Nickel, Elsie G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nouchi, Mitsue M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rodgers, Marie L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simons, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smyth, Anna M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephenson, Elizabeth, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tirado, Gonzalez C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vance, Vivian J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Ruby E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Mary G., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Barr, Virginia M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Dyer, Arvilla L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gray, Barbara D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinley, Harriet, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reynolds, Cora D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rosengreen, Julia A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rosenthal, Viola L., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be major

Aimi, Alfred C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arnold, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Badger, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barber, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blake, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clary, William P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clemons, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Densford, Charles F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Esher, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fazio, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gardner, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawley, Eric B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hosmer, William, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knapp, Peter T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lackie, Leo D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarty, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Sim C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ramsey, Bobby A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rhodes, Remus C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Riggan, Raymond B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roger, Norvel G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rose, Buel T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Snopek, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Steedly, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sturdivant, Thurman O., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vincent, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Prosper N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watke, Frederic W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Jimmie L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be major

Frosberg, Paul O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petersen, Gordon H., xxx-xx-xxxx.

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Todd, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major

Dodd, Edwin N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kramer, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

Hart, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Stewart, Vivian L., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be captain

Alexander, Lynn P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beegle, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, William J. III., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bouknight, Glenn E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brewer, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Milton E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buhmann, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cabaniss, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caggins, Myles B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chartier, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ciliberti, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cisternino, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cobb, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Corson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
De Gyurky, Szabolcs, xxx-xx-xxxx.
De Moor, Maurice A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Forville, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foster, Jean A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Friel, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frye, Ivan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gallinaro, Alfred S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Garner, Douglas V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graham, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hadden, Majo A. III., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heck, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hewlett, Palmer A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holliday, Jay D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hollis, Joseph E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hughes, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Frank T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kenny, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knapp, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Konieczny, Jerome J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leach, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lenhart, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Letzer, Larry L., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lind, Herbert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mielke, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullek, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oszczakiewicz, Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Piper, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Powell, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reh, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rosenberg, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scialdo, Claudio J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Siemon, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sirace, Joseph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Solomon, Mendel S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stammer, Nelsen F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stewart, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Voelker, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be captain

Bolton, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmerman, Matthew, xxx-xx-xxxx.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captain

Becker, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Oleskevich, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tesch, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captain

Chapple, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLaughlin, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Staley, Leo G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vescovi, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be captain

Boggs, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bratt, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Jerald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutcherson, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meek, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seefeld, Herman W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be captain

Hanna, Jerry N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Maurine L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hooper, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCamley, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 17, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John L. Hazard, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning John D. O'Malley, to be captain, and ending Arthur A. Whiting III, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES — *Monday, April 17, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, president, Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, and, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou art my God, early will I seek Thee.—Psalms 65: 1.

We pray together.

As we come to Thee today, we pray, our Father, that the men and women who meet here and have responsibility in decisionmaking for our Nation will be given:

The energy needed to face their work;

The diligence needed to do it well;

The strength to conquer temptations that will come.

In these days of momentous events give to them and all our leaders:

Wisdom to know when to speak and when to keep silent;

When to act and when to refrain from action.

Help all of us to live today in such a way that our world will be a better place. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9395. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with teachers and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the purchase of annuity contracts;

H.R. 9900. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and of civilian employees who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; and

H.R. 10344. An act to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Compact on Mental Health.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 1346. An act relating to benefits for employees of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1998. An act relating to educational personnel in the District of Columbia;

S. 2956. An act to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86–420, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HART, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CHILES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WEICKER as members, on the part of the Senate, of the U.S. delegation to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, May 16 to 21, 1972.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ELIMINATION OF SURETY BONDS FOR FEDERAL PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13150) to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13150

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

TITLE I—ELIMINATION OF SURETY BONDS FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PERSONNEL

ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL SURETY BONDS

SEC. 101. (a) No agency of the Federal Government may require or obtain surety bonds for its civilian employees or military personnel in connection with the performance of their official duties.

(b) The personal financial liability to the Federal Government of such employees and personnel shall not be affected by reason of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) For the purposes of this title, the term "agency of the Federal Government" means any agency, department, or other entity of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and includes each entity listed as a "wholly owned Government corporation" in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846).

RESTORATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS OF ACCOUNTS OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS AND AGENTS FOR LOSSES TO THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 102. (a) Whenever—

(1) it is necessary to restore or otherwise adjust the account of any accountable officer or his agent for any loss to the United States due to the fault or negligence of such officer or agent, and

(2) the head of the agency of the Federal Government concerned determines that the amount of the loss is uncollectable,

such amount shall be charged to the appropriation or fund available for the expenses of the accountable function at the time the restoration or adjustment is made. Such restoration or adjustment shall not affect the personal financial liability of such officer or agent on account of such loss.

(b) The restorations and adjustments provided for by subsection (a) of this section shall be made in accordance with regulations which the Comptroller General of the United States shall prescribe and issue.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

SEC. 103. (a) For each of the first five full fiscal years following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Congress, on or before the 31st day of December first following the close of such fiscal year, a report of the experience of agencies of the executive branch under this Act in such form as may be necessary to enable the Congress to determine the results of operations under this Act.

(b) Each agency of the executive branch shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury such information as the Secretary may require to carry out the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

EXISTING SURETY BONDS AND LIABILITIES

SEC. 104. Each surety bond procured before the date of enactment of this Act for any of the civilian employees or military personnel of the Federal Government and in effect on such date shall remain in full force and effect for all periods provided in the bond subject to the cancellation and other provisions therein. Any change made by this Act in existing law shall not affect—

(1) any liability of a surety to the Federal Government arising under the provisions of any such bond;

(2) any responsibility of a surety upon any such bond of a consular officer under former section 1735 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 1199); or

(3) the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, concurrently with the courts of the several States, over any action brought on any such bond of an internal revenue officer or employee.

TITLE II—CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

PART 1—CHANGES IN TITLES OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENACTED AS POSITIVE LAW

TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 201. The first sentence of section 109 of title 3, United States Code, relating to the bond required of the employee placed in charge of certain property in the Executive Mansion, is amended by striking out ", and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, give bond for the faithful discharge thereof, said bond to be in the sum of $10,000, and to be approved by the Director of the National Park Service".

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 202. Section 5512(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and his sureties".

TITLE 6, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 203. Title 6, United States Code, relating to official and penal bonds, is modified as follows:

(1) sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 14 are repealed;

(2) the last sentence of section 6 is amended by striking out "Except with respect to bonds obtained under section 14 of this title, no" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "No";

(3) the table of sections of such title is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 14; and

(4) the title of such title 6 which reads "Title 6—Official and Penal Bonds" is amended to read "Title 6—Surety Bonds".

TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 204. (a) Section 4834, relating to fidelity bonds of commissioned officers of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, and section 6026, relating to bonds of officers in the Supply Corps, United States Navy, of title 10, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 453 of such title 10 is amended by striking out—

"4834. Fidelity bonds: accountable officers; Quartermaster Corps.".

(c) The table of sections of chapter 555 of such title 10 is amended by striking out—

"6026. Supply Corps officers: bonds.".

TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 205. (a) Section 204 of title 17, United States Code, relating to the bond required of the Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 3 of such title 17 is amended by striking out—

"204. Same; bond.".

TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 206. (a)(1) Section 564 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections of chapter 37 of such title 28 is amended by striking out—

"564. Bond.".

(b) Section 566 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the default or misfeasance of a deputy in connection with the bond of a deceased United States marshal, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)"; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b) thereof.

(c) Section 671(b) of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bond of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, is repealed.

(d) The last sentence of section 674(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bond of the librarian of the Supreme Court, is repealed.

(e)(1) Section 952 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of clerks and deputies of Federal courts other than the Supreme Court, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections of chapter 57 of such title 28 is amended by striking out—

"952. Bonds of clerks and deputies.".

(f)(1) The second paragraph of section 954 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the default or misfeasance of a deputy in connection with the bond of a deceased clerk of a Federal court, is repealed.

(2) The section heading of such section 954, and the item relating to such section 954 in the table of sections of chapter 57 of such title 28, each is amended by striking out "and remedies against".

TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 207. Section 708(b)(1) of title 32, United States Code, relating to the bond required of property and fiscal officers of the National Guard, is repealed.

TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 208. (a) Section 5 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the bond required of the Commissioner of Patents and other officers of the Department of Commerce, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 1 of such title 35 is amended by striking out—

"5. Bond of Commissioner and other officers.".

TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 209. Section 4204(4) of title 38, United States Code, relating to fidelity bonds of employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service, is amended by striking out "and premiums on fidelity bonds of employees".

TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 210. (a)(1) The last sentence of section 301 of title 44, United States Code, relating to the bond of the Public Printer, is repealed.

(2) The section heading of such section 301 is amended by striking out "; bond".

(3) The item relating to section 301 in the table of sections of chapter 3 of such title 44 is amended by striking out "; bond".

(b) Section 308(b) of title 44, United

States Code, relating to the bond of a disbursing officer of the Government Printing Office, is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence ", his estate, or the surety on his official bond," and inserting in lieu thereof "or his estate"; and

(2) by striking out in the second sentence "and the sureties upon his bond are" and inserting in lieu thereof "is".

PART 2—CHANGES IN PROVISIONS OF LAW CONTAINED IN TITLES OF THE UNITED STATES CODE NOT ENACTED AS POSITIVE LAW

TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 220. (a) Section 57 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 65), relating to the bond of the Secretary of the Senate, is repealed.

(b) Section 58 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 75), relating to the bond of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, is repealed.

(c) Section 59 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 65 and 75), relating to the depositing of the bonds of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, is repealed.

(d) Sections 4 and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act defining certain duties of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes", approved October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 645, 646; 2 U.S.C. 82), relating to the bond of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, is repealed.

(e) Section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-six, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 897, 2 U.S.C. 82), is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth paragraphs.

(f) The last sentence in the fourth paragraph under the center heading "Library of Congress" and with the side heading "Custody, Care, and Maintenance of Library Building and Grounds" in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, and for other purposes", approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 546; 2 U.S.C. 136, second sentence), relating to the bond of the Librarian of Congress, is repealed.

(g) The last paragraph under the heading "Senate" in the First Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1926 (84 Stat. 810; 2 U.S.C. 64a), relating to the bond of the Financial Clerk of the Senate in case of the death, resignation, or disability of the Secretary of the Senate, is amended by striking out ", under his bond as Financial Clerk,".

(h) That part of the Act entitled "An Act to abolish the office of administrative assistant and disbursing officer in the Library of Congress and to reassign the duties thereof", approved May 11, 1928 (45 Stat. 497; 2 U.S.C. 142a), which reads ": *Provided*, That the person who shall disburse the appropriations for the Library of Congress and the Botanic Garden shall give bond payable to the United States in the sum of $30,000, with sureties approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the faithful discharge of his duties", is repealed.

(i) Section 7 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 350; 2 U.S.C. 75a), relating to the bond of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the disbursing clerk of the House, is amended—

(1) by striking out in the third sentence ", his estate, or the sureties on his official bond," and inserting in lieu thereof "or his estate";

(2) by striking out in such third sentence "but such disbursing clerk and his sureties shall be responsible therefor under their bond" and inserting in lieu thereof "but such disbursing clerk shall be responsible therefor"; and

(3) by striking out the last two sentences which read as follows:

"The bond for the disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives shall be in the same amount as the bond required of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require such disbursing clerk to renew his bond to the United States.".

(j) Section 105(n) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 372; 2 U.S.C. 123b(n)), relating to the bonds of the Director of the House Recording Studio and the Director of the Senate Recording Studio, is repealed.

(k) Clause (2) of that part of the first section, preceding the first proviso in that section, of the Act entitled "An Act to fix the responsibilities of certifying officers and disbursing officer of the Library of Congress", approved June 13, 1957 (71 Stat. 81; 2 U.S.C. 142b), which reads "(2) be required to give bond to the United States, with good and sufficient surety approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such amount as may be determined by the Librarian of Congress, pursuant to standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury;", is repealed.

TITLE 7, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 221. (a) Section 524 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2216), relating to the bond of the chief clerk of the Department of Agriculture, is repealed.

(b) Section 507(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (52 Stat. 73; 7 U.S.C. 1507(a)), relating to the personnel of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" immediately before "delegate"; and

(2) by striking out ", require bond of such of them as he may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums of such bonds".

TITLE 11, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 222. (a) Section 50 of the Bankruptcy Act (30 Stat. 558; 11 U.S.C. 78), relating to the bonds of referees, receivers, and trustees, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a), relating to the bonds of referees;

(2) by striking out "referees," in subsection (g);

(3) by striking out "referees," in subsection (h);

(4) by striking out "referee," in subsection (k); and

(5) by striking out subsection (l), relating to the period during which proceedings may be brought upon referees' bonds.

(b) Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a)(5) of this section, proceedings upon referees' bonds procured before the date of enactment of this Act and in effect on such date may be brought at any time during the period ending two years after the alleged breach of the bond, but not thereafter.

TITLE 12, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 223. (a) Section 326 of the Revised Statues (12 U.S.C. 3), relating to the oath and bond of the Comptroller of the Currency, is amended by striking out "; and he shall give to the United States a bond in the penalty of $250,000, with not less than two responsible sureties, to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office".

(b) Section 327 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 4), relating to the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, is amended by striking out ", and give the United States a surety bond in the penalty of $100,000, to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office,".

(c) Section 309(d) of the National Housing Act (68 Stat. 621; 12 U.S.C. 1723a(d)), relating to the personnel of the Government National Mortgage Association, is amended by striking out "Bonds may be required for the faithful performance of their duties, and the Association may pay the premiums therefor.".

TITLE 15 UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 224. (a) Section 5(a) of the Small Business Act (72 Stat. 385; 15 U.S.C. 634(a)), relating to the general powers of the Small Business Administration, is amended by striking out "to provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine;".

(b) Section 10 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (62 Stat. 1073; 15 U.S.C. 714h), relating to the executive staff of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is amended by striking out—

(1) ", require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor"; and

(2) "The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds."

TITLE 16, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 225. (a) Section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 59; 16 U.S.C. 831b), relating to personnel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is amended by striking out "require bonds of such of them as the board may designate,".

(b) Section 4(f) of such Act (48 Stat. 60; 16 U.S.C. 831c(f)), relating to the bonds of the treasurer and assistant treasurers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is amended by striking out ", which treasurer and assistant treasurers shall give such bonds for the safekeeping of the securities and moneys of the said Corporation as the Board may require".

TITLE 19, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 226. Sections 2619 and 2620 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 31, 32), relating to the bonds of customs officers and authorizing regulations therefor, are repealed.

TITLE 22, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 227. (a) Section 1735 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 1199), relating to the liability of consular officers for neglect or malfeasance generally, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and his sureties upon his official bond" and "of the penalty" in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) by striking out ", under such bond," in the last sentence thereof.

(b) Section 35 of the Act entitled "An Act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor", approved February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1216; 22 U.S.C. 813), is amended—

(1) by striking out "bonded" immediately before "officers" in the fourth sentence thereof; and

(2) by striking out the sixth sentence thereof which reads as follows:

"Said district accounting and disbursing officers and their agents shall be bonded respectively to the United States for the faithful performance of their duties in such penal amounts as the President may require.".

(c) Section 1011 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 808), relating to bonds of officers and employees of the Foreign Service, is repealed.

(d) Section 239(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 816; 22 U.S.C. 2199(d)), relating to the general powers of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is amended by striking out "to require bonds of officers, employees, and agents and pay the premiums therefor;".

TITLE 24, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 228. (a) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 565; 24 U.S.C. 43), relating to the bond of the treasurer of the Soldiers' Home, is amended by striking out ", and the treasurer of the home shall be required to give a bond in the penal sum of $20,000 for the faithful performance of his duty".

(b) Section 4839 of the Revised Statutes (35 Stat. 592; 24 U.S.C. 165), relating to the bonds of the superintendent and disbursing clerk of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, is amended—

(1) by striking out ", and shall give bond for the faithful performance of his duties in such sum and with such securities as may be required by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) by striking out "who shall give a bond satisfactory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," in the second sentence thereof.

(c) The second paragraph under the subheading "Saint Elizabeths Hospital" under the general heading "Department of the Interior" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes", approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 920; 24 U.S.C. 166), is amended by striking out "who shall give a bond satisfactory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and".

TITLE 25, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 229. (a) Section 2075 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 51), which reads "Sec. 2075. The President may, from time to time, require additional security, and in larger amounts, from all persons charged or trusted, under the laws of the United States, with the disbursement or application of money, goods, or effects of any kind, on account of Indian affairs.", is repealed.

(b) Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to legalize the deed and other records of the Office of Indian Affairs, and to provide and authorize the use of a seal by said office", approved July 26, 1892 (27 Stat. 273; 25 U.S.C. 7), is amended by striking out "who shall give bond in the sum of one thousand dollars,".

(c) The Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and five, and for other purposes," approved April 21, 1904 (33 Stat. 191; 25 U.S.C. 66, 52a), is amended—

(1) by striking out, in the twenty-fifth paragraph under the center heading "Current and Contingent Expenses", the sentence relating to the bond of superintendents of Indian training schools which reads "And the superintendent upon whom such duties devolve shall give a bond as other Indian agents."; and

(2) by striking out, in the thirty-second paragraph under the center heading "Current and Contingent Expenses", the proviso which reads ": *Provided*, That hereafter when it becomes necessary to make large per capita payments to Indians, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to require any disbursing officer of the Indian Department to file a special bond in such amount as may be necessary to make such payment in one installment, the expenses incurred in procuring such special bond to be paid by the United States from this appropriation".

(d) Title II of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight", approved March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1020; 25 U.S.C. 66), is amended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof the following: "And the superintendent upon whom such duties devolve shall give a bond as other Indian agents."

(e) The second paragraph under the subheading "Secretary" under the general heading "I. General Provisions" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine", approved April 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 71; 25 U.S.C. 52), which reads—

"Hereafter when the Secretary of the Interior deems a new bond necessary he may, in his discretion, require any disbursing officer under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to execute a new bond, with approved sureties, in such amount as he may deem necessary, and when accepted and approved by the Secretary of the Interior the new bond shall be valid and the surety or sureties of the prior bond shall be released from liability for all acts or defaults of the principal which may be done or committed from and after the day on which the new bond was approved." is repealed.

(f) The proviso in the second paragraph under the center heading "Advertisement for Sale of Indian Lands (Reimbursable)" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921", approved February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. 414; 25 U.S.C. 53), is amended—

(1) by striking out "the official bond given by the disbursing agent to the United States shall be held to cover and apply to the acts of the employees authorized to act in his place, who shall give bond to the disbursing agent in such sums as the latter may require, and with respect to any and all acts performed by him while acting for his principal, shall be subject to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law for official misconduct of disbursing agents."; and

(2) by inserting in lieu thereof "such clerk, while acting for his principal, shall be subject to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law for official misconduct of disbursing agents.".

TITLE 26, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 230. (a) Section 6803(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating, in part, to bonds for postmasters who are furnished certain stamps and other devices, is repealed.

(b) Section 7101 of such Code, relating to the form of certain bonds, is amended by striking out "sections 7485 and 6803(a)(1)" and by inserting in lieu thereof "section 7485".

(c) Section 7103(e) of such Code, relating to cross references to provisions for personnel bonds, is repealed.

(d) Section 7402(d) of such Code, relating to actions brought on the official bond of certain internal revenue officers or employees, is repealed.

(e) Section 7803(c) of such Code, relating to the bonds of internal revenue officers and employees, is repealed.

TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 231. (a) The first sentence of section 176 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 419–1), relating to the bonds of disbursing clerks of executive departments, is amended by striking out "; and shall each give a bond to the United States for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office according to law in such amount as shall be directed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and with sureties to the satisfaction of the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury; and shall from time to time renew, strengthen, and increase his official bond, as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct".

(b) Section 302 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 142), relating to the bond of the Treasurer of the United States, is repealed.

(c) Section 304 of the Revised Statutes (49 Stat. 1238, 68 Stat. 496; 31 U.S.C. 144) is amended by striking out ": *Provided, however*, That no appointments shall be made under the provisions of this section until the official bond given by the Treasurer shall be made in terms to cover and apply to the acts and defaults of every person appointed hereunder".

(d) Section 375 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 1012), relating to false reports of collectors with respect to bonds delivered for suit, is repealed.

(e) Section 378 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 1013), relating to the report of the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury to the officer from whom a bond was received, is repealed.

(f) Section 3501 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 270), relating to the bonds of certain officers, assistants, and clerks in the Bureau of the Mint, Department of the Treasury, is repealed.

(g) Section 3555 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 281), relating to officers of the New York assay office, Bureau of the Mint, is amended by striking out "the oaths to be taken, and the bonds and sureties to be given by them," and inserting in lieu thereof "and the oaths to be taken,".

(h) Section 3600 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 475), relating to the bonds of officers in mints or assay offices authorized by law to act as depositaries, is repealed.

(i) Section 3613 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 480), relating to certain deputies in the Department of the Treasury, is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof which reads as follows: "The official bond given by the principal of the office shall be held to cover and apply to the acts of the person appointed to act in his place in such cases.".

(j) Section 3614 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 481), relating to the bonds of special agents employed by departments, is repealed.

(k) Section 3625 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 506), relating to distress warrants against sureties of certain officials who receive public moneys and fail to render proper account and payment, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and his sureties" wherever such words occur in the first sentence thereof;

(2) by striking out, in such first sentence, the word "reside" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "resides";

(3) by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows:

"Where the officer resides in a district other than that in which his estate may be, which it is intended to take and sell, then such warrant shall be directed to the marshals of such districts, respectively.".

(l) Section 3628 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 509), relating to the execution of a distress warrant against the sureties of a delinquent finance officer, is repealed.

(m) Section 3629 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 510), relating to liens on lands of delinquent officers and their sureties, is amended by striking out "and his sureties" and "or them".

(n) Section 3630 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 511), relating to the sale of lands of delinquent officers and their sureties, is

amended by striking out "or his sureties," and "and his sureties".

(o) Section 3631 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 512), relating to the validity of the conveyance by a United States marshal of lands of a delinquent officer and his sureties, is amended by striking out "or his sureties".

(p) Section 3632 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 513), relating to the return to a delinquent officer or his surety of moneys in excess of amounts needed to satisfy distress warrants, is amended by striking out "or surety, as the case may be".

(q) Section 3634 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 516), applying the distress-warrant provisions of the Revised Statutes to all Government officers charged with disbursement of public money and to their sureties, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and to their sureties,"; and

(2) by striking out "they" and inserting in lieu thereof "he".

(r) Section 3639 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 521), relating to the duties of officers who are custodians of the public money, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof which reads as follows: "The President is authorized, if in his opinion the interest of the United States requires the same, to regulate and increase the sums for which bonds are, or may be, required by law, of all United States attorneys, collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, and surveyors of customs, Navy agents, Quartermaster General, registers of public lands, paymasters in the Army, and by all other officers employed in the disbursement of the public moneys, under the direction of the Department of the Army or the Navy Department.".

(s)(1) Section 3646(a) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 528(a)), relating to issuance by the Secretary of the Treasury of duplicate checks for lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced original checks, is amended by striking out "or his sureties" wherever such words occur in the proviso contained therein.

(2) The last sentence of section 3646(c) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 528(c)) is amended by striking out "or his sureties" wherever such words occur in such sentence.

(t) The second proviso under the heading "United States Courts" and with the side heading "Payment of fees in postal cases" contained in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-six, and for prior years, and for other purposes", approved February 26, 1896 (29 Stat. 25; 31 U.S.C. 110), which reads "; *Provided further*, That hereafter all fees for United States attorneys, marshals, clerks of courts and special counsel necessarily employed in prosecuting civil suits instituted by the Auditor for the Post Office Department through the Solicitor of the Treasury against the sureties on the official bonds of late postmasters, as provided for by section two hundred and ninety-two, Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be paid from the appropriations for expenses of the United States Courts", is repealed.

(u) The second proviso under the heading "Miscellaneous" and with the side heading "Silk Investigations" contained in the Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three", approved June 3, 1902 (32 Stat. 303; 31 U.S.C. 533), which reads "*And provided further*, That advances of public money from the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture only to such chiefs of field parties, agricultural explorers, special agents, and others as shall have given bonds in such sums as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct", is repealed.

(v) That part of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine", approved May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 259; 31 U.S.C. 534), relating to bonds required of chiefs of field parties who are advanced public moneys for fighting forest fires, which is under the heading "Forest Service" and with the side caption "General Expenses, Forest Service", and which reads "and hereafter advances of money under any appropriation for the Forest Service may be made to the Forest Service and by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to chiefs of field parties for fighting forest fires in emergency cases, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, and detailed accounts arising under such advances shall be rendered through and by the Department of Agriculture to the General Accounting Office;" is amended by striking out ", who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct,".

(w) Section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and ten, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1027; 31 U.S.C. 494), relating to the bond of an acting disbursing officer in case of sickness or absence of disbursing clerk or disbursing agent, is amended—

(1) by striking out the second sentence thereof which reads as follows: "The official bond given by the principal of the office shall be held to cover and apply to the acts of the person appointed to act in his place in such cases."; and

(2) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the following: ", and such acting officer shall be required by the head of the department, independent bureau, or office to give bond to and in such sums as the disbursing clerk or disbursing agent may require".

(x) The paragraph under the heading "Treasury Department" and the sideheading "Offices of disbursing clerks" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eleven, and for other purposes", approved June 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 487; 31 U.S.C. 1015), relating to the bond of the deputy disbursing clerk of the Treasury Department, is amended—

(1) by striking out "he shall give bond to the disbursing clerk in such sum as the said disbursing clerk may require,"; and

(2) by striking out ", and the official bond of the disbursing clerk executed hereunder shall be made to cover and apply to the acts of the deputy disbursing clerk".

(y) The first paragraph immediately above the center heading "Life Saving Service" and with the sideheading "Compensation for disbursements restricted to bonded appointees" contained in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and twelve, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1387; 31 U.S.C. 546), is amended by striking out "and who have qualified by giving bonds".

(z) The first proviso under the heading "Department of Commerce" and under the subheading "Coast and Geodetic Survey" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nineteen, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 688; 31 U.S.C. 550), relating to the bond required of chiefs of parties under the Coast and Geodetic Survey who are advanced public moneys, is amended by striking out ", who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of Commerce may direct,".

(aa) The Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nineteen", approved April 15, 1918 (40 Stat. 523; 31 U.S.C. 535), and the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922", approved March 2, 1921 (41 Stat. 1210; 31 U.S.C. 535), relating to the bond required of the commissioner on the part of the United States who is advanced public moneys in connection with activities regarding the United States-Canada boundary, which is under the heading "Boundary Line, Alaska and Canada, and The United States and Canada", are each amended by striking out in the first proviso thereto the following:", who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct,".

(bb) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize disbursing officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to designate deputies", approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 888; 31 U.S.C. 103a), is amended—

(1) by striking out "and the consent of their surety or sureties, if any"; and

(2) by striking out ": *Provided*, That every deputy so designated for a disbursing officer who is bonded shall, if not already under bond, give bond as required by the head of the department concerned".

(cc) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes", approved December 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 875; 31 U.S.C. 82c), is amended by striking out "(2) be required to give bond to the United States, with good and sufficient surety approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such amount as may be determined by the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, pursuant to standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (2)".

(dd) The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer", approved December 24, 1942 (61 Stat. 717; 31 U.S.C. 1014), is amended—

(1) by striking out in the third sentence "his estate, or the surety on his official bond" and inserting in lieu thereof "or his estate";

(2) by striking out in such third sentence ", and his surety," and "under his bond"; and

(3) by striking out the last two sentences which read as follows:

"The bond of the Acting Chief Disbursing Officer or acting regional disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the Chief Disbursing Officer or the regional disbursing officer, respectively. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer, or the assistant regional disbursing officer, to renew and increase his bond to the United States.".

(ee) The first proviso in the Act entitled "An Act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes", approved May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 101;

31 U.S.C. 82i), is amended by striking out "or his surety".

(ff) The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, incapacity, or separation from office of a disbursing officer of the military department", approved July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 296; 31 U.S.C. 103b), is amended—

(1) by striking out in the third sentence ", his estate, or the surety on his official bond," and inserting in lieu there "or his estate";

(2) by striking out in such third sentence "and his surety," and "under his bond"; and

(3) by striking out the last two sentences thereof which read as follows:

"The bond of the deputy disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the disbursing officer. The Secretary of the military department concerned may, from time to time, require the deputy disbursing officer to renew and increase his bond to the United States.".

(gg) The proviso contained in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 176; 31 U.S.C. 95b), is amended by striking out "disbursing officer, agent, or surety of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "disbursing officer or agent of the United States".

TITLE 33, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 232. Section 4(a)(7) of the Act entitled "An Act for creation of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the Saint Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation of consummate certain arrangements with the Saint Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the Saint Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes", approved May 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 94; 33 U.S.C. 984(a)(7)), relating to the power of Corporation to require fidelity bonds of its employees, is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" immediately before "delegates"; and

(2) by striking out ", require bonds of such of them as the Administrator may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds".

TITLE 47, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. BCC. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize payment of expenses of the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System out of receipts of such system as an operating expense", approved May 20, 1926 (44 Stat. 576; 47 U.S.C. 16), is amended by striking out "; and the expenses of procuring necessary official bonds, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, of enlisted men employed in connection with such money transfers, shall be paid out of the receipts of such system as an operating expense".

TITLE 48, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 234. Section 4(1) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 352; 48 U.S.C. 1407c(1)), relating to personnel of the Virgin Islands Corporation, is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" immediately before "without regard to the provisions of any other law," and

(2) by striking out "; and to require bonds from such of them as the Corporation may designate, the premiums therefore to be paid by the Corporation".

TITLE 50 APPENDIX, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 235. Section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes", approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 415; 50 App. U.S.C. 6), relating to the bond of the alien property custodian, is amended by striking out "The alien form and amount, and with such security as the President property custodian shall give such bond or bonds, and in such shall prescribe.".

PART 3—CHANGES IN PROVISIONS OF LAW CONTAINED IN THE CANAL ZONE CODE

TITLE 2, CANAL ZONE CODE

SEC. 240. Section 121(a) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 15; 2 C.Z.C. 121(a)), relating to the bonds of certain personnel of the Panama Canal Company, is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon in paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

PART 4—GENERAL REPEAL PROVISION

GENERAL REPEALER

SEC. 250. All laws or parts of laws not amended or repealed by part 1, 2, or 3 of this title and providing for surety or fidelity bonds for civilian employees and military personnel of the Federal Government for the faithful performance of their duties are repealed.

PART 5—REENACTMENT OF FORMER PROVISION OF TITLE 6, UNITED STATES CODE

NOTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCIES INCURRED BY FEDERAL OFFICIALS

SEC. 260. Whenever any deficiency is discovered in the accounts of any official of the United States or in the accounts of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, the accounting officers making such discovery shall notify immediately the head of the department having control over the affairs of such official or officer of the nature and amount of such deficiency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "and" and insert "or".

Page 8, line 7, strike out "branches" and insert "branch".

Page 10, line 2, strike out "897" and insert "807;".

Page 19, line 13, strike out "a".

Page 20, line 7, strike out "thereof" and insert "under the heading 'Indian Agents—Proviso' ".

Page 20, line 9, strike out "a".

Page 21, line 14, strike out "employees" and insert "employee".

Page 27, lines 10 and 11, strike out "and with the side heading 'Payment of fees in postal cases' ".

Page 31, line 24, strike out "visio" and insert "viso".

Page 36, strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert the following:

(1) by inserting "and" immediately before "without regard to the provisions of any other law," and

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE PACIFIC TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9135) to amend the Act of August 19, 1964, to remove the limitation on the maximum number of members of the board of trustees of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 9135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to charter by Act of Congress the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden", approved August 19, 1964 (Public Law 88-449), is amended by striking out the second sentence.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to express my support for H.R. 9135, a bill I authored and cosponsored, which would remove the limit on the number of trustees permitted to serve on the board of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden.

This measure, also sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), has been expeditiously brought to the floor for consideration through the efforts of the Judiciary Committee and its Subcommittee No. 4, chaired respectively by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS). I am grateful for their diligent efforts, and those of the other members of those panels.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill to accomplish a simple purpose. In 1964, Congress passed a bill which I introduced and which granted a Federal charter to the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden for the purpose of establishing for the American people an educational and scientific center in tropical botany and furthering research and study with regard to the uses of tropical botany in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, medicine, and other sciences. The garden is located on the Hawaiian island of Kauai, within walking distance from where I was born. Despite the Federal charter, no Federal funds, only private resources, have been expended for the development of the garden.

The 1964 charter establishes a maximum membership for the garden's board of trustees at 15. For a variety of reasons, the present board feels that the limitation should now be removed, and that is the sole purpose of H.R. 9135.

Representatives now serving on the board of trustees come from the Mid-Atlantic States, the District of Columbia, the Midwest, California, the Southwest, and Hawaii. In terms of interests and professions, the Board now has representatives of the medical profession, the business community, the education community, garden clubs, and nonprofit institutions. I shall offer for inclusion at the conclusion of my remarks a list of the current board members. Prudent expansion of the board would enable the garden to draw interest and support

from a wider geographical and professional background, contributing inestimably to its further development.

Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively minor measure in terms of the often weighty matters which concern this House, but its approval and enactment would substantially improve the capacity of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden to achieve its worthy goals. I urge its unanimous passage.

I offer at this point a list of the present membership of the garden's board of trustees and a Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial explaining the garden's work in the RECORD:

PACIFIC TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDEN

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, MARCH 1972

John Gregg Allerton, Lawai-Kai, Hawaii.
Robert O. Anderson, Roswell, New Mexico.
I. W. Colburn, Chicago, Illinois.
Harold J. Coolidge, Washington, D.C.
Lowell S. Dillingham, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Mrs. Nicholas R. du Pont, Greenville, Delaware.
Deane W. Malott, Chairman, Ithaca, New York.
Mrs. William Wood McCarthy, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Milton McGreevy, Kansas City, Missouri
H. Bruce Palmer, New York, New York.
S. Dillon Ripley, Washington, D.C.
Edward H. Rynearson, M.D., Rochester, Minnesota.
Herbert C. Shipman, Hilo, Hawaii.
Mrs. Gardiner Symonds, Houston, Texas.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 15, 1971]

NATURE PRESERVED

Off and growing on Kauai is an asset that is under-appreciated: The first unit of the congressionally-chartered Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden.

A 200-acre slice of the island adjoining and just mauka of the private 150-acre Allerton Gardens is to be preserved, hopefully, for all time—for garden development.

Here nature will be preserved instead of destroyed.

Here at a time of urgent concern over environment a very positive step has been taken entirely with private funds.

The 200 acres were acquired from McBryde Sugar Co. with a $1 million grant from the late Robert Allerton, whose lush gardens lie below the site.

Mr. Allerton was a Chicago resident who more than 30 years ago fell in love with Kauai and decided to use his considerable fortune to preserve and enhance a part of it.

His adopted son, John Allerton, now continues the development of the private gardens at sea level and is, as well, a leading worker for the Pacific Botanical Garden project on the high slopes.

On Jan. 30 the Pacific Botanical Garden administration headquarters at Lawai was officially dedicated and announcement was made of a national drive to raise $5.8 million to expand and enlarge the project so that the "mother garden" at Lawai will eventually have satellite gardens elsewhere in Hawaii and perhaps outside the State as well.

The project won a congressional charter in 1964 which gives it national recognition and assures its tax-exempt status but leaves its financing to private philanthropy.

The price of preserving nature, fortunately, is still on a square foot basis only a millionth of the cost of owning a painting by an old master—and much more rewarding to most.

On this basis it is hoped the appeal of the Botanic Garden will spread and that its national board of directors will manage to raise the funds to carry it forward and expand it.

At Lawai's dedication Thomas Jefferson was quoted on the importance of botanical gardens and mention was made of gardens elsewhere in the world that are hundreds of years old.

Lawai can well join this list. It is starting, under the direction of its scientific director, William S. Stewart, to immediately protect and preserve endangered Hawaiian plant species. It will move on from there to collect tropical plants which show indication of having medicinal value, and later will search out tropical plants of potential economic or ornamental value.

The emphasis, it will be noted, is on tropical—an area where Hawaii can make a unique contribution to the U.S. and where Lawai can make a special contribution to Hawaii.

Colin Lennox, former territorial forester, said at the dedication that there is no place in the world the size of Hawaii with such a diversity of plants and that Lawai is the best of all Hawaii sites for the "mother garden."

W. W. G. Moir, Mrs. Loy Marks and the late Mr. Allerton were singled out at the dedication as the Islanders who have had most to do with the creation of the garden.

They have rallied around them distinguished national and international support.

The project has been building for almost 18 years but finally is reality. It can be a monument to all its founders that can and should endure for centuries.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECALL OF RETIRED COURT OF CLAIMS COMMISSIONERS FOR TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12979) to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the recall of retired commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims for temporary assignments.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 12979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Represented of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the chapter analysis of chapter 51 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto the following new catchline:

"797. Recall of retired commissioners."

SEC. 2. Chapter 51 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"§ 797. Recall of retired commissioners

"(a) Any commissioner who has retired from regular active service under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be known and designated as a senior commissioner and may perform duties as a commissioner when recalled pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The United States Court of Claims, whenever it deems such action advisable, may recall any senior commissioner, with the latter's acquiescence, to perform such duties as a commissioner and for such period of time as the court may specify.

"(c) Any senior commissioner performing duties pursuant to this section shall not be counted as a commissioner for purposes of the number of commissioner positions authorized by section 792 of this title.

"(d) Any senior commissioner, while performing duties pursuant to this section, shall be paid the same allowances for travel and other expenses as a commissioner in active service. He shall also receive from the Court of Claims supplemental pay in an amount sufficient, when added to his civil service retirement annuity, to equal the salary of a commissioner in active service for the same period or periods of time. Such supplemental pay shall be paid in the same manner as the salary of a commissioner."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN STAR ROUTE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1989) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the renewal of certain star route contracts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 1989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5005(b)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the word "holder" the words "or an individual performing the mail transportation services under such a contract".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 5005(b)(2) of tite 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'holder' and inserting in lieu thereof 'contractor or subcontractor'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS IN FAVOR OF MIAMI TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA AND THE MIAMI INDIANS OF INDIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5199) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255, 256, 124–C, D, E, and F, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Indians in the Commissioner's docket numbered 251–A, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5199

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds appropriated by the Act of July 22, 1969 (83 Stat. 49), to pay judgments awarded to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255, 256, 124 C, D, E, and F, and to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in the Commission's docket numbered 251 A, together with interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and litigation expenses, shall be distributed as provided in this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary may make appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds and interest thereon, using interest funds first, to pay costs incident to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall bring current to the date of this Act the roll prepared pursuant to section 4 of the Act of October 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 909), by (a) adding the names of children born to enrollees on or prior to and living on the date of this Act, (b) by adding the names of persons living on the date of this Act who were eligible for enrollment under said section 4 but were not enrolled, and the names of their children born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act, and (c) by deleting the names of persons who are deceased as of the date of this Act.

SEC. 4. An application for addition of a name to the roll pursuant to section 3 of this Act must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility of an applicant shall be final.

SEC. 5. On completion of the roll by the Secretary of the Interior, the balance of the funds appropriated to satisfy the judgments in dockets numbered 255, 256, 124 C, D, E, and F, and interest accumulated thereon, shall be distributed equally to the individuals enrolled.

SEC. 6. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of July 22, 1969 (83 Stat. 49), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 251–A, together with the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 7. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall distribute a per capita share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, and shall distribute a per capita share payable to a deceased enrollee directly to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than eighteen years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary of the Interior determines appropriate to protect the best interest of such persons.

SEC. 8. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax and shall not be subject to any lien, debt, or attorney fees except delinquent debts owed to the tribe or the United States.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior is authoried to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the establishment of deadlines.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, through Page 2, line 4, strike out all section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the funds appropriated by the Acts of July 22, 1969 (83 Stat. 49), and January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1981), to pay judgments awarded to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255 and 124–C, dockets numbered 256, 124–D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and to pay a judgment awarded to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 251–A, together with interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and litigation expenses, shall be distributed as provided in this Act."

Page 3, lines 1 through 5, strike out all of Section 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. On completion of the roll by the Secretary of the Interior, the balance of the funds appropriated to satisfy the judgments in dockets numbered 255 and 124–C, dockets numbered 256, 124–D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and interest accumulated thereon, shall be distributed equally to the individuals enrolled."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "thall" and insert "shall".

Page 4, lines 4 through 8, strike out all of Section 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 8. None of the funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 5199, as amended, is to authorize the distribution and use of four judgments in favor of the Miami Indians totaling in excess of $5.25 million.

A prior judgment in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma has been distributed pursuant to a roll prepared under a 1966 statute—80 Stat. 909—and the pending bill provides that the 1966 roll will be brought up to date and used for the distribution of these new judgments. This roll is a descendancy roll covering about 3,066 Miami Indians of Indiana and 816 Miami Indians of Oklahoma. It will be updated by deleting the names of deceased persons, by adding the names of children born since 1966, and by adding the names of persons who were eligible for enrollment under the 1966 Act but were not enrolled.

The entire judgment fund will be distributed per capita to the Indians on the updated roll, with the exception of $10,000 which belongs exclusively to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and will be retained by the tribal organization.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 255 and 124–C, dockets numbered 256, 124–D, E, and F, and dockets numbered 131 and 253, and of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 251–A, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7093) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute per capita to all persons whose names appear on the roll of the Osage Tribe of Indians approved by the Secretary of the Interior September 24, 1921, pursuant to the Act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), all funds which were appropriated by the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1981), in satisfaction of a judgment that was obtained by the Osage Nation of Indians in the Indian Claims Commission against the United States in dockets numbered 105, 106, 107, and 108, together with interest thereon, except the sum of $1,000,000 and any funds that revert to the Osage Tribe to be expended for an education program or other programs beneficial to the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and except the amount allowed for attorney fees and expenses and the cost of distribution.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may make appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds and interest thereon, using interest funds first, to pay costs incident to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, a share or proportional share payable to a living original Osage allottee shall be paid to such allottee.

(b) A share of a deceased Osage allottee having died prior to or after the passage of this Act shall be distributed to his heirs of Osage Indian blood pursuant to an order determining heirs by the Secretary of the Interior or a court of competent jurisdiction of the State of Oklahoma, and such distributions by the Secretary of the Interior shall be final and conclusive. In the event the heirs of Osage Indian blood of an Osage Indian having died prior to or after the passage of this Act have not been determined by the Secretary of the Interior or a court of competent jurisdiction of the State of Oklahoma, such share shall be distributed to the heirs of Osage Indian blood upon the filing of proof of death and inheritance in accordance with the Oklahoma law of intestate succession in a form satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior whose findings and determinations upon such proof shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That when a person of Osage Indian blood receives an amount totaling less than $20 from one or more shares of one or more Osage allottees, that amount shall not be distributed to the individual, but will revert to the Osage Tribe.

(c) A share or proportional share payable to a person of Osage Indian blood under eighteen years of age and any person under guardianship pursuant to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction notwithstanding the fact he has received a certificate of competency shall be disbursed under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. All claims for per capita shares by heirs of Osage Indian blood shall be filed with the Superintendent, Osage Agency, Pawhuska, Oklahoma, not later than eighteen months from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the Osage Tribe. Unclaimed shares of distributees shall revert to the Osage Tribe six months after determination by the Secretary of the Interior of their right to share.

SEC. 4. No part of any funds which may be distributed under this Act shall be subject to Federal and State income tax, nor subject to any lien, debt, or claim of any nature whatsoever against the Osage Tribe or individual Indian. Payments made under this Act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as defined by the Social Security Act, laws relating to pensions and benefits payable to veterans, and pensions and benefits paid by any State.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is au-

thorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "September 24, 1921," and insert in lieu thereof "April 11, 1908,".

Page 2, lines 4 to 7, strike out "to be expended for an education program or other programs beneficial to the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 2, following line 9, insert a new subsection (b) as follows, and reletter the succeeding subsection accordingly:

"(b) The sum of $1,000,000 plus any funds that revert to the Osage Tribe may be advanced, expended, invested, or reinvested for the purpose of financing an education program or other socioeconomic programs of benefit to the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, such programs to be administered as authorized by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 4, lines 3 to 10, strike out all of Section 4 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 4. None of the funds distributed per capita under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 7093 is to authorize the distribution of a $13,250,000 Osage judgment. All except $1,000,000 will be distributed per capita. The $1,000,000 will be used for education and other tribal programs.

The judgment is final and the money has been appropriated. There is a dispute, however, about how the per capita distribution should be made. The Osage Tribe has a closed roll that was prepared in 1908. The bill provides that the money will be distributed equally among the persons who are on that roll. A living enrollee will take his full share. The share of a deceased enrollee will go to his Osage heirs, regardless of the amount of Osage blood they have. An heir who is not an Osage is excluded. Under this plan all living Osages will not share. The children and grandchildren of their living heir will be excluded, because they are not heirs of the deceased enrollee.

The alternative urged by some of the Osage Indians is to prepare a new roll of all living Osages of one-quarter degree blood, or more, and to distribute the judgment among them equally. The official tribal organization and the Department of the Interior oppose this alternative.

The 1908 roll has the names of 2,229 persons. Only 447 are alive. These 447 living enrollees have 2,384 descendants, who will not be able to share in the judgment through their living ancestor. Some of them may, however, be able to qualify as the heirs of deceased enrollees.

In addition to the 447 living enrollees and their 2,384 descendants, the descendants of the deceased enrollees number 5,413. The total Osage population is 8,244. The available information does not show how many of these 5,413 may qualify as heirs. Many of them are children and will not qualify because their parents are living. Some of the children may, however, qualify as heirs of other deceased relatives.

The amounts of the per capita payments will vary widely, depending upon whether the individual is a sole heir or one of multiple heirs of a deceased enrollee. Some of the 447 living enrollees, who are entitled to a full share, may also be heirs of deceased enrollees.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5199 authorizes the long over-due distribution of over $5.25 million in funds awarded the Miami Indian Tribe. For more than 2 years, members of the tribe in my own State have anxiously been waiting for the Congress to determine the method for payment of the awards, and I believe the bill which we have before us will help to expedite that payment. The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, as well as the full House Interior Committee, have unanimously recommended passage of H.R. 5199, and I urge its adoption at this time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREPARATION OF A ROLL OF PERSONS OF CALIFORNIA INDIAN DESCENT AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12404) to amend section 5 of the act of September 21, 1968—82 Stat. 860—relating to preparation of a roll of persons of California Indian descent and the distribution of certain funds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 12404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act of September 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 860), is hereby amended by deleting the dollar figure of $325,000, in the last sentence and substituting the dollar figure of $475,000.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12404 is to increase by $150,000 the ceiling on the amount of money that may be spent in compiling a roll of California Indians for the purpose of distributing a $29,100,000 judgment. The cost of preparing the roll is paid out of the judgment.

A 1968 statute (82 Stat. 860) directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a roll of the Indians of California for the purpose of distributing the $29,100,000 judgment, but provided that the cost may not exceed $325,000.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has reached this ceiling and has not finished the roll. The reasons are understandable because of the large number—more than 75,000—of applications that must be processed. By way of comparison, a California Indian roll prepared pursuant to the act of May 24, 1950, cost $245,000 and contained 36,094 names. The roll currently under preparation is a completely new roll, based on different eligibility standards, that will contain almost twice as many names, and that will be prepared under a consumer price index that increased from 81.6 in 1950 to 132.1 in 1969.

If the $325,000 ceiling on the use of the judgment fund to complete the roll is not raised, the money that is necessary to complete the roll will have to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7093 and urge that it be passed. H.R. 7093 provides for the distribution of $13,250,000 in funds awarded members of the Osage Indian Tribe by the Indian Claims Commission nearly 2 years ago. The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs conducted public hearings on H.R. 7093 in November of 1971, and subsequently both the subcommittee and the full House Interior Committee unanimously recommended approval of the bill which is before us today. I believe members of the tribe are deserving of prompt and expeditious action from the Congress with respect to the funds which they have been awarded, and I urge that H.R. 7093 be approved without further delay.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION ON REVISION OF JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7378) to establish a commission on revision of the judicial circuits of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know why we should establish another commission, what the full intent of the amendments are, and specifically why the additional expenditure when it would seem to me that the conference in being and the courts and their administrative mechanism could handle this problem.

Mr. Speaker, hearing no response, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LAND TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9676) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of the University of Tennessee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF LAND TO STATE OF OREGON FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4634) 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to release on behalf of the United States the condition in a deed dated November 9, 1956, conveying land in Clackamas County, Oregon, to the State of Oregon (as reflected on drawing 4540, filed with the district engineer, Seattle, Washington) which requires the land so conveyed to be used for military purposes only and provides for reversion of such land to the United States if at any time it ceases to be so used, but only with respect to a sixty-foot right-of-way cutting across the northeast corner of such land for a distance of approximately three hundred and forty feet, and only if the State of Oregon or an authorized agency of the State conveys such right of way (subject to section 2 of this Act) to Clackamas County to be used as a public highway to provide a direct intertie between Clackamas County Road 40 to the west and Mother Road to the east.

SEC. 2. The right-of-way conveyed to Clackamas County under the first section of this Act shall be used only as a public highway and for related purposes, and if such right-of-way at any time ceases to be so used, title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and, in addition, title to all improvements made by Clackamas County during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to impose such additional terms and conditions on the release and conveyance authorized by this Act as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 4. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the release and conveyance authorized by this Act shall be borne by the grantee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof, the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to release or modify on behalf of the United States the reservation and conditions in a deed dated November 9, 1956, conveying land in Clackamas County, Oregon, to the State of Oregon (as reflected on drawing 4540, filed with the district engineer, Seattle, Washington) one of which requires the land so conveyed to be used for military purposes only and provides for a reversion of such land to the United States if at any time it ceases to be so used, but only with respect to a sixty-foot right-of-way cutting across the northwest corner of such land for a distance of approximately three hundred and forty to four hundred feet, and only if the State of Oregon or an authorized agency of the State conveys such right-of-way (subject to section 2 of this Act) to Clackamas County to be used as a public highway to provide a direct intertie between Clackamas County Road 40 and Mather Road.

"SEC. 2. The release and the deed of conveyance of the right-of-way to Clackamas County as authorized under the first section of this Act shall provide that the right-of-way shall be used only as a public highway and for related purposes, and if such right-of-way at any time ceases to be so used, title thereto shall immediately revert to the State of Oregon, together with any improvements made by Clackamas County without payment of compensation therefor, and in which event the right-of-way shall again become a part of Camp Withycombe and be subject to the same reservation and conditions set forth in the aforementioned deed of November 9, 1956.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to impose such additional terms and conditions on the release and conveyance authorized by this Act as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"SEC. 4. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the release and conveyance authorized by this Act shall be borne by the grantee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to release on behalf of the United States certain land use restrictions with respect to a proposed right-of-way of approximately 60 by 340 to 400 feet, constituting a portion of a 233.91-acre parcel of land in Clackamas County, Oreg., heretofore conveyed by the United States to the State of Oregon for military purposes pursuant to the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 793), so that the State may convey this right-of-way to Clackamas County for use as a public highway.

The proposed release involves the lands of Camp Withycombe, formerly the Clackamas National Guard target range, located in Clackamas County, 9 miles southeast of Portland, Oreg. This facility, comprising 233.91 acres of land with improvements, was conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed executed by the Secretary of the Army, dated November 9, 1956, pursuant to the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 793). Both the act and the deed made the conveyance subject to certain reservations, restrictions and conditions, to wit:

First, reserved to the United States all minerals, oil, and gas with rights-of-entry; second, the property is to be used only for military purposes, and if not so used, title thereto shall revert to the United States with all improvements and without compensation; and third, in event of national emergency or declaration of war, the Secretary of Defense may reoccupy and use the property without payment. Camp Withycombe has, since its establishment, been used for National Guard purposes and currently is utilized by the Oregon National Guard for military academy operations in small unit tactics, a firing range, and storage depot.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING PERSONS FROM COUNTRIES ASSISTING THE UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN VIETNAM TO RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONS AT THE THREE SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8209) 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.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8209

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of November 8, 1966, Public Law 89–802 (80 Stat. 1518), is amended as follows:

(1) Subsections (b) and (c) are amended to read as follows:

"(b) A person may not be admitted to an Academy for instruction under this Act unless his country, after November 9, 1966, has assisted the United States by providing manpower or bases in connection with hostilities in Vietnam.

"(c) Not more than twenty persons may receive instruction under this Act at any one Academy at any one time."

(2) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "1970" and inserting in place thereof "1975".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, delete the number "8" after November, and insert in lieu thereof the number "9".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend until October 1, 1975, the authority under the act of November 9, 1966, Public Law 89–802—80 Stat. 1518—to admit foreign nationals to each of the service academies. The proposed legislation also would increase the number of persons who may be admitted to each academy by authorizing a maximum of 20 enrolled at any one time.

PRESENT LAW

Present Law—10 U.S.C., 4344, 4345, 6957, 9344, and 9345—provides permanent authorization for each service academy to admit 20 students from the American Republics, including Canada, and four additional students from the Republic of the Philippines.

EXPLANATION AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE LEGISLATION

Students from other foreign countries have been admitted from time to time by virtue of special legislation enacted by the Congress. The act of November 9, 1966, Public Law 89–802—80 Stat. 1518—authorizes the admission of up to four students from foreign countries to each of the service academies, provided that the student's country was at the time of his admission assisting the United States in its efforts in Vietnam by the

provision of manpower or bases. That act further specifies that no person may be admitted to an academy under the provisions of the act after October 1, 1970.

The bill, H.R. 8209, as proposed by the Department of Defense, would therefore amend Public Law 89–802 to: First. Extend from October 1, 1970 to October 1, 1975, the authority contained in the act, and, second, increase the number authorized in attendance at each academy at any one time from four to 20.

In view of the expiration of the delimiting date of existing law and the desire of the executive branch to continue their temporary program for the admission of foreign nationals to the service academies, the Department of Defense has requested favorable congressional action on H.R. 8209.

It is considered that the admission to the service academies of citizens of friendly foreign nations, regardless of geographic location, is in the national interest of the United States. The goodwill and the fellowship created among all the cadets and midshipmen is deep and abiding, and, although difficult to measure, is undoubtedly cumulative, favorable, and enduring. The military expertise instilled in foreign cadets and midshipmen, coupled with their exposure to American ideals and principles, provides a much needed asset, particularly in those less developed countries where the United States is seeking to encourage stability, meaningful progress, and reasonable leadership. The U.S. alliance system and military assistance programs underscore the extent to which the U.S. politico-military relations are conducted in an allied environment. Academy education for selected foreign cadets and midshipmen could contribute to a better understanding of military concepts, standardized procedures, logistics, strategy, and tactics, and even democratic ideals and goals.

BACKGROUND

Set forth below is information concerning foreign students currently attending service academies and those who have previously attended the academies since 1954.

FOREIGN STUDENTS CURRENTLY ATTENDING SERVICE ACADEMIES

Naval Academy, total	19
Peru	3
Philippines	2
Nicaragua	1
Colombia	3
Chile	3
Honduras	2
Costa Rica	1
Uruguay	1
Jamaica	1
New Zealand	1
South Vietnam	1
Military Academy, total	24
El Salvador	2
Philippines	4
Nicaragua	2
Honduras	2
Guinea	3
Bolivia	1
Guatemala	1
Uruguay	2
Panama	2
Colombia	1
Costa Rica	2
South Korea	1
South Vietnam	1
Air Force Academy, total	16
Philippines	2
Costa Rica	2
Chile	1
Jamaica	1
Panama	1
Uruguay	3
South Korea	2
Mexico	1
Dominican Republic	1
El Salvador	1

GRADUATES OF FOREIGN STUDENTS FROM THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

Naval Academy, since 1954, total	77
Malaysia	1
Belgium	6
Ecuador	8
Peru	12
Philippines	17
Venezuela	5
Cuba	2
South Korea	1
Nicaragua	3
Colombia	
Panama	4
Argentina	3
Chile	7
Honduras	1
Costa Rica	5
Military Academy, since 1961, total	23
El Salvador	1
Philippines	6
Guatemala	1
Panama	3
Jamaica	2
South Korea	1
Nicaragua	1
Honduras	1
Uruguay	1
Costa Rica	3
Chile	2
Thailand	1
Air Force Academy, since 1962, total	13
Bolivia	1
Philippines	4
Chile	1
Panama	1
China (Taiwan)	1
New Zealand	1
Thailand	1
Venezuela	1
Jamaica	1
Uruguay	1

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT AIR FORCE ACADEMY (SINCE 1962)

Country	Graduated	Resigned or discharged	Now attending	Total admitted
Bolivia	1			1
Peru		1		1
Thailand	1			1
Philippines	4	2	2	8
Costa Rica		1	3	4
Venezuela	1			1
Chile	1	1	1	3
Jamaica	1	1	1	3
Panama	1		1	2
Uruguay	1		3	4
China (Taiwan)	1			1
New Zealand	1			1
South Korea			2	2
Mexico			1	1
Dominican Republic			1	1
El Salvador			1	1
Total	13	6	16	35

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT MILITARY ACADEMY (SINCE 1961)

El Salvador	1		2	3
Philippines	6		4	10
Nicaragua	1	1	2	4
Honduras	1		2	3
Guinea			3	3
Bolivia			1	1
Guatemala	1		1	2
Uruguay	1		2	3
Panama	3		2	5
Colombia			1	1
Costa Rica	3		2	5
Jamaica	2			2
Chile	2			2
South Korea	1		1	2
Thailand	1			1
South Vietnam			1	1
Total	23	1	24	48

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT NAVAL ACADEMY (SINCE 1954)

Malaysia	1			1
Belgium [1]	6			6
Ecuador	8	1		9
Peru	12		3	15
Philippines	17	1	2	20
Venezuela	5	2		7
Cuba	2	3		5
Nicaragua	3		1	4
Columbia	2		3	5
Panama	4	4		8
Argentina	3			3
Chile	7		3	10
Honduras	1		2	3
Costa Rica	5	1	1	7
Uruguay		1	1	2
Jamaica			1	1
New Zealand			1	1
South Vietnam			1	1
South Korea	1			1
Total	77	13	19	109

[1] Under the terms of the special laws by which the Belgium students were admitted to the Naval Academy, the cost of their education was paid by the Belgium Government. For all of the other students at the 3 service academies, the U.S. Government paid for the entire amount of their education.

There are currently 59 foreign students attending the three service academies. These students are attending under legislation previously enacted by the Congress and includes permanent legislation authorizing students from the American Republics, including Canada, the Philippines, and those eligible countries as defined under Public Law 89–802.

This bill would permit no more than 20 persons at any one academy at any one time from those countries who have assisted the United States by providing manpower or bases since November 9, 1966 in connection with hostilities in Vietnam.

The determination of eligible countries under this bill would be made by the Department of State. The State Department would make a formal notification to the Ambassador of the eligible country. At the present time Australia, Nationalist China, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, South Vietnam and Thailand are eligible under H.R. 8209.

Students appointed to the service academies under H.R. 8209 will be in addition to those presently authorized for appointment from U.S. citizens. The Department of Defense assured the committee that under no circumstances would a citizen of the United States be denied entrance to the service academies under the provisions of this act which increases the total spaces available at the academies. Past experience has indicated that all authorized spaces are not utilized, thus enabling the academies to

accommodate the authorized foreign nationals.

H.R. 8209, a temporary law, would authorize a maximum of 20 additional foreign students at each Academy at any one time. This would increase the total to 44 foreign students eligible to attend each service academy at any one time.

It is to be noted that under permanent provisions of law the Philippine Government is already permilted to send four students to the service academies. In discussing the possible application of this bill to the Philippine Government, witnesses from the Department of Defense advised that although the bill does not specifically exclude the Philippine Government, there was no present plan to use the authority of this bill to increase the number of Philippine students who may be eligible to attend the service academies.

NOMINATION PROCEDURES FOR FOREIGN NATIONAL AT SERVICE ACADEMIES

The State Department makes a formal announcement to the foreign Ambassador of the countries that are eligible to make nominations. The U.S. Ambassador in each eligible country then receives the nominations and conducts the initial screening for security. The nomination is then sent by the service attaché (Army, Navy, or Air Force) of the U.S. Embassy to the service academy for which the nomination has been made. The nomination is then processed by the service academy. The nominee is tested upon the same basis as other nominees to the academy. The final approval of each foreign nomination is made by the Department of Defense through the various service Secretaries. The Ambassador of the Nation of the successful applicant is then informed of the student's selection. The student is then given a physical examination and travel orders to travel at U.S. Government expense to the service academy.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The average cost, including pay and allowances costs, will be approximately $3,500 per year per student. The students would be paid the same as other midshipmen and cadets, which is the equivalent to one-half of an ensign or second lieutenant's pay, plus the appropriate subsistence allowances.

The overall average cost, which includes all the overhead cost of operating the service academies, the cost associated with the staff, the summer training, the travel cost, and the summer field duty in the case of West Point cadets, is approximately $52,000 at West Point, $53,000 at the Air Force Academy, and $51,000 for the Naval Academy. This cost covers the entire period of 4 years.

It is not anticipated that enactment of this proposal will result in any substantial increased budgetary requirement of the Department of Defense.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 766) to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, of course—I wish to commend the committee handling this legislation for the fine cooperation I have personally had with the committee and also the cooperation given to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs generally. It has been a great contribution.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to speak in opposition to this measure. Under present circumstances it is appropriate that it be approved.

It is important and appropriate, however, that this record shows clearly to the Congress and the public exactly how and under what terms the disposal will be made.

This bill states in broad terms that:

> The time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The quantity of 515,200 tons is large in relation to annual consumption of zinc metal being equivalent to approximately 50 percent thereof on an annual basis at present consumption rates. In earlier proceedings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee, it was pointed out that authorization to dispose of such a relatively large quantity without some well-defined method of disposal might well have an adverse effect on usual markets.

To avoid this possibility, the Administrator of the General Services Administration entered into negotiation with all of the producers of primary zinc metal in the United States seeking a definitive method of disposition that would meet the criteria broadly expressed in this bill.

I am informed that these negotiations have now been successfully concluded, resulting in agreements by substantially all of the producers of primary zinc in the United States to purchase the excess zinc and move it into consumption through normal marketing processes at rates of not less than 50,000 tons nor more than 150,000 tons per year until the excess has been exhausted. Prices to be paid for the various grades and qualities of zinc metal available from the stockpiles will in all cases be related to average market prices at the time of withdrawal, and will not result in any profit to the purchasers. Some of the metal available from the stockpiles is of specification that has been outdated in commercial use, or in simple terms, below current commercial grades, since it was put into the stockpiles. The producers have agreed, where feasible, to reprocess such metal into currently acceptable commercial grades, returning to the Government any increase in the value thereof through reprocessing. The program provides for a set-aside of 75,000 tons that may be withdrawn for Government use or purchased by others, but in the event any part of it is not so disposed of at the end of the program, it will be purchased by the primary producers.

Those concerned with these complex negotiations are to be congratulated on the successful conclusion of them and authorization for disposal of 515,200 tons of zinc through S. 766 may now be made with greater assurance that the intimate disposal will be made in an orderly manner, without avoidable loss to the United States and without disruption of usual markets.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of the bill or a representative of the Committee on Armed Services could advise what the status of the stockpile will be following this disposal with regard to zinc.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman that I formerly served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services handling surplus stockpile problems, but I am not currently so assigned nor have I been designated to handle the bill on the floor for today; but, based on that past experience and the information provided to me, I will simply add to the statement saying that at the present time there is an inventory of over 1,117,000 short tons whereas the present stockpile objective is 560,000 short tons.

This bill would dispose of the difference between those two figures in the amount of 515,000—rounded figure—short tons, bringing us down to what the OEP requested we have in the two stockpiles controlled by the Congress.

Furthermore, the GSA will, on the basis of experience and past programs, put this on the market in such a way as to allow an upset price, but not to upset the market itself.

I believe it will be very adequate to handle it in this manner.

From the beginning, and back in the first 6 years that I was in the Congress, when I served on the Armed Services "Stockpiles" Subcommittee I also had the vital and provincial interest that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) has in lead and zinc production. I also recall that at one time after the OEP said we needed no further stockpiling of lead, that we controverted that and took necessary and successful action on the floor of the House.

I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) who is in charge of the bill, if in his judgment the amount that would be continued in the stockpile under this bill is sufficient to meet the security requirements of the United States?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we went into that in some detail and I have no doubt that it will and this is supported by the announced policies of the Joint Chiefs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As the gentleman knows, there has been a steady downgrading of the stockpiling requirements over a number of years. I am one of those who fears that we have cut these stockpiles to a dangerously low level on a number of strategic items.

However, I have great confidence in the judgment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) and shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 766

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately five hundred and fifteen thousand two hundred short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607. Such disposition may be made without regard to the requirements of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

SEC. 2. (a) Disposals of the material covered by this Act may be made only after publicly advertising for bids, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section or as otherwise authorized by law. All bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest to do so.

(b) The material covered by this Act may be disposed of without advertising for bids if—

(1) the material is to be transferred to an agency of the United States;

(2) the Administrator determines that methods of disposal other than by advertising are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable loss or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; or

(3) sales are to be made pursuant to requests received from other agencies of the United States in furtherance of authorized program objectives of such agencies.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as of January 31, 1972, the total inventory of zinc held by General Services Administration was approximately 1,117,673 short tons. The present stockpile objective, established December 3, 1969, is 560,000 short tons. Of the 42,437 short tons previously authorized as excess, 22,097 short tons are available for transfer to Government agencies under Public Law 89–9 (approved April 2, 1965), and 20,340 short tons are available for commercial sale under authorization of Public Law 89–322 (approved November 4, 1965). The additional excess of 515,200 short tons is covered by S. 766.

The average acquisition cost of the zinc in the national and supplemental stockpiles was $278.77 per short ton of metal. The present published market price for prime western grade zinc is $340 per short ton, or 17 cents per pound. This material has been in the stockpile for a period of 7 to 25 years. The annual storage cost is $46,368.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The legislation would provide congressional approval of the disposition of approximately 515,200 short tons of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. In addition, the bill would waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for disposition of strategic and critical material from the national stockpile.

BASIC LAW

NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Under section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a), the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness is authorized and directed to determine which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of the act and the quality and quantities of such materials which shall be stockpiled under the act.

Section 3(e) authorizes General Services Administration, at the direction of the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to dispose of any materials held pursuant to the act which are no longer needed because of any revised determination made pursuant to section 2. Notice of any disposition must be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof. The plan and date of disposition must be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of material to be released, and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against disruption of their usual markets. The express approval of the Congress of any proposed disposition is required unless the revised determination, referred to above, is by reason of obsolescence of the material to be disposed of.

SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The legislation which established the supplemental stockpile, section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 456), provided that materials shall be released from the supplemental stockpile only under the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

DISPOSALS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

As indicated in the statues cited above, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of zinc is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

In addition, the bill would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b) with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however, preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. Thus, the waiver will permit the immediate disposal of zinc upon enactment of S. 766.

ZINC

Zinc is a bluish white metal, which is hard and brittle and has a high crystalline structure when broken. At about 250° F., it is ductile and can be rolled into thin sheets. Special high-grade zinc, which is 99.99 percent pure, is used for making diecastings and for some brass. High-grade zinc is 99.98 percent pure; brass special is 98.7 percent pure; and prime western is 98 percent zinc with up to 1.60 percent lead as the chief impurity.

Zinc is extensively used in diecasting and galvanizing. It is alloyed with copper to form brass and its electrogalvanic properties make it useful in protecting steel and iron from corrosion. It is also used in the manufacture of batteries.

Sources: Canada, Japan, Australia, Peru, and Mexico.

METHOD OF DISPOSAL

The General Services Administration proposes to make the zinc available (a) for sale; (b) for transfer to agencies of the U.S. Government; or (c), to the extent authorized by law, as payment for expenses—including transportation and other accessorial expenses—of acquisition of materials, or of refining, processing, beneficiating, or rotating materials pursuant to section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b, and of processing and refining materials pursuant to section 303(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2093(d)).

RATE OF DISPOSAL

GSA proposes to make the 515,200 short tons of excess zinc available for commercial sale over a period of years. The quantities and timing of disposals will be determined upon evaluation of prior sales and current market conditions. Quantities of this material required for transfer to Government agencies will be over and above those involved in the commercial sales program.

PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAM

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other Federal agencies concerned at any time he considers such action advisable, or at any time consultation is requested by such agencies. If any significant modification of the program appears necessary or advisable as a result of such consultation, the change will be publicly announced.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

World mine production of zinc (metal content) in 1970 amounted to 5,594,136 short tons, of which the United States accounted for 534,136 short tons. For slab zinc U.S. production was 1,111,158 short tons in 1969, decreasing to 954,967 short tons in 1970. U.S. consumption of slab zinc in those 2 years was 1,368,323 and 1,186,951 short tons, respectively. Imports of slab zinc were 329,008 short tons in 1969, and 270,413 short tons in 1970. Import of ores in 1969 were 602,120 short tons and 525,759 short tons in 1970. Import sources in 1970 for slab zinc were Canada (45 percent), Japan (12 percent), Australia (11 percent), Peru (12 percent), and other countries (20 percent). Import sources for zinc ores in 1970 were Canada (60 percent), Mexico (25 percent), Peru (9 percent), and other countries (6 percent).

FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government, but will result in substantial return to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the zinc now held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the General Services Administration that all available zinc in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile authorized for disposal for commercial use by previous legislation has been disposed of, and the approval of this bill will permit the General Services Administration to begin immediate disposal of the excess contained in this legislation.

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

DESIGNATING CERTAIN LANDS IN THE CEDAR KEYS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IN FLORIDA AS WILDERNESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 736) to designate certain lands in the Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as wilderness.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890, 892; 16 U.S.C. 1132(c)), certain lands in the Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge, Florida, as depicted on a map entitled "Cedar Keys Wilderness—Proposed", and dated August 1967, is hereby designated as wilderness. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The area designated by this Act as wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act.

SEC. 3. Except as necessary to meet minimum requirements in connection with the purposes for which the area is administered (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no commercial enterprise, no temporary or permanent roads, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of motorized transport, and no structure or installation within the area designated as wilderness by this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "August 1967," insert the following: "revised October 1, 1971,"

Page 1, line 8: Strike out "wilderness" and insert "the Cedar Keys Wilderness".

Strike sections 2 and 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and a legal description of the Cedar Keys Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

"SEC. 3. The Cedar Keys Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 736 would designate as wilderness approximately 375 acres of the Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge, in the State of Florida.

The proposed Cedar Keys Wilderness consists of four small islands in the Gulf of Mexico which are located approximately 3 miles seaward of Levy County, Fla. These four islands are known as Seahorse, Snake, Deadman's and North Keys.

These islands are of great value as a nesting ground for colonial birds and provide a sanctuary for many of the more abundant species as well as several that are threatened such as the bald eagle, brown pelican and the osprey.

The islands consist of narrow white sand beaches, salt marshes and mangrove swamps. There is no commercial timber or grazing of livestock and the mineral potential is slight.

On Seahorse Key there is an inactive lighthouse and an active marine laboratory adjacent to the lighthouse that is used and maintained by the University of Florida as a base for scientific research of marine resources. Because the daily use of these facilities, together with adjacent boat docks, would be incompatible with the concept of wilderness, a small 3-acre tract containing all these improvements was excluded from the area to be designated as wilderness. This exclusion does not bisect the island, but it does eliminate from wilderness designation all man-made improvements on the islands.

Because of its small size and the importance to colonial birds, the Cedar Keys Wilderness will support only limited public use. It can, however, be effectively used for wildlife-oriented recreational activities, shell collecting and beach combing during periods when nesting birds will not be disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend favorable consideration of H.R. 736.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 766.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON CHOOSES TO ENLARGE THE WAR IN AN EFFORT TO SALVAGE HIS UNWISE AND ILL-CONCEIVED CONCEPT OF "VIETNAMIZATION"

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

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is now apparent that the President has chosen to enlarge the war with the bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi, in an effort to salvage his unwise and ill-conceived concept of "Vietnamization." Many of us said during the Johnson administration that since our leadership had determined that we would not or could not win the war in Vietnam that we should get out. This continued to be the consensus of the American people, I believe, when President Nixon assumed office in January 1969.

During the 1968 election campaign, Mr. Nixon assured the American people on the No. 1 political issue of Vietnam that he had a solution to it. Upon assuming office, he told us this solution was "Vietnamization," a doctrine that was to keep American forces fighting in Vietnam for an indeterminate period. This period was to end whenever the South Vietnamese were adequately trained and equipped to defend themselves.

Vietnamization has cost our Nation the lives of 20,000 of our finest young people and permanently disabled well over 100,000. This is a price much too high to justify the nonexistent benefits which many of us predicted. This is in evidence now as the South Vietnamese falter without the presence of American ground forces.

The President, however, has merely accentuated and compounded the folly of Vietnamization by responding to its apparent failure by now enlarging the war in bombarding Haiphong and Hanoi.

This may very well trigger an enlargement of the war by Russia and China.

This last action seems utterly inexcusable. Surely the President could not conceivably have taken such action unless he has knowledge of dramatic events and facts which are unknown to us and the American people. If he does have such, I now implore him to level with us and tell us what he knows to justify what appears to be such a monumental blunder.

THE PRESIDENT IS RIGHT ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in extending the bombing to additional military targets in North Vietnam, President Nixon is following the only sound course open to him. In this he should have nothing but support from the American people. South Vietnam is in serious trouble. The North Vietnamese have thrown virtually all their resources into an all-out effort to destroy the Thieu government or to seize and seal off significant areas of the country. Either will represent a blow at Vietnamization and a loss of prestige worldwide for the United States and its administration. By this action the perfidy of the North Vietnamese Government is again revealed in stark detail. They continue to show contemptuous disregard for all attempts for a peaceable settlement of the war on honorable terms.

The only effective help the United States now can give in the fighting is through airpower. The full potential of this support should be applied. We are still in this war only because we failed long ago to make a full effort for victory. A halfhearted effort will not do the job now.

Airpower cannot win for South Vietnam but it can help them to win. It will not be effective unless the South Vietnamese stand and fight. This they are doing in creditable fashion in most instances but the real showdown is still ahead. It could come in weeks or even days. The South Vietnamese are already hard pressed on several fronts and the North Vietnamese forces are not yet fully committed.

It is not sufficient to use airpower at the fighting front. By extending the war to targets which have long been sanctuaries, much damage can be done to the logistics support which is essential to the North Vietnamese. It is much easier to destroy tanks, trucks, guns, and rockets in storage yards at Haiphong harbor; or on railroads coming out of China, than it is to destroy them singly on the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Our concern at the moment must be for the survival of South Vietnam, not for the feelings of Red China or Russia. The President is doing what he must do. All of Indochina not now in Communist hands will fall swiftly if South Vietnam does. It is for the right of self-determination that we have already expended lives and treasure almost beyond measure. America cannot quit now.

ESCALATION OF WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(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 supreme issue before the House today must be the escalation of the war in Indochina.

The events in Southeast Asia over these past few days have ripped away whatever remaining doubt there may have been as to the President's Vietnam policy. It is a failure and a fraud. Vietnamization is not a policy of peace. It is a program of continued death and destruction. Rather than ending our involvement in Indochina, the administration has fueled the fires of war.

As we meet here today, American bombers are spreading the ravages of war throughout Southeast Asia. The fighting has increased. An American armada is being amassed off the coast of North Vietnam.

These actions are directly contrary to the desires of the American people and the law of the land. Section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971—Public Law 92–156—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.

Yet this administration has cast this mandate of the Congress and the American people aside and has opted for military adventurism by escalating the war, ordering American air strikes against Hanoi and Haiphong.

This callous disregard for the law and the desires of our people cannot be tolerated. It is the Congress—and only the Congress—that has the authority over war and peace. And the Congress must now face up to that responsibility.

I call upon all Members of the House to join with me in demanding that the President order an immediate halt to all American bombing missions in Southeast Asia and that he order an immediate resumption of the Paris negotiations.

And I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to join with me in supporting legislation to cut off all funds for his disastrous conflict by legislative action.

This war must end. And it is the Congress that must end it—now.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Hanoi has offered to resume the Paris peace talks if we will halt the bombing. Our answer to that should be that we will stop the bombing if Hanoi will stop the invasion across the DMZ. That is a most logical quid pro quo.

After all, it was the invasion across the DMZ into South Vietnam that triggered the bombing. We should also be mindful of the fact that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong negotiators have been meeting with the allies in Paris for 3 years, with no appreciable results. Resumption of such stalemated talks is an inadequate exchange for a bombing halt. Nothing less than a halt in this invasion across the DMZ into South Vietnam would justify a halt in the bombing.

Mr. Speaker, despite this invasion by some 12 divisions out of their 13 divisions by the North Vietnamese, the South Vietnamese have in effect stopped this military operation. Because we have been able to undertake the bombing that has been done we have been able to continue the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. In the last 7 days the United States has withdrawn an additional 5,000 U.S. military personnel from South Vietnam and those withdrawals will continue, and they will continue only in safety if we are able to continue air and sea military operations such as we have been doing. Those airpower and seapower operations will be continued for the safety and the security of the American troops still in Vietnam.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it has always been thought that the only way to win this war is by an invasion and by massive bombing, and that the only reason we never did that was because this country did not want to take the calculated risk of starting another world war III.

Has there been a change in the policy, and now this country is willing to take that calculated risk of injecting this Nation and possibly the world into world war No. 3?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is a complete red herring that has no relevancy to what the President has done.

Mr. O'NEILL. You might think it is a red herring.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The President initiated the bombing in order to blunt an invasion of South Vietnam across the DMZ by regular North Vietnamese troops, and I suspect he will continue the bombing until they stop the invasion. The United States is not going to sit down and idly let this invasion involve the jeopardy and the safety of the American troops that are being withdrawn from South Vietnam.

Mr. O'NEILL. That has always been the answer of the gentleman from Michigan, that what I stated was just a red herring.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

IRRESPONSIBILITY UNCHECKED BY CONGRESS

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

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to vehemently protest the resumption of wide-scale bombing of North Vietnam. The President has turned back the clock 6 years to 1966. He has made a significant decision about U.S. foreign policy evidently without so much as a by-your-leave to Congress. The alarming confrontation of superpowers has come back to haunt us while the Congress sits by.

According to reports, the recommendation for escalation of U.S. bombing was made by a committee headed by Mr. Henry A. Kissinger, the President's adviser on national security.

The Constitution lays upon Congress a substantial responsibility for foreign affairs and war making. Congressional committees have been established for these purposes. Yet it appears that the President has embarked on a fateful new course upon advice, not of Congress, but of Mr. Henry A. Kissinger, the elusive mentor who cannot be brought to confer with Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the distinguished minority leader can explain that.

Mr. Speaker, were I possessed of your responsibility in the leadership of the House, I should be doubly anxious, not only for the prerogatives of this body, but also for the fate of this Nation and all peoples. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will hear from you some reassurance as to our grave concerns.

WHO IS REALLY ESCALATING?

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, to charge the President with escalation of the war is unbelievable and incredible. The North Vietnamese escalated the war with all-out aggression, committing 12 of 13 divisions plus sophisticated equipment, tanks, missiles, rockets and everything in their military arsenal. Hanoi has launched a full-scale attack on four fronts, in addition to continuing its aggression against Laos and Cambodia.

The all-out aggression, coming at a time when the President is continuing withdrawal of our troops, is unwarranted stark aggression comparable to that of Hitler and Mussolini.

The President has made every honorable move toward peace through his visit to Peking, an announced continuation of withdrawal and the proposed journey for peace to Moscow. President Nixon absolutely had no alternative but to protect the withdrawal of our men or run the risk of the withdrawal forces being overrun or cut off. It would be utter folly to go to Moscow in a few weeks on our knees when Soviet Russia is the principal supplier of the North Vietnamese aggression.

I support the President in this forthright action and believe he will have the support of a great majority of the American people. No peace with honor can be consummated unless North Vietnam ceases this aggression against its neighbor and manifests some desire to release American prisoners of war.

The peace talks in Paris were used by Hanoi to prepare for this new diabolical, sinister and outrageous aggression. The President should have the support of Congress, the American people and free nations the world over.

WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it seems incredible that this thing has happened; that the United States is once again bombing in heavily populated areas deep in the interior in North Vietnam.

The issue, I would submit to this House, is not whether there was an invasion across the demilitarized zone, but whether the policy that the United States Government has been following—that the President has been following—is a valid policy.

I think what has happened here in the past few weeks demonstrates that it is a bankrupt policy and is bound to fail. We have been trying to defend the maintenance in power of a particular regime in South Vietnam, and it is for that reason and that reason alone that we have not been able to negotiate an end of this war.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the distinguished gentleman of the Armed Services Committee (Mr. HARRINGTON) in a resolution sponsored in the other body by Senator MUSKIE and others, calling for the cessation of U.S. military activity against North Vietnam.

The bombing will accomplish nothing but death and destruction. Have we not learned by now that the North Vietnamese cannot be punished into submission?

And what of our prisoners of war and missing in action in North Vietnam, What does this brutal renewal of bombing do to them and their chances of rejoining their loved ones?

The American people are sick of this war. Bombing will never end it. Let the Congress demand that the bombing stop, and after that the war.

THE MASS BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

(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 fact is that the bombing is not new. The President has been conducting it for a long time. To say that we are bombing because of an attack by the North Vietnamese is wholly inaccurate; the bombing has been going on and on, even during the negotiations, and it was evident that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese would not stand around indefinitely being bombed at home and ignored in Paris.

We cannot hope to secure peace, to successfully withdraw our troops, and to have our prisoners of war come home if we continue to engage in the massive bombing of North Vietnam.

On the opening day of this session I introduced a resolution to censure the conduct of the President because of his resumption of mass bombing raids on North Vietnam and his announcement that he would ignore section 601 of Public Law 92–156.

Three months have passed, and the President once again flaunts the will of the American people and the Congress by escalating the war to dangerous new heights. The bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi is a reckless act that deserves the condemnation of the Congress, and I urge my colleagues to consider the censure resolution as a necessary restraint on the conduct of the President.

The President continues to inflict savage bombing upon the people of Indochina, for the purpose of restraining in power the dictatorial regime of General Thieu. It is the responsibility of Congress to call a halt once and for all to this seemingly unending war.

A number of courses of action are open to us today. The most appropriate and effective would be to call up and pass the Gravel-Drinan bill, of which I am a sponsor. This bill would cut off funds for the bombing, and would terminate funds for all U.S. military operations in Indochina 30 days after its enactment, with an extension of 30 additional days if POW release has not been effected by the end of the first 30-day period.

Vietnamization is a fraud, and the South Vietnamese Government remains completely dependent upon American airpower. It is time for the Congress to find out for itself exactly what is going on in Indochina and who is responsible for the collapse of the negotiations in Paris. I would urge the House to approve my resolution of inquiry, House Resolution 918, which will be considered tomorrow before the Armed Services Committee and here on the floor sometime next week.

We have a right to know the facts. We have a responsibility to act.

THE BOMBING OF VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address these remarks to the Members of the House, but particularly to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for whom I have great affection. I have worked with him and have great respect for him, though many times I have not agreed with him.

I should like to ask the gentleman to consider the following question. Some of us are opposed to our involvement in the war in Vietnam. I oppose that war. Others in this House support the war. I ask the minority leader, "Will you not bring before the House a declaration of war resolution and have the House vote on it?"

What has happened is that the President has declared war without the Con-

gress doing so. We are now bombing the capital and major port of North Vietnam. We are playing Russian roulette. The escalation of the bombing may involve us in a third world war. If the House is willing to do that, let it have the courage to stand up and vote for such a war. But I do not believe that the minority leader or those of my colleagues on the majority side who support this war are willing to put the issue to a vote in the House because you would not dare go to the country in November with such a vote on the record.

Do you not think that you owe it to the House of Representatives because of the respect that all of us owe to the House and its constitutional prerogatives to put it to a vote?

REORDERING OF PRIORITIES

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about another war that is going on in the State of New York. I was very much surprised to notice that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) had chosen to run against the foremost and first of the reform candidates to come down to Washington, Mr. Fitz-Ryan. There is a lot of talk about reordering priorities around here. I had thought that her priority was to displace conservatives with reform candidates. But I think they have now become reordered so that the first priority is to keep the gentlelady (Mrs. ABZUG) herhelf in Congress, come what may.

WEST VIRGINIA WALKATHON FOR MARCH OF DIMES

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my feet are very sore today. Every muscle in my body aches a little bit today. On Saturday 480 teenagers and a small handful of adults started out on a 25-mile walkathon to raise money for the March of Dimes and the Mason County, W. Va., Youth Center. It was raining and we had to keep off the hard roads and walk in the mud most of the way. After walking 10 miles I was ready to quit, especially because I had several political meetings I was supposed to address. But what would you do if a group of 400 skeptical teenagers asked you, "Congressman, you are not going to quit now, are you?" Of course, the answer had to be negative, so I did walk all 25 miles with these muddy shoes to prove it.

I promised to round up 10 Members of Congress who will each pledge a dollar a mile for each mile I walked. If any additional colleagues would like to pledge a dollar a mile for the Mason County March of Dimes, we would be very grateful for these contributions.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the minority leader, now that the Tonkin Gulf resolution has been repealed, under what authority from the Congress is the President taking the new action that he has—not in the context of protecting our troop withdrawals, but in protecting something that obviously has not worked called Vietnamization?

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be very glad to respond. Vietnamization has been successful and is working. We have taken our commitment in 1968 in Vietnam from 544,000, which President Nixon had when he came into office, down to 80,000 at the present time. This has been the result of Vietnamization, and the continued withdrawal of American troops by President Nixon will continue as long as we are able to insure the safety of those left and the safety of those who are being withdrawn. Does the gentleman want to put in jeopardy the lives of those who are being withdrawn and those who are left?

Mr. WOLFF. Certainly not. I have specifically in my statement excluded the protection of the troops for I give the highest priority to the safe return of our POW's and information on our MIA's. However, the President has not said that the present action is to protect the withdrawal of our troops. He has said it is to protect the South Vietnamese Government. To once again come to their rescue, to begin again the whole process, and reverse our policy of disengagement.

NO ONE IS FOR WAR, BUT WE MUST FACE REALITY

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if one would sit idly by and listen to everything that is said here today, he might conclude that there are some in this body who are for war. Nobody in his right mind is for war—this war or any other war. But there are times when we must face a situation as it is, not as we would like it to be—and I consider this to be one of those times.

Let the record show—and I defy anybody to dispute it otherwise—that the invasion under discussion and now underway comes in the form of an attack, an invasion by the regular forces of the North Vietnamese on South Vietnam, and in the process the North Vietnamese have shelled cities and military installations where our military people are. And are we to sit idly by and allow our men to be attacked without having the ability to respond to that attack? I think not.

Now, does it make any real difference whether a bomb is dropped from an airplane on North Vietnam or whether it is shelling from some long-range land-based gun on South Vietnam?

I say we must respond or see our troops who are withdrawing killed and I commend the President for having the fortitude to do it to protect American troops. The war has been escalated by North Vietnam, not the United States. Why, if you want to be fair, do not those of you who demand a bombing halt at least ask the North Vietnamese to stop their invasion of South Vietnam?

POLICY IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with the expertise born of 7 days in Southeast Asia and all the limitations which that implies, I would say to the minority leader and to those of my own party who defend the policy in Vietnam, that our policy is a fraud—a fraud in the sense that while we measure our decline by the number of troops withdrawn, the bombings have regularly occurred and dramatically increased, and so has the naval buildup, to the point that we are back where we were in 1968.

I think it is time for the air of calm that permeates the White House and those who defend this policy to be shattered in an effort to make the Congress face reality and to make the American public face reality and grapple with it. We must face the reality that if Vietnamization is going to succeed, it means it will succeed only with a heavy and costly commitment of air and naval power for an indefinite period of time. It is this open-endedness that we have not yet faced and which we must face now.

Let us not measure success based on a direct effort to support a South Vietnamese Government that at best has only halfhearted support from those it professes to lead, a government which I do not think we would like to defend in this country.

AMERICAN POLICY IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the statements made by the leading Democratic candidates for the Presidency and by some of my colleagues concerning the bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi. Are these men and women willing to sacrifice the lives of nearly 85,000 American soldiers who are still in Vietnam, who are facing this attack? Are they really willing to let the North Vietnamese, through their absolute disregard for human life, try to dictate the course

of an American presidential campaign? The United States has been withdrawing and will continue to withdraw its troops as scheduled in spite of this unprovoked massive invasion from the north.

I suggest we will all see Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MCGOVERN change their tune when they recognize that the American people are not about to have their national leadership managed and manipulated by Hanoi.

RETALIATION AGAINST NORTH VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all are aware that the invasion has been underway for roughly 2 weeks now. As I recall, at the beginning of the invasion there was a great silence throughout the land. Candidates for the Presidency made no demand for withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces. There were no demonstrations in our cities or North Vietnam for the withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces.

But then about a week ago the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris requested their "friends" in America to take steps to stop the President's retaliation against North Vietnam. I would say that their "friends" have gotten the message.

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TO NORTH VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, when the tumult and the shouting dies an objective military historian, I believe, would have to record the fact that the renewed bombing in the north is an appropriate and logical and probably necessary response to the aggression of the North Vietnamese.

There are American forces threatened by this aggression, and I feel the President would be less than responsible if he did not take whatever action is necessary to protect their lives.

The North Vietnamese are aggressors of long standing in Laos, in Cambodia, and in South Vietnam. Even the Vietcong divisions, so called, are now comprised 75 or 80 percent of North Vietnamese regulars.

This is in response to an invasion and aggression, to protect the right of the people of South Vietnam to self determination and to protect American soldiers, and it is appropriate and it is right.

THE SECRET PLAN OF THIS ADMINISTRATION TO END THE WAR

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, after everything is said that can be said, we now know that the secret plan of this administration to end the war turned out to be a bomb—1 ton for every 60 seconds since this administration came into office.

The monthly average of Americans killed in the U.S. intervention in Indochina during the previous administration was 586. The monthly average under this administration so far is 515.

RELIEF FROM RESTRICTIONS ON SOVIET JEWS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 471) to seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews, as amended.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). 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. 107]

Alexander	Eckhardt	Morse
Archer	Edwards, La.	Moss
Badillo	Erlenborn	Nix
Belcher	Esch	Pryor, Ark.
Blanton	Eshleman	Rees
Blatnik	Flowers	Roy
Bolling	Ford,	Ruth
Brademas	William D.	St Germain
Burton	Fountain	Schmitz
Byron	Fraser	Schwengel
Carney	Frey	Seiberling
Cederberg	Galifianakis	Shoup
Celler	Gallagher	Sisk
Chisholm	Hébert	Skubitz
Clark	Helstoski	Smith, Calif.
Clausen,	Hosmer	Stanton,
Don H.	Hutchinson	James V.
Clay	Ichord	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Stephens
Colmer	Jones, Tenn.	Stokes
Corman	Kee	Stubblefield
Coughlin	Landgrebe	Stuckey
Crane	Long, La.	Symington
Culver	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	Macdonald,	Terry
Davis, S.C.	Mass.	Thompson, Ga.
de la Garza	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Martin	Vigorito
Dent	Mills, Ark.	Whalley
Devine	Minshall	White
Diggs	Mitchell	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Monagan	Wright
Dwyer	Moorhead	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). On this rollcall 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RELIEF FROM RESTRICTIONS ON SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 471

Whereas in the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world, indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas the Jews and other religious minorities of the Soviet Union are being denied the means to sustain their identity inside that country and the opportunity to maintain that identity by moving elsewhere; and

Whereas the right freely to emigrate, which is denied Soviet Jews, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; and

(3) request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

(4) raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman who brings the bill to the floor from our Committee on Foreign Affairs whether or not it would be his intent to yield for the purpose of an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the rules of the House wherein the gentleman would sacrifice control of the remaining time if he did yield for such an amendment, but I am also aware of the tradition and precedents of the House wherein we customarily strike the whereases and even the nonappropriate resolves, so I merely make that inquiry of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I believe the parliamentary inquiry would have to be answered by the Chair rather than by myself.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman is correct, of course. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for the Chair to recognize other than the leadership handling the bill on the floor under these circumstances for the purpose of an appropriate amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair will inform the gentleman from Missouri that no amendments can be offered when the House is considering a bill under suspension of the rules.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the 92d Congress 162 Members introduced 48 bills and resolutions covering the status of Soviet Jews and their rights of emigration. All of these were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The committee reports out today a modified version of the principal resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

BACKGROUND

Jews in the Soviet Union have suffered both legal and social discrimination for many centuries. Antisemitism has been used both under the tsars and since the revolution of 1917 as a political instrument. In recent years, the repudiation of some of the harsher elements of Stalinism resulted in some improvement in the status of Jews but this period ended with the internal Soviet reaction to the 6-day war in 1967. Since that date, there has been a return to official antipathy toward Jews as an expression of Soviet hostility toward Israel, and, correspondingly, of friendship toward the Arab countries. There has also been a renewed sense of cultural identity and self-assertion by many Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union. The combined force of these two elements forms the painful record of Soviet Jewry in the past 5 years.

A series of trials in 1970 and 1971 of Soviet Jews charged with antistate activities, including the attempted hijacking of a Soviet commercial airplane, served to focus world attention on policies of the Soviet Union toward its Jewish citizens. This international interest, in turn, accelerated the development and expression of solidarity among many Soviet Jews. Several public demonstrations by Soviet Jews illustrated this new expression of solidarity. A sharp interest in emigration, particularly to Israel, was another expression of that solidarity which was especially difficult for Soviet authorities to handle. For not only was world attention now directed to Soviet Jews but their desire to emigrate raised a wider problem: If Jews are allowed to leave, other Soviet minorities may seek the same right, perhaps using similar public expressions which might greatly embarrass Soviet authorities and possibly, if unchecked, create genuine problems of public order. The possible tension with Arab countries which fear the influx of many thousands of Soviet Jews into Israel gave the Soviet's still another dimension. The final element in the dilemma was the obvious temptation of succumbing to the pleas for emigration visas to get rid of the troublemakers.

Against these conflicting pressures, Soviet authorities tried to build a variety of defenses. The trials in 1970 and 1971 of Soviet Jews accused of the Leningrad hijacking and of printing antistate tracts were probably intended to show trials to warn other Jews of the dangers of agitation. The increase in emigration visas issued in 1971 over preceding years—a trend continued so far into 1972 also—was apparently an attempt to counter some of the hostile world press attention caused by the trials. Yet the continued restrictions against the thousands of Soviet Jews who wanted to emigrate—many of whom undoubtedly were encouraged to apply because others had received vias—kept world attention focused on the problems of Soviet Jews and not on the very limited attempts by the Soviet Union to solve them.

Although it is difficult to assess the effects of the pressures on Soviet Jews in the last 5 years, it seems that two strong, and sometime conflicting, elements are present: First, Soviet Jews are increasingly aware of their identity as a separate group within the Soviet Union which the world is watching. This group of self-awareness makes certain cultural expressions of increasing importance. The lack of available books in Hebrew, of matzohs, and other cultural and religious articles, of synagogue services and rabbis are deeply resented deprivations which Soviet Jews are prepared, in growing numbers, to protest. Second, a different trend is to abandon the Soviet Union as a country hostile to Jews and start a new life elsewhere, particularly in Israel. This is a solution which appeals to more and more Soviet Jews, especially younger ones.

PROVISIONS OF THE RESOLUTION

The preliminary clauses describe briefly and in summary form the background outlined in the preceding section. The resolved clauses then state that it is the sense of Congress that the President should take immediate steps to—

(1) Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

All citizens of the Soviet Union are guaranteed, in their Constitution, the rights of freedom of expression and of the exercise of their religion. These rights, as indicated in the preceding section, are often denied citizens in practice. Soviet Jews, for historical and political reasons, have been among the most frequent and consistent victims of this denial among the many ethnic and religious minorities of the Soviet Union, all of whom are deprived, to some extent, of these freedoms. This clause asks the President, through intercession with the Soviet Government, to seek the exercise of these basic human rights of freedom of expression and of religion for all citizens of the Soviet Union.

(2) Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

This clause refers to the special problem for Soviet citizens who seek to practice their religion. Such practice is discouraged, with a great variety of devices, as part of the Communist ideology. This is a matter which affects millions of Soviet citizens besides the 2 to 3 million Soviet Jews. But Soviet Jews bear a special burden. They are discriminated against both because of their religion and because of their nationality. The President is encouraged to use whatever channels are available to him to intercede on behalf of all Soviet citizens seeking to practice their religion.

(3) Request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the counries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

The U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, passed in December 1948 by the General Assembly, expressed in article 13 the right of everyone "to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." The exercise of this right is among the most basic defenses of an individual against a repressive government. Without this right in force, all others become clouded since departure from repression to some point beyond that repression often remains the only hope for those unable to obtain the exercise of other rights. The declaration also expresses, in article 14, the right of everyone "to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution." Article 15 affirms the universal right to change one's nationality.

The exercise of these rights is a difficult matter for the Soviet Union which undoubtedly fears, with some justification, that allowing Jews to emigrate will encourage other minorities to seek the same rights. This problem is among the most fundamental facing the Soviet Union, for its existence contradicts the tenets of that country's official ideology whose promise of ultimate human freedom must always remain disputed when citizens are unable to perform the most simple and direct act open to men under government: to step away from the jurisdiction of that government.

The committee's only amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 471 changed the first word of this clause to "request" instead of "demand," which the committee deemed an inappropriate word to describe the approach requested by the President to the Soviet Government.

(4) Raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

This clause, unlike the preceding three, expresses no new concern nor does it call for any new approach with the Soviet Government. Rather, it seeks to use the United Nations as the proper forum for the discussion by our Government of the denial of rights of Soviet Jews and other minorities. The United Nations represents the aspirations of the most basic human hopes and ideals. Its General Assembly, where all countries meet as equals, and whose Declaration of Human Rights is the most basic and universal expression of those rights, is the proper place within the United Nations for this discussion.

SPIRIT OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution, in the form approved unanimously by the committee, builds on the considerable interest in the problems of Soviet Jews within the Congress and on the belief, which seems to have a strong foundation, that the Soviet

Union's attempts to improve the status of its Jewish citizens has been in direct relation to the world attention given this problem.

The first resolution introduced in this Congress in the House of Representatives on Soviet Jewry was House Concurrent Resolution 8, sponsored by Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO. It was a greatly modified version of Mr. ANNUNZIO's resolution which the Department of State endorsed in 1971. The committee felt, however, that a more detailed resolution was appropriate, especially as the situation within the Soviet Union developed in the course of 1971. The Anderson-O'Neill resolution, with minor modifications, was judged the most appropriate vehicle for that expression.

The committee is aware that a resolution concerning Soviet Jews, particularly one which calls upon the President to take specific steps with the Soviet Government, might be misinterpreted by those who feel such an approach is inconsistent with the spirit of detente and with the President's coming visit to Moscow. These views, however well-intentioned, seem to the committee to neglect several important facts: First, detente does not and cannot mean the submergence of genuine issues of concern to either the United States or the Soviet Union. Rather, detente should mean the active exploration by both countries, with good will and understanding of solutions to the problems dividing the countries.

Second, the record of the protests by and concerning Soviet Jews indicates that the Soviet Government, like our own Government and that of all other countries, does indeed respond to public opinion. The expression of concern by Congress, representing a wide segment of American public opinion on this issue, will, judged by the past, have a salubrious effect on Soviet policies toward its Jewish citizens.

Third, instead of limiting the President's coming to Moscow visit, the committee hopes that the President will use that visit to discuss Soviet Jewry among those issues which presently limit the cooperation and development of better relations with the Soviet Union.

The resolution is presented with this spirit of realism and idealism: that the United States must accept its responsibilities to speak with concern for victims of oppression and discrimination wherever they exist; that mutual understanding between all countries, including that existing between the Soviet Union and the United States, must be marked by a fidelity to the highest aspirations of human freedom no matter what the record of performance by any country might be; and, finally, that the Congress, representing the popular voice within Government, has a special role in expressing those aspirations independent of the particular government in charge in any country at the time.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States take certain definitive steps to ease the plight of Soviet Jews. This resolution merits the support of each and every Member of the U.S. Congress. It is in keeping with our own concept of the dignity of man, as well as the prevailing international concept as expressed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

The resolution would have the President:

First. Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

Second. Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

Third. Request the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Fourth. Raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgressions of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

The persecution of minorities under czarist Russia is well known. The 1917 revolution and the establishment of the present Soviet Government and its Constitution was designed and intended to prevent and preclude those practices. However, modern Soviet history, particularly under Stalin and Khrushchev, are replete with the systematic actions of discrimination and persecution of Soviet minorities, particularly the Soviet Jews. Documentation of present Soviet practices is somewhat more difficult to provide. However, we do know of the continued efforts to subjugate and discriminate against the Soviet Jews—in the practice of their religion, traditions, and daily living.

The increase in the Soviet people's awareness of human dignity in the past few years, as expressed by many members of the Soviet intelligentsia, has given rise to increased efforts by many Soviet citizens to obtain greater personal freedom. This has in turn given impetus to many thousands of Soviet Jews to seek to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice. This principle is set forth in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Urging the President to call upon the Soviet Government to honor those principles is clearly called for at this time.

The increase in the issuance of exit permits to Soviet Jews in the past year most certainly must be in part attributed to the international expressions of concern. The forthcoming visit of President Nixon to Russia presents a unique opportunity for the President, in behalf of the American people, to further express our concern over the treatment of Soviet Jews by that Government.

At the same time it would appear to be most fitting and appropriate to raise the issue in the United Nations General Assembly of the Soviet Union's transgressions of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities. Such action would serve to express the concern of the international community over Soviet policies toward its people.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too strongly express the need for unanimous approval of this resolution. The milk of human kindness and concern for our fellow man calls for its support.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to congratulate the gentleman from New York for this resolution, and also to comment that within the past week I have been in France and have had the opportunity of meeting with some people very much involved with the problems of the Soviet Jews. They point out very clearly to me the fact that there is a quota system now in the universities affecting the Jews, limiting them to 10 percent of the universities, and there are no Jewish newspapers allowed and there are no rabbinical schools. I think this speaks very much to some of the issues being suggested by this resolution, and I certainly support it and congratulate the gentleman for it.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentleman for coming forth with this resolution. I am in hearty support of it.

For a very long time, many of us in the House have sought practical means by which our Government can assist in alleviating the plight of the thousands of Jews in the Soviet Union who wish so dearly to go to Israel and other countries.

It has been my strong belief that the problems suffered by Jews in the Soviet Union and elsewhere are not difficulties to be faced by them alone. These are fundamentally questions of human rights and human dignity of importance to all men everywhere. These are matters between all governments and not simply questions for people of a single religious and ethnic strain.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join my distinguished colleague, Mr. ROSENTHAL, in cosponsoring the House Concurrent Resolution 471 which asks that the Soviet Union grant these basic rights to their Jewish citizens. The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 471

Whereas in the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world, indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas the Jews and other religious minorities of the Soviet Union are being denied the means to sustain their identity inside that country and the opportunity to maintain that identity by moving elsewhere; and

Whereas the right freely to emigrate, which is denied Soviet Jews, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human

Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; and

(3) request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

(4) raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities

To assure that some assistance will be forthcoming, it is the hope of many of my colleagues and myself that the President of the United States will raise this important issue of the right of emigration of Soviet Jews who desire to leave the Soviet Union. A text of a letter currently being circulated—and which I have signed—is as follows:

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In the interest of peace and the easing of world tensions we, the undersigned, welcome your forthcoming trip to Moscow. We also urge you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and to help redeem Soviet Jews, thus fulfilling the hopes of millions of Americans who have labored on their behalf.

Mr. President, we respectfully petition you on behalf of three million Soviet Jews. We urge you to be their advocate and to convey to Soviet leaders the concern of millions of Americans, and people of good will everywhere, over an oppressed minority which faces discrimination, and is prevented from perpetuating its history, its culture and its ancient religious heritage. Nearly forty of its finest young people are in Soviet prison camps because they sought to live as Jews, while others seeking to emigrate are harassed. If some succeed in departing it is only after months of struggle and of deprivation.

Mr. President, we urge you to exert your influence to help free Jewish prisoners of conscience and to help Soviet Jews achieve the fundamental right to live as Jews and to leave for Israel and elsewhere.

A similar letter is being circulated throughout the Greater Cleveland community pleading with President Nixon to raise these issues with the leadership of the Soviet Union.

It is only when questions like these regarding Soviet Jewry become matters between great nations and not matters solely among ethnic or religious groups, that moral enforcement of the human rights and dignity of all mankind will become a meaningful reality.

The Jews in the Soviet Union who wish to leave used to have to pay 80 rubles for an exit permit or about $100. To meet such payment, household effects were sold to friends and others at cut rates.

Now the rate for exit has been raised to 800 rubles or about $1,000 per person. This is not a tax—it is a ransom. It is unconscionable that a civilized and mature member in the family of nations should require such tribute for the right to emigrate—so fundamental a right in every civilized country. The Soviet Constitution clearly recognizes that right, but the Government still refuses fully to recognize that right, and then requires so impossible a fee—a tribute—to exercise that right.

The Jewish people has survived under harsh, impossible circumstances over thousands of years. This spring is marked by two events of importance in the recent history of the struggle of the Jewish people to survive: A new date of remembrance has just been designated to honor those who perished in the holocaust of the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto, followed in a few days by the celebration of the anniversary of the rebirth of the Jewish people through the creation of the democratic State of Israel. These events should remind all Americans of the costs in lives and in intellectual treasure of the 6 million Jewish people annihilated—not centuries ago, but within the lifetime of most of us. These reminders should serve to rededicate ourselves to a course of action which will prevent, forever, the return of such monstrous barbarity. It must remind us that the repression of men anywhere is a threat to men everywhere.

It is remarkable to recall that from the time of the fall of the Warsaw ghetto to the rise of the new State of Israel only 5 years elapsed. It is a tribute to this valiant people that such survival was feasible.

That those qualities continue to be tested by the Soviet Union seems ludicrous. That there should be demands of tribute of $1,000 per person who desires to leave is ironically reminiscent of the plight of the Jews who were traded for trucks during World War II.

It is time that our Nation show its allegiance and belief in the fundamental rights which have been embodied in our own founding documents, the United Nations Charter on Human Rights, and in the religious principles by which we say we live. For the Soviets' part, they would do well to practice those similar principles which are expessed in their constitution.

Our President can demonstrate a clear commitment to these basic human rights by concurring with our resolution and by raising this vital issue of emigration of Soviet Jewry with the leadership of the Soviet Union when he meets with them in May.

Then it would become clear that our Nation's commitment to such ideals are of the very highest diplomatic order and importance. We owe that to this valiant people, and to ourselves and the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

All of these ideals, hopes, and prayers can and will be expressed more fully on Solidarity Day for Israel and Soviet Jewry on April 30, 1972, throughout the United States.

It will be with a great deal of pride that I will join my friends and neighbors, non-Jews and Jewish people, to show our entire community's support of fundamental human rights for our Jewish brothers in the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for bringing forth this resolution and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471 which expresses the sense of the Congress against the oppression of Soviet Jews and others who are being denied their basic international human rights. I speak in favor of this resolution as a cosponsor of the legislation and as one who believes the Congress has a moral responsibility to speak out against the kind of oppression which destroys the cultural, religious, and social freedoms of any people.

House Concurrent Resolution 471 calls upon the President to make known to the Soviet Union our Nation's opposition to the discrimination against minority groups in Russia. The resolution urges the President to seek relief for those who do not have freedom of expression of ideas or the exercise of religious views. The resolution also urges the President to demand that the Soviet Government permit its citizens the right to emigrate to countries of their choice, a right which is affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

The above positions are basic human rights and are not the province of any nation to repress. That is why the resolution finally calls upon the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of Soviet violation of the Declaration of Human Rights. This last section of the legislation is in my opinion the most important for it calls upon our Nation's representatives in the U.N. to enforce that body's own declarations—to test the willingness of that world body to stand by the basic rights it has set forth. There can be no excuse for turning our backs on the substantial violations of human rights which have taken place in the Soviet Union.

I urge my colleagues to vote for House Concurrent Resolution 471 and to take a strong position in support of Soviet Jews and against oppression of any people.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and his committee for their efforts in behalf of this noble cause.

This is not just a question of Jewish rights, but it is a question of human rights, the rights of all people oppressed throughout the world.

Yesterday, on the 24th anniversary of the State of Israel, I had the opportunity of attending services in my area and listening to the Counsel General of Israel, Mr. David Rubin, who spoke to us about this great cause. He told of those Jews who are fortunate enough to get to Israel that when they first get off the plane they kneel and kiss the ground of their fathers and forefathers with tears of gratitude in their eyes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman yielding further to me. I want to continue for just a few more moments.

However, the next day these emigrees are faced with the harsh realities of the new life they have to lead plus the reality of obtaining a home, a job, and other necessities they so desperately need.

While this resolution is very much in order, we must also address ourselves here in the United States to helping Israel cope with the difficult problems of handling this immigration from Russia in terms of additional economic assistance.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will include the concurrent resolution on the right to emigrate from and to one's own country which I introduced last year. My colleagues will note in the preamble that I made mention of the case of Rita Gluzman whose husband had been precluded from joining her in Israel. I am pleased to say that her husband now has joined her and I am happy to have helped bring this about. Her letter which I include at this point made my efforts all worthwhile:

NATANYA, ISRAEL
February 13, 1972.

Congressman JACK KEMP,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEMP: I am glad to tell you that we are getting settled—my husband and I are studying. We are both working very hard and our little boy is growing up as a healthy and robust "Sabra".

I am writing to you as I would like to share my happiness with you. I remember that when I was miserable I turned to all those who were ready to listen to me and asked them to help me in getting my husband back. You like many of your co-patriots, have helped me a lot. And I know that I am not the only one whom you helped. The Jews in the Soviet Union, feeling the support of the public opinion in Europe and especially in the U.S.A., can fight for their right to live in Israel, and can even be successful in this fight of theirs.

The first fruits of this fight can already be seen—many people come from there. However, I cannot forget that many thousands of my brothers and sisters are still awaiting the happy day when they will be able to go to Israel. They feel the moral and effective support of such people as you. They know that the pressure of the West on the Soviet Authorities brings positive results—and they expect this help from you. I know this from my personal experience when I went to the U.S.A. to ask for your help.

I wish much happiness to you personally and to all those in America who had helped me as well as to all those who are still helping my numerous friends in the U.S.S.R. God bless you all.

Sincerely yours,

RITA GLUZMAN.

And in conclusion, I am also very happy to see that the concept of bringing this issue of the right to emigrate before the United Nations General Assembly, which we initiated and promoted publicly and in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, has been adopted today.

I appreciate the fact that the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. ROSENTHAL, took additional time which he yielded to me.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 462

Whereas the Congress is concerned about the fact that some nations have not adhered to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights which specifically recites that all people have a right to expatriate themselves—to pass freely from state to state, to remove themselves from a jurisdiction which they find destructive or offensive to their rights; and

Whereas the vengeful trial of Jews attempting to leave Leningrad, the plight of hundreds like Rita Gluzman whose husband has not been allowed to emigrate from Ukraine to join her and their baby son in Israel, the killing of approximately sixty-five people trying to flee East Berlin, the brutal beating, recapture, and subsequent prosecution of the Lithuanian seaman on an American Coast Guard vessel, the expressed fear of Solzhenitsen that if he accepted the Nobel prize in Stockholm, he could be barred forever from his Russian homeland are all evidence of the fact that some nations have not honored the aforementioned basic and internationally recognized human right, the right of everyone to leave any country and return to his own country; and

Whereas both authoritative world opinion and international law consider the right to leave and to return as a fundamental human right binding on all governments; and

Whereas this extremely important moral issue has never been brought before the United Nations General Assembly: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United Nations, should present to the United Nations General Assembly in fitting manner the issue of the right to emigrate from and also return to one's country.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for yielding to me.

I had the privilege and opportunity to visit in January of this year in the State of Israel and observe firsthand the arrival of the emigres from the Soviet Union in Israel. No words of mine can describe properly the impact in terms of hopes and expectations that can be witnessed by anyone who sees what is going on there.

We know, of course, the valiant venture of the State of Israel and how they have welcomed these new citizens wholeheartedly. I hope we can go forward with the kind of support that is needed in order to assist them in this great effort, so that they may have not just an opportunity to return to a land of hope and freedom but have the opportunity which they need once they arrive in Israel.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this resolution up.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471 which seeks relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews. I have continuously spoken out to urge that the Soviet Union ease its harsh restrictions and permit Jewish citizens to preserve and practice their cultural heritage without harassment and to emigrate if they so choose. I have sought relief for Soviet Jews through other legislation which would provide for the issuance of emergency immigration visas for Soviet Jews.

On March 6, in anticipation of the President's impending visit to the Soviet Union, I sent a letter to the White House urging that the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union be given the highest priority in the President's meetings with Soviet leaders. The text of my letter to the President is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1972.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Despite the recent easing of restrictions on emigration from the U.S.S.R. to Israel, harassment and incarceration of Soviet Jews continues. Members of this minority are regularly deprived of cultural and religious rights; discrimination in education and employment is rampant.

A vigorous reaction to this intolerable situation has been voiced by the Congress, in debate and in resolution, and by the American people in public meetings and in the national press. Expressions of deep concern have been conveyed by the leaders of several Western nations to Soviet officials. You are the spokesman for a nation which has traditionally espoused the concept of minority rights and which now demands humane treatment for Soviet Jewry. Your intercession with regard to this matter when you visit with Soviet officials later this spring would be appropriate as well as effective.

I therefore respectfully urge you to use the occasion of your forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union to discuss with Soviet leaders the plight of Russian Jews. Any quest for honest and productive relations with the Soviet Union demands the satisfactory resolution of this fractious issue. I trust you will carefully consider placing this item on the agenda of your discussions with Soviet leaders.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

The resolution before us today, as was my letter, is addressed to the President and, as did my letter, calls upon him to urge the Soviet Government to permit free expression of ideas and religion and the right of citizens to emigrate. These basic rights and freedoms are affirmed in our own traditions and in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The President now has the opportunity, hopefully with the endorsement of the Congress, to bring this important issue directly to the leaders of the Soviet Union. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this resolution and I hope that the President will be able to report some substantive progress on this deeply disturbing problem which can only be described as a human tragedy.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I now

yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, which expresses the sense of this body that this Nation must make every effort possible to urge an end to the restriction of Soviet Jews.

The persecution of members of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union is not a recent development. The people in that country have been discriminated against both under the czarist regime and in the years following the revolution of 1917. Over the years the rights of Soviet Jews, which are supposedly guaranteed to them in the Soviet Constitution, have in practice been denied. In recent times this minority has been used by the Soviet Government as a tool to express dissatisfaction with certain international events.

Following the 6-Day War in 1967, for example, there was a return to official antipathy toward Jews by the Soviets reminiscent of the harsher elements of the Stalinist era. In this way the Soviets were expressing dissatisfaction with Israel and at the same time expressing their support of the Arab nations.

The abuse of rights of the Soviet Jews was also evident in the series of trials in 1970 and 1971, when they were charged with antistate activities, including the attempted hijacking of a Soviet commercial airliner. These trials served to focus world attention on the policies of the Soviet Union toward its Jewish citizens. I have not remained idle during this period.

We as the foremost legislative forum in the world cannot just stand idly by while the rights of the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are denied. We must voice our strong opposition to the policies of that nation toward its almost 3 million Jewish citizens and accept our responsibility to speak out concerning the victims of oppression and discrimination wherever they exist.

This is a timely measure in view of the President's upcoming visit to Moscow. We cannot allow detente to mean the submergence of genuine issues of concern to both nations. In this regard, we must impress upon the President the concern and determination of this body that the problems of Soviet Jewry should be high on the list of issues discussed during his upcoming talks with Soviet leaders.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that my colleagues will join with me in voting for this resolution. It is a strong statement in support of those of the Jewish faith living in the Soviet Union and it seeks to provide them with the opportunity of self-expression, including the right to emigrate to any nation they wish.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471.

This resolution was approved unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and offers a timely reflection of the concern both of Congress and the American people over the plight of the Soviet Jews.

Hearings of the Subcommittee on Europe were held on this resolution in November of last year. That resulted in the legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, in approving this resolution, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has focused attention on the restrictions encountered by Soviet Jews.

These restrictions are detailed in the committee report. They are generally known to Members of the House, many of whom have followed this problem with concern in recent years.

The resolution we are considering here cannot, of course, guarantee a change in the Soviet Government's attitude toward its citizens. But, on occasion, the Soviet leadership has shown that it is responsive to world opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution states that it is the sense of Congress that the President should take immediate steps to:

First. Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

Second. Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

Third. Request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affrmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Fourth. Raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

I believe that this resolution is constructive, realistic, and responsive to the aspirations of all who value human freedom. Let us demonstrate here today our concern for human freedom by voicing our approval of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, a "sense of Congress" resolution urging President Nixon to use all of this country's powers, directly and through the United Nations, to relive the oppression of Soviet Jews and to allow their emigration.

The record is full of examples of harassment and persecution of Soviet Jews. Despite continued oppression, many thousands of Jews in Russia have stood up for their own heritage and for their own human rights. As a nation founded on principles of basic freedoms, we can do no less than to support, in every way possible, their struggle for freedom.

One right, especially important to Jews in Russia, which has been arbitrarily denied, is emigration. This important right is embodied in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

This resolution is largely symbolic, but it can have two important effects. First, it is an important, public, official statement which again tells the world of the Soviet Union's oppression of Jews. World opinion will not dictate policy to Russia, but it cannot be totally ignored either.

Second, it encourages the President to present this subject forcefully to the Soviets during his proposed visit. A congressional resolution, showing wide public interest, will make this an issue of national consensus, rather than one of personal diplomacy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy, and unanimous passage of House Concurrent Resolution 471, which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 39, of which I am an author.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to compliment the sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Foreign Affairs noted in its report on House Conference Resolution 471, Jews in the Soviet Union have suffered both legal and social discrimination for many centuries.

In fact, the Soviets have used antisemitism as a political device. Today we see in the Soviet Union official antipathy toward Jews which reflects the Kremlin position regarding Israel.

I found it most interesting that the committee called attention to the fact that the Soviet Constitution states that all citizens of the Soviet Union are "guaranteed" the rights of freedom of expression and the exercise of their religion. In practice, of course, these rights are often denied Soviet citizens.

House Conference Resolution 471 reflects our concern for the plight of Soviet Jews who are being denied their very identities in the U.S.S.R. and who are prevented from moving elsewhere. The right to freely emigrate is a basic human right and one that has been affirmed unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

By asking the President of the United States to call upon the Soviet Government to honor these rights and others we are also affirming our commitment to these rights.

Jews in the Soviet Union bear a special burden. They suffer because of their religion and their nationality. We in Congress have a special responsibility in expressing the aspirations of our citizens who are dismayed at the treatment of Soviet Jews. I urge our total support of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I wish to

commend him and the committee for sponsoring this resolution which I wholeheartedly support.

Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of a similar House resolution to the one we consider today, and as a firm advocate for full freedoms for Soviet Jews, I urge speedy consideration and passage for House Concurrent Resolution 471, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President call upon the Soviet Union to take immediate steps to correct the many inequities and discriminations perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Long Island are unanimous in their call for an end to the repression of Soviet Jews by the Russian Government, and I have taken every opportunity to make their views plain here in Washington. I have worked closely with the many Long Island groups who have devoted their energies to ending this repression, and will continue to lend my efforts to that worthy purpose.

For while limited freedom for all Soviet citizens is itself deplorable, the policy of "no freedom at all" for Soviet Jews is an abomination which must be dealt with in the most forceful way we know how.

Chief among those normal freedoms which other peoples of the world enjoy but which are denied to Soviet Jews, is the freedom to emigrate to a nation of their choice.

Because I was so concerned about this basic denial of rights, I long ago wrote President Nixon asking that he address this repression at the first opportunity with Soviet officials and lend the full weight of the office of the Presidency to this struggle for human rights.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, in speaking for the people of Long Island, I call for immediate passage of this worthy legislation so that Soviet Jews will enjoy the full freedoms which they so richly deserve. I feel certain I have the full backing of all Long Islanders on this important matter, and I hope my colleagues in the Congress consider this legislation as important as I do.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

As one of the 162 Members of Congress who introduced bills concerning the status of Soviet citizens to emigrate, I am glad to see that House Concurrent Resolution 471 is coming up for a vote today.

We in America often forget that behind the Iron Curtain citizens are deprived of the most basic of human rights. This resolution clearly states the resolve of Congress to have the Soviet Union change its policy toward Soviet Jews and other Soviet minorities.

In this past Saturday's Washington Post, an article appeared concerning a leading dancer with Leningrad's Kirov Ballet.

The dancer, Valery Penov, was dismissed for trying to emigrate to Israel.

The right to emigrate, the right to worship, the right to hold private views and freedom of assembly are basic human rights that are deprived citizens of the Soviet Union.

I urge that the President take this resolution as a mandate to raise this issue during his talks with the Russian leaders at the May summit meeting.

Today we are approaching an era of detente, however, those who feel that differences between our two great nation's should be submerged in the search for detente are wrong. Where violations of basic human rights occur, the United States has an obligation to speak up and strongly condemn them. It is my hope that the Soviet Union will be moved by the full weight of world public opinion and abide by the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights which was unanimously adopted by the U.N. General Assembly.

Debate on this issue also points out another serious problem which the Congress will be facing in the coming weeks, the continuation of Radio Free Europe. For the Jews of the Soviet Union and for the other oppressed minorities behind the Iron Curtain these world broadcasts give them the strength to carry on while they are denied their basic freedoms.

While the passage of this resolution is a small step, let us hope that it will lead to the day when the citizens of the Soviet Union can freely express their ideas, exercise their choice of religion, and have the right to emigrate freely.

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. This is a time when Congress must be concerned about the rights of minorities, in this country and abroad, as well as with the rights of suppressed majorities in Africa.

I think this Congress should express its sentiments in opposition to the continuing repression faced by Soviet Jews and their denial of human rights in the U.S.S.R.

We must call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the freedom of religion that is now missing. The President must use all channels open to him, formal and informal, to press for the end of discrimination against Soviet Jews. On his forthcoming trip to Moscow, I hope the President will press the Soviet Government to permit its citizens to emigrate to the country of their choice, as endorsed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, the President and the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations should raise the question of Soviet abridgement of these basic rights in the General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot in good conscience sit silently and condone this continued persecution.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) as well as all of the members of the subcommittee and the sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 471, requesting that the President take up the issue of the oppression of Soviet Jews with Moscow comes at a particularly opportune time.

The President's trip to Russia rapidly approaches, contacts with the Soviet Union increase with steady regularity as detailed arrangements begin to take their final form.

It is important that Congress inform administration officials now, just as such contacts expand, that it is deeply concerned about the plight of Soviet Jews. It is important that all Members of Congress stand today with moral people all over the world and speak out. It is important that as representatives of this great democracy, we resolutely declare that oppression of Jews just because they are Jews should not and will not escape notice and condemnation.

As the elected chief of a freedom-loving people, our President must vehemently protest the treatment of Jews, their persecution and deprivation. He cannot stand by as Jews, against their will and in violation of United Nations agreements, are sentenced to life in a vast wasteland devoid of culture and religious sensitivity.

Our overwhelming passage of this bill makes the record clear: the United States will not falter in its demands that the Soviet Government end its oppression of Jews, no matter what the diplomatic situation.

Our resolution today demonstrates unequivocally that Soviet attempts at cultural genocide of Jews will not escape our condemnation, even in the thick vapors of a thawing cold war.

In the months since I introduced a resolution on urging the President to speak out on behalf of Soviet Jews, their situation has changed somewhat. Emigration has increased, and thousands of Jews deluge government offices with visa applications. Only a small proportion are lucky enough to have their requests granted.

Some members of our State Department urged that Congress lower the tone of its concern, in light of some easing of restrictions. However, while more Jews have been able to escape the tyranny of the Soviet Government and settle in Israel, the KGB has adopted a vigorous policy of severe repression of activists who agitate for visas and Jewish rights after their applications have been rejected.

In the past, the Moscow KGB has led Russian secret police in persecuting Jews with its example of confinement to mental institutions, jail sentences, and unexplained arrests.

But as of last week, the Leningrad KGB has decided not only to emulate the dastardly record of its Moscow counterpart but to surpass it as well. Sergei Gurevitz, a Jewish physicist who was fired from his teaching position when he applied for a visa to Israel and then threatened with institutionalization when he walked in the street with a

yarmulke, a skull cap, has been informed that he will either take a job in a concrete factory or spend a year in jail for parasitism.

Friends who spoke to him on Saturday found him ready to accept any menial job in the hope that his visa might come through.

However, he told his callers that two unnamed friends would be tried on charges of parasitism now being trumped up by the Leningrad KGB and will be sentenced to spend a year in labor camps.

These new incidents of repression herald an intensifying of persecution and a worsening of the situation of Jews, although a fortunate minority are now able to escape.

When the President is in Moscow, he must make it clear to the Russian Government that the plight of Jews must only get better, not worse.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, reported out by the Subcommittee on Europe, chaired by my distinguished friend and colleague, BENJAMIN R. ROSENTHAL. I am proud that I am a cosponsor of the resolution and that it has been brought to the floor so quickly so as to permit the House of Representatives to state its position in support of the Soviet Jews and other minorities repressed and discriminated against in the U.S.S.R. before the President meets with Soviet authorities next month in Russia.

Soviet Jews and other minorities in the U.S.S.R. in ever-increasing numbers are seeking to emigrate from the Soviet Union to other countries willing to accept them. That right to emigrate is one accorded to Soviet citizens under the constitution of the U.S.S.R. as well as under the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to which the U.S.S.R. is subject.

There are many Jews and other minority members who will never leave the U.S.S.R., but will live out their lives there, and this resolution concerns itself also with their condition. It is vital that the Soviet Union accord to all of the minorities in its boundaries the religious and cultural rights guaranteed under the very constitution which governs the U.S.S.R. I know of my own knowledge, having visited the Soviet Union in March 1971, that Soviet Jews at that time, and I understand the situation has not changed, were subject to what can only be described as cultural genocide. Leaders of the Jewish community were falsely accused of crimes against the Soviet Union. These crimes consisted of such acts as translating Russian textbooks into the Yiddish and Hebrew languages so as to acquaint Jewish children with the languages of their ancestors. And another alleged anti-Soviet act for which men and women have been sent to Soviet jails was the sending of a petition to the United Nations asking for assistance to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

However, world pressures do have an effect on the actions of the Soviet Union. As a result of these pressures, the Soviet Union has relaxed to some degree its obstacles to the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. However, while the emigration has increased, it is still a trickle compared to the great number of Jews who wish to leave.

I am proud that our own Government in October 1971 by a letter of commitment issued by the then Attorney General opened its doors so that any Soviet Jews wishing to leave the U.S.S.R., and permitted to do so by the U.S.S.R. will be given sanctuary here without regard to quota restrictions. I am privileged to have been the original sponsor of the bill which led to the issuance of that letter.

I hope that President Nixon will take up the matters outlined in the resolution, when he visits Moscow next month. I pray that the Soviet Union will open wide its door so as to allow those who wish to leave to do so and that it will provide equal religious and cultural freedom to Soviet Jews who remain in the U.S.S.R. now granted other nationalities in the Soviet Union. There is no question in my mind that the Soviet Union is an oppressive state vis-a-vis its own people, but the very least that can be asked of that state is that it provide whatever justice does exist, equally to all of its people, including its Jewish minority.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and the other members of the committee for their leadership in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471.

As the report accompanying the resolution notes, over 48 bills and resolutions concerning the status of Soviet Jews, including one that I introduced on December 1, 1971, with 46 colleagues, were introduced and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and the members of the full committee for their diligent efforts to produce a fine resolution which deserves the support of all Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, many times throughout our history, we, as Americans, have expressed our sympathy for oppressed citizens of other countries. Examples from our early days as a Nation include American sympathy for and support of the French Revolution. More recently, we have voiced concern and support for the people of Greece and Vietnam, and for the minorities in Rhodesia and South Africa.

These expressions of sympathy have occasionally been made at times when here at home we have failed to live up totally to our deeply held ideals of freedom, opportunity, equality, cultural diversity, and justice under law. Nevertheless, it is the policy of all branches of our government—legislative, executive, and judicial—to abide by these ideals at home and we have done much to ensure a greater enjoyment of these rights in other lands.

It is perfectly appropriate and consistent for the United States to express its sympathy for Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith.

Last January, I visited the Soviet Union together with several of my colleagues with whom I serve on the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee.

Each night, after my official business had been concluded for the day, I visited with a number of Jewish scientists and engineers whose names I had obtained prior to my departure.

On Wednesday, January 12, I attended a farewell dinner at the home of Dr. Alexander Lerner, an internationally reknowned computer expert. Dr. Lerner had invited several of his close friends, all of whom had applied for permission to emigrate and all of whom I had met before at some time during my stay.

Just as we started the first course, two Soviet KGB men appeared at the door stating they were looking for a "desperado" masquerading as a foreigner. When I was unable to produce my passport, which was at my hotel, the two men took me into custody.

The police kept me in a bare room with a single light bulb for about 45 minutes. They did not question me or harm me in any way. When they informed me that they had satisfied themselves as to my identity, they released me with an offer to hail a taxi to take me back to my hotel.

Shortly after I left Dr. Lerner's apartment in the company of the two KGB agents, Mrs. Lorel Pollack, a member of a Chicago Chapter of Hadassah, placed a call from Chicago to Dr. Lerner. Listening in on the call was a Chicago CBS–TV affiliate reporter. He was there at Mrs. Pollack's request as part of an effort to focus world public attention upon the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Mrs. Lydia Koreneld, a guest at Dr. Lerner's dinner, told Mrs. Pollack that I had just been taken away by the police. Immediately, thereafter, CBS News in Chicago flashed the word to the news media throughout the country.

Forty-eight hours later, due, perhaps to the publicity generated by my detention, a decision was made, "at the highest levels of the Soviet Government," according to our State Department, to expel me from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I learned first-hand in the U.S.S.R. the type of conditions under which Soviet Jews are living.

There is no doubt that the three and a half million Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are suffering from a policy of oppression and discrimination which denies them certain basic human freedoms and the full package of rights and privileges enjoyed by the other 120 officially recognized minority groups in the Soviet Union.

Many Jews in the Soviet Union are placed in physical danger solely because of their ancestry, although they are not in

the danger of the mass murder that Jews all over Europe faced during the infamous holocaust of the Third Reich.

Soviet Jewry today is threatened with cultural and religious genocide from a policy of forced assimilation—a deliberate government-sponsored effort to stamp out all vestiges of Jewish religious and cultural heritage.

Synagogues have been systematically closed down for the past 30 years. Less than 70 synagogues remain to serve a population of three and a half million Jews. This compares with the 120 synagogues in Chicago which serve a Jewish population of only 200,000. Moreover, through the use of police informers, those Jews who wish to attend the remaining synagogues are intimidated and made afraid to do so.

The study of Hebrew is systematically and forcibly discouraged. Recently, Moscow's only Hebrew teacher was imprisoned on vague charges of "hooliganism."

The Soviet government rigorously bans the manufacture or importation of Jewish religious objects.

Jews who manifest a desire to emigrate to Israel are fired from their jobs, their kids expelled from schools and universities, and parents harassed both officially and unofficially.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, recent phone calls I have made to my new friends in the Soviet Union, indicate that the Soviets have begun a new campaign designed to stem the desire of thousands, perhaps millions, of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel.

The Soviets failed to stop this rising tide through mass trials of alleged "leaders," such as the conspiracy trials in Leningrad approximately 1 year ago, due to the tremendous adverse worldwide publicity these trials generated. They similarly failed when they attempted to create a headless "movement" by permitting the "leaders" to leave for Israel.

Now, the Soviets have apparently decided to threaten individual Soviet Jews with trials for economic crimes as a means of intimidation. Two individuals with whom I have spoken in the past several days, Vladimir Slepak and Serge Gurvits, both highly respected scientists, have been informed that unless they take jobs as manual laborers in a cement factory outside of Moscow, they will be charged with "economic parasitism"—a "crime" which carries a maximum sentence of 2 years in prison plus banishment to Siberia.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but the broad outlines of the situation are clear. Jews are the subject of intense cultural, religious, and job discrimination in the Soviet Union not visited on any other single minority group.

This cruel fact is hardly news. The Soviet Union has a long history of prerevolutionary anti-Semitism under the czars manifested by bloody pogroms in all sections of Russia and Eastern Europe.

What is new today, however, is that peoples of all nations are viewed as possessing individual rights which were unthought of years ago. This new consciousness of human dignity is exemplified by the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the constitutions of many nations, including that of the Soviet Union. World opinion will no longer tolerate violations of these rights, let alone the murderous pogroms of a hundred years ago in Russia and Poland, and a generation ago in Germany.

It is also true that discrimination against all forms of religion in the Soviet Union is not particularly new. Beginning with the Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviet Union has discriminated against those who are religious or otherwise viewed as dissenters from official policy.

Here again, what is new is the changed state of affairs. Shortly after the 6-day war in the Middle East, Jews in the Soviet Union experienced a tremendous interest in Israel, accompanied by a renaissance of concern and interest in Jewish religious culture and tradition. In part, the Soviet Government viewed this increased interest as it views any expression of dissent—as a threat to its authority to govern. In part, the government viewed this revived interest as contrary to the government's policy of support for the Arabs in the Middle East.

These two forces converged and led to an intensified campaign of discrimination against Jews, with the result that today they are victims of far more intensive discrimination and oppression than that experienced by any other religious or cultural group in the Soviet Union.

Jews, unlike other minority groups, are not permitted to establish their own schools. Jews, unlike Muslims, for example, are not permitted to leave the Soviet Union for religious study. Jews, unlike other minority groups, have systematically been placed on trial for "hooliganism," and other crimes. All of these facts indicate that the Jews have been singled out for "special treatment."

At a crucial point in Russian history, Lenin wrote a tract entitled, "What is to be Done?" We ask the very same question today.

I have spoken with hundreds of Jews—both in the Soviet Union and who recently left the Soviet Union. They all indicate that the Soviet Government is sensitive to world opinion, that unofficial expressions of concern do have a beneficial effect upon the policy of the Government if they are peaceful and lawful, and do not involve violence or destruction of property. It is unmistakably clear that official expressions of concern would be even more meaningful.

The time has come, therefore, for the United States to make known its disapproval of the Soviet policy towards Russian Jews.

Thus far, the President, has not made his views on this subject forcefully or well known.

Upon my return from the Soviet Union, I contacted Dr. Kissinger, the President's adviser on foreign affairs, in order to meet with him prior to the President's trip to Moscow. I received a letter from one of Dr. Kissinger's assistants informing me that Dr. Kissinger would be unable to meet with me.

Mr. Speaker, the President should make his deep personal concern as well as the concern of all Americans, Jews and non-Jew alike, known to the leaders of the Soviet Union when he visits Moscow. The passage of this resolution will give the President support for this type of discussion.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this resolution and a deep searching discussion of this matter between the President and the leaders of the Soviet Union are not the only two actions which our Government can take to help ameliorate the plight of Soviet Jewry. There are many other ways in which our country could make its concern known.

I therefore support the resolution before this body which calls upon the President to take immediate and determined steps to call upon the U.S.S.R. to end religious discrimination and to permit its citizens to exercise their right to emigrate.

The Soviet Union must be made to realize that, as an established power which does not face any real external threat, it need not fear competitive ideas; it need fear neither those who criticize Soviet society nor those who seek to recall their cultural heritage.

Finally, the Soviets must be made to realize that the detente it apparently seeks with the United States can only be furthered, not stymied, by granting to Soviet Jewry as well as others in the Soviet Union, the full rights of worship, cultural diversity, and migration enjoyed by citizens in all freedom-loving nations.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 471 has my strong support.

For many years, the Jews of the Soviet Union have been denied basic rights accorded other people. Yet, they yearn for religious and cultural identity. They plea for the opportunity to give free expression to their faith.

Could anyone doubt the depth of their conviction when yearly, during the High Holy Days, they press into Moscow's Central Synagogue by the thousands, despite the risk involved?

Could anyone doubt the extent of their suffering when, less than a year ago, we read accounts of the trials at Riga and Leningrad?

For years the Jews of the Soviet Union—considered a nationality in the U.S.S.R.—have pleaded for the first-class citizenship guaranteed to them by the Soviet Constitution. They want the right to celebrate the traditions of their forefathers—a right of other nationalities—and the right to study the history, language and literature of their people. They want newspapers and periodicals, schools and textbooks and the opportunity to come together freely with their fellow Jews in the U.S.S.R. They also want to associate with Jewish organizations beyond their borders. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews want above all the opportunity to join their families abroad.

In the past, free people around the world have expressed their concern about the treatment of Soviet Jews. From time

to time, a glimmer of hope was kindled, as small concessions—often temporary—were granted. Yet, only recently, with thousands of their number permitted to emigrate to Israel, could we take encouragement for our efforts of the past. For many of us have been deeply involved in this cause for many years.

This is why, as cochairman of the Democratic Platform Committee in 1946 and again in 1968, I was able to have a provision included in our Party's statement protesting communist oppression of Jews and other minorities.

This is why, as U.S. Representative-elect, I addressed the President on behalf of Soviet Jews, and as a member of the House of Representatives, cosponsored legislation to provide 30,000 special immigrant visas to Soviet Jews wishing to enter the United States.

It is also why I wrote to Frank Shakespeare, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, requesting that the Voice of America add Yiddish to the other language services for Eastern Europe.

Because of my concern, I joined 43 colleagues in the House last June in writing to President Nixon, asking him to make a public statement protesting the trial of Soviet Jews in Kishinev, Moldavia, for an alleged skyjacking attempt. We urged the President to press the Soviet Government to take affirmative action to grant Soviet Jews the full rights enjoyed by citizens of all freedom-loving nations.

It is also why I joined my colleagues last summer in urging Secretary of State William P. Rogers to see that every possible effort be made by the U.S. Government and Embassy officials in the Soviet Union to help members of the U.S. press corps attend the trial. "Their presence," our letter stated, "not only will alleviate the growing concern which the secrecy of these trials has caused, but it is also the one guarantee that the defendants will receive a fair trial."

On August 6, 1971, I cosponsored a resolution virtually identical to the bill we are considering today, and on February 8, 1972, I cosponsored another, extremely important bill—one which would provide $85 million to help Israel care for Soviet Jews while they are being settled.

Earlier this month, I joined over 75 colleagues in writing to President Nixon asking that on his forthcoming trip to Moscow that he urge Soviet officials to release some 40 religious prisoners—Jews incarcerated for practicing their faith.

Today, the House must pass House Concurrent Resolution 471. Our moral duty is clear. As a legislative body representing a free people, this act is our responsibility on behalf of our brethren who yearn to have the blessings of a free land.

Indeed, it is imperative that the President know of our strongly held desire that, when he goes to Moscow in May, he call upon the Soviet Government to permit free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution. It is our hope that he will take the opportunity to try and secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities, and allow them to emigrate at will. We are also expressing our determination that the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights—particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities—be raised in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Man's inhumanity to man must be everybody's business—wherever it occurs. So long as discrimination in the Soviet Union remains, we cannot give up the fight. We will protest injustice.

We will shout forth the clarion call of the Book of Exodus, "Let My People Go." We will not stop until Soviet officials affirmatively respond to our cry.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his splendid work on this resolution as well as all members of the subcommittee. I believe that this resolution, in eminently reasonable and statesmanlike form, does express the sentiments long felt by Members of this House that Americans must protest the treatment of Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Unon.

This resolution comes as a welcome and logical follow up to the joint statement of protest signed by over 300 Members which I had the honor of initiating back in 1967.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet Union has been responding to the pressures of the world community to make some improvement in the situation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union, and to permit numbers of Jews to leave. It is important, indeed it is imperative, that we maintain that pressure.

There is today, as the Members know a substantial flow of Jewish families from the Soviet Union running somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 a month, most of them going to Israel. This is an extraordinary development. It is, in a way, an historic lifting of the Iron Curtain. Nobody knows quite why it is taking place, but it is taking place, and we want to be sure that in a reasonable and not in a provocative way we maintain the pressure to keep this flow coming from the Soviet Union, and toward improving conditions for those who remain.

I would also like to touch upon a phase of the problem that some of the other Members have mentioned, and that is that this resolution should be followed soon by action of the Congress to make some provision toward assisting the State of Israel in absorbing this large number of refugees.

I had the honor recently of being on an official mission from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, along with the able gentleman from New York, (Mr. HALPERN) during which we visited the staging area, the refugee center in Vienna, where the Jewish refugees come in from the Soviet Union, and then went on to Israel to inspect at firsthand the problems involved in this resettlement effort there. There are gigantic problems. The expenditures that the Israelis are making, the sacrifices they are making to accommodate these people, are a perfectly extraordinary and inspiring thing to witness. But they cannot do it alone. The American Jewish community on a private basis is generously responding to the need, but I believe it would be also in the interest of the United States and incumbent upon us from a moral and practical viewpoint that the Government of the United States assist also in aiding Israel to carry this very great burden of providing homes, apartments, jobs, language training, and all the rest of the things needed by these refugees from the Soviet Union.

I want to make one other point about them, and that is that they are not, as has sometimes been described, primarily older people, the infirm, or children. On the contrary, these refugees come from all walks of life, they are of different ages and from different backgrounds. Many of them have valuable skills which makes it all the more remarkable that they are being allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

I hope the resolution before us will be adopted overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN).

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of this resolution. I commend the chairman of the European Subcommittee, my distinguished colleague from my neighboring district, the able gentlemen from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) on his sponsorship of this legislation and on his superb stewardship in guiding it to the floor today.

This resolution expresses in no uncertain terms America's abhorrence of the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jewish population and reaffirms our commitment for basic human rights.

From the earliest times, Jews in Russia have been subjected to various pressures and forms of discrimination. For the Russian rulers, anti-Semitism often proved to be a convenient instrument of policy. During the tsarist period a variety of laws were used against the Jewish population and often resulted in widespread programs—the goal being eradication of the Jewish ethnic identity—culture, religion, and language.

The current wave of discrimination against the Jewish population in the Soviet Union illustrates the degree to which anti-Semitism is still promoted and exploited by the Soviet Government. The status of Soviet Jews has in many cases deteriorated to that of second-class citizens in a society that espouses equality as a basic tenet of its national life. The Jews in Russia have been denied religious and cultural freedom as well as the right to emigrate freely. Today, I hope this body will act to reaffirm our commitments to oppressed people throughout the Soviet Union and express its indigna-

tion regarding the treatment of Soviet Jews.

Only last week I returned from a study mission on the subject of the emigration of Russian Jews with our fine and capable colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). We observed firsthand the arrival of hundreds of Jews from the Soviet Union in Vienna en route to the State of Israel. We saw them as they arrived. We met with them, talked with them, and witnessed their reactions as they stepped off planes and trains and touched for the first time, land other than their native Russia soil. We saw the look in their eyes and could sense the joy in their hearts. But we could also sense their apprehension. Nevertheless, their determination to face the challenges of their new life was most apparent. It was without doubt the most moving experience in my life.

The day after these emigrants arrived, we visited them at a temporary shelter where we sat in groups, and through interpreters, talked informally about their plights in the Soviet Union. If ever anyone had doubt of the suppression of freedoms in the Soviet Union, I only wish they could have listened to these refugees. Among them were doctors, engineers, teachers, journalists, tailors, shoemakers, farmers, housewives, elderly men and women, children and young couples. They all came with but one goal: to find new life within the concepts of their spiritual and moral beliefs and to be free of repression and fear.

We also visited an absorption center in Israel where highly sophisticated programs were planned for the constructive readjustment of Israel's newest citizens. We saw typical housing units for Russian refugees and we spoke to many of the residents. Not all were newcomers, some had lived there for months; others for years.

Later on in our mission we were privileged to be on hand at the airport in Tel Aviv to meet the plane which carried the same groups we met at the train station and at the airport in Vienna and at their temporary residence there before they embarked for Israel.

Several of the refugees recognized us as they stepped off the plane with their bright eyes and broad smiles—surely more outgoing than when they arrived in Europe—more confident and more determined. We exchanged hearty "shaloms" and warm handshakes. This was a touching scene, one that I wish every Member of this House could have experienced.

Our hearts were enlightened by what we saw, what we learned and what we experienced. This experience evidenced the great hope ahead for people who wish to be free.

The Russian Jews we met were the fortunate ones, for their applications were approved by Soviet officials based on supporting affidavits from relatives in Israel. There have been an average of 2,000 such emigrants a month coming to Israel since the beginning of this year.

But out of 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union this number is small indeed, yet it is a good beginning and points to the effectiveness of responsible action. The consensus of all of those to whom we spoke is that responsible United States attitudes and world opinion has helped motivate the Soviet Union to relax its policy toward an effort to allow these numbers to migrate.

Clearly though, this is not enough. We must not rest until all those who seek religious and cultural freedom are able to achieve it.

That is why legislation like this, expressing the will of the American people through their representatives in the Congress, is so imperative. That is why I was so delighted when our committee approved this resolution unanimously and why I trust this entire body will also give it such resounding approval.

I trust the adoption of this resolution will be the forerunner of favorable action by this Congress to provide special U.S. assistance to Israel to help in the tremendous and costly effort to absorb these refugees from Communist suppression. This, I believe, would be in keeping with our repeatedly pronounced humanitarian policy of providing refugee relief and consistent with the principals of justice and freedom.

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to have his remarks appear in the RECORD following those of Mr. BINGHAM.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Chamber today attended religious services in the church or synagogue of our choice over the weekend and probably gave little thought to the rights and the freedom we, as Americans, exercised in so doing.

But there are millions of people within the Soviet Union who are denied this basic human right.

Even where the state has permitted churches to remain, the Soviet Government frowns on attendance at worship services and pursues repressive tactics to discourage religious observances.

Perhaps the people most gravely injured by these oppressive policies of the Soviet Government are the Jews who find their rights severely limited on ethnic as well as religious grounds.

This blatant denial of human rights to Jews and other religious and ethnic minorities is the basis for this resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker.

The evidence offered our committee during consideration of this and other legislation regarding Soviet Jews stands as awesome testimony to the courage of this people, who, despite the repressive actions of the Soviet Government and the reprisals they face for merely acknowledging their Jewishness, continue to strive to maintain their religion, culture, and faith.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the first provision of this resolution would urge the President to press the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

In this resolution we are expressing our concern not only for the rights of Soviet Jews, but for Soviet Baptists, members of the Russian Orthodox Church, Catholics, and others who are similarly repressed.

It has recently come to my attention, for example, that children have been taken from their rightful parents and placed in orphanages merely because the parents sought to take their children to Baptist churches. Children under 14 years of age are not permitted to attend services in the church and their parents face economic reprisals for attending church or holding worship services in their homes.

And this brings me to the second provision of this resolution, which urges the utilization of formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

We have heard testimony of Soviet Jews being denied jobs, education and the free expression of their culture. Baptists have lost their homes because they held worship services there. Many additional acts against religious groups are documented, including imprisonment for the exercise of freedoms of speech and of conscience.

Many of those within the religious minorities, but particularly the Jews, have sought to immigrate to other lands, such as the effort by many Jews to go to Israel. Until recently when pressure from within and without the Soviet Union forced some modification of that Government's policy, these requests were denied.

Even now, the numbers permitted to leave are very small.

In the past year I have met with a number of Soviet Jews who have fled their country and I have become personally and painfully aware of the intransigence of the Soviet Government where emigration rights are concerned.

Thus the third provision of our resolution deals with this basic right accorded by all freedom-loving nations to their citizens, the right to emigrate.

The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights acknowledges the right of citizens to emigrate to the countries of their choice and the Soviet Union is a signatory to this declaration. Yet it flagrantly violates this right daily.

The fourth provision would, therefore, call on the President to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's violation of the Human Rights Declaration.

There is substantial evidence to indicate that outside pressure has been instrumental in bringing about changes in Soviet policy with regard to discrimination and persecution of minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this resolution will put the U.S. Congress on record in opposition to the violation of human rights presently being perpetrated within the Soviet Union.

It will also serve to call to the attention of the rest of the world the plight

of our fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain in their quest for freedom to follow the dictates of their conscience and their God.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) for bringing it to the floor. Also I want to commend the principal sponsors of the resolution, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

The cause of Soviet Jews, Mr. Speaker, has been taken up by people of all religions—Protestants, Jewish, and Catholic. They are joining together trying to help to persuade and urge the Soviet authorities to approve the immigration visas that have been requested by Soviet Jews.

Only a few weeks ago in the city of Chicago, the cause of Soviet Jews was the subject of a conference of representatives of all religious faiths, a meeting that culminated an assembly in a Roman Catholic cathedral under the personal sponsorship of Cardinal Cody.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this cause is the pride of all good men of good will.

A few weeks ago during the Easter recess, I traveled to Israel and spoke to a number of Russian Jews who only recently had arrived there. Their story is both a grim one and a glorious one—grim in their description of the harsh treatment they received from authorities in the Soviet Union for stating their desire to leave the Soviet Union for Israel—glorious in their courage and fortitude in standing up against the Soviet authorities and demanding their legal right to leave the Soviet Union—and I say their legal right because it is their legal right under the Constitution of the Soviet Union and their various conventions of the United Nations to which the Soviet Union has subscribed.

For the first time in the 50-year history of the Soviet Union, a group of its citizens has dared to challenge the Government. This is not an isolated confrontation as has happened on occasion by freedom-loving individuals and intellectuals. Rather, it is a position taken by thousands of Jews who have requested visas to leave the Soviet Union. More than 70,000 affidavits have been sent from Israel to Soviet Jews seeking exit permits. Hundreds of others are watching to see what happens to their countrymen who have dared to challenge the Soviet authorities.

As it has been pointed out so well in the report, those who apply for exit permits, Jews who seek to emigrate to Israel are harassed and mistreated and they lose their jobs. Their children are dismissed from college, if they happen to be there. Some are confined to jail and some are confined to mental institutions. In many cases the Soviet postal authorities have refused or have failed to deliver affidavits from relatives in Israel, who must acknowledge applications for exit permits. Those who receive their visas to leave the Soviet Union must first pay the equivalent of $1,000 per person before they can leave the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed an important resolution because the pressure of world opinion must be brought to bear upon this problem. This resolution will help to bring the force of public opinion to help Soviet Jews and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The plight of Soviet Jewry, alarming throughout the 1950's and 1960's, is now even worse. All but institutionalized, the Soviet Government's bigotry strikes out at Jews everywhere in Russian life: in jobs, housing, education, travel, cultural activities of every kind.

We, in the Congress, have a moral responsibility to help alleviate their plight.

The resolution now before us, honoring that responsibility, urges President Nixon to take these steps:

First. Call upon the Soviet Union to allow the free expression of ideas and the free exercise of religion.

Second. Exhaust our diplomatic contacts with the Soviet Union, formal and informal, in an effort to end discrimination against religious minorities.

Third. Ask the Soviet Union to permit its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice.

Fourth. Raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Jews and other religious minorities.

More than 2,300,000 Jews now live under the Kremlin's yoke. Yet no newspaper—indeed, virtually no publication whatever—is published in Yiddish. No school teaches in the Jews' tradition or tongue. No theater celebrates their cultural heritage. No central organization binds them together in common purpose. Even food, the kosher dishes Jews have savored in a tradition still surviving after thousands of years, is denied them. Few shops, if any, carry these foods or their principal ingredients.

Soviet Jews endure persecution almost reminiscent of the 18th century czarist pogroms that left hundreds of thousands hanged and pilloried throughout Russia.

It is hardly surprising, Mr. Speaker, that many Soviet Jews want to emigrate to Israel. But the Kremlin grants few exit visas—perhaps 10 percent of those sought, and even these slowly and grudgingly. Their cost is nothing short of extortionate; about $1,000, a fabulous sum to any Russian citizen. After years of groping through the redtape strewn in their path by Soviet officialdom, Jews granted visas face still more vexing obstacles. Their departures are delayed—often for months, sometimes for years. And, since they must explicitly renounce Soviet citizenship to become eligible for visas in the first place, they are suspended in a kind of eerie political limbo—without jobs, without permanent living quarters, without official status of any kind. They become, as the newspapers whimsically say, "nonpersons."

We in the Congress must continue to make their plight known to the world. We must continue to make speeches. We must continue to sponsor resolutions. We must continue to plead with worldwide organizations like the United Nations.

Even the Soviet Union, no matter how glacially aloof to the world community, cannot ignore public outrage.

I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, THOMAS MORGAN, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I urge its prompt adoption.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for having brought to the floor today this very timely, very appropriate resolution which puts Congress on record as recognizing the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union, and calls upon the President to take actions which will reaffirm the commitment of this Congress and this Nation to freedom and justice.

House Concurrent Resolution 471 is a measure designed to bring to bear the influence of the United States on behalf of the persecuted Jewish minority in the Soviet Union.

The harsh plight of all minority groups in the Soviet Union is well known. The mistreatment of Soviet Jews, however, is especially severe because they are discriminated against both because of their religion and their cultural heritage. The resolution which is before us today addresses this intolerable situation.

First, the resolution requests the President to call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and exercise of religion by all of its citizens. And there can be no doubt that Soviet Jews are being denied these fundamental human rights. Judaism is not permitted in any central or coordinating structure; unlike the other 10 recognized religions in the Soviet Union, each congregation must function in isolation. Publication of religious literature and Bibles is not permitted nor is the manufacture of religious articles. Synagogues have been closed in almost systematic fashion as a result of both direct and indirect governmental action—in 1956, there were 450 synagogues, in April of 1963, 100 and today the figure has dwindled to less than 60. And unlike most other nationalities, the distinctive language, activities, and community institutions of Jews have also been severely restricted. There are no longer any Jewish publishing houses, newspapers, theaters, or communal institutions. As Leonid Rigerman, a 30-year-old physicist whom I aided in entering this country by intervening with the State Department in order to confirm his U.S. citizenship, stated:

A Jew cannot be a Jew in Russia. We are deprived of all forms of Jewish culture; you cannot study the language; Jewish religious literature is forbidden.

Although the rights of freedom of speech and religion were written into the Soviet Constitution, they have never been honored. Those of us who are fortunate enough to enjoy these freedoms have a responsibility to work for the relief of oppressed people the world over.

The resolution calls on the President to use all available channels, formal and informal, to convey this position. This provision is particularly timely, in light of the President's expected visit to Moscow. I think it is essential that the President talk face-to-face with Soviet leaders about the treatment of Soviet Jews, for this will show these officials that Americans are truly concerned about the welfare of Soviet Jewry.

The resolution also calls upon the President to request of the Soviet Government that it allow its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice, as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The Jews in Russia are struggling to maintain their cultural and religious identity in an atmosphere of suppression. The tragedy of this situation is compounded by the Soviet Government's refusal to grant its citizens the right to emigrate to countries where religious and cultural diversity are tolerated. Yet, just as they are not permitted to exercise their religion and sustain their cultural identity in the Soviet Union, they are, at the same time, being denied the right to leave the very society that is stifling them.

There are some who have had the good fortune to be allowed to leave Russia—in 1970, less than 1,000 Jews emigrated from Russia; in 1971 roughly 13,000 emigrated; and this year it is estimated that, if the current rate of emigration is maintained, 30,000 Jews will be permitted to leave the Soviet Union.

Most Soviet Jews who have expressed a desire to emigrate have indicated their strong wish to settle in a land where they are truly welcomed—the State of Israel. Israel, which is already heavily burdened with the cost of maintaining her own defenses, is now faced with the problem of absorbing the influx of Soviet Jews. Therefore, I am cosponsoring a bill to provide up to $85 million in assistance to Israel in the resettlement of those Soviet Jews who are granted the right to emigrate.

Finally, the resolution calls on the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, a declaration adopted unanimously by the United Nations. I believe that the United Nations is an appropriate forum for raising this issue of international concern, for it is a body that was organized to promote peaceful relations between nations as well as personal liberty within nations.

The struggle of the Jews in the Soviet Union to attain religious and cultural freedom, an issue which should be of paramount international concern, must be assisted simultaneously on many fronts. Therefore, I have introduced a resolution 454, which expresses the sense of Congress that the Voice of America should undertake broadcasts in the Yiddish language into the Soviet Union. After I introduced this measure in the House, where it was cosponsored by over 100 of my colleagues, 22 Senators introduced an identical measure in the Senate. Yiddish is the primary language of many Jews living in the Soviet Union and is an integral part of Jewish culture. Voice of America broadcasts in Yiddish would provide an immeasurable psychological uplift to Soviet Jews and would provide them with unquestionable evidence of genuine American concern.

I have long been actively involved in the effort to assist Soviet Jewry. In past Congresses, I have introduced resolutions, similar to the one we are considering today, to condemn religious persecution in the Soviet Union. In the 91st Congress, I introduced a bill requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families outside the Soviet Union.

In December of 1970, nine Soviet Jews were among 11 persons tried and convicted in Leningrad of the attempted hijacking of an airliner. The fact that two death sentences and harsh prison terms were imposed prompted me to urge then-Speaker McCormack, then-Majority Leader Carl Albert and the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to bring to the floor, in the closing days of that Congress, a resolution condemning the persecution of Soviet Jews and urging the Soviet Union to provide fair and equitable justice for its Jewish citizens, as I had introduced. On December 31, the House leadership brought to the floor, and the House passed, House Resolution 1336 which put the House on record in support of religious freedom and equal justice for all Soviet citizens.

We have had some other success. For instance, congressional pressure on the administration led to the announcement by Attorney General Mitchell on September 30 of last year, that he would exercise his parole authority to enable Soviet Jews to enter our country.

If Soviet Jews are to win their struggle for survival, their cause must be kept center-stage. It is widely believed that worldwide concern and pressure on Soviet officials is responsible for the increase in the number of Jews being permitted to emigrate. This shows the necessity of increasing and intensifying the pressure of world opinion. I believe that the resolution under consideration today will serve to focus world attention on the problem of Soviet Jewry and will intensify the pressure on the Soviet government to grant basic rights to the oppressed people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete support of the spirit of "determined step No. 4," in this House Concurrent Resolution No. 471.

I suspect that although not traveled as much, I have as much concept of human kindness and equality in my soul as most, and certainly I would decry discrimination anywhere. However, I think "determined" step No. 4 in the resolution would easily and properly handle step No. 3—which is not quite so determined—particularly if we implement determined step No. 4 under the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to which both our Nation and the other sovereign nation under consideration are signatory.

What I really rise for today—and if I had a bosun's whistle, I would sound out loud and clear and say, "Now hear this":

One, I think this legislation should not have come out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the first place, because it is segmental and discriminatory legislation.

Two, I object violently to the procedure of bringing it up under suspension of the rules wherein, as determined by parliamentary inquiry a while ago by myself, there are no amendments allowable whether before or after consideration of the text or the preamble under the present rule on suspension.

Third, there are absolutely no departmental reports—favorable or otherwise.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that this will be about as effective, insofar as determined steps No. 1 and 2 are concerned in a demand—or petition—to the U.S.S.R., as the proverbial fifth teat on a boar to a suckling pig.

If this is not segmental and separate legislation for individuals, why did we not do the same thing for the Congo in Kinshasa or Biafra? Why would it not be just as effective to expect the representatives of the Soviet Union to have a concurrent resolution of their Presidium and implore us to solve our religious or ethnic problems? Indeed, is determined step No. 2 not a very basic mixing of religion and state, of the secular and the religious? Read those "determined steps" again, I implore my fellow Members.

I think we should not send unadorned ambassadors around the world, in violation of the amendments to our Constitution, assuming the functions of the Department of State or the executive branch, and I think that we should strike all the whereases in this legislation under consideration plus the first three "resolves," because the fourth one would handle that which is apropos and pertinent nicely—especially the third.

I cannot imagine us countenancing the going to the Republic of Ireland or to the British Commonwealth at this time with such a resolution, let alone an individual self-appointed member.

I ask again, why should we do it in this particular case, as well intentioned as the final results may be? But think of the legislative situation under which we act, think of the paradox of the proponents' objecting to the defense of the South Vietnamese and their religion, and their desire for individual liberty; when the self-same people are such strong proponents of this legislation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Europe Subcommittee chairmen and members for bringing out this resolution. I might suggest that this kind of resolution and other manifestations of world opinion have had a salutary effect upon the problem of treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. I think they have created important changes in many of the policies of the Soviet Union. We most certainly should seek to express the weight of this body and the views of this country with respect to abuses of the rights of individuals all over this world.

The joining together of Jews and non-Jews alike in the court of world opinion has effected a change in the Soviet policy toward emigration of those Jews who desire to emigrate and toward greater freedom for those Jews who wish to remain, but to live their lives as Jews, with a Jewish identity, and with full access to Jewish cultural and religious institutions.

I think that Congress does well to support this resolution. I hope that Mr. Nixon will bring it to the attention of the leaders of the Soviet Union when he visits there.

The 3 million Soviet Jews represent the third largest Jewish community in the world, yet the last Hebrew language book published in the Soviet Union was published in 1928. While this single fact does not tell the entire story, it speaks volumes about the general state of Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Union.

House Concurrent Resolution 471 calls upon the President to take the following four steps with regard to the plight of Soviet Jews:

First, call upon the Soviets to permit free expression and the free exercise of religion by all of its citizens;

Second, utilize our contacts with Moscow to seek an end to discrimination against religious minorities;

Third, ask that the Soviet Government permit free emigration by its citizens, as guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and,

Fourth, raise in the U.N. General Assembly the question of Soviet violations of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, especially against Jews and other minorities.

In considering the issue of Soviet Jews, it is important to keep in mind the fact that there are two groups to which we refer. The essential distinction between them is that some Soviet Jews wish to leave the Soviet Union, to emigrate to Israel, the United States, or other nations, while some wish to remain there and be allowed to live as Jews and to practice the Jewish religion.

Jews who have sought to leave for Israel or to rejoin broken or scattered families elsewhere have encountered difficulty, harassment, and imprisonment. Jobs and educational opportunities may be denied as soon as application for an exit visa is made. The pressure of world opinion, including resolutions such as this one, has had a salutary effect upon this problem, however, and it has eased somewhat in recent months.

During my visit to Israel last summer, I was informed by officials at an absorption center providing temporary homes and training facilities for immigrants that the number of Soviet Jews migrating to Israel is now at the rate of 1,000 per month. Despite this stepup, many Soviet Jews are still seeking exit visas and enduring considerable hardships, including imprisonment, in the meantime.

There have also been grave obstacles placed in the path of Jews who desire to remain in the Soviet Union, but who want the right to identify and live as Jews and to have free access to the Jewish language, cultural, religious, and educational institutions. Yiddish-language cultural and educational publications, which flourished during the early years of the Soviet regime, barely exist today. Only occasionally are Yiddish books published; only 16,000 copies of the Yiddish monthly magazine, Sovietish Heimland, are printed and many of these are exported.

Although ideologically the Soviet Government is committed to atheism, its laws—as written—do allow for freedom of religious worship. In actuality, however, and unlike other recognized religious sects, Judaism is not permitted any central or coordinating structure in the Soviet Union, and publication of Bibles and prayer books is severely limited. Despite these restrictions, tens of thousands of young Jews gather to sign up with and engage in the activities of Jewish synagogues across their nation.

We must demonstrate our concern for those Jews who would remain in the Soviet Union as well as for those who wish to leave, and I am pleased to note that this resolution does that. It is gratifying to see the Congress of the United States join with the millions of people dedicated to human rights in urging that Soviet Jews be granted all of the rights of other Soviet citizens, be permitted to live as Jews and to practice the Jewish religion, and be permitted to emigrate if they so desire. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the facts which have confronted us concerning the Soviet Union are indisputable. In a nation where there are over 3 million Jews, the lack of religious facilities is scandalous. In a land of many nationalities, each permitted its own schools, books, language, and culture, there is one nationality which is denied these rights—the Jews. In a nation which represses all religions, one group is singled out for special and vindictive abuse—the Jews. They cannot freely live their lives as Jews.

In House Concurrent Resolution 471, we have before us an opportunity to express our collective concern over the plight of these innocent victims of religious persecution. Gratified by the President's recent expression of commitment to the rights of free emigration and religious liberty for all, let us now call upon him to do all that he can to insure that the Soviet Government permit the free expression of ideas by all its citizens, utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials to secure an end to this discrimination, demand the right to emigrate for these people, and raise this issue in the United Nations.

Certainly, there is much more that we in Congress can do. For example, I have cosponsored with Congressman BINGHAM and others, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel. It appears that the Soviet Union is, indeed, responsive to public pressure. Recent developments indicate a change in Soviet policy on emigration. They fear pressure and will respond, if it is strongly and widely expressed.

But this resolution is most timely in view of the President's upcoming trip to the Soviet Union. It is my sincerest hope that the President will go to Russia in the knowledge that the entire Congress has expressed its deep concern in this matter and that he will include the plight of Soviet Jewry along with the many other vital topics on the agenda.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor.

I also take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 471, Congress will be calling on our Government to lend its full weight to ending Soviet oppression of its Jewish minority. Specifically, the resolution urges the President to take the following four actions: First, to call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; second, to utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; third, to request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and fourth, to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Mr. Speaker, a number of us, myself included, sponsored legislation virtually identical to the resolution under consideration. We did so in the belief that the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jewish citizens is directly related to the world attention which has focused on this problem. Certain actions of the Soviet Government appear to substantiate this contention. For example, the recent increase in the number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union appears to

be a deliberate attempt by the Soviets to counter hostile international reaction to the repression of its Jewish minority.

The President's forthcoming trip to Moscow offers a unique opportunity for talks with Soviet leaders concerning the plight of Russian Jews and other religious minorities. Passage of the resolution before us could significantly enhance the prospect of Soviet Jews coming under discussion at that summit as well as the prospect of further concessions resulting from the outcry of world public opinion.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the House considers today a measure which is of monumental importance to millions of Jews who reside in the Soviet Union, and who are virtually held captive by a government which will not recognize the rights bestowed by either its own constitution, or the declaration of human rights which every member of the United Nations has pledged to support and uphold. The deplorable inhumanity and indifference which has been visited upon the Jewish people is a disgrace not only to the leaders of the Soviet Union, but to every freedom-loving people on the face of the earth. As I have often remarked, it may be said that as a democracy it is our responsibility to make the world community aware of the injustices which are occurring on a daily basis. It is important that we continue to speak out lest we in America take our freedom for granted.

But what is more imperative is that we match our words with action. House Concurrent Resolution 471 accomplishes that objective. Through the auspices of the President of the United States and the Soviet Union, House Concurrent Resolution 471 calls upon the Soviet Government in its own words·

To permit the free expression of ideas and exercise or religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet constitution.

For centuries, the Jews in Russia, as well as elsewhere in Europe, suffered extreme persecution and oppression at the hands of tyrannical czars and monarchs. With the emergence of communism, the plight of the Soviet Jew has not improved. Yet today there is no excuse for the endurance of such hardships and humiliations, for with the creation of the State of Israel, the Jews have at last secured a homeland. Israel is ready, willing, and able to accept Russian Jews. Yet, while they remain imprisoned within the Soviet Union, Israel is powerless to provide these people with the homeland for which they long.

While the Russians have permitted increasing numbers of Jews to leave the Soviet Union, they have been extremely selective. While the unskilled and the uneducated are permitted to leave, thousands of technicians, scientists, teachers, and professional people have not been allowed to leave. This practice is in clear violation of the declaration of human rights, which affirms the right of every man and woman to emigrate freely and without restriction.

Recently, I received a letter from a young man in the Soviet Union who stated that he had tried, unsuccessfully for a year, to obtain an emigration visa.

The consideration of this resolution is very timely. Next month the President will visit the Soviet Union and confer with top officials there. Should the House and Senate pass this measure, the President must recognize the importance of this issue to the people of the United States. To my mind, this resolution is of utmost urgency, as it speaks to the core of human existence: the desire to be free. By enacting House Concurrent Resolution 471 the House will be taking a positive and decisive step to aid the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union whose only purpose is to attain the freedom to emigrate to their homeland. I call on my colleagues to act favorably upon this measure.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, when the Ninety-second Congress convened on January 22, 1971, my first act was to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 8 which expressed the sense of Congress against the persecution of Soviet Jews by Soviet Russia because of their religion.

Since that time many similar resolutions have been introduced by my colleagues in the Congress, and I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) who is the outstanding chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for holding hearings on my bill as well as on other bills seeking relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews.

The result of those hearings is the bill we have before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 471, which urges the President to call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens, to utilize contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities, to request the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice, and to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

The religious, social, cultural, and legal discrimination against the Jews in the Soviet Union has been in evidence for hundreds of years. However, in recent times there has been a rebirth of cultural identity of Soviet Jews, and with this rebirth has come a greater willingness for self-assertion by many Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Jews, in growing numbers, are protesting being deprived of Hebrew books, cultural and religious articles, synagogue services and rabbis, and, increasingly, the Soviet Jews have indicated their strong desire to start a new life elsewhere—particularly in Israel—and to abandon the Soviet Union because of its hostility to Jews.

With the advent of the President's trip to Moscow, next month, the timeliness of the legislation before us today becomes even more apparent. It is my hope that the President will raise the subject of Soviet Jewry and will speak in behalf of the Soviet Jews who have for so long been victims of oppression and discrimination in the Soviet Union. The United States has long been an advocate of the highest aspirations of human freedom, and Congress, by the passage of this legislation, will indicate to the President and to the Soviet Union that Americans are keenly aware of the plight of Soviet Jews and are hopeful that the meeting in Moscow will result in greater recognition of the human rights of Soviet Jews and also freedom for Soviet Jews to emigrate to the country of their choice.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter I directed recently to the White House urging the President to speak in behalf of Soviet Jewry during his forthcoming trip to Moscow, as well as an article which appeared a few months ago in the Washington Post outlining the growing sentiment in the United States in behalf of the Soviet Jews:

APRIL 7, 1972.

HON. CLARK MACGREGOR,
Counsel to the President for Congressional Relations, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLARK: I am enclosing for your information a memorandum as well as an attached letter I have received from the Committee on Soviet Jewry in Chicago.

The Committee asks that the President, during his forthcoming trip to Soviet Russia, do all within his power to secure some relief for the persecuted Soviet Jews in their struggles for repatriation to Israel. The 48 Jewish families in the Soviet Union who have signed the enclosed letter ask that the President include in his itinerary a meeting with them as a step toward bringing about some solution of this urgent problem.

I do hope in the interest of peace and the easing of world tensions it will be possible for the President to extend all possible consideration to this request during his forthcoming trip to Moscow.

I shall look forward to hearing from you and appreciate your cooperation.

With every best wish, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1971]

PRELUDE TO NIXON TRIP: SOVIET JEWS DRAW NEW U.S. ATTENTION

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

Delicately mixing diplomacy and a dab of politics, the Nixon administration is deepening its intervention into a particularly sensitive area of Soviet domestic life—the condition of Soviet Jews—even while the President is preparing for the major diplomatic project of his trip to Moscow next May.

The effort has its ironic aspect: The last two Democratic Presidents, presumably much more responsive to Jewish voters and advisers than a Republican chief executive, did very little of substance or political visibility to help the cause of Soviet Jews. Some memos on the issue which he did not use were prepared for John Kennedy: in his lone public reference, he condemned synagogue closings in passing during a speech to the U.N. General Assembly—without naming the Soviet Union. Lyndon Johnson's attention seems to have been only private.

Richard Nixon presumably counts less on Jewish voters and expects less from them. His Mideast policy, for instance, has distressed many American Jews: his pro-suburbs policy appears to be directed only incidentally at them. But he has done a great deal—enough to privately astonish some of his Jewish critics on other issues—in respect to Soviet Jews.

In fact, he is no stranger to the issue.

He has a little known but long term record of concern. As Vice President in 1959, he responded to a request from American Jews and successfully undertook to have President Eisenhower take up the Soviet Jewish question privately with a visiting Kremlin official, Anastas Mikoyan. In his own trip to Moscow that year. Mr. Nixon inaugurated the practice of having high American officials request the Russians to review the cases of those residents, including many Jews, who had tried and failed to join close relatives in the United States.

His administration's record is curiously little known. First, he has identified himself with American Jews and others who want to help Russian Jews, by publicly receiving delegations and lending White House status to their appeals.

Reversing a tough American immigration policy dating back to World War II, the administration announced on Sept. 30 that it would admit without limit Soviet Jews who might want to immigrate. Attorney General Mitchell said he had decided so to use his "parole authority" (used in the past for Czech and Cuban refugees) because of "mounting evidence that Soviet Jews have unsuccessfully sought permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union." Congressional sponsors of legislation to grant 30,000 non-quota emergency visas to Russian Jews halted their efforts, acknowledging that the Nixon initiative was more generous and effective.

Congress has prepared scores of resolutions over the years urging the Soviet Union to end discrimination against its Jewish citizens and to allow those so minded to leave. The Annunzio resolution, one of several currently being studied by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is the first to receive presidential endorsement. In offering support, the State Department set aside its customary aloofness from such an "internal" matter and explicitly accepted the resolution's purpose of "helping focus world attention on the plight of Soviet Jewry."

Finally, in a series of State and White House pronouncements, the administration has protested specified Soviet acts, such as the death sentences handed down last year to some Jews who had hijacked a plane to go to Israel—the sentences were later commuted. It has had American representatives at the United Nations turn from generalized appeals for "human rights" to specific appeals for Soviet Jews' right to emigrate—emigration to Israel is reaching new highs this year. In a 21-page statement to a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Nov. 8, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard Davies made a comprehensive indictment of Kremlin policy toward Russian Jews.

Events then took an odd turn. The New York Times ran the Davies story on the front page under the headline "U.S. Asserts Soviet Jews Are Not Living in Terror." Actually, Davies didn't so "assert"; he said carefully that "with respect to the majority, claims that Soviet Jews as a community are living in a state of terror seem to be overdrawn."

Reacting just to The Times, not to the text, however, the American Jewish Congress at once said it was "shocked and outraged by the attempt of the U.S. State Department to diminish the severity of the situation facing Soviet Jews." Also reacting just to The Times, Pravda can dispatch from its New York correspondent quoting Davies as saying, "The statement that Soviet Jews live in conditions of terror is not valid." Davies had refuted "the fantasies of the Zionists," Pravda concluded.

The result is that an official statement on Soviet Jews of unprecedented fairness, sympathy and toughness was presented to two important audiences—the readers of The Times and the readers of Pravda—as an official deprecation of the plight of Soviet Jews. At one end, the administration was attacked by weighty groups in the United States for heartlessly and bureaucratically selling out Soviet Jews. At the other end, its purposes were gleefully distorted by the Russians in their continuing attempt to minimize the international political costs of the way they treat their Jews.

That leaves President Nixon headed for Moscow next spring. If past performance is any guide, he will surely raise the subject of Soviet Jewry. This prospect does trouble some diplomats, who fear that Moscow's extreme sensitivity on the Jewish issue makes it risky for the United States to press it. But the facts argue otherwise. Mr. Nixon has vigorously involved the American government in the plight of Soviet Jews and simultaneously he has moved to explore better relations with the Kremlin. His record so far shows the two do fit.

Once again, I would like to commend Congressman ROSENTHAL, chairman of the Subcommitte on Europe, as well as the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, from Pennsylvania for taking prompt action in reporting this much-needed legislation and I urge my colleagues to join in bipartisan support of House Concurrent Resolution 471 expressing the sense of the Congress regarding relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter before the House and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

In declaring that the United States recognized 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, President Nixon called upon all Americans to join in observing the year "through deeds and words which promote a spirit of brotherhood and of mutual respect among all peoples".

It is in keeping with this spirit enunciated by the President that I would like to lend my whole-hearted support to House Resolution 394 regarding persecution of Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union. House Resolution 394 declares it to be the sense of Congress that the President urge the Soviet Union to permit free expression of ideas, and discrimination against religious minorities and allow Soviet citizens the right to emigrate. The State Department is called upon to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the U.S.S.R.'s transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights.

I feel that the President's visit to Moscow next month would be a most opportune time to discuss the problem of Soviet Jews The government of the U.S.S.R. is sensitive about what world opinion thinks of its treatment of Jews and other minorities. World public opinion was clearly a factor, for example, in the commutation of the death sentences passed on Jews convicted of treason in Leningrad in December 1970 for seeking to leave the U.S.S.R. allegedly by plotting to commandeer an aircraft. World public opinion in general has restrained the Soviet authorities from broadening the use of quasilegal punishment against Jewish activists in the U.S.S.R.

I feel that the President has not only an opportunity, but also a duty to discuss with Kremlin leaders both the degree to which feeling is aroused in the United States regarding the plight of Soviet Jewry and the necessity for an improvement in their existence before true detente can occur between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Restrictions against Jewish religious and cultural life in the Soviet Union have been amply documented and need little repetition here; these include entirely inadequate religious facilities, harassment for synagogue attendance, lack of Yiddish or Hebrew language teaching, exclusion from careers considered sensitive and from important political jobs. These are well-known and longstanding abuses. In addition anti-Zionism reaches alarming levels periodically and is usually tied to the degree of tension existing in the Middle East.

All Soviet citizens suffer from the Soviet policy of militant atheism and the government's refusal to consider emigration as a right rather than a rare privilege. But the limitations on Jews have been even more severe. This is perhaps because Jews invite Russian suspicion due to their international connections—many of them have relatives abroad in Israel, the United States, and Western Europe. This heightened Soviet hostility is made even more difficult by a renewal of Jewish consciousness and pride especially among Jewish youth. "The Jews of silence" have found their voices and have been in the forefront of a growing civil rights movement. As a result, these outspoken Jewish activists have been dealt with arbitrarily and harshly. A number have been sentenced to terms in forced labor camps. Individual applicants for emigration are harassed. Even so, thousands publicly demonstrate pride in their heritage and large numbers have the hope that they, too, like Jews elsewhere, will not only be able to persevere as Jews but also to occupy a place of honor in the world. Thousands of Jews—and mainly Jewish youth—crowd the synagogues on Jewish holidays.

My colleagues and I in the Congress are continually reminded of the plight of Soviet Jews and have introduced numerous bills and resolutions expressing our concern and urging that steps be taken to persuade the Soviet Union to liberalize its policies regarding human freedoms as well as emigration. I would like to reiterate that President Nixon's upcoming trip to the Soviet Union may well be a unique opportunity to express the concern of the U.S. Government and to urge the Soviet leadership to temper its policies toward its Jewish citizens.

I firmly believe that the U.S. Government must continue to pressure the Soviet Union in the hope that this will result in the Jewish minority being able to live in peace and freedom in their country and that those wishing to emigrate may be allowed to do so without fear.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation identical to House Concurrent Resolution 471, I urge the unanimous support of our colleagues for this expression of congressional concern for

the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

No group in history has been discriminated against as widely and as persistently as the Jews. In clear violation of its own constitution, which recognizes the right of national self-determination and cultural and religious freedom, the Soviet Government has consistently pursued a policy of forced assimilation of its minorities, which has been especially severe with regard to Soviet Jews. The pending resolution calls on the President to urge the Soviet Government to "permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution."

Because of the policy of forced assimilation, many Soviet Jews see no future for them as Jews in Russia, and see no alternative open to them but to emigrate. The Soviet Union, however, has disregarded its own laws and violated a number of international agreements and conventions to which it is a signatory, concerning the right to emigrate. The right to emigrate has been denied to thousands of Soviet Jews. In fact, the Soviet Government has treated those who have submitted applications for visas as "enemies of the Soviet people."

The pending resolution calls upon the President to request the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right "to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights."

In addition, the resolution calls on the President to "utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities," and to "raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities."

Evidence suggests that the Soviet Union is sensitive to world opinion and particularly the protests against its treatment of Soviet Jews. The number of Jews allowed to emigrate in 1971 exceeded the number in 1970 and 1969. The House of Representatives and the Congress should continue its contribution to the body of world protest.

I think it is particularly important that the Congress make its strong position clear on the eve of the President's scheduled trip to Moscow. With the mandate outlined in House Concurrent Resolution 471 there can be no question of the support of the U.S. people for the Soviet Jews. While this is a difficult issue indeed, I think it is important that the President include it on the agenda of matters to be discussed with the Soviet leaders.

Again, I urge our colleagues to give House Concurrent Resolution 471 their unanimous support.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, life in the Soviet Union for Russian Jews continues to be a matter of great concern to all of us. In many cases Soviet Jews have been relegated to the status of second-class citizens in a nation that professes the ideal of equality as basic and paramount. They have been denied the right to exercise their religion freely, their right to emigrate is seriously abridged, and many other basic human rights that we here in the United States take for granted, are known in theory but not in reality by the Jews and other Soviet minority groups.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States and as an American Jew, I am cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 471 with the hope that the conscience of mankind in general and certain parties in particular, will lead to action that will alleviate the plight of the Jews and other minorities in the U.S.S.R.

This resolution declares it to be the sense of the Congress that the President urge the Soviet Union to permit free expression of ideas, end discrimination against religious minorities, and allow Soviet citizens the right to emigrate. The State Department is called upon to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights.

I believe, in addition to the general feeling we all have that human beings everywhere regardless of creed, color, or other distinctive characteristics, should be accorded basic rights on an equal basis, that there are specific points that argue strongly in favor of a liberalization of minority treatment by the Soviet Union.

First, the free expression of ideas and the ability to practice one's religion in a unrestrained manner, are rights guaranteed to Soviet citizens by articles 124 and 125 of the Soviet Constitution.

Second, persecution of minorities is a humanitarian problem with universal importance. By expressing its concern and recommending actions to be taken to eliminate this problem, the American Congress is acting in a manner fitting to the world role of the United States.

Finally, since the resolution includes not only Soviet Jews but all other Soviet religious minorities, it expresses concern not for a limited sector of a given population, but for a very large number of people. The universality of this resolution is certain to have wide domestic and global appeal.

A restricted existence in the Soviet Union has for long been a fact of life for Jews. If these restrictions are not lifted the alternatives for the future of a Jewish community are not bright. Silent acceptance of their status is becoming increasingly hard to bear as it becomes evident that a way of life, a culture and a religion are in the process of being eliminated.

We must rededicate ourselves to assist Soviet Jews as well as other oppressed minorities throughout the world.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be able to rise in support of House Congressional Resolution 471 today in behalf of Soviet Jewry and the cause of human rights. With President Nixon's forthcoming trip to Moscow, I feel it is the duty of us, the Members of Congress, to pass unanimously this resolution calling upon the Soviet Government to permit the exercise of freedom of speech and religion, and to permit its citizens the right to emigrate to countries of their choice.

I am proud to identify with this cause of human rights and urge that my colleagues do the same. We can do nothing less for a people who have certainly paid the price.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon travels to Moscow in May, the agenda for his discussions with the Kremlin leaders should include one topic which will probably be absent from the list—the status of Soviet Jews. Every Russian citizen, regardless of religion or national origin, is denied certain freedoms which we in the West take for granted, but the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union has captured the sympathy of the world for two reasons. Religious and ethnic minorities in Russia have always been singled out for special persecution, and the Jews in particular symbolize the sufferings which all minority groups have endured.

The long tale of Jewish history in their wanderings through Europe, Asia, and Africa has been a continuous chronicle of oppression. In our own supposedly more enlightened century, the chosen people survived the worst holocaust of all under the Nazi terror. It seems particularly unjust, therefore, that they should be restricted in the practice of their faith and forbidden to return to the religious homeland from which they were driven so many centuries ago.

In the conviction that religious liberty for Soviet Jews represents the basic freedoms to which the whole human race aspires, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution with an overwhelming vote of affirmation, so that the President of the United States and rulers of Russia will know that we stand behind our brothers in spirit. So long as any human being is denied the right to worship God as he chooses, our own profession of religious faith and faith in the ideals of democracy is diminished.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the proposal before us today to place the U.S. Congress on record as opposing the cultural genocide being waged against the Jews of the Soviet Union, I rise to urge its enactment.

This concurrent resolution, Mr. Speaker, expresses in clear and brief language our commitment to human dignity and religious freedom and our absolute refusal to tolerate that kind of religious persecution which has already cast a grotesque scar on the history of our time.

The operative language of this resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; and

(3) request of the Soviet Government that

it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

(4) raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been invited to go to Israel next month as a consulting fact-finder on behalf of the National Interreligious Consultation on Soviet Jewry. I hope that on that occasion I will be able to bring with me the message that here in the United States, our highest legislative body has proclaimed unequivocally its opposition to the persecution of the Soviet Jews, by enacting this resolution.

I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the text of my testimony before our Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of this bill:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the conditions which confront the Jews of the Soviet Union. Your committee is performing an excellent public service in its deliberations on this situation.

I pray that the experience of the Jews in the 20th century—and indeed, the experience of persecution of Jews over 5,000 years—will never be forgotten. Antisemitism is a malignancy which is periodically suppressed, but unless we are constantly vigilant, it will proliferate. Unless Americans of every background and, particularly, those of us in Congress, bring to the attention of people throughout the world the plight of Soviet Jewry, we shall pay a terrible price for our negligence.

A dispatch from Moscow in the November 14, 1971, New York Times by Hedrick Smith contained the following account:

"Striding along the treelined streets of the Moldavian capital of Kishinev a few days ago, a Jewish chemist quietly described how his fervent desire to emigrate to Israel was frustrated by fear. If he applied for an exit visa, he said he might lose his job, and there would be trouble for his wife and two small daughters.

"In a Ukrainian city, members of a large Jewish family complained that they had been waiting eight years to get out of their cramped, one room apartment. When new apartments become available, they said, Jews never seem to get them."

Accounts such as these are typical of the often-subtle, often-obvious discrimination levied against Jews by government agencies in the Soviet Union.

A constituent of mine who recently returned from an extensive tour of the Soviet Union reported that he had enormous difficulty in making contact with Soviet Jews. "They fear to talk with Americans in public places, or even in their own homes," he said, "because they have reason to believe that secret service agents are watching and listening."

SECRET PRACTICES

Some Americans who travel in Russia have adopted the practice of secretly depositing ritual prayer shawls and copies of the Hebrew scriptures in Russian synagogues. Ritual objects of the Jewish faith are systematically destroyed by anti-Jewish elements in the Soviet Union.

Jewish synagogues have been closed, and only a comparative few remain. More than 90 percent of the remaining synagogues have no rabbis today because there is no Jewish seminary for training rabbis. The few remaining rabbis are old men in their seventies and eighties.

In his excellent study, "Soviet Jewry Today and Tomorrow" (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971), the distinguished correspondent Boris Smolar reports that the Jewish heritage in Russia is being extinguished:

"On the whole, it can be said that the average young Jew in the Soviet Union feels like an orphan who is eager to find out more about the parents he has never seen. There is very little that his father or mother can tell him about the meaning of being a Jew, because most of the Jewish parents in the U.S.S.R. today are either Soviet-born themselves or they were raised under the Soviet regime. He looks, therefore, to his Jewish grandparents for Jewish guidance—if they are still alive."

Those of us in the Congress who have long supported heavy pressures by our Government to make the Kremlin change its policies with respect to Jewish emigration continue to be appalled by the callousness of the Soviet regime. Notwithstanding the unequivocal language of article 13, paragraph 2 of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights—officially ratified by the Soviet Union—that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own," Soviet Jews are simply not permitted to leave, at least not in substantial numbers.

At a time when prison reform is becoming a high national priority in our country, we should pause and reflect on the effective imprisonment of Soviet Jews. As our Supreme Court has forcefully indicated in *Kent* v. *Dulles* and a long line of other decisions, the freedom to travel outside of one's own country is a fundamental human right. Forbidden to leave Russia, the Soviet Jews are, in effect, incarcerated in a place where, for the most part, they are the victims of invidious class discrimination.

STATE DEPARTMENT VIEWS

I realize that State Department employees have come before your committee and said, in effect, that there is no pervasive anti-Jewish discrimination in Russia. Such statements, I submit, are untrue and reflect badly upon our Government. I recognize that we are currently engaged in complex negotiations with the Soviet Union. And I realize President Nixon wants nothing to detract from the success of his planned trip to the Soviet Union. And I realize that the SALT talks are in a critical phase. However, the State Department and other Federal agencies, in their attempts to keep the Kremlin at ease, have bent the truth to the point of obliteration.

To those who claim there is no systematic discrimination against the Soviet Jews, I would present Boris Smolar's account of employment opportunities for a Jew in Russia:

"The Soviet economic machine, in need of all kinds of labor, no longer makes any distinction between Jew and non-Jew, as was the case during the latter years of the Stalin regime, or even in the early years of the Khrushchev regime. Promotion of Jews to higher positions is a different thing. This may explain why Jewish engineers . . . feel they do not receive the same recognition they see given to others."

Months ago I joined with Congressman William Ryan and many others of our colleagues in a resolution urging inclusion of Yiddish broadcasts over the Voice of America. The evidence is clear that a substantial portion of Soviet Jews speak Yiddish as their principal or secondary language. Yiddish broadcasts, even if only a few minutes a day, would indicate in a concrete way our compassion and warm feelings toward the Soviet Jews.

It was a very modest request.

Although it is hard to believe, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Shakespeare, and high-level representatives of the State Department refused to comply. They summoned a variety of largely misleading and irrelevant data in their arguments. At briefings, they stated and implied that Yiddish broadcasts, no matter how innocuous in content, were inconsistent with our Government's policy of not disturbing the Kremlin.

Is this the moral fiber which characterizes American history? Is this the broad dissemination of differing points of view piously claimed by the Voice of America? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in matters affecting the social status of an ethnic or religious group in any country, we must speak out when there is pervasive injustice. The evidence of such injustice in the case of the Soviet Jews is overwhelming. If we fail here to protest, then we will have made a mockery of those principles upon which our Nation was founded. The lesson of Nazi Germany must never be forgotten: If we ignore this problem, it most certainly will not go away. By enlisting the force of world opinion against class discrimination in Russia, we can hope to get results. History demonstrates that the Russians are at least as sensitive to our opinion of them as we are to their opinion of us.

FIVE SPECIFIC DEMANDS

I therefore urge our Government to endorse the five specific demands upon the Soviet Government made by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry:

1. To permit Jews throughout the U.S.S.R. freely to develop Jewish communal and religious life and institutions and to associate and work with comparable Jewish communities and religious groups inside and outside the Soviet Union.

2. To make available the educational institutions, schools, teachers, textbooks, and scholarly materials necessary to teach Soviet Jews the heritage, the languages, the history, the beliefs, the practices, and the aspirations of the Jewish people.

3. To permit its Jewish citizens freely to practice, enhance, and perpetuate their culture and religion by the establishment of appropriate institutions including places of worship, and other religious facilities, theaters, publishing houses, newspapers, and journals, and to remove all discriminatory measures designed to restrict this freedom.

4. To use all means at its disposal to eradicate anti-Semitism and discrimination against individual Jews and to require, as the first step in this program, the immediate cessation of the virulent antisemitic propaganda that has suffused the Soviet mass media since the Six-Day War between the Arabs and Israel in 1967.

5. To permit Soviet Jewish families, many of whom were separated as a result of the Nazi holocaust, to be reunited with their brethren abroad and to implement the Kosygin promise of family reunion.

These demands are just. They were first promulgated several years ago and were adopted on February 25, 1971, by the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry, held in Brussels. The conference was attended by 750 Jewish leaders from 27 countries, and was addressed by, among others, former Justice Arthur Goldberg, and David Ben Gurion, former Prime Minister of Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud your committee's concern with these problems and I appreciate this opportunity to express my views.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Israel, I am especially aware of the problems of Soviet Jews and, in particular, the problems they encounter in attempting to exercise their

right to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

While in Israel, I talked with many people about this problem, which is very real to the Israelis. Some Soviet Jews have been allowed to emigrate. Others have not. As a result, families have been separated in some cases.

This restrictive, inconsistent, and inhuman policy as regards emigration cannot be justified on any civilized basis by the Soviet Union. The policy should be changed. This resolution as a reflection of American public opinion may help to persuade the Soviet leaders that their emigration policies must be changed.

We are all aware of the other areas of discrimination against Soviet Jews that are dealt with in this legislation. Certainly if the Soviet Union proposes to exercise any moral leadership in the international community it should first permit all its citizens to enjoy the benefits of those provisions of its own constitution which permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion.

I urge approval of this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to express my support for this resolution which calls upon our Government to exert all possible diplomatic pressure for the relief of the oppressed religious minorities within the Soviet Union.

In particular, this measure addresses itself to the special burden which more than 3 million Soviet Jews carry in the face of Soviet oppression. Soviet Jewry is discriminated against not only on the basis of religion, but because of their nationality as well.

In the past 5 years we have witnessed a growing sense of cultural and religious identity among Russian Jews. Their government has reacted with increased social and legal restrictions against their basic rights. We only have to recall the Leningrad show trials of 1970 and 1971 to understand how strong the religious convictions of the Soviet Jewry are and how cruel the response of the Soviets has been.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some who would doubt the effectiveness of this resolution, who would say what is the use, why should we bother.

I would hope that none of us here today will fall prey to such pessimism. The record shows that world public opinion has in the past had a great effect on the internal policy of the Soviet Union. Since those infamous Leningrad trials 2 years ago, we have witnessed an unprecedented increase in the number of emmigration visas given to Jews.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution is extremely important. It is important for those religious minorities who still hope to be free, it is important for Jews all over the world who share the suffering of their less fortunate brothers and it is important for all men of good will.

For if we were to remain silent, if we were to ignore the plight of these people who so desperately and courageously struggle against tyranny, then history would judge our silence as a serious and grievous sin against the principles of freedom and equality which we hold so dear.

Mr. Speaker, Soviet Jews have borne the burden of their oppression with gallant patience and endurance. As President Nixon prepares for his trip to Moscow next month, I can think of no better time for us to reaffirm our support for the relief of Soviet Jews.

In a very real sense, Mr. Speaker, we, as Americans, have a duty to respond to the plight of the Jews as well as the Catholics of Eastern Europe who have been denied their basic human rights. For my part, I am proud to accept that duty and I know that my colleagues will join me by passing this resolution today.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we finally have this resolution before us and that it now has the support of most of those Johnny-come-latelies in the Congress who a few years ago could see no reason for expressing any concern over the denial of basic freedoms to millions of Russian Jews.

In supporting this concurrent resolution, I am reiterating a position that I made known some 5 years ago to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, to the Soviet Government in Washington, and to our own State Department. Essentially, that position is that every man and woman in an open society should have the right to move about freely, to leave a country and go to any other country that lays out the welcome mat. Our resolution defines this as "the right freely to emigrate," a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, yet a right that has been denied to many Jews wanting to leave their Russian homeland for the State of Israel.

In response to the ancient cry, "Let my people go," the modern Pharaohs in the Kremlin have relaxed their rules to the extent of granting exit permits to a few thousand Russian Jews in the last 2 years. However, those allowed to leave were mostly the aged, the infirm and the unskilled. Few Jewish doctors, or lawyers or skilled craftsmen have been allowed to emigrate to Israel. What the Soviet Government has done, in fact, has been to throw a mere sop to critical world opinion, which demands the right of free movement for Soviet Jewry.

The resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, is a slightly modified version of one which I and several colleagues joined in sponsoring on August 6, 1971. Specifically, it expresses the sense of Congress that the President of the United States shall take these four steps:

First. Urge the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet constitution;

Second. Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities;

Third. Demand that the Soviet Government let its citizens emigrate to the countries of their choice; and

Fourth. Raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

I am not so naive as to believe that the mere passage of such a resolution in the Congress of the United States will bring any immediate relaxation of the policies of repression which the Soviet Government has long practiced against Jews and other minority groups. However, I do hope and believe that such expressions by ourselves and others will over the long run lead Soviet officials to adopt policies more compatible with the U.N. Declaration of Rights and indeed with the principles espoused by the Soviet Union's own constitution.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering under suspension of the rules House Concurrent Resolution 471, a resolution that urges the Soviet Union to recognize the basic human rights of its Jewish population. I hope that all of my colleagues in the House will support this measure, for the United States has long stood as the champion of oppressed peoples throughout the world.

The Jews of the Soviet Union, I am sad to say, are being repressed and denied the basic human dignity that should be associated with such a proud and energetic people. Jewish culture is being suppressed in Russia today: Synagogues are being closed, the teaching of Hebrew is discouraged, and emigration to Israel is made exceptionally difficult, if not denied altogether. All of these actions run contrary to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, a document that the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted.

The passage of this resolution will greatly assist the President in his upcoming and historic journey to the Soviet Union. In his conversations with Soviet leaders, President Nixon will be able to express the sense of the Congress that the religious and cultural identity of all peoples should not be denied. Only in this way can we build a world free from hatred and repression, and a world that affords human dignity to all of its citizens.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, a bill which I consponsored and which, if enacted, will proclaim the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should take immediate steps to:

First, call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution;

Second, utilize formal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities;

Third, demand of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

Fourth, raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Decla-

ration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States take many of our freedoms for granted. Two in particular that we take for granted are—freedom of religion, and freedom to emigrate. These like many of our rights seem unimportant until they are taken away from us. In the Soviet society, however, where there are more than 100 nationalities, many of whom scorn and discriminate against each other, and where it has state policy of atheism, the story is different. Simple things such as Yiddish books on library shelves, kosher food, schools where Yiddish is taught, and the freedom to come and go to a synagogue without being harassed, which are taken for granted in the United States, are denied to Soviet Jews.

In fact, in our country, there is a popular bumper sticker that says "America Love it or Leave it." This is a simple statement of a freedom which we enjoy, but one that is denied Soviet citizens; namely, the right of emigration.

In one sense in the Soviet Union the Jew is an eternal stranger. In some ways the Jews' situation is worse than that of any other minority. There is the question of whether he belongs to a nationality, an ethnic group, or a religion. Further, since the inception of Israel, the Jew has two homelands that compete for his loyalties, his native land, and his spiritual homeland, a concept that is contrary to the tenets of communism.

The fact that Jews through the world are very good citizens of their countries is unimportant in the Soviet Union. Jews, no matter where they live, have been assimilated, prospered, and consider themselves citizens of their native land first and Jews second.

Currently, Jews in the Soviet Union are subjected to a delicate system of quotas designed to maintain a balance of proportional representation of all nationalities in the economy, in high government, and in party organs such as the central committee. He is scorned and discriminated against in a society where this is a century old tradition. Moreover, the Jewish religion is one that has come under new condemnation because of the 6-day Arab-Israeli war in 1967, and the following hostilities. Israel is at war with a group of countries whose principal ally and supporter is the Soviet Union and because of the propaganda against Israel, anti-Semitism has again become acceptable, if not fashionable, in the U.S.S.R.

The Jew is doubly damned in the U.S.S.R., first for being ethically Jewish and second, for being culturally Russian. They are suspected of harboring dual political and psychological loyalties to a homeland other than the U.S.S.R., a suspicion that anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda, has not allayed but, rather fostered.

Most of the nationalities have their own territories, where the language is their own and where most officials are of their nationality. Theoretically the Jews have Biro-Bidzhan on the Chinese border. However, culturally and politically the dominant role in Biro-Bidzhan has been played by Russia, not Jews.

There are other minority groups in Russia who face the same harsh policies as the Jews. The Jews it seems, however, are always singled out and must bear the brunt of religious persecution, and their plight signals trouble for all who would practice religion in the oppressive, atheistic atmosphere of the Soviet Union today.

Ever since the Communists came to power and atheism became a national policy of the Soviet Union, there has been suppression of all religion, yet many pursue the faith of their fathers and are willing to leave their native land in order to continue doing so, much as our pilgrim fathers first left England to come to America.

A quick review of the history of the Jews in Russia under the Communists will show that the present situation is part of a pattern of ongoing persecution. Jews flocked to the revolutionary banner in the early 1900's. The overthrow of the tsar gave them a chance to leave the settlements and the chance to escape the threat of death and being forced into work progams. Jews like Totsky, Zinoviev, Kameney, Svedlov, and Litvinov were indispensable to Lenin in the revolution, and as long as Lenin was alive anti-Semitism was held to a minimum.

By 1939, however, Stalin had purged the party leadership of most of its Jewish members. After the Hitler-Stalin pact, foreign Jewish Communists who had found refuge in Moscow suddenly found themselves being shipped to Germany and Hitler's concentration camps, and Soviet propaganda swung to the Nazi line.

After World War II, Stalin cracked down on what he termed "rootless cosmopolitans" and shut down virtually all Yiddish cultural institutions. In 1952, nearly 30 Jewish writers and intellectuals were liquidated and Stalin set the stage for the "anti-Zionist" purges in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. If Stalin had lived this surely would have led to mass murder of the Jews in the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

Khrushchev once denied publicly that anti-Semitism exists in Russia, yet even under Khrushchev dozens of Jews were shot as economic speculators, and the furor began over Yevtushenko's poem "Babi Yar."

What Stalin started, and Khrushchev finished, was the destruction of Jewish cultural life.

Under Brezhnev, as a result of the 6-Day War Between the Arabs and the Israelis, and the Soviet commitments to the Arab countries, anti-Zionism and official anti-Israel policy has been instituted.

Until 1967, the Jews in the Soviet Union solved their dilemma by ceasing to be Jews. After the 6-day war, however, and as a consequence of Moscow's campaign against Israel and Zionism, some assimilated Jews have been reimbued with a sense of their own Jewishness. Scores of Jews have sent and signed petitions to the Kremlin demanding exit visas; others have staged hunger strikes and sit-ins. This has resulted in mass arrests, intimidation, convictions, and jail sentences for some.

Inadvertently, the Kremlin has fostered Jewish awareness and has thereby created a demand by Jews and others for emigration visas, but Soviet leaders see the desire to leave as an expression of disloyalty to the Soviet Union. It is estimated, however, that actually only about 5 percent of Soviet Jews have expressed a desire to emigrate. It is further estimated that if all restrictions were removed, and Jews could emigrate without difficulty, that only about 10 percent would do so. The reason is that the Soviet Jews professionally are very well off in many fields—such as art, music, science, literature, engineering, and law. Although Jews represent less than 1 percent of the total Soviet population, they account for 14.7 percent of all the physicians, 8.5 percent of the writers and journalists, 10.4 percent of all the judges and lawyers, and 7.7 percent of the actors, musicians, and artists. In addition, 14 percent of the Jewish population in the Soviet Union has a higher or specialized secondary education which almost triples the rate of other Russians. Many Jews, therefore, feel they have a vested interest in the Soviet Union and would not leave under any circumstances.

It is difficult, therefore, to understand the Soviet Union's denial of such basic human rights, such as the expression of ideas, the exercise of religion, and the right of dissident Jews to emigrate. To me, the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 471 is essential, since it sets forth the outrage of most Americans over the plight of religious minorities in the Soviet Union, and its passage will show that public opinion in the United States opposes the actions of the Brezhnev government in this regard. Perhaps, through this moral persuasion by the Congress in passing H.R. 471, we and other free nations of the world will be able to influence the Soviet leaders to relax the policies in the Soviet Union in this vital area of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that House Concurrent Resolution 471 be passed by the House of Representatives today, since we are virtually on the eve of President Nixon's trip to Moscow scheduled for next month. The passage of this will afford the President the opportunity to carry out the expression set forth in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1971, I wrote President Nixon urging that he make the plight of the Soviet Jews a part of his agenda in his talks with Soviet leaders. My letter to the President stated:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1971.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the United States Congress and as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to respectfully submit a proposal relative to your forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union.

I feel that your trip early next year offers a propitious opportunity for you as the President of the United States, in your talks with Soviet leaders to discuss the issue of the seri-

ous plight of the Russian Jews and other religious minorities in the U.S.S.R. This action would be in keeping with the Republican platform adopted at the 1968 Republican Convention, and would be responsive to feelings of the American people as shown by public opinion polls. I am sure that this serious situation will be a matter of great interest when the platforms of the two major political parties are reviewed and redrawn next summer.

I note that Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada discussed the Soviet Jewish question with Russian authorities when he last visited Moscow. Similar intercession has been made by a number of European leaders. It seems to me, therefore, that you as the President of the United States, speaking with the prestige of our great nation, could very appropriately request that discussions on this serious problem be made a part of the agenda of matters to be discussed at your meeting.

The Communist bloc nations have, in my opinion, made a practice of seeking United Nations' actions to suit their convenience, and I, therefore, feel that we can cite with impunity the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to the Soviet leaders, especially in light of the desire for compliance thereof by the U.N. member states.

It is my conviction, also, that a significant alleviation of the Soviet Jewish problem through your intercession might well strengthen your hand in the ultimate hope for a mutually-acceptable peace settlement in the Middle East.

United States Attorney General John Mitchell has already stated that under existing law Soviet Jewish refugees could be admitted to the United States under the parole authority provided by our immigration laws, in case of those persons who do not elect to immigrate to Israel. Under existing authority religious refugees from the Soviet Union are entitled to seek sanctuary in the U.S. on the same basis accorded the escapees from Hungary and the more recent Cuban refugees, who came to the U.S. following the Castro revolution.

It is my hope that such discussions would encompass not only the Jews of the U.S.S.R., but also Christians and other minorities who most certainly are faced with oppression and certain indignities. I feel it would be helpful, also, if you requested a meeting with the leaders of the various religious faiths when you are in the Soviet Union, thereby demonstrating the friendship of the people of the U.S. for those seeking religious freedom.

As you know, the Congress has in its many resolutions and other expressions, requested and authorized you, as our President, to take some action in these matters. In fact, you, when you were a member of the House, Senate and even Vice President were one of the pioneers who years ago sought this very goal. I'm sure you recall that during President Eisenhower's Administration, in 1953, the Congress condemned the persecution by the U.S.S.R. of all minorities. In 1954, the Congress asked the churches and synagogues of America to set aside a portion of their services on Easter Sunday and Passover for special prayers for deliverance of all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom of worship.

Since the Six Day War the anti-Jewish policy of the Soviet Union has been obvious. Our Government has detailed the reports on how, in the U.S.S.R., Jews are imprisoned on trumped-up charges; the anti-semitic propaganda in the Soviet press and radio; the deprivation of cultural and religious rights; discrimination in education and employment; and the drastic restrictions on the Jews and the deprivation of the right of many Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

There seems little doubt that the Jews have been singled out for special restrictions and that they are denied certain limited considerations accorded other minorities.

The publicity of the treatment of the plight of the Soviet Jews has made the Communist leaders very sensitive to this issue. This conduct has undermined the Communist propagandized pretensions of equality and justice for the oppressed. It is true that there have been some indications of limited Kremlin concessions resulting from the rising outcry of world public opinion and some Jews have finally been permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union. I feel, however, that your personal intervention, as our country's President, might bring about a major revision of the present existing Soviet anti-religious policies.

I feel that there is much that might be gained by your intervening and that such action would not result in any diplomatic complications or embarrassment, even though I am aware that the issue of Soviet Jewry has become one of explosive political potential in the Middle East, as well as in the unaligned "third world."

I feel that any action by you in this regard would receive the full support of the members of Congress and all of the American people interested in the rights of all people to fair and humane treatment.

Your consideration of these suggestions will be greatly appreciated not only by me and the members of Congress, but by people of goodwill throughout the world.

With kindest wishes,

Sincerely,

J. HERBERT BURKE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the author of a similar bill, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471.

This measure calls for a governmental commitment to use formal and informal channels to express our great concern about Soviet Union oppression of religious and cultural freedoms as well as restrictions on the right to emigrate.

Specifically, the President is asked to request that the Soviet Government honor the words of its constitution by permitting the free exercise of religion and the expression of ideas by all of its citizens.

In addition, this resolution states our desire for the President to request of the Soviet Government, that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

For centuries, Jews in the Soviet Union have suffered both legal and social discrimination. In recent years, however, their status improved, but this liberalization ended with the internal Soviet reaction to the six-day war in 1967. Since that date, there has been a return to official antipathy toward Jews as an expression of Soviet hostility toward Israel. This reaction, coupled with the renewed sense of cultural identity and self-assertion by many Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, has formed the painful record of Soviet Jewry in the past 5 years.

World attention was focused on Soviet policy toward its Jewish citizens after a series of trials in 1970 and 1971 of Soviet Jews charged with antistate activities, and after the attempted hijacking of a Soviet commercial airplane by Soviet Jews.

To counter some of the hostile world press attention caused by the trials, Soviet officials increased the number of emigration visas issued in 1971, and thus far in 1972 has continued this trend.

Yet the continued restrictions against the thousands of Soviet Jews who wanted to emigrate have kept world attention focused on the problems of Soviet Jews and not on the very limited attempts by the Soviet Government to solve the problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to serve as a beacon of hope and encouragement to the oppressed people of the world. We must take steps to encourage the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to express themselves through cultural and religious activities. Soviet Jews should not be deprived of books in Hebrew, of Matzohs, and of synagogue services. They should be allowed to emigrate and start a new life elsewhere.

The bill before us, House Concurrent Resolution 471, urges the President to use his influence, and to use the powers of his office to encourage the Soviet Government to take steps to relieve the discrimination that presently takes place against Soviet Jews.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and, thus, offer a promise of hope to the oppressed people of the world.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, in particular since the 1967 Israeli-Arab war, the plight of Soviet Jews, denied the means to sustain their religious and cultural identity inside Russia, and denied the ability to move elsewhere, has been brought forcefully to the attention of the American public and people of the world.

As we consider Concurrent Resolution 471 today, I think it well to look for a moment at the background—well as it is known by many—which led to the drafting and introduction of this resolution of which I am a cosponsor.

In Russia, the anti-Semitism which flourished under the czars resulting in the pogroms of 1905 and 1906 officially ended with the Revolution. Within the Soviet ideology, under the Soviet Constitution and embodied in Soviet law, all nationalities are encouraged to participate in their group existence through cultural and educational institutions and activities in their own language.

During the first three decades of the Soviet regime, there was no question that the intent of this ideology of a union of many cultures included the Jews as well as the other 107 nationalities that make up the U.S.S.R.

But over the years that intent has clearly changed. While as late as 1940, 100,000 Jewish children attended Yiddish school, today there is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the entire U.S.S.R.—this in spite of the Soviet law which permits the organization of such classes at the request of 10 parents. This systematic cutting off of Russian Jews from Jewish culture pervades other areas. No Judaic periodicals or devotional literature can be published,

no prayer shawls or phylacteries, essential to the services, can be produced, no meaningful official contact with coreligionists abroad can be held.

Take all these steps together and one begins to understand the term "spiritual genocide" which has been used to describe the Soviet policy toward their Russian Jewish minority. And this policy appeared to be working. A gradual dying of interest in Judaism was predicted, for it seemed quite logical that, denied access to synagogues, reading no Jewish books and having no Jewish cultural life, the Russian Jew would become less and less Jewish and gradually be lost sight of in the Russian society.

But then came the six-day war. With it came a revival of pride in being Jewish for many Russian Jews. With this revival of a sense of pride in identity came the drive by many to emigrate to Israel—their state, their spiritual home.

At first these requests were denied Then emigration was a mere trickle. Last year, under mounting pressure of world opinion in opposition to this Soviet policy, 13,000 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. The trickle has become a stream.

It was against this background that House Concurrent Resolution 471 took shape, to state the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should take steps to call upon the Soviet government to permit free expression of ideas and the free exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with Soviet law—in short, end this drive toward "spiritual genocide" of the Jewish minority.

Passage of this concurrent resolution will also put the United States on record as demanding that the Soviet Government permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, to which the Soviet Union is a signatory. It also calls upon the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the question of the Soviet Union's disregard of the Declaration of Human Rights.

House Concurrent Resolution 471 was conceived and introduced prior to the President's announcement of his trip to Russia this May. As a cosponsor of this resolution, I would urge its adoption at any time.

But what better time to pass it than now, as the President prepares for his historic trip. How better to arm our President as he enters into discussion with the Soviet leaders, than to present him with this clear declaration of the conscience of the American people that the rights to religious freedom guaranteed under the Soviet Constitution, and the right to emigrate subscribed to by the Soviet Union in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights should and must be adhered to.

Mr. Speaker, the pressure of world opinion has raised the trickle of emigrants from the Soviet Union to a stream. With passage of this concurrent resolution, we here today can perhaps help turn that stream into a flood.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, which I cosponsored in its original version.

This resolution calls for a firm commitment on the part of the Government of the United States to the expression of our deep concern for the treatment of Jews, and, indeed, of all religious minorities, in the Soviet Union. It calls upon the President to utilize both formal and informal channels, including the United Nations, to express this concern.

By passing this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Congress will call upon the President to request that the Soviet Government honor the words of its own Constitution, by allowing all of its citizens to practice the free expression of religious beliefs and cultural ideas. In addition, the President would be requested to plead for the right of Soviet citizens to emigrate to the countries of their choice. I think that all of us have been greatly heartened in recent months by the Soviet Government's relaxation of its attitude toward the emigration of Jewish citizens to Israel. This development, in large measure, is due to the overwhelming effort to mobilize world opinion in behalf of Soviet Jews. This effort must not be relaxed.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more appropriate time for the Congress to be acting on this resolution. The President is now preparing for his very important and much-publicized visit to Moscow. It is my fervent hope that he will have this congressional mandate to carry with him.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of a similar resolution I wish to support the bill before us today and express my concern for Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens.

There is ample evidence that Jews in the Soviet Union suffer discrimination in a number of ways. They have been forbidden the free practice of their religion, they are not allowed to leave the country to emigrate to other countries, and they have been systematically excluded from the Soviet Government.

Last year more than 100 colleagues of both parties expressed their concern by supporting a House resolution for congressional action. The day for that action is before us now. I think it is appropriate that we pass this bill so that the President can present this message from the people of the United States and their fairly elected legislators to Soviet leaders in Moscow.

There are those who protest that our voice is but a cry in the wilderness, that it will do no good, that it will fall on deaf ears, that it will be ignored by the Soviet Government which will go on its way.

There is some reason to doubt that assessment, although we know Russia will be more motivated by what is in its own interests rather than moral considerations.

The fact is Soviet leaders are sensitive to world opinion, especially as some voices of that opinion are Communist parties in other countries which have shown their willingness to risk Soviet censure by striving to demonstrate that tenent of communism is social justice.

Private citizens in the United States and the Government are unanimous in supporting humanitarian fair treatment for the minority peoples, religions, and creeds in the world. We are not indifferent to repression within our borders, and without. We are especially sensitive to repression by government whether by official decree or tacitly acknowledged. We provide our own people with the means to redress these wrongs and we are not indifferent to those in other countries.

The history of two great genocides in this century demonstrates what can happen when minority oppression is not vigorously opposed.

There is further reason to believe our expression of concern here today will be heeded by Russian leaders.

The Russian constitution provides for the free expression of ideas and exercise of religion by all of its peoples. It may be that our action is the nudge which will spur their leaders to the literal observance of their constitution.

For us in this Chamber this is an opportunity to renew our faith in the ideal of religious freedom on which our country was founded and because of which our forebears suffered hardship and privation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471 which was originally introduced by Mr. O'NEILL and myself last August along with 117 House cosponsors. This resolution recognizes the repression of Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union and calls upon the President of the United States to do three things: First, to urge the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and exercise of religion; second, to utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to religious discrimination; third, to request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice; and fourth, to raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Mr. Speaker, with the President scheduled to visit the Soviet Union next month, I think today's discussion of this resolution is most timely, and I would hope that prior to that visit, this resolution will have received the overwhelming endorsment of both bodies of the Congress. It is our hope that the President will use the occasion of his visit to discuss the plight of Soviet Jews and other religious minorities and to make a special plea for their relief on the behalf of the American people and in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In a message to American Jewish leaders on January 11, 1971, President Nixon made the following statement:

> You may be certain . . . that this Administration, reflecting the traditional liberties upon which this country was founded, joins with you in urging freedom of emigration as explicitly provided in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in

its commitment to cultural and religious freedom at home and abroad.

Writing in the Washington Post last year, columnist Stephen S. Rosenfeld noted that President Nixon "has a little known but long-term record of concern" for the plight of Soviet Jews. Mr. Rosenfeld went on to write:

Mr. Nixon has vigorously involved the American government in the plight of Soviet Jews and simultaneously he has moved to explore better relations with the Kremlin. His record so far shows the two do fit.

So the resolution under consideration here today is certainly in keeping with the policy and concern of this administration for Soviet Jews and therefore in no way can be construed to have an undermining effect on the President's forthcoming visit or as an embarrassment to the administration.

Mr. Speaker, in my testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe last fall, I pointed out that:

The mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union is especially severe because they are discriminated against both because of their religion and their nationality.

Unlike the other 10 recognized religions in the Soviet Union, each Jewish congregation must function in isolation. The publication of religious literature and Bibles and the manufacture of religious articles are forbidden. There can be no replacement of aging rabbis because there are no religious schools or rabbinical seminaries, nor are theology students permitted to study abroad. Synagogues have been closed in almost systematic fashion as a result of both direct and indirect governmental action. The number of synagogues in the Soviet Union has steadily declined from 450 in 1956, to 100 in 1963, until today there are less than 60.

It is little wonder then that thousands of Soviet Jews requested permission to emigrate in order to maintain their religious and cultural identity. And while the Soviet Government has allowed for an increased outflow of Soviet Jews in recent months in the face of international attention and pressures, its record is still abysmal, and still runs in direct contravention to article XIII of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states:

Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter which was transmitted to President Nixon on March 20 of this year, signed by 48 Jewish families from all over the Soviet Union. In that letter these families pointed out that more and more applications have been made to Soviet authorities requesting the right to emigrate to Israel, and yet, in their words, "all our applications were unreasonably refused." The letter went on to state most eloquently, and I quote:

We see in your forthcoming visit to the USSR a happy possibility to use our influence, not only in solution of urgent international problems, and in the name of general humanitarian purposes, not only for the improvement of Soviet-American relations, but also for the sake of those people who are expecting sympathy to their destinies from everybody who can help them.

M. Speake, I think we owe it to these families and thousands like them in the Soviet Union to demonstrate our humanitarian concern for their plight by the passage of this resolution today. I think we owe it to the President to give him the full backing of the Congress to raise the twin issues of religious freedoms and free emigration in his forthcoming discussions with the Soviet leadership. This resolution offers an excellent vehicle for that purpose and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

At this point in the debate, I wish to include the full text of the letter signed by the 48 Soviet Jewish families. The letter follows:

MARCH 20, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently, more and more Soviet Jews applied to you with a request to help them in their struggle for repatriation to Israel.

We have also repeatedly addressed the Soviet authorities, asking them to let us repatriate to Israel, but all our applications were unreasonably refused.

We see in your forthcoming visit to the U.S.S.R., a happy possibility to use your influence, not only in solution of urgent international problems and in the name of general humanitarian purposes, not only for the improvement of Soviet-American relations, but also for the sake of those people who are expecting sympathy to their destinies from everybody who can help them.

Your recent answer to the appeal of Ruth Alexandrovich strengthened our assurance in your support. Our problem is the problem of freedom to display one's national feeling, freedom to choose a mother tongue and culture, freedom to choose the country to live.

Addressing your attention to the problem, we are feeling at the same time that, should you get interested in it during your visit to the Soviet Union and express the wish to meet Soviet Jews, you will be offered meeting and interviews with such people of Jewish nationality which do not share our national feeling.

And again we shall be spoken for, and represented by people who have the right to do it only on behalf of themselves and those who authorize them.

For this *not* to take place, we ask you, Mr. President, to include in your itinerary in the USSR, a meeting with the people who sign this letter. We applied to the Soviet authorities with a similar request. . . . (heavy telephone interference at this point). . . .

We hope that the request will not be followed by preventive measures aimed at our isolation, and your visit will not be darkened by repressions against the Jews for their wish to meet the President of the United States of America.

Yours very truly,
Signatories to the letter to President Nixon.

FROM MOSCOW

Lydia Korenfeld, Lazar Lubarsky, Stella Goldberg, Alla Smilianskaya, Gavriel Shapiro, Leonid Tsipin, Boris Kogan, Alexander Lerner . . . (interference) . . . Vladimir Gershovich, Yakov Pisarevsky.

Vladimir Slepak, Viktor Polsky, Pavel Abramovich, Yuri Kosharovsky, David Markish, Boris Orlov, Levi Libov, Anatoly Galperin, Leonid Kosovoy, Boris Binbinder.

Mussia Zeichik, Vladimir Prestin, Ilya Kurasin, Vladimir Markman, Yosef Begun, Mikhail Klaitchkin, Sergei Gurwitz, Anatoly Yudakov (?), Isaak Penson, Roman Rutman.

FROM LENINGRAD

Izrail Varnavistky, Mira Kornblit, Lev Lerner, Genrikh Mirkin, Daniel Teitelbaum.

FROM SVERDLOVSK

Mark Levin.

FROM VILNA

Zelik Gafanovich, Anatoly Herhkovich, Yelena Ilyovich (?), Boris Shapiro, David Olshavang, Mikhail Pakterman, Rashel Zaksider, Arkay Baazhin, Etain Finkelshtein . . . (interference) . . .

ANDERSON HAILS PASSAGE OF SOVIET JEW RESOLUTION, URGES PRESIDENT NIXON TO RAISE ISSUE IN MOSCOW

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) today hailed House passage of his resolution calling for the relief of Soviet Jews as "a solid showing of Congressional concern for the plight of Soviet religious minorities" and as "a vehicle of support for the President in raising the twin issues of religious persecution and free emigration in his forthcoming discussions with Soviet leaders."

The resolution, H. Con. Res. 471, urges the President to call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free exercise of religion in the Soviet Union and the right to emigrate, and to raise the issue of Soviet transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities, in the U.N. General Assembly.

Following passage of the resolution, Anderson and Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.), co-authors of the measure, held a press conference with Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, and Miss Katia Palatnik, a recent Soviet Jewish emigre to Israel. Miss Palatnik's sister, Raiza Palatnik, remains imprisoned in the Ukraine for anti-Soviet activities which include the possession of Hebrew poems and literature about Israel.

In Anderson's words, "The story of Raiza Palatnik is but one example of the type of Soviet government persecution being practiced against its citizens of the Jewish faith. Official restrictions against Jewish and cultural life in the Soviet Union have been amply catalogued in recent years. These include inadequate religious facilities, pressures against synagogue attendance, the prohibition against publication of religious materials, including Bibles, and the refusal to permit rabbinical training."

Anderson went on, "It is little wonder that thousands of Soviet Jews have requested permission to emigrate in order to maintain their religious and cultural identity. And yet the Soviet record to date on emigration has been abysmal and only token, in clear contravention of Article XIII of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Anderson revealed that he had received a copy of a letter to President Nixon from 48 Soviet Jewish families in which they protest Soviet rejection of their applications to emigrate and urge the President to raise this matter in his May visit.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, seeking relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews, and I commend my distinguished colleagues from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) on their leadership in this effort to draw attention to the plight of Soviet Jews.

The resolution which we are discussing today is virtually identical to House Concurrent Resolution 394, which I cosponsored in August of last year. That resolution received wide bipartisan support here in the House of Representatives. There is an urgent need to speak out

against the oppression of a minority with whom we feel a great kinship. Furthermore, we realize that in our dealings with the Soviet Union we cannot afford to silence our own beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, in testifying on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 394 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last November, I made reference to the experiences of four of my constituents from Highland Park, Ill., in the Soviet Union when they visited there last year. In the course of their visit, Mr. and Mrs. Bert Braverman and Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Alpert had occasion to meet a small number of Soviet Jews some of whom were seeking to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, these honorable and lawabiding American citizens were detained and harrassed at the Moscow airport at the time of their intended departure from the Soviet Union. They were searched, interrogated for a period of several hours, detained for a total of 30 hours, and suffered the confiscation of a tape recorder, a camera, and other personal items. The sole offense of these honorable American citizens was a genuine and compassionate concern for those embracing their religion who were being oppressed by officials in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the actions taken already by our citizens have contributed to the sharp increase in the number of Soviet Jews who have been permitted to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. to Israel, and elsewhere. It is my feeling that passage of this concurrent resolution will provide further relief to these beleaguered persons whose only offense is that they seek to worship God in their own way—and according to their deepest beliefs. It is unthinkable that we would fail to speak our forcibly and in unmistakable words as we are doing in this brief resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an overwhelming vote in support of this measure—House Concurrent Resolution 471.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I joined the other members of the committee in urging House approval of House Concurrent Resolution 471.

It is important that we dramatize the plight of the Soviet Jews and that of all peoples in the Soviet Union who are persecuted for their religious beliefs.

Soviet involvement in the Middle East when related to the foreign policy goals of the Tsars and their constant expansionist programs points out the need for the free world to be ever alert to Soviet foreign policy machinations. It is also important that the domestic political dictatorship within the U.S.S.R. be continually called to the attention of free world citizens. The government pressure, intimidation, and denial of civil rights to Soviet Jews is an international disgrace.

Therefore, I am pleased to see this resolution receive such overwhelming support, and I am hopeful that this affirmative step by the House will demonstrate to the Kremlin the need for its providing Soviet citizens with religious freedom which has been so long denied them.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, William Shakespeare some 400 years ago wrote:

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

Perhaps Shakespeare, seer of truth in the human existence, with these words was foretelling the current plight of Soviet minorities, particularly Soviet Jews. "Bound in shallows" if they seek to remain both Soviet and Jews, the 2 to 3 million members of this minority are restricted in their public, private, and religious lives. Contrary to stipulation in the Soviet Constitution, they are not allowed to be either Soviet or Jew. They are instead placed in a fishbowl when they strive to live as Soviet citizens and harassed when they attempt to worship as Jewish celebrants. They constantly stand in the eye of surveillance, beneath an unveiled, threatening shadow of arrest.

Such prejudice for many years has been the case. Recently, however, a new form of officially proscribed intolerance has dictated that Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel or elsewhere are finding themselves "bound in miseries." Perhaps the Soviet government is fearful that emigres would later speak out against policies in their former homeland, or perhaps it is just concerned that a mass exodus would bespeak dissatisfaction by itself. Perhaps it worries over the opinions their strategically situated Middle Eastern allies might develop if the rights of humanity and freedom of national choice were extended to Jews—thus perhaps adding the human resources of thousands to the besieged state of Israel. It could be for any of numerous reasons that the Soviet government, until the spotlight of world attention in recent months focused on the problem, deemed proper the disregard of a 1948 United Nations' civil rights declaration and clamped a tight lid on Jewish population exit visas.

However, Mr. Speaker, within the next 6 weeks, the tide can, should, and must roll in to submerge the shallows and miseries of Soviet Jews and float them to the higher ground of more fortunate life. By our overwhelming vote for House Concurrent Resolution 471 today, this body is telling the President, the American people, and the world that the waters of concern are rising. By using this and the dictates of conscience as his base, the President can thus present in his discussions with Soviet government leaders next month the dismay of the American people at the inhumane treatment accorded these Jews and other minority groups.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, events of the past year have demonstrated that the Government of the Soviet Union, despite its protestations to the contrary, is in some degree sensitive toward public opinion on the subject of its treatment of the Jewish population of that nation. The increase in emigration over the past year—while it is still shamefully below what ought to be permitted—would not have come without the constant pressure that those in Congress and outside have applied.

It is time for the Congress to go on record as declaring formally that the fundamental violations of basic human rights which the Jewish population of the Soviet Union suffer are intolerable to civilized men and women.

The resolution before us today is commendable and I urge the House to pass it overwhelmingly so that those in power in the Soviet Union will understand how deeply the American people feel about the questions of religious and personal freedom.

This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take the following steps to ease the plight of Soviet Jews:

Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

Request the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

We are not here asking the Soviet Government to do anything that is not routinely and regularly done within our own country. The rights of Soviet Jews as of other oppressed people across the globe must be forcefully supported by this body.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers, in the Bill of Rights, guaranteed the freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and the right of peaceful assembly. These are among our most cherished liberties—an essential part of our lives. However, in many countries, people are frustrated in their desire to practice their religion. Among these groups are many minority peoples in the Soviet Union, particularly the Jews.

Jews in the Soviet Union have been persecuted over many centuries. Toward the end of the czarist days, the pogroms of the late 19th and early 20th centuries made these times among the darkest for Russian Jewry.

With the Bolshevik Revolution, a new form of government and a new constitution came into being in 1917. The new Soviet Constitution secured for Soviet citizens religious freedom and the freedom of development of national minorities and ethnic groups. Article 123 of this Constitution states:

Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political and other social activity, is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or conversely, the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or national exclusiveness or hatred or contempt, are punishable by law.

However, in reality, Soviet practices have not fulfilled these guarantees.

In recent years, the plight of the Soviet Jew has become more apparent to the outside world. And for many Soviet Jews who have not been fully assimilated into the Soviet way of life, a new awareness, a new sense of Jewishness, has developed. The lack of cultural and religious items and the lack of synagogues are deeply resented deprivations.

The Soviet Jew, particularly the younger one, is often desirous of starting a new life outside of the Soviet Union most frequently in Israel. This development has stimulated a wave of applications for permission to emigrate. These courageous people have risked their jobs, their personal freedom, and their physical safety to go to Israel. And thousands are being allowed to leave. But these thousands are only a small fraction of the estimated 2.6 million Jews who are Soviet citizens.

For Russian Jewry, a few positive signs exist. For the first time in decades, Jewish training for the rabbinate was allowed by Soviet officials. In Moscow a school was opened informally last fall with 10 students, although offical authorization did not come until later. Jews are employed in all sectors of the Soviet economy which is another change brought by the Bolshevik Revolution. Also, Jews represent 10 percent of the scientists, intellectuals, and scholars in the Soviet Union, although they comprise only 1 percent of the population of the nation.

Yet the Jews in the Soviet Union are victims of anti-Semitism. For example, Jews are now in Soviet prisons and labor camps on various charges, often without trial. If we believe in religious liberty, we cannot tolerate this anti-Semitism.

I again urge the President, as I have done in private correspondence, to take up the matter of the Soviet Jews during his upcoming visit to the U.S.S.R. next month. I ask President Nixon to convey to the Soviet leaders the consensus of the House of Representatives and the American people that the Soviet leadership treat all their citizens with dignity and respect.

The resolution before the House today expresses the concerns of many citizens of the United States and my own convictions. It places the U.S. House of Representatives on record against this continuing injustice.

This resolution does the following:

It calls upon the Soviet Union to permit freedom of expression and ideas as guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution itself.

It urges the U.S. Government to use both formal and informal means to persuade Soviet officials to move to end discrimination against Soviet Jews.

It requests the Soviet Union to allow all Jewish citizens to emigrate if they desire.

Finally, it suggests that the United Nations undertake the problem of Soviet Jewry and the treatment of other minorities in the Soviet Union.

I support this resolution and hope my colleagues will also.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of concerned Americans to protest the actions of the Soviet authorities against their Jewish citizens. It is American-Soviet relations, we always recognize the Soviet Government is basically totalitarian and demonstrates this by depriving Jewish citizens of elemental human rights.

I know that the cause of world peace is overwhelming and I want the President to be most successful in his visit to Moscow. But since the Soviet Government always attempts to gage American public opinion, I feel it is vital that we let them know the full measure of our thinking over their treatment of their Jewish citizens.

As cosponsor of a resolution asking the President to exert his influence to encourage the Soviet Government to permit its Jewish citizens to practice their religion without interference and to emigrate if they choose, I hope that the concerted efforts of many groups and individuals throughout the United States will help impress upon the Soviet authorities the folly of their policies.

I cite one example of what is happening to Jews in the Soviet Union today.

Since the Soviet Government makes it as difficult as possible for effective communications with Soviet Jewry, the Cleveland-based Union of Councils for Soviet Jews depends on telephone conversations for much of its information. The following was received from Roman Rutman, of Moscow, over the telephone on April 4, 1972, by Dr. L. Rosenblum, Union of Councils chairman:

Less than a month has passed from the time that we last appealed to you pertaining to the illegal actions of the Soviet authorities against the Jews of Kiev desiring to meet in front of the synagogue. We wanted you to know that such actions are ominous indications of coming violent anti-Semitic activities. The actions of the militia and the KGB in front of the Moscow Synagogue, on Archipava Street, during the first night of Passover, Wednesday, March 29, was a continuing indication that the religious oppression has reached Moscow as well.

Police and KGB prohibited Jews from congregating in front of or even near the Synagogue. Following services as Jews left the synagogue the authorities resorted to violence. Jews who stopped for a moment to wish one another a happy Passover were pushed off the synagogue steps. The spirit of the holiday was further distorted by loud speakers blaring, "immediately leave the area, leave the street clear for traffic, stop singing and dancing." The police diverted heavy traffic down narrow Archipova Street, thus creating a very tense atmosphere around the Synagogue. A human chain of police pushed and forced old and young alike who came out of the synagogue. This action culminated in a number of Jews being arrested.

Not wishing to obstruct traffic and listening to the commands of the police a number of young people gathered in a nearby park. They were immediately attacked and beaten and a few dozen were arrested. While the police attack was taking place, a number of enraged officers screamed and made anti-Semitic statements, "this time let's finish them off, catch the damn Jews." The entire episode had the smell and feeling of a pogrom.

We hope that the world Jewish Community and free men everywhere will listen and hear our plea.

The letter was signed by Mr. Rutman, Victor Polsky, Vladimir Slepak, Alexander Lerner, Natan Feingold, Vladimir Prestin, Pavel Abramovitch, Eugeni Gerser, Boris Olov, Victor Yachot, Mikhail Klatchin, Gergei Gurvitz, Ilia Korenfeld, Anatoli Galperin, Vladimir Kovel, Leonid Koshevoi, Lev Libov, Gabriel Shapiro, Valeri Krizhak, Yuri Wasserman, Boris Kogan, Boris Einbinder, Vladimir Roginsky, and Yosef Begun.

This telephoned letter gives another glimpse into Soviet tactics against its Jewish citizens.

As an American who visited the Berlin wall not too long after it was erected, I know somewhat of the terror and frustration under which people can live. I, along with other Americans harbor that basic hate of oppression and compassion for the underdog. There may be many things wrong with our country, but we still maintain this love of freedom and the need to share it with those less fortunate.

So our campaign waged against the Soviet authorities is not unusual nor unique. It is in keeping with a history and heritage that have served us well and, God willing, will continue to do so.

To what do we object in the Soviet Union's treatment of Jews?

The news media have given us some indication of the criminal trials and the charges that have been levied against Jews for alleged plots and other "crimes." Some of these so-called crimes consisted of possessing books on Jewish history and the Hebrew language.

Sentences to prison camps for these "offenses" have been cruel and lengthy. I understand from reliable sources that there are at least 65 Jewish political prisoners serving in Soviet labor camps.

We know, for instance, that once a Jew makes application to immigrate to Israel that he loses his job. Other things may follow such as harassment and surprise visits and searches by Soviet authorities.

If a Soviet Jew finally does receive permission to leave, he goes almost destitute since the government takes as its "fee" almost all his money and possessions. The steps leading up to permission to emigrate are horrendous and inhumane with humiliating and punitive procedures imposed.

The public pressure upon these people is terrific. Of course, the news media in the Soviet Union all are government controlled. Public denunciations of Jewish citizens are part and parcel of the overall Soviet policy to harass and to discourage.

I have been afforded the opportunity to hear from Soviet officials their explanation of all these things. It does not impress me that their Jewish citizens reportedly have as much religious freedom as anyone else in Russia. That does not answer the basic facts of persecution and denial of human rights.

I am not impressed that the Soviet Government does not permit any other able-bodied individuals, scientists, and professors to emigrate. Permitting only the aged and feeble to emigrate is a cruel policy that discriminates unjustly no matter what individuals' religions may be.

And, last of all, I am not impressed

with the contentions that the Soviet Jews are fomenting their problems in an effort to gain a worldwide audience. The answer to this is even simpler: let them go.

What does impress me is the fact that there are some 70,000 application requests representing about 250 million people on file from Soviet citizens who want to leave. I understand requests are increasing by 2,000 to 3,000 monthly.

And all of this in the face of the knowledge that the Soviet Government will use every means at its command to harass, persecute, and even imprison individuals who want to leave, particularly for Israel.

Therefore, I believe that action by the House of Representatives, organizations and individuals is imperative in letting the Soviet Government know that we know what is the truth.

I urge the President to impart these feelings to the Soviet Government. I would hope the State Department would agree to discussing these important issues of human rights with Soviet officials. I think we constantly should remind the Soviets that the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights affirms the rights of people to immigrate to countries of their choice.

Perhaps, we can convince the Soviet Government to change. And if we cannot, then we must continue to speak out for basic human rights and religious freedom. We can do no less.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, there are five compelling reasons for the House resoundingly to affirm our commitment to religious freedom by overwhelmingly approving House Concurrent Resolution 471 today.

One obvious reason is the reality confronting the Soviet Jew. We know that Jews are officially recognized as a nationality in the Soviet Union—the ninth largest among 142 nationalities—yet they do not have the same rights as have been granted to other nationalities. We know that the Soviet Union is hardly a free country. But with the major exception of the Soviet Jew this lack of freedom is dispensed on a nondiscriminatory basis. We recognize the fact that there are Jews in the Soviet Union today who simply seek the same rights, limited as they may be, as their fellow citizens. They consider themselves good Russians, good patriots and they want to be good Jews. They seek no special treatment, simply the same equality under Soviet law extended to other Soviet citizens. We should support their quest for equality.

At the same time we know that there are Russian Jews who want to leave their country and we also know that there is a country willing to accept them—Israel. At the great risk of employment and personal safety, many thousands of Russian Jews have registered with the Israeli representative in the Soviet Union—the Dutch Embassy—for permission to leave. Because of the Soviet policy of harassment of Russian Jews, it does not seem unreasonable to seek for them the opportunity to leave a repressive society that has singled out the Jew for special repression.

And we also speak today in behalf of other religious minorities who seek the freedom to worship and to live their lives as Soviet citizens or to emigrate.

How is Congress to respond to this reality?

There are those who say that it is not right for Congress to apply pressure to a foreign government. I disagree. For this is a question not of military pressure, not of economic pressure, but of moral pressure. And I say our most proper course of action is moral pressure. Plain and simple and civilized pressure. Not because it might leave us with a clear conscience, but because pressure works.

I specifically refer to an example of this by reading a portion of an editorial from the respected Manchester Guardian Weekly:

> General Franco finally listened to the world-wide appeals for a reprieve of the six condemned Basques . . . international protest worked this time. It was also effective in the other brutal case—the Leningrad "hijack" trial.

A second compelling reason is that the time is now for the Congress officially to spell out our country's policy. We must take advantage of the thaw in relations among the leaders of the world today.

Third. With the President going to Moscow, now is the time to give him the benefit of a congressional resolution demonstrating that our government recognizes and condemns the discriminatory policy of the Soviet Union.

Fourth. We have a proud legacy to maintain. Passage of this resolution would be in the best tradition of our country as a leader of the free world.

Fifth. We must act as a Congress to attempt to stop the senseless violence by some in our society who seek to inflame passions against the Soviet Union through misguided acts of violence.

Continued violence against Soviet property and citizens in our country as well as against some of our own citizens who seek to bridge the gap between our two countries is abhorrent to us all. This kind of action will only result in a chilling of the thaw we so earnestly seek to continue.

I want to make my reasons clear on this subject. I do not say that Congress should act because of, or in response to these senseless acts—this is not the way our government operates. Nor am I saying that our passage of a strong resolution would stop vandals from further acts of violence. But a firm resolution from the floor of this chamber would signal to those who may sympathize with this type of extreme action exactly where this government stands on this moral issue.

In summation, I believe that for these five reasons Congress should accept this resolution.

We have signed letters to the President urging that this matter be on his Moscow agenda. We have testified before the Subcommittee on Europe on this question. We have responded to the great many letters from concerned citizens of our districts. Now we must pass this resolution.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor with great enthusiasm to support this resolution which we are considering today. I urge the widest possible support; indeed, I hope for a unanimous vote from this body for these actions which call upon the President to exercise a number of initiatives involving the Soviet Union.

It comes just about a month before the President is due to meet with the rulers of the Kremlin. I have no doubt that the strength of our actions today will in no small measure determine the intensity of the President's talks in relation to this resolution when he meets with the Soviet leaders.

We ask the President to urge the Soviet leaders to give the peoples of that nation freedom of expression and religion, freedom to emigrate. We ask him to instruct the State Department to prefer charges before the General Assembly of the United Nations for the continuous, repeated and unending violations by the Soviet Union of the Declaration of Human Rights, to which, ironically, it is a signator.

Mr. Speaker, my greatest sympathy goes out to all of these persecuted minorities of the Soviet Union—to the Ukrainians, the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the White Russians—to all of them.

And although this resolution addresses itself to all of the persecuted minorities of the Soviet Union, I am sure all of us know that our direct target is the Jews of the Soviet Union.

While there are no free people in the Soviet Union, while all nationalities and religions are being discriminated upon, in truth it must be stated that no group faces a more bitter present or a more uncertain future than the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union.

It is the Jews that are being sentenced to prison and even death for the "crime" of wishing to leave. It is the Jews who are being barred from the doors of their synagogue in Kiev. It is the Jews who have faced the systematic destruction of their religion and culture.

It is very true that for the first time substantial numbers of Jews are being permitted to leave the Soviet Union, mostly for Israel. But at the same time we must recognize and realize that they represent only a small fraction of the Jews who wish to leave—to go where they can be free people.

And also we must know that the vast majority of those being released are from the Baltic nations held in captivity by the Soviets since 1940 or from Georgia. Few, very few, are given exit permits from Russia, from the Ukraine, from Byelorussia.

Just the mere request for an exit permit results in imprisonment, harassment, loss of employment and expulsion from organized society.

And this applies to every segment of the Jewish population—professionals, artists, and laborers. Just the other day, a premier dancer of Russia was deprived of his work and subjected to the worst harassment because he applied for an exit permit to Israel.

This is not an exception; this is the rule. Words cannot describe the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Therefore, while I fully support all of the actions described in this resolution, while I sincerely hope and pray that some day all of these tormented people in the Soviet Union will some day enjoy true liberty, I am pragmatic enough to know that the mere intervention of the President will not change the total course of events in the Soviet Union.

But there is one area in which there is possible movement—further release of Jews from the Soviet Union. I would urge that the greatest emphasis be put on this area by the Congress and the President.

May I echo the prayer, the wish, the hope of many of my Jewish friends when I say:

Let my people go.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that this measure, House Concurrent Resolution 471, to seek relief from restrictions placed upon Jews in Soviet Russia, will be resoundingly approved by this House this afternoon.

As most Members are aware the resolution, with one amendment, was unanimously recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and it expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should substantially execute the following actions to help to ease the plight of Soviet Jews:

First. Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution.

Second. Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

Third. Request the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Fourth. Raise in the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President should be requested to initiate these actions because of the intense interest that is manifest in the country and the Congress in the problems of Soviet Jews, because of the overwhelming evidence that has been presented here demonstrating that Soviet Jews are being unduly and unjustly deprived of normally accepted freedoms and privileges and because it has become obvious that Soviet Union officials correctively react almost in direct proportion and relation to the well-founded and documented criticisms of the United States and other free world peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will be, in my conviction, a timely reiteration that the United States, as the free world's leader willingly and openly accepts and responds to our duty to speak with concern for victims of illegal and unjust oppression and discrimination wherever they exist and I hope, therefore, that this measure will be overwhelmingly endorsed by this House without extended delay.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill.

I am cosponsor of a similar measure (H. Con. Res. 393).

I urge approval of the pending resolution by the House.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, as the cosponsor of a number of measures aimed at aiding the repressed Jewish community in the Soviet Union, I am pleased and proud to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471 this afternoon.

Both under the tsars and the Communist rulers the Jews in the Soviet Union have historically been the victms of the most vicious campaigns of anti-Semitism. One need only recall the brutal pogroms conducted during the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II and the acts of terrorism conducted during the 1930's by Stalin and his henchmen. The campaign to weaken and destroy the Soviet Jews is only overshadowed by the terrible years of Hitler's Germany.

A proud, educated, industrious and cultured community, the Russian Jews have long been denied basic rights and human dignity guaranteed to them by the Soviet Union's own constitution and various international pacts. Jews are denied full access to all aspects of Soviet life. Jews are forbidden their own schools and the teaching of Hebrew and Yiddish is severely restricted; since the 1940's the world famous Hebrew and Yiddish theater has been almost completely closed down; Jews are the victims of strict quota systems in the universities and more advanced technical schools; they are forbidden to exercise any degree of cultural autonomy although other nationalities are permitted to do so.

The current wave of abuse and intimidation has intensified since the end of the 1967 6-day war. Not only are vast numbers of Soviet Jews denied permission to emigrate, but they are increasingly victimized by economic discrimination. Many older Jews are being discharged from their jobs and young Jews are finding it much more difficult to secure suitable employment. In addition, police surveillance and harassment have risen markedly and a significant number of raids on Jewish homes have been conducted. Those seeking to emigrate to Israel and other countries are particularly singled out and suffer many severe forms of discrimination and persecution.

The resolution before us this afternoon clearly puts the Congress on record as favoring meaningful efforts by our Government to ease the plight of Soviet Jews. Further, by passing this measure we will help to focus worldwide opinion on the brutal and totalitarian tactics being employed by Soviet authorities to carry out their ill-conceived campaign to destroy the centuries-old Jewish community. Clearly, as a member of the family of free nations, the United States cannot stand mute as hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children are cruelly denied the right to practice their religion; to have freedom of movement; to have full and free access to the political, social, and economic institutions of the Soviet Union; and to observe their own rich culture and language.

It is particularly appropriate that we take favorable action on this resolution today as the President and his advisors prepare for their forthcoming trip to the Soviet Union. Certainly the issue of the repression of Soviet Jews must be a priority item on Mr. Nixon's agenda and the Congress has the unique opportunity to express our official sentiment on this vital question. We must clearly indicate that we will accept nothing less than full religious freedom for Soviet Jews and an immediate end to barbarous acts of discrimination against them as well as other religious minorities.

I urge that our colleagues participate in this important endeavor and join in supporting this resolution. The plight of the 3.5 million Soviet Jews who daily suffer job discrimination, racial slurs, and the anxiety that arises from being regarded as outcasts by fellow citizens must not be ignored. We must reinforce our words with affirmative action on House Congressional Resolution 471.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of a resolution seeking the relief from restrictions for Soviet Jews, I applaud the Foreign Affairs Committee's efforts to bring House Concurrent Resolution 471 to the House floor for a vote today—and I am confident it will receive overwhelming support.

As a Congressman, I have taken every opportunity available to me to state the concern of my constituents over the unfair treatment of Soviet Jews—and to make extra visas available to Soviet citizens trying to emigrate to the United States.

Further, believing that our governmental and diplomatic officials should use every avenue available to them to urge the Soviet Government to grant all its citizens the rights due them under the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights, I cosigned a letter sent to Commerce Secretary Stans asking him to bring up the matter of Soviet Jews during his trade talks in Moscow.

We are going to pass this resolution today, and the concern of the House will be made crystal clear. So I believe it is an appropriate time for us to urge President Nixon, in behalf of the Congress and all concerned American citizens, to convey to the Soviet leadership our concern for the millions of Soviet citizens who face discrimination, who are prevented from perpetuating their cultural and religious heritage, and who are denied the right to emigrate. Certainly, these should be the rights of any individual.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 490 calling on the President to take action with respect to repressive treatment of citizens of the U.S.S.R. by the Soviet Government. This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the Pres-

ident should call upon the Soviet Government to abide by its own constitution and permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens. Also, efforts are called for to bring about an end to discrimination against religious minorities. Furthermore, the President is urged to request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens to emigrate to the countries of their choice in accordance with the United Nations Declaration of Human rights and to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's violation of the declaration.

We have long been aware of the disregard of the Soviet Government for the rights of its citizens. There is, of course, little we can do to effectively direct Soviet policy. However, we have learned that Soviet leaders are not entirely insensitive to public opinion. Late last year for example, there was some relaxation of restrictions on the emigration of Soviet Jews as a result of the pressure of world opinion. The President now has a unique opportunity during his planned trip to the Soviet Union to bring pressure to bear on Soviet authorities to clarify policy with respect to ethnic and religious minorities within the U.S.S.R. and to encourage conformance with the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights. This resolution urges the President to sieze this opportunity.

Last December on my return from Israel, I wrote to the President in regard to the plight of Soviet Jews. I include my letter in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During my recent visit to Israel, I was most impressed with the intense love of country and willingness to sacrifice all to insure the nation's survival on the part of the Israelis. The spirit of her people is undoubtedly Israel's greatest asset in her struggle and survival amid her hostile neighbors.

This patriotic spirit has, I believe, spread to encompass the whole of Soviet and American Jewry who share the hopes and desires of their relatives in Israel. As a result, in the last year, the American Jewish community has combined with the Israelis to seek a resolution of the plight of the Soviet Jews.

We should be encouraged by recent events. I understand that, as a result of the increased pressure of world public opinion, the Soviet Union in recent weeks has granted exit visas in large numbers and without too much difficulty. Approximately ten planeloads of immigrants arrive weekly in Vienna, Austria, enroute to Israel or other destinations around the world.

Certainly this is an encouraging sign but these same immigrants who have already been released warn that such beneficence may be cut off at any time. In the words of one immigrant, "what tomorrow may bring—nobody is ready to predict."

For this reason, Mr. President, I request that the issue of Soviet Jewry be placed high on your agenda when you visit the Soviet Union in 1972.

Soviet authorities are to be commended for relaxing tensions in this area during the past few weeks and the gratitude of the American Jewish community should be extended to them. Certainly this is an indication of goodwill on their part.

However, the possibility of an instantaneous revocation of this relaxation of controls hovers as an ugly specter over an otherwise joyful situation. It is to be hoped that your visit to the Soviet capital may clarify our understanding of the Soviet policy with regard to the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel or elsewhere in the world.

I hope, Mr. President, that it will be possible for you to give an affirmative reply to this request. The American Jewish community shares my concern as do many of my colleagues in the Congress.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us. Some months ago I wrote the President in support of the general policies outlined in this resolution. I am happy to support and vote for the resolution which puts approximately the same substantial thrust in the more formal and public language of House Concurrent Resolution 471.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse as strongly as possible House Concurrent Resolution 471 and its call for justice for Soviet Jewry.

As a cosponsor of this proposal, I feel it is imperative that the President take with him to Moscow the deep concern of the American people for the plight of Jews and other religious minorities who are denied the basic freedom of sustaining their identity in the Soviet Union and are refused the alternative of moving to lands where they would be welcome and could maintain their identities.

It is the obligation of the Congress to articulate this strong feeling of the American people and to lay upon the President this humanitarian obligation which could make his trip to the Soviet Union meaningful for all men and women who love freedom, value it for themselves and wish to assure that others have an opportunity to share this basic human liberty.

House Concurrent Resolution 471 expresses our concern for the plight of Soviet Jewry. It is timely, in view of the President's impending trip, and it is timelessly right in view of this Nation's great commitment to the inalienable right of freedom of worship.

The resolution calls upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution. It urges our own Government to utilize all formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials to see that this is done, to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities.

It requests the Soviet Government to permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. And it calls upon our own Government to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's trangression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

These are the methods of persuasion and of public pressure. We cannot use force on a greater power. But these methods can be effective if they are backed by a determined public opinion in the United States and in the rest of the free world, and if our official agencies, especially the Congress and the President, persist in seeking a greater measure of justice for oppressed religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

The victims of Soviet oppression cannot raise their voices without fear. But we can voice their cries for justice for them and we should not be still until they have been accorded the basic human rights declared by the nations of the world.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. We have a special obligation as Americans, Mr. Speaker, to speak out against repression, suppression, and oppression wherever and whenever they exist.

Unfortunately, all three exist today in regard to Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union. The measure before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 471, speaks out in the name of the American people against this Soviet denial of Jewish rights.

In denying its Jewish citizens the rights of freedom of speech and religion as well as emigration, the Soviet Union denies both its own constitution and the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights.

Soviet Jews have issued a cry for help to the world. It is necessary that the world respond.

In approving this legislation, we are calling upon the President to give this Nation's answer by raising the matter with the Soviets and with the United Nations.

Only by expressing our disapproval to the Soviet Union in every way open to us, and by getting the other nations of the world to join us in the United Nations can we impress upon the Soviet Union the full impact of world opinion.

There are indications the Soviet attitude towards its Jewish citizens is softening—witness increased emigration visas in the past year—which in itself demonstrates that world opinion has some effect in the Kremlin.

That is all the more reason, Mr. Speaker, for us to constantly reiterate our objection to the existence of such a repressive policy at all. I urge approval of this resolution.

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and plan to cast my people's vote for it.

The deprivation of human rights within the Soviet Union has long been a festering grievance to all her many ethnic and religious minorities.

I understand reluctance to interfere in the domestic policies of another sovereignty, but then in reality are we so doing or are we merely asking that reported human rights violations be placed on the agenda of the United Nations to be aired by the oratorical expertise of that oracle? In passing, I might comment that the Soviets have not hesi-

tated to get involved in our domestic problems, viz, the freeing of Angela Davis.

I have introduced many resolutions similar to the one under consideration, namely:

House Resolution 496, covering human rights violations of all minorities in the Soviet Union.

House Concurrent Resolution 61, to place the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights of Soviet-occupied Lithuania on the agenda of the United Nations.

House Concurrent Resolution 62, Byelorussia.

House Concurrent Resolution 63, Estonia.

House Concurrent Resolution 64, Ukraine.

House Concurrent Resolution 161, the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union.

House Concurrent Resolution 341, Latvia.

House Concurrent Resolution 555, to perpetuate the existence of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches within the Soviet Union.

A strong vote in favor of passage of this resolution will be most timely in telegraphing to the Soviets the feeling of this body as the representatives of the American people against the further escalation of the war in Vietnam by invasion and aggressive action of the North Vietnamese Communist troops armed with Soviet weaponry. It should also serve as a reminder of the deprivation of human rights and further exploitation of the North Vietnamese people by the Russians who have turned North Vietnam into a weapons proving ground resulting in provoked resumption of U.S. bombing.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, to provide relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews.

The great need for such an expression by the Congress was made stunningly clear to me during my recent trip to Russia with the Select Subcommittee on Education. While there, I took the opportunity to visit and talk with a number of Jews about their life. I believe it unnecessary to recount the details of the coverage our activities on the trip received. But the attention we elicited clearly illustrates the extreme sensitivity of the Soviet Government to one of their more serious domestic problems.

My trip convinced me that it is now quite possible to live happily and successfully as a Jew within the Soviet system, if religion and cultural heritage are abandoned. And even though emigration policies have become significantly less rigid in Russia in the last few years, I think the free world has an obligation to keep informed about the situation and to manifest its concern by unanimous passage of House Concurrent Resolution 471 by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of Concurrent Resolution 471 to seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews.

This resolution would bring to the attention of the United Nations that Russia does not abide by the U.N.'s Declaration of Human Rights. It would point out, for all the world to see, that Russia, which affirmed the declaration, denies the right to its citizens to emigrate from the Soviet Union to countries of their choice.

This resolution would urge our President to represent America in appealing to the United Nations and the Soviet Government.

With this resolution of Congress concern, the President would explain that the Soviet Constitution guarantees to its citizens free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion—but that the Soviet Government has denied those freedoms to Jews,

With this resolution, the President could request Soviet officials to end discrimination against religious minorities and permit those who wanted to, to move out of Russia.

While this resolution is designed to relieve immediately the oppression of Soviet Jews, it would offer relief to all religious minorities in Russia. It would once again proclaim that America stands for freedom to all people. It would demonstrate clearly that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics speaks out for freedom, but acts for oppression.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, a resolution seeking relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews. The measure is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 393 which I cosponsored on August 6, 1971.

The pending resolution points out that "in the Soviet Union men and women are denied a freedom recognized by all civilized countries of the world." This is the right to emigrate, a right affirmed by the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights adopted by a unanimous vote of the General Assembly.

With passage of this measure, the Congress will be expressing its belief that the President should immediately:

First, call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution;

Second, utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities;

Third, request of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

Fourth, raise in the General Assembly of the U.N. the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

The visit by President Nixon to the Soviet Union next month presents a unique and valuable opportunity for discussions of the status of Soviet Jews. It is inconceivable to me that the continued cultural and spiritual genocide against 3 million Jews would not be an item for serious deliberation at this summit meeting.

On January 26, 1972, I wrote President Nixon to point out that his trip:

> Offers a propitious opportunity for the President of the United States, in your talks with Soviet leaders, to discuss the issue of the serious plights of the Russian Jews.

In my letter to the President, I also wrote:

> Your personal intervention, as our country's President, might bring about a major revision of the present Soviet antireligious policies against Jews and other religious minorities as well.

Today, I renew this request to the President and I urge all my colleagues to join me in asking the President to list the question of Soviet Jewry high on his agenda for the May visit to Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for us as free people to remain constantly aware of the terrible invasion of human rights perpetrated by the Soviets against their Jewish citizens. We must also see that the pernicious antisemitism of the Russian Government if brought to the widest possible attention in the hope that the glare of the public spotlight will assist in mitigating the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, calling on the President to take steps to ease the plight of Soviet Jews.

I introduced two similar bills which call upon the President to urge the Soviet Union to permit the free expression of ideas in accordance with the Soviet Constitution, utilize contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities, and demand that the Soviet Government permit its citizens the right to emigrate.

The 3 million Soviet Jews suffer discrimination in practicing their religious and cultural traditions, access to education, and the right to fair trial. They also are not allowed to emigrate freely to countries which would allow them these freedoms.

As the President prepares to travel to the Soviet Union to discuss matters of mutual concern, this is a very opportune time to call on him to ask the Soviet Union to end this religious discrimination and grant the Jews who are obliged to remain the rights guaranteed to them in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and two human rights conventions.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the plight of millions of Jews in the Soviet Union. They have suffered legal and social discrimination for many, many years. Today, we have an opportunity to urge the President to address himself to this serious problem. House Concurrent Resolution 471, identical to a resolution I cosponsored, would establish as the sense of this distinguished body, that President Nixon call upon the Soviet Union to end its discriminatory practices against all its citizens.

What better time for this widely supported resolution than on the eve of President Nixon's historic journey to the Soviet Union. A journey for peace among men, and to encourage the entire

world that two powerful nations are willing to sit down together and discuss matters of great significance.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 471. We, as representatives of the greatest free nation in the world, must express our sentiments clearly and do what we can to put an end to discrimination throughout the world.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this House to publicly express its concern over the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union, who for years have been persecuted, relegated to second-class citizenship, and denied the right to freely emigrate to the countries of their choice as affirmed in the United Declaration of Human Rights.

The legislation before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 471, is an entirely appropriate vehicle to express this concern. As a cosponsor of the original legislation, I feel it is important to focus attention on the discrimination practiced against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union, and it is entirely proper for our great Nation to do all in her power to rectify the situation as it exists in the Soviet Union today.

The four-pronged approach contained in this measure—calling upon the Soviet Government to permit free expression of ideas and exercise of religion by all citizens; utilizing formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination; requesting that the Soviet Government permit its citizens to emigrate freely; and raising in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgressions against the U.N.'s Declaration on Human Rights—provides for a comprehensive method of bringing attention to the problem and laying the groundwork for a solution as well.

I believe this measure merits the support of all, and I certainly hope that it receives the overwhelming endorsement of this body today.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 471, which calls on the President to seek relief for oppressed Jews in the Soviet Union. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Rosenthal, for his tireless efforts on behalf of the oppressed Soviet Jews, and for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

This Nation was founded and populated by the religious refugees of an earlier time, and we should not forget our heritage now—especially when so much is at stake for the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

The resolution before us would call upon the President to do four things:

First. Call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution;

Second. Utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities;

Third. Request of the Soviet Government that it permits its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice, as affirmed by the United Nation Declaration of Human Rights; and

Fourth. Raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights, particularly against Soviet Jews and other minorities.

During the past several years, I have been privileged to cosponsor a number of bills and resolutions similar to the measure before us today, and I am hopeful that passage of this resolution will help to bring public pressure to bear on behalf of the cause of oppressed Soviet Jews.

The upcoming trip by the President to Moscow presents a unique opportunity to impress upon the Soviet leaders the depth of concern around the world for the religious freedom of Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union. A number of Members of the House have joined me in the past few weeks in sending letters to President Nixon, urging him to include this issue in the agenda for his trip. The text of my letter follows:

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: In the interest of peace and the easing of world tensions we, the undersigned, welcome your forthcoming trip to Moscow. We also urge you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and to help redeem Soviet Jews, thus fulfilling the hopes of millions of Americans who have labored on their behalf.

Mr. President: We respectfully petition you on behalf of three million Soviet Jews. We urge you to be their advocate and to convey to Soviet leaders the concern of millions of Americans, and people of good will everywhere, over an oppressed minority which faces discrimination, and is prevented from perpetuating its history, its culture and its ancient religious heritage. Nearly forty of its finest young people are in Soviet prison camps because they sought to live as Jews, while others seeking to emigrate are harassed. If some succeed in departing it is only after months of struggle and of deprivation.

Mr. President: We urge you to exert your influence to help free Jewish prisoners of conscience and to help Soviet Jews achieve the fundamental right to live as Jews and to leave for Israel and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, passage of the resolution before us today will not be the first action this House has taken to ease the plight of Soviet Jews. In 1971 I cosponsored H.R. 6698, a bill to provide 30,000 additional special visas for Soviet Jews who wished to emigrate to the United States. After considerable pressure by the Judiciary Committee the Attorney General agreed in October 1971 to invoke his special "parole" authority to admit Soviet Jews into the United States regardless of whether any refugee visas were available. This was an important demonstration. America would continue to open its arms to the oppressed religious minorities of the world, in the best tradition of religious freedom and human compassion.

The resolution before us today is an important statement of principle. It hopefully will add to the mounting public awareness and concern over the oppression of the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union. But it does not have the force of law. It is an expression of concern. Other bills have been introduced, however, in areas where we do have power to do something legislatively. In February, I cosponsored legislation which would provide foreign aid to Israel to assist that nation in resetting the increasing numbers of Soviet Jews who are finding their way out of the Soviet Union and are emigrating to Israel. I have also been privileged to join with my distinguished colleague from New York, WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, in introducing legislation which would authorize the Voice of America to broadcast in Yiddish to the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. To the Jewish people of that part of the world who have been denied the right to free expression of their beliefs and their heritage, such broadcasts could provide a meaningful psychological boost.

Mr. Speaker, there is an ancient Jewish custom which calls for the groom, at a point in the wedding ceremony, to step on and break a wine glass. This is intended to remind the celebrants that even in their supreme moment of joy, there are people in the world who are suffering. In that spirit, we must be mindful today that even on this happy occasion when we move toward passage of this important resolution expressing support for Soviet Jews, the fight is not over yet for those brave people.

There are still millions of Jews in the Soviet Union who are being denied full expression of their religious and cultural heritage. Jews are forbidden their own schools and the teaching of Hebrew and Yiddish is severely restricted. Since the 1940's the world famous Hebrew and Yiddish theater has been almost completely closed down. Jews are the victims of strict quota systems in the universities and more advanced technical schools. They are forbidden to exercise any degree of cultural autonomy although other nationalities are permitted to do so.

Many older Jews are being discharged from their jobs and young Jews are finding it much more difficult to secure suitable employment. In addition, police surveillance and harassment have risen markedly and a significant number of raids on Jewish homes have been conducted. Those seeking to emigrate to Israel and other countries are particularly singled out and suffer many severe forms of discrimination and persecution.

A tragic example of that oppression has been the case of Prof. Alexander Lerner. He has been stripped of his professional standing and his job, all because he asked to go to Israel. It was during a visit to Professor Lerner's apartment that Congressman SCHEUER was arrested by the Soviet police. Last month, I addressed a letter to Secretary of State William Rogers, calling upon him to inquire of the Soviet Ambassador concerning the status of Professor Lerner's request to emigrate, and the deprivations to which he has been subjected in his homeland. A copy of that letter and an article from the Chicago Sun-Times describing his plight follow:

MARCH 30, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM F. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to ask you to inquire about the status of Professor Alexander Ya. Lerner, a scientist and computer expert living in Moscow. He has been a trusted and respected member of the

Soviet scientific community, a professor