabulating the results of a survey mailed to 158,000 homes in the district. Based on the 17,500 replies received as of mid-March, 62 percent said they favor complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam by the end of June, conditioned only on the return of all U.S. prisoners of war. Only 20 percent favor President Nixon's announced policy of gradual withdrawal. Only 4 percent favor a policy of escalation for military victory.

Asked to choose the Nation's priorities, more constituents—40 percent—"ending the Vietnam war" than any other item.

How can the Government of a democracy continue to ignore the deep, persistent, and growing demand of the vast majority of the people on an issue of the gravest national policy? Obviously the President has abandoned even the pretense of following the public's desires on this issue. This leaves it up to the Congress. How can Members of this House face the voters this fall if they have not done everything in their power to force an early end to this pointless horror?

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to number among my constituents Mr. John S. Knight, president of Knight Newspapers and one of the most courageous, earliest,

and incisive public critics of this misbegotten military misadventure. In his latest "Editor's Notebook", published in newspapers all over the United States, Mr. Knight reiterates that the direction for the United States in Vietnam is "Out" and the time is "Now." Mr. Knight's editorial follows:

JOHN S. KNIGHT'S NOTEBOOK—SOUTH VIETS MUST HACK IT THEMSELVES

It has been five years since I was in Vietnam, and naturally many things have changed since then.

"Pacification" was the Johnson administration's slogan for rooting out the Viet Cong's "infrastructure," a fancy term for the enemy guerrilla establishment which dominated the hamlets and villages by night.

"Winning the hearts and minds of the people" was another euphemism coined by the State Department. This phrase gave Americans at home a kind of quiet confidence that the South Vietnamese welcomed us as their saviors and fellow believers in the brotherhood of man.

Those were the days, remember, when nearly everyone in the U.S. was gung ho for this mad adventure which has now cost us 45,679 American combat death, 302,820 wounded and 10,123 dead from non-hostile action—to say nothing of the billions of dollars sapped from our not unlimited resources.

I recall chatting about the war one evening with Amb. Ellsworth Bunker at the American Embassy in Saigon. He is a wise diplomat with long experience in dealing with troubled situations in Argentina, India and the Dominican Republic. His words were prophetic: "Certainly we can prevent and indeed have prevented the South Vietnamese from losing the war, but they must in the end win it themselves."

Was this remark the forerunner of President Nixon's Vietnamization policy, the training and equipping of South Vietnam's forces since they "must in the end win it for themselves"?

The massive withdrawal of American fighting men by the Nixon administration—while continuing impressive naval and air support—confirms that view. President Nixon's confidence in the ability of the South Vietnamese to fend for themselves has always been high. To say that much of this confidence flows from political expediency and pragmatic judgments is not an overstatement.

But now, the latest offensive from North Vietnam gives early indication that Mr. Nixon's well-laid plans may be in jeopardy. While the South Vietnamese have more than a million men under arms, Robert S. Boyd of our Washington bureau reports that "South Vietnam's army, facing its most crucial test, is stretched awfully thin:

"The 1,084,000 men under arms actually boil down to a relatively few combat troops able to compete with the tough North Vietnamese regulars. About 200,000 soldiers organized in 13 combat divisions must bear the brunt of the fighting."

South Vietnam's numerically large military force includes 258,000 lightly armed Popular Forces, described by Boyd as "largely peasant boys who have been given a carbine and a little training while assigned to guard their home villages or hamlets. They have poor leadership, are often overrun by Viet Cong guerrilla bands and are no match for regular soldiers."

Another 294,000 South Vietnamese serve in the Regional Forces. Their assignment is to provide security for districts and provinces against Viet Cong guerrillas and main force units. Boyd says that while they are said to be vastly improved in the last year, the RF's are still outclassed by North Vietnam's regulars.

The remaining 532,000 men in the South Vietnamese army (ARVN), navy and air force are widely distributed in four military regions. The North Vietnamese have some 480,000 regulars in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. The United States is down to nine combat battalions (about 800 men each) in South Vietnam, compared to 172 battalions a few years ago.

President Nixon likes to refer to "his options." Actually, he has very few remaining in Indochina. He is committed by his withdrawal decision to place his faith in what Rowland Evans and Robert Novak call "an Asian army of U.S. design and manufacture, but never before put to this kind of test."

Hanoi, on the other hand, can seriously weaken Nixon's bargaining power prior to the President's journey to Moscow on May 22. Evans and Novak suggest that the purpose of the North Vietnam attack is to force Nixon into crucial war-settlement talks on Communist terms.

Hanoi's leaders are well aware that South Vietnamese forces are no match for their regulars in the field. And, for the first time in the war, the North Vietnamese are deploying their own air power and anti-aircraft missiles with considerable success.

Of course, the President could exercise the option of even heavier bombing in the North and perhaps including Hanoi and the port of Haiphong. Yet the negatives lie in curdling our attempts to improve relations with Peking and Moscow, and bringing the war back to the front pages and the television tubes in an election year.

Beyond that, there is no evidence to show that our previous heavy bombing attacks have in any way weakened the determination of the North Vietnamese to fight.

The question is often raised as to why the North Vietnamese have the will to carry on and are so truculent in negotiations, while the South Vietnamese fall miserably in leadership and national unity.

Historically the North Vietnamese have never accepted the concept of two Vietnams. The 17th parallel is said to divide North and South Vietnam, but the 1954 Geneva agreements stipulated that the parallel was to be "a provisional military demarcation line," and not a political boundary or national frontier.

Withdrawal of North Vietnamese from the South was a temporary arrangement pending general elections after which the country was to be reunited. As Professor George McT. Kahin of Cornell University explains: "The Geneva agreements did not leave two separate states. They left two contesting parties within a single national state. The North Vietnamese will never accept the proposition that they are an 'outside force' in Vietnam."

In 1954, the then President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam refused to proceed with elections which Prof. Kahin argues "were the major quid pro quo in inducing Ho Chi Minh's Vietnam to abandon control over a substantial part of the territory that had been wrested from the French."

The betrayal of Hanoi—if such it was—is the compelling reason why the North Vietnamese will never accept a cease-fire and armistice until a political settlement is reached with South Vietnam. And that is why the negotiations at Paris are stuck on dead center.

So what should President Nixon do? As I see it, he should protect the safety of our withdrawing troops, gradually remove our air and naval forces and then declare the war to be at an end so far as the United States is concerned.

This course of action would undoubtedly produce anguished lamentations about our "sacred commitments," and dire predictions of a blood bath in South Vietnam.

I say that we have fulfilled our "commitments," if indeed we had any. We stopped aggression from the North, armed and

equipped a huge South Vietnamese army, inflicted extensive bombing on North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and sent more than half a million Americans to Indochina.

We said we were "fighting a limited war for limited objectives." Those objectives were achieved so long as we maintained a huge fighting force prior to Mr. Nixon's doctrine of Vietnamization.

So what other objectives remain? If South Vietnam can't hack it now, when will Saigon be prepared?

As Amb. Ellsworth Bunker said in 1967: "The South Vietnamese must in the end win the war for themselves."

And the hour is now.

#### POTOMAC NATIONAL RIVER

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, time is running out on open space, recreation areas, and wilderness. Our Nation now has a population of more than 200 million, and this will increase to 300 million within the next 50 years even if families limit themselves to an average of two children. It will double if the average is three children.

Such a growth potential puts considerable stress on our resources. Greatly increased industrial development in the Potomac River Valley is assured, and this makes it imperative that we begin planning now for the world our children will be living in, in just a few years.

For this reason I have introduced H.R. 14020, a bill to establish the Potomac National River. This bill provides for protection by the Department of the Interior of 70,000 acres in the Potomac River Valley through acquisition of about 40,000 acres and the use of scenic easements, zoning, sellback-leaseback arrangements, and other possible planning tools for the remainder.

In the past, geography, history, and economic forces have protected the natural and man-molded treasures of the Potomac River Valley from destruction by intense development. The flood of westward growth parted in its course and left a relatively natural Potomac Valley. But today time is catching up with the river—and us; more good fortune can no longer be depended upon to protect an irreplaceable resource from urban sprawl which is moving from population centers in Washington, Maryland, Virginia, and even Pennsylvania.

Another factor illustrating the pressures is the rise in land values along the Potomac. If we do not act today, the costs will be much higher when we are finally forced into action.

The cost of land in Montgomery County, Md., is increasing at an average of 10 percent per year. Certainly, the areas along the river are no exception. Land in the Great Falls area is today worth from \$15,000 to \$20,000 per acre.

Naturally, land costs are lower as one gets away from the metropolitan area. The rate of increase in value, however is still quite high. In Frederick County, Md., recreational land costs have experienced an average annual increase of 12.5 percent over the last 5 years.

These rising land values have been experienced on the Virginia side of the

river as well. Over the last few years, land costs in Fairfax County, for example, have gone up at a rate of at least 10 percent a year.

In order that the States which form the Potomac Basin and the citizens generally can be as closely involved as possible in the development of the Potomac National River, I provide in my bill for a permanent 14-member Advisory Commission. This Commission will meet at least semi-annually with the Secretary of the Interior in order that he might report and consult with the Commission concerning the development and administration of the National River.

The membership of the Commission would be appointed by the Secretary of Interior as follows:

First. Eight citizens recommended by the Governors of Potomac Basin States who must be residents of counties containing a part of the National River:

Two from West Virginia;

Two from Virginia; and

Four from Maryland—but no more than two from any one county.

Second. One member, a resident of the District of Columbia, recommended by the District of Columbia Commissioner.

Third. Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park Commission.

Fourth. Three members designated by the Secretary from the general public, two of whom shall be members of regularly constituted conservation organizations and one of whom shall be the Chairman of the Commission.

In order to insure adequate planning for the entire river, my bill directs the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with appropriate State and local authorities, to study and report within 2 years to Congress the Department's recommendation for extending the National River from the District to the Chesapeake Bay or providing for other conservation and recreation measures for preservation of the lower river or Potomac estuary.

Two years ago the passage of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act was the first step toward the preservation of the Potomac River Valley. At that time, I pledged my efforts toward making the Potomac National River an eventual reality.

The choice is between a river comprised of wilderness, open space, developed recreation areas and farmland, interspersed with towns and areas of commerce, or a mammoth open storm drain running through a nightmarish strip of oversized cities and suburbs and Coney Islands.

And the choice is clear for citizens and their government; the administration has an obligation to support a comprehensive plan and goal for the Potomac, the Interior Committees of the House and Senate have an obligation to hold hearings, and Potomac citizens must make clear their determination that specific action will begin to save an irreplaceable area of their environment and the environment of their children.

The full text of H.R. 14020 is inserted below for the information of my colleagues and the general public.

## H.R. 14020

A bill to establish the Potomac National River in the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve and develop for the enjoyment of present and future generations the main stem of the Potomac River and adjacent land areas in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia which possess unusual natural, scenic, historic, fish and wildlife, and recreational values, including the historic and scenic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, there is hereby established the Potomac National River (hereinafter referred to as the "national river"). The national river shall consist of the lands, waters, and interests therein within the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary Map, Proposed Potomac National River," numbered PNR 20,000, dated March 1972. The drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may revise the boundaries of the national river from time to time, but the total land acreage within the national river shall not exceed seventy thousand acres, of which title to not more than forty thousand acres shall be acquired and retained in fee simple absolute, and with respect to the remaining acreage, only such easements and other interests in land shall be acquired, or retained (when prior acquisition of the underlying fee is determined to be necessary or desirable) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That no lands owned by any State shall be included in the boundaries of the park—

(1) unless they are donated to the United States, or

(2) until a written cooperative agreement is negotiated by the Secretary which assures the administration of such lands in accordance with established administrative policies for national park system areas, and

(3) until the terms and conditions of such donation or cooperative agreement have been forwarded to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and Senate at least sixty days prior to being executed.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary may acquire lands, waters, and interests therein (including scenic easements) within the national river by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, but the Secretary shall refrain from acquiring, for two years from the date of the enactment of this Act, any lands designated on the boundary map for acquisition by any State if he has negotiated and consummated a written cooperative agreement with such State pursuant to section 1 of this Act. Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, without transfer of funds, for use by the Secretary in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) When an individual tract of land is only partly within the national river, the Secretary may acquire the entire tract in order to avoid the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside the boundaries may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal land within such boundaries, and any portion of said land not utilized for such exchanges may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended. Any funds received in the disposal of such lands shall be credited to the appropriation for the acquisition of lands, waters, and interests

therein for the national river, and any such funds are authorized to be appropriated for such purpose in addition to the amount authorized in section 11 of this Act.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the national river, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the States of West Virginia, Virginia, and Maryland, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. In all other respects, the Secretary shall exercise his exchange authority in accordance with the provisions of section 5(b) of the Act of July 15, 1968 (Public Law 90-401; 82 Stat. 354).

(d) In exercising his authority within the national river pursuant to section 5(a) of the Act of July 15, 1968 (Public Law 90-401; 82 Stat. 354), the Secretary shall afford to the heirs or devisees of any owner or owners of record who may have died within the two-year period referred to in section 5(a), the same rights that any such owner or owners of record may have had thereunder.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the States of West Virginia, Virginia, and Maryland, and their political subdivisions within the vicinity of the national river, to plan, acquire, develop, and manage lands within and adjacent to the national river for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation, or similar public purposes. Funds allocated to the States under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 shall be available for such planning, acquisition, and development.

(b) Outside any such plan in regard to lands outside the boundaries, but in the vicinity of the national river shall have been presented to the Secretary and approved by him, upon such terms and conditions as shall be satisfactory to him, the Secretary may grant to the political subdivision presenting such plan funds to assist in the acquisition of needed lands, which funds shall not exceed 25 per centum of the total cost of said lands, and which shall be in addition to any funds granted from the allocation to the States, pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965: *Provided*, That any such funds shall be appropriated from the funds accruing to the Federal share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall take into account local and State development, land use, conservation and recreational plans affecting or relating to areas in the vicinity of the national river, shall, consistent with the purposes of this Act, exercise the authority granted by this Act in a manner that will not conflict, with such local or State plans.

(d) The Secretary may refrain or agree to refrain from exercising his authority under this Act to acquire private property within the boundary of the national river so long as he finds that the applicable plan or ordinance continues to promote the use and development of such property in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) With the exception of property that the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of administration, preservation, or public use, any owner or owners (hereinafter in this section referred to as "owner") of improved property may, on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary, retain an existing right of use and occupancy for the purposes hereinafter set forth of the improved property for a definite term of not more than twenty-five years or, in the case of natural persons in lieu thereof for a term ending upon the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later, such term to be elected by the owner, for (1) noncommercial residential purpose, including use of a family vacation residence; (2) agricultural purposes; or (3) educational purposes. The

Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Such right (A) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to assure that the property is used in accordance with the purposes of this Act, (B) may be transferred, assigned, or devised, and (C) may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for (i) noncommercial residential, including use as a family vacation residence, (ii) agricultural purposes, or (iii) educational purposes, as the case may be, and upon tender to the holder of the right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains in effect on the date of termination.

(b) As used in this section the term "improved property" means (1) a detached one family dwelling (A) which serves as a place of abode of the owner, whether full or part time, (B) construction of which was begun before January 1, 1967, (C) and which at the time of acquisition meets the requirements of applicable State, county, or municipal laws, ordinances, codes, rules, or regulations relating to building, construction, or public health, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of non-commercial residential use, or (2) any property that is used exclusively for agricultural purposes and continues in such use, including housing directly incident thereto, or (3) any property that is used exclusively for educational purposes and continues in such use: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from improved properties any waters of land fronting thereon, together with so much of the land adjoining such waters or land as he deems necessary for public access thereto.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to negotiate and enter into such concession contracts, for periods not to exceed twenty-five years, as he may deem necessary for the accommodation of visitors, with any former owner or operator of property which, in the judgment of the Secretary, was at the time of its acquisition being operated for public commercial recreational purposes.

(d) The operation and occupancy of lands and improvements thereon by recreation or conservation organizations may, in the discretion of the Secretary and in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by him, be continued by lease, permit, or agreement for such terms as the Secretary may determine not, however, to exceed a total period of twenty-five years for any such organization.

SEC. 5. With the occupation of those lands and waters, included within the national river pursuant to section 7 of this Act, the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the national river in accordance with the appropriate Federal and State law, to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and employment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall administer the national river in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16

U.S.C. 1-4), except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural and historical resources may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this Act. In administering the national river or any part thereof included within the boundaries, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with non-Federal public bodies for the operation and management by either the Secretary or such bodies of certain portions of lands within the boundaries of the national river in accordance with a mutually acceptable management plan.

(b) In the administration of the national river, the Secretary may issue easements, licenses, or permits for rights-of-way through, over, or under the lands in Federal ownership within the national river, or for the use of such lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be appropriate and consistent with the use of such lands for the purposes of this Act.

(c) Except as may be specifically set forth in this Act or other Acts of Congress, nothing herein contained shall be deemed to affect or alter the exercise of existing jurisdiction or rights of any State in which the national river is located, regarding the control or regulation of the waters of the Potomac River, including the flow, usage, and quality thereof.

Sec. 7. (a) The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, as established by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (84 Stat. 1978) is hereby included within the national river and shall continue to be administered as the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park within the national river as an identifiable unit thereof, in accordance with the authorities contained in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act: *Provided*, That any lands within the boundaries of the national river may be added to the historical park by the Secretary for reasons of historic integrity, or for the purpose of facilitating administration or the restoration of major historical and engineering features of the park.

(b) Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 450bb), or as may hereafter be augmented, redesignated, or modified by Act of Congress, is hereby included with the national river, and shall continue to be administered as the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park within the national river as an identifiable unit thereof, in accordance with all authorities available to the Secretary for administration of the national river and the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park.

Sec. 8. (a) The enactment of this Act shall not affect adversely any valid rights heretofore existing, or any valid permits heretofore issued, within or relating to areas authorized for inclusion in the national river.

(b) Where privately owned lands are located between lands acquired for the national river and the Potomac River, the owners of those lands shall have access to their lands, subject only to such restrictions or requirements as the Secretary may find essential to the preservation and sound management of the river.

Sec. 9. Except as specifically authorized by the Congress, the Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance within the national river of any dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.): *Provided*, That the provisions of that Act shall continue to apply to any project, as defined in that Act, already constructed or under license to be constructed.

Sec. 10. (a) There is hereby established a National River Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), composed of fourteen members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Eight members, who shall be residents of counties any part of which is included within the boundaries of the national river: two from Virginia, two from West Virginia, and four from Maryland. Each member shall be appointed from recommendations made by the Governors of the respective States of Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland. However, no more than two members so appointed shall be residents of any single county in any one State.

(2) One member, who shall be a resident of the District of Columbia, appointed from recommendations made by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

(3) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission established by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (supra).

(4) Three members designated by the Secretary from the general public, two of whom shall be members of regularly constituted conservation organizations and one of whom shall be Chairman of the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission shall serve for a term of three years, except that the terms of the initial members shall be from one to three years, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, in such manner as to insure that the terms of not more than four of them will expire in any one year: *Provided*, That any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, for the remainder of the term: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park Commission, the Commission established by this Act shall be composed of the twelve members designated pursuant to (1), (2), and (4) of this section.

(c) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such, but the Secretary is authorized to pay, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission and its members in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(d) The Commission may make such rules and regulations concerning the conduct of its business as it deems advisable to carry out its function under this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall, from time to time but at least semiannually, meet with, report, and consult with the Commission on general policies and specific matters related to the plan of development and administration of the river.

(f) The Commission may advise and consult with other Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments, and persons on matters relating to public recreation, historic preservation and interpretation, scenic protection, wildlife protection, and conservation and protection of natural resources, including water resources, within and in the vicinity of the river.

Sec. 11. (a) Within two years after the enactment of this Act the Secretary shall report to Congress his recommendations as to the extension of the national river or other legislative action for the conservation, scenic protection, and improvement of public recreational opportunities from the area established by this Act to the mouth of the Potomac River at Chesapeake Bay: *Provided*, That any such lands or interest in land shall not be considered in calculating the limitations on acreages set forth in section (1) of this Act.

Sec. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### THREAT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM THROUGH POLITICIZING EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President today addressed the first of a series of "Headliner Lunches" in the new quarters of the Capitol Hill Club, the national Republican club. Vice President AGNEW sounded a significant warning about a serious threat to academic freedom through the politicizing of the educational process. Because of the challenging and thought-provoking content of his remarks, I insert here the full text of the Vice President's speech.

#### ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

My subject today is a threat to academic freedom—specifically the threat to the availability of scholarly, diverse research products which arises because some intellectuals are attempting to impose an ideological conformity on American education.

Over two years ago, I directed public attention to the lack of diversity in the process of deciding what news should be presented to the American people, and in the singular ideological conformity of those who make news judgments for the television networks and most major publications of national impact.

My topic here is of equal, if not greater, importance to the future of our system. For if, in the words of Epictetus, "Only the educated are free," then the politicizing of the learning process and the substitution of indoctrination for education strikes at the very roots of a free society.

This politicizing process takes many forms.

At its worst, it can be described as nothing less than anti-intellectual Yahooism on the part of members of the academic community who, however few in number, have at times been permitted to disrupt or have encouraged disruption of the process of free discussion and inquiry.

A notorious example of the activities of these academic Yahoos occurred at the convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Philadelphia several months ago.

At that meeting, tomatoes were thrown at a United States Senator, while other speakers had to be given police protection. All this, keep in mind, was the result of the tactics of fewer than one hundred persons given permissive rein to disrupt the proceedings of a convention of 5,000 scholars representing an organization of an estimated 180,000 members.

To his credit, one of the vice presidents of the organization, Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, denounced members of this militant Yahoo minority, charging them with "political harassment that has no place in a scientific meeting."

"I'm a political scientist," said Dr. Moynihan, "and I smell fascism."

Less credit, however, is due officers of the association who sought to appease the incontinent totalitarianism in their midst.

One of these officials was quoted as saying, after the tomato-throwing episode—and I quote directly: "If there weren't these disruptions it would mean these meetings are not significant."

Let me submit, ladies and gentlemen, that the death of free speech and inquiry is never a unilateral act. It comes in two parts.

First, there are those vicious members of a community who would kill freedom; second, there are those fatuous leaders of a community who, by their acquiescence and lack of intellectual fortitude, stand by and permit the murder to occur.

This threat of dogmatism and intolerance of diverse opinion in the academic community is a matter of concern to every American.



For history has demonstrated that there can be no more dangerous form of anti-intellectualism than that kind practiced by highly educated, self-righteous intellectuals who consider themselves superior to the point of infallibility.

Indeed, we know that the worst excesses of the mob during the French Terror were carried out under the leadership of "men of learning" who thought themselves the ultimate products of the Age of Reason and Science; that the ideological precursor of Mussolini's fascism was a poet-philosopher; and that the Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment of Hitler's Germany held a Ph.D. from one of his country's most respected universities.

In this regard, Frederic Lilje, in his book, *The Abuse of Learning*, pointed out how the politicizing of the universities during the years of the Weimar Republic laid the ground work for the rise of the Third Reich. Wrote Professor Lilje of the German academic scene during the Weimar period:

"The universities were unable to remain islands on which the unpolitical scholar and scientist could live in seclusion from the fierce agitation on all sides . . . already, years before Hitler was made chancellor, groups of nationalist conspirators and, later, Nazi students began to foment unrest and provoke violence inside the universities."

That "strong-arm bullying" has become a feature of many scholarly gatherings here in America during recent years is attested by Bruce Blossat in a recent report. Beyond what Mr. Blossat describes as "disreputable shouters who make a specialty of mindlessness," there are those, the columnist asserts, who carry their ideological bias onto the school grounds and the campus.

Scholars-with-a-cause, they too often permit their devotion to that cause to outweigh their dedication to scholarship, or even to the elementary principles of free inquiry.

We find such narrow-minded academic ideologues, says Mr. Blossat, engaging in faculty boycotts or harassment of fellow scholars "who, in the past decade or so, have dared to labor for the federal government."

We are all familiar with notable cases of this kind in recent years. In my opinion, such boycotting and harassment have written a shameful chapter in the annals of American education. It is a chapter made all the more hypocritical by the participation or acquiescence of many educators who in the past intoned their views regarding "academic freedom," deploring what they viewed as Right-wing efforts to "intimidate" the free academic system.

A similar debasement of scholastic professionalism occurs when political academic fill the air—to quote Mr. Blossat "with confusing and exaggerated statements on major public issues."

An example of this facet of academic Yahoolism, cited by Dr. Jean Mayer, has been the pseudo-scientific clamor surrounding recent national debates over the anti-ballistic missile, the supersonic transport, and the underground nuclear tests at Amchitka.

Yet, well-publicized as are these examples of the politicizing of the academic community, they nevertheless do not reveal the disease of academic anti-intellectualism in its most pernicious form.

That occurs when the ideological virus is brought into the classroom and the teaching process itself.

Recently Professor Sidney Hook addressed his attention to a deeply disturbing aspect of this problem: the conversion of formerly authoritative and objective sources of encyclopedic information into vehicles of propaganda.

This is not to say that all such sources have been so converted. But as has occurred in the area of news reporting, recent years have witnessed a growing tendency toward the "interpretive" rather than the "objective" in a number of research publications

as well as textbooks of significant circulation.

Professor Hook's special concern was the transparent ideological bias shown by the new editors of one major encyclopedia who refused to publish a previously accepted study by the respected conservative scholar Ernest van den Haag.

Writes Professor Hook of this incident: "Signs are multiplying that partisan criteria utterly irrelevant to genuine intellectual achievement are being brought to bear on the evaluation of scholarly findings. Judgments on scholars and on their work all too often now reflect ideological prejudice rather than scrupulous evaluation of contributions."

Unless checked, such opinion imbalance, similar to that which affects our national news media, holds ominous implications.

For if biased segments of the news media can distort the view of the world in which we live it necessarily falls to the educational community in its pursuit of truth and fact, to assure today's distortion is not perpetuated in tomorrow's history books.

Nevertheless, the incident of editorial bias involving Professor van den Haag would seem to be only a single exhibit evidencing the fact that the Sander Vanocurs have their doctrinaire counterparts in the groves of academe. This is substantiated by an examination of the kind of politicized material that is getting into standard works that teachers and parents rely on as general reference books for today's students.

For example, one major encyclopedia company—other than that which refused to publish the van den Haag study—produces an annual yearbook that can be found in school libraries and homes throughout the country. It bears a respected name in the publishing world. Yet, the New Leftward bias of its current editors can readily be ascertained by any fair-minded teacher or parent who takes the time to read its contents.

To illustrate this point, let me compare the manner in which this particular yearbook dealt in its annual "People in the News" section with two Americans prominent in the news during the year 1970.

First, consider what young readers will learn about a person to the editor's ideological liking—the Radical Left Attorney William Kunstler:

"The American legal system has given rise over the years to a remarkable breed of courtroom lawyer—the sharp, resourceful, selfless defense attorney, who often at the risk of reputation and pocketbook will take up unpopular causes, defend unpopular individuals, and, in the folklore at least, emerge triumphant . . ." the yearbook tells students.

"One of the most remarkable of this breed is William Moses Kunstler, who fights with conviction for causes that he feels are relevant to social and political justice in America. . . . What makes William Kunstler a different type of lawyer is that he has come to feel he and his colleagues are the last line of defense against the destructive forces of tyranny and, in particular, that the lawyer has a duty to help pave the way for important social changes to overcome tyranny . . ."

"Kunstler has been criticized for his overdramatic manner, for his faulty preparation of cases, and for his phenomenal ego. But his sincerity and his devotion to his clients and to his causes have never been in question. This selflessness has made him a kind of folk hero to the young. . . ."

To be sure the advanced student of propaganda can only pay tribute, however grudging, to the skilled manner in which the writer of that paean to Mr. Kunstler makes the point that his subject is an admirable individual whom the young reader might emulate, regardless of what he might hear around the family dinner table.

Nor should this artful technique be considered accidental. The same yearbook features equally laudatory biographies, some

verging on the ecstatic, covering such New Left folk-heroes and heroines as the Berrigans, Angela Davis and Jane Fonda.

On the other ideological hand, there are less admirable Americans whose "sincerity" and "devotion to causes," not to mention "selflessness," are less apparent—at least to the editors.

Indeed, a comparison only of the opening line in the Kunstler biography with that given the President of the United States is sufficient to draw the pejorative inference the editors intend:

"Richard M. Nixon is president of the United States," they tell the young reader, "but he is above all a politician."

Now if that, for a starter, doesn't open a youngster's eyes, there follows sufficient inuendo to do so, including even the Radical Left canard that the President once labeled all students "bums."

In this regard, since it bears strong witness to the matter of anti-intellectualism in the academic community, let me take this occasion to lay that blatant distortion to rest once and for all.

Here we see a prime example of the big lie technique perfected by Hitler's propaganda and enlightenment ministry. For the fact is—and it is readily ascertainable fact—that the President's mention of "bums" in the spring of 1970 was made with specific reference to arsonist vandals who had destroyed the lifework of a foreign scholar at Stanford University—and I, for one, believe that, if anything, the President was restrained in so describing the perpetrators of such a senseless, despicable and cruel act of destruction.

The President has never applied that term to protestors or young people, however. The contention that he did is simply one of many gross falsehoods in the propaganda arsenal of those latter-day Goebbels of the Radical Left who daily assault, not simply this President, but rather the institution of the Presidency itself—an assault strengthened by the ready and all-too-willing cooperation of their ideological allies in the national news media and, as we see, the academic world.

Nor is that the only Left-inspired untruth the editors of this encyclopedic yearbook set forth as objective fact. In addition, they included in their 1970 yearbook the misrepresentation that "twenty-eight (Black) Panthers have been killed in police clashes since 1968"—a propaganda myth now thoroughly discredited but which still remains, unretreated, in public and home libraries, as part of encyclopedic history.

Unfortunately, Professor Hook informs us, such examples of politicized standard reference works are no longer isolated cases. Rather, they represent what he terms a "disquieting phenomenon" of our times.

The fact is that teachers and parents can no longer take it for granted that scholarly objectivity and thoroughness will be the standards in much of the material students use for basic reference.

To discover, in Professor Hook's words, that once "reputable and time-honored" reference works have "now fallen into the hands of editors who have ideological axes to grind . . ." is indeed disquieting, not only in itself but in its symptomatic meaning to the entire American educational system.

Disquieting as it may be, however, no American can ignore the danger such politicizing presents to our educational system.

I have therefore spoken out on this issue today because responsibility for maintaining the academic integrity of our educational system is a matter of major concern to every American.

What I have urged is not the imposition but the *elimination* of ideological conformity; not censorship but *freedom of inquiry*; not the interjection of the politics of the Nixon Administration or any other administration, but the *removal* of current poli-

tics from American education; not book-burning but more books, covering every point of view and not just the propaganda of the view favored by the professor.

Yet, I have little doubt that despite this purpose, there will be criticism in the days to come that the Vice President seeks to "intimidate" or "repress" dissenters at scientific meetings, not to mention limit the latitude of encyclopedia editors. At the very least, we will be advised by self-serving spokesmen that in discussing the ideological bias of such individuals I have somehow had a "chilling effect" on academic freedom.

So be it. I myself have no intention of being intimidated, repressed, chilled or deterred by the propaganda techniques of those who desire that they and they alone shall choose the parameters of public dialogue on issues that affect the American people.

Through nearly two centuries, we Americans have considered education to be a major social priority—in the words of the 16th President who died 107 years ago this week, "the most important subject which we, as a people, can be engaged in."

As a free people, we have rejected the totalitarian concept that education should be a weapon of the state or of a single ideology.

Thus, despite the political passions that have characterized given periods in our history, we in the end always have recognized that solutions to human problems and differences can best be found not in the heat of ideological warfare but in the light of rational discourse.

For this, we can credit a tradition of free inquiry nurtured and sustained by the American educational community.

Upon American educators in this critical period, therefore, the burden of that tradition now falls. Today, as in the past, the people of America—and most especially, young Americans—look to them for responsible scholarship and an academic atmosphere free of political zealotry.

This then is one of the most critical challenges of our time: to assure for this and succeeding generations of American youth an educational system based not on the ignorance of superstition or ideological stricture, but on the principle of free inquiry and rational dialogue in a society of diverse and competing opinion.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANN, for April 12, 1972, to attend funeral of Hon. James F. Byrnes.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for April 12, 1972, and the balance of week on account of official business.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. STOKES (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, Tuesday, April 11, through Thursday, April 13, on account of official business.

Mr. JAMES C. CORMAN, for Tuesday, April 11, on account of illness.

Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, April 11, through Thursday, April 13, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROUSSELOT) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARSHA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUNNELS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINO, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PODELL, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. COTTER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, on April 12, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL, on April 12, for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN, on April 12, for 60 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLENBACK (at the request of Mr. KEITH) to extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 13188.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROUSSELOT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. GUDE in seven instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. BELL in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. MIZELL in eight instances.

Mr. DEVINE in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER in three instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in four instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUNNELS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. RANGEL in three instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. KARTH.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. FULTON in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in five instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in five instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. PATTEN in 10 instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to extend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12749. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1973.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 12, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1971, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for

printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, Washington, D.C., April 10 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During calendar year 1971, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

Extraordinary contractual adjustment

denied by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board:

a. The Board considered one request for extraordinary contractual adjustment during 1971. Acme Machine & Tool Co., Inc. requested relief in the amount of \$24,672.63 on the basis of the Government's and the contractor's mutual mistakes. The request was denied.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. FLETCHER, Administrator.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT, Speaker of the House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804, the calen-

dar year 1971 report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense is transmitted herewith.

Table I shows that 245 contractual actions were approved and that 112 actions were disapproved. Included in the number of actions approved are 112 actions for which a potential Government liability cannot be estimated.

Table II lists the actions which have an actual or potential cost to the Government of \$50,000 or more. Also included in this list are the 112 actions above for which a potential cost cannot be estimated.

Sincerely,

BARRY J. SHILLITO, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

EXTRAORDINARY CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE (PUBLIC LAW 85-804) JANUARY-DECEMBER 1971

TABLE I.—SUMMARY REPORT OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1971

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Department and type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Department of Defense, total.....	245			112	
Amendments without consideration.....	2	\$1,512	\$1,341	27	\$23,956
Correction of mistakes.....	74	3,814	3,625	66	1,236
Formalization of informal commitments.....	31	372	366	9	99
Contingent liabilities.....	112			1	
Disposition of property.....	3			2	
Other.....	21	672	672	7	
Amendments without consideration (Lockheed).....	2	(1)	623,000		
Army, total.....	53			25	
Amendments without consideration.....				6	8,275
Correction of mistakes.....	21	476	386	11	726
Formalization of informal commitments.....	25	347	342	7	40
Contingent liabilities.....	3			1	
Disposition of property.....	2				
Other (Secretarial authority and residual powers).....	1				
Amendments without consideration (Lockheed).....	1	(1)	123,000		
Navy, total.....	106			11	
Amendments without consideration.....	2	1,512	1,341	5	8,593
Correction of mistakes.....	18	2,820	2,847	4	18
Formalization of informal commitments.....	3	12	11		
Contingent liabilities.....	82				
Disposition of property.....	1			2	
Air Force, total.....	46			35	
Amendments without consideration.....				3	5,762
Correction of mistakes.....	16	410	295	28	305
Formalization of informal commitments.....	1	7	7	2	59
Contingent liabilities.....	27				
Other (contract modification or termination).....	1			2	
Amendments without consideration (Lockheed).....	1	(1)	500,000		
Defense Supply Agency, total.....	40			41	
Amendments without consideration.....				13	1,326
Correction of mistakes.....	19	108	97	23	187
Formalization of informal commitments.....	2	6	6		
Other.....	19	672	672	5	

<sup>1</sup> Lockheed financial requirement exceeded \$1,000,000,000 for all programs.

TABLE II.—LIST OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF \$50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE JANUARY-DECEMBER 1971

Name and location of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
AMENDMENTS WITHOUT CONSIDERATION			
Navy: Gap Instrument Corp., 110 Marcus Blvd., Hauppauge, N.Y.	\$1,091,329	MK-53 attack consoles.....	The company has asserted that it faces a financial crisis of such major proportions that without immediate relief it will be unable to continue operations. The MK-53 units, which constitute an integral portion of a shipboard underwater fire control system, are tightly scheduled for installation as Government furnished equipment on 2 classes of Navy vessels presently under construction. A number of the remainder are for delivery to foreign governments. Although other companies have produced the console under prior contracts, none are currently in production. Should this company be forced to cease operations the Navy stands to lose its advance payments of approximately \$2,265,000. In addition the estimated cost of reprocurement is approximately \$6,000,000.

Name and location of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
S.W. Electronics & Manufacturing Co., 12 Fellowship Rd., Cherry Hill, N.J.	250,000	AN/ARR-69 auxiliary radio receivers	The contractor is a small firm of approximately 60 employees and its financial distress was precipitated when it became unable to make delivery and receive payment under a contract for the Government of Pakistan after the U.S. State Department imposed temporary restrictions upon the shipment of military supplies to that country in April 1971. The AN/ARR-69 radios are being purchased for use by both the Navy and the Air Force on F-4J, A-4B, TA-F4 and A-7E aircraft. Government inventories have been exhausted and equipment is not available for installation on operational aircraft. Introducing another source would entail a delay of from 12 to 18 months and a substantial increase in unit prices.
Air Force: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.	500,000,000	C-5A aircraft	In March 1970 the company submitted a letter to DOD citing its contractual and financial problems on several major Defense programs including the Cheyenne helicopter and the C-5A aircraft. The company asserted that "the unprecedented dollar magnitude of the claims and disputes" in which these programs among others were involved would "make it financially impossible for Lockheed to complete performance of these programs if we must await the outcome of litigation before receiving further financing from the Department of Defense." After a thorough review of this matter, the Deputy Secretary of Defense determined on June 4, 1971, that it was necessary to continue these essential defense programs as such action will thereby facilitate the national defense. Although such action will permit the company to continue operations its losses on these programs will be severe. In the case of the C-5A aircraft contract a fixed loss of \$200,000,000 was negotiated with the company. The actions taken with respect to the AH-56A Cheyenne basically involved a restructuring of the AH-56A research and development contract and the settlement of the claims of the corporation, then in litigation, relating to the AH-56A production contract which had been terminated for default. These actions were based on the authority of Public Law 85-804 and the authority to resolve disputes arising under the provisions of government contracts. The company's loss on the AH-56A contracts is estimated at \$119,000,000. For further details see comment above concerning the C-5A aircraft.
Army: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.	123,000,000	AH-56A helicopters	The actions taken with respect to the AH-56A Cheyenne basically involved a restructuring of the AH-56A research and development contract and the settlement of the claims of the corporation, then in litigation, relating to the AH-56A production contract which had been terminated for default. These actions were based on the authority of Public Law 85-804 and the authority to resolve disputes arising under the provisions of government contracts. The company's loss on the AH-56A contracts is estimated at \$119,000,000. For further details see comment above concerning the C-5A aircraft.

FORMALIZATION OF INFORMAL COMMITMENT

Army: Stromberg Datagraphix, Inc., 1600 Kapiolani Blvd., Honolulu, Hawaii.	269,144	Ancillary micromation equipment	General Services Administration placed a contract with Stromberg for the installation and rental of equipment at USARPAC overseas commands during fiscal year 1969. During fiscal year 1970 the Government continued to use this equipment while a new contract was being negotiated. The resulting contract excluded these commands which should have been covered.
--	---------	---------------------------------	--

CORRECTION OF MISTAKES

Army: Polarad Electronics Corp., 43-20 34th St., NW., Long Island City, N.Y.	165,400	Signal generator AN/URM-103	The contract escalation clause cited Code No. 1-25 ("Wholesale prices and price indexes") published by the Department of Labor as a price indicator. This price index has been found to be inappropriate and inadequate and is being changed to U.S. Department of Labor Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) 366.
North Electric Co., 553 South Market St., Galion, Ohio.	66,252	7th Army tactical switching systems	The U.S. Army Electronics Command issued an RFQ for 3 7th Army tactical switching systems with an option to purchase 3 more. The requirement to install, test and check the system was not set out as a separate item but appeared by way of a footnote. When the contract was awarded it required the contractor to furnish 6 systems instead of 3. The contractors bid covered the installation of only 3 systems instead of 6.
Navy: Bendix Corp., Electrodynamic Division, Lankershim & Sherman Way, North Hollywood, Calif.	2,658,406	AN/APN radar Altimeters	The original contract for 880 AN/APN-141 radar altimeters was a fixed price incentive contract permitting both fixed price or fixed price redeterminable purchases to be made. The pricing formula set the initial ceiling at 115 percent of target cost. Amendment No. 4 called for 450 additional units and excluded all reference to the ceiling. The effect of this modification was to increase the total final price permitted by the ceiling.
Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Lockheed California Co., 2555 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, Calif.	98,182	P-3B aircraft	On Jan. 13, 1966, contract was awarded for 45 P-3B aircraft at a total fixed price. Shortly thereafter the contracting officer ordered various modifications to be made to 17 of the aircraft which required extra work as well as partial termination of some work originally required on those planes. No provision was made at that time for the additional costs.

OTHER

Defense Supply Agency: Steuart Petroleum Co., 4646—40th St., NW, Washington, D.C.	671,723	Removal of ceiling contained in escalation clause of residual fuel contracts	Steuart Petroleum Co. is the only supplier capable of supplying and distributing all No. 6 fuel oil requirements for the Federal Government in the Washington metropolitan area. There are over 200 separate delivery points within the area. Contractor would incur loss as a direct result of ceiling on escalation under the contract. Ceiling did not foresee price rise due to shortages in both product and transportation.
---	---------	--	---

CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities on account of claims for death or injury or property damage arising out of nuclear radiation, use of high energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the contractor's insurance program were included in 112 contracts (the potential cost of these liabilities cannot be estimated inasmuch as the liability of the Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described in the indemnification clause). Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear armed guided missiles, experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives or performance in hazardous areas.

Name of contractor	Number of contracts		
	Army	Navy	Air Force
Aerojet General Corp.	3		
Avco Corp.		2	
Bendix Corp.		1	
Boeing Co.			3
General Dynamics Corp.		17	
General Electric Co.		10	1

Name of contractor	Number of contracts		
	Army	Navy	Air Force
Hercules, Inc.		1	1
Honeywell, Inc.		1	
Hughes Aircraft Co.		1	
Litton Systems, Inc. (Ingalls Shipbuilding (Division))		2	
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.		11	
Martin Marietta Corp.			2
Murphy Pacific Marine Salvage Co.		1	
Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co.		7	
North American Rockwell Corp.		14	3
Nuclear Engineering Co., Inc.		2	
Raytheon Co.		2	
Thiokol Chemical Corp.			4
Vitro Corp.		1	
Washington Technological Associates, Inc.		1	
Western Electric Co.		1	
Westinghouse Electric Corp.		8	
Proposed awards	2		10
Total	3	82	27

Note.—In addition to the above, indemnification clauses will be inserted into all air transportation contracts entered into by the Military Airlift Command for transportation services to be performed by air carriers which own or control aircraft which have been allocated by the Department of Transportation to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 18, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Panama City Harbor, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted June 8 and June 9, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 92-196); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 7, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Des Moines River at Attumwa, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted October 5, 1966 (H. Doc. No. 92-197); to the Committee on

Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1843. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to suspend operation of the restrictions on authorized strength of Army officers in the grade of major for fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1844. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report of country allocations of grant military assistance for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 653 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1845. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report that NASA has provided no specialized or technical services to State or local governments during 1971 under the authority of title III of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 or section 203 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1846. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of foreign excess property by NASA during 1971, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1847. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the denial of one request for an extraordinary contractual adjustment during 1971, pursuant to 72 Stat. 972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1848. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions taken by the Department of Defense to facilitate the national defense during 1971, pursuant to section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on disaster preparedness, pursuant to section 203 (h) of Public Law 91-606; to the Committee on Public Works.

1850. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a request for the return of the proposed prospectus on the Waltham, Mass., Federal Records Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1851. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for improving the institutional manpower training program in South Carolina, Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4634. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain land to the State of Oregon to be used as a public highway; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8209. A bill to amend and extend for a temporary period the act of November 9, 1966, permitting persons

from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 766. An act to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 92-971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 736. A bill to designate certain lands in the Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as wilderness (Rept. No. 92-972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1915. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States (Rept. No. 92-973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 13034. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13434. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 14070. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities and research and program management, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 14108. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 978. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the University of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13918. A bill to provide for improved financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:  
H.R. 14261. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:  
H.R. 14262. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1970 relating to the Chicago River, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 14263. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 14264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age), and medicare benefits, will be payable at age 60 (with such insurance benefits being payable in reduced amounts at age 57); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14265. A bill to remove the limitation on payments for consultant services in the Community Relations Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 14266. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. STREEB):

H.R. 14267. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Delaware Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 298, and the Absentee Delaware Tribe of Western Oklahoma, et al., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 72, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 14268. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14269. A bill authorizing the entry or parole into the United States of Cuban refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 14270. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GETTYS (for himself and Mr. ICHORD):

H.R. 14271. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to provide for the pass through of extra costs reasonably attributable to an increase in the minimum wage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 14272. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have not indicated they wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14273. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14274. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to relieve broadcasters of the equal time requirement of section 315 with respect to candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 14275. A bill to provide for crediting service as an aviation midshipman for purposes of retirement for non-Regular service under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and for pay purposes under title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14276. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, to provide that with respect to certain irrigation cost-sharing programs the Secretary of Agriculture shall pay at least 50 percent of the cost of each such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14277. 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. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14278. A bill to provide military assistance to Israel in order to assist in the resettlement of Russian refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 14279. A bill to provide financial and other aid to enable the United States to assist Jewish refugees to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel or the country of their choice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 14280. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of fair stained and better India ruby mica films first or second quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 14281. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to provide for highway safety programs on Indian reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14282. A bill to modify the project on the Little Colorado River for local flood protection at Holbrook, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14283. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 14284. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 14285. A bill to amend section 7 of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14286. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage and assist in the development on a demonstration basis of projects to meet the special health care and related needs of elderly persons in a campus-type setting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14287. A bill to provide homemaker services to elderly individuals in need thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14288. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to establish within the Bureau of the Census a Voter Registration Assistance Administration to carry out a program of financial assistance to encourage and assist the States in registering voters; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 14289. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for establishment and operation of departments of geriatrics, programs for training physicians' assistants and medical assistants, and to establish a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14290. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14291. A bill to reduce recidivism by providing community-centered programs of supervision and services for persons charged with offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14292. A bill to amend the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to broaden the scope of its programs for prisoners in such a way as to include various categories of prisoners not now eligible for such treatment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14293. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Japanese Americans who were placed in internment camps during World War II shall be credited for civil service retirement purposes with the time they spent in such camps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14294. A bill to repeal the meat quota provisions of Public Law 88-482; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14295. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 14296. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorize the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 14297. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 14298. A bill to provide for the assignment of unused laboratory space and facilities to unemployed scientists; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 14299. A bill to assure a more adequate retirement income for employees by requiring the establishment of employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans and providing additional protection for the rights of participants in such plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan insurance program under corporate administration, to provide for the portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to carry out these programs and enforce these requirements, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 14300. A bill to provide that a State or political subdivision may levy a tax with respect to a federally assisted housing project which under Federal law is otherwise exempt from State and local taxes but is required to make payments in lieu of taxes, where such payments are less than the amount of the taxes from which it is so exempt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 14301. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 14302. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish separate optometry services in the Armed Forces, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14303. A bill to amend section 5042 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals who are not heads of families to produce wine for personal consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14304. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepaid prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 14305. A bill to authorize and direct the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Wasatch National Forest in the State of Utah by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 14306. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a special program of transportation services for older persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 14307. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14308. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide that partial disability and death pension be paid in the case of persons whose annual income exceeds the annual income limitation by an amount not in excess of the minimum amount of pension payable in 1 year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 14309. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14310. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for individuals aged 65 and older during nonpeak periods of travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 14311. A bill to provide emergency relief to real estate taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14312. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime, to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. REID, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 14313. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for repair or construction work on or about the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14314. A bill to abolish the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to repeal the authority for the extension of the west-central front of the U.S. Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. REID, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 14315. A bill relating to the expenditure of funds for the restoration or extension of the west-central front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14316. A bill to create a fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the fund for endangered wildlife, to be administered by the Department of Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 1149. Joint resolution to protect U.S. domestic and foreign policy interests by making fair employment practices in the South African enterprises of U.S. firms a criteria for eligibility for Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 1150. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 1151. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the month of May as "National Bedding Plant Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YATRON):

H.J. Res. 1152. Joint resolution to designate Benjamin Franklin Memorial Hall at the

Franklin Institute, Philadelphia, Pa., as the national memorial to Benjamin Franklin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.J. Res. 1153. Joint resolution to improve the foreign relations of the United States and enhance the prospects of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H. Res. 918. Resolution requesting certain information from the President and the Secretary of Defense relative to the military involvement of the United States in Indochina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. JONES of Tennessee):

H. Res. 919. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for the rural electrification program for fiscal 1972 should be made available by the administration to carry out that program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

H. Res. 920. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 921. Resolution urging supplemental appropriations to implement the President's message of March 17, 1972, calling for equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

366. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the establishment of certain governmental offices within Oklahoma to be manned by Oklahoma Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 14317. A bill for the relief of Flora Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14318. A bill for the relief of Lola Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14319. A bill for the relief of Jesus Chea and his wife, Maria Chea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 14320. A bill for the relief of Larry Hoyt Lunsford and Estelene Lunsford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14321. A bill for the relief of Maria Francisca Bieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 14322. A bill for the relief of Ismael Bautista Corona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### AN INVITATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

#### HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, we who are from the First State have always prided ourselves in knowing a good thing when we see it; and often the Delaware General Assembly is far ahead of the rest of us in that regard.

I recently received in the mail a copy of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly inviting the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable SPIRO T. AGNEW, to participate in the Third Annual Delaware Legislative Invitation Golf Tournament and banquet on June 9 in Dover, Del.

The resolution makes note of the challenge offered by the previous all-time 18-hole high score of 156 and of the many beautiful shade trees which make expeditions into the rough a pleasure.

I hope that the Vice President takes note of this kind invitation, as I am certain his presence would lend great dignity to the occasion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, sponsored by Representative George Jarvis, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 44

ANNOUNCING THE FORTHCOMING LEGISLATIVE INVITATION GOLF TOURNAMENT AND BANQUET AND EXTENDING AN INVITATION TO ATTEND SAME TO VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO T. AGNEW

Whereas, it has been decided that the Third Annual Delaware Legislative Invitation Golf Tournament and Banquet will be held on June 9, 1972, at Maple Dale Country Club in Dover; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the committee (Senator Melvin A. Slawik and Representative Arthur W. Dobberstein, Co-Chairmen; Lt. Governor Eugene D. Bookhammer; Representatives George Jarvis, Hudson E. Gruwell and R. Glen Mears, Sr.) to make this a super day and evening; and

Whereas, the Vice-President of the United States, noted links-lover Spiro T. Agnew, a resident of our neighboring State of Maryland, was unable to accept an invitation to display his well-publicized golfing talents (?) to a Delaware audience because of an overseas assignment from his boss, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon; and

Whereas, the 126th General Assembly of the State of Delaware would be delighted to have the Vice-President take aim on the all-time high score (156) of the Legislative Invitation, established by Representative Kenneth W. Boulden last year, or the previous high total (134) scored by Senator David H. Elliott in 1970; and

Whereas, the Maple Dale Country Club members on the committee (Representatives Dobberstein and Gruwell) assure the Vice-President that the numerous beautiful trees on this course are most conducive to keeping one cool while searching for errant shots that stray into the rough.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the members of the House of Representatives of the 126th General Assembly, the Senate concur-

ring therein, that a cordial invitation be extended to Vice-President Agnew to participate in the June 9 (rain date: June 12) event.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded immediately to Vice-President Agnew with additional copies to U.S. Senators J. Caleb Boggs and William V. Roth, Jr., Congressman Pierre S. duPont IV, Governor Russell W. Peterson and Republican National Committee Co-Chairman, Thomas B. Evans, Jr., golfer extraordinaire.

### REMARKS OF AXEL SPRINGER TO THE GERMAN ATLANTIC SOCIETY

#### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the privilege of visiting the Springer Verlag in Berlin. I have always been deeply impressed by the quality of the Springer Press and its international reputation. It was only after meeting Axel Springer, its distinguished publisher, and observing his fine organization, however, that I came fully to understand the reasons for that quality and to appreciate that the outstanding reputation of this man and his publications is well deserved.

It is because of the high esteem in which I hold him, as well as the great significance of the issue of detente and the pivotal role in which West Germany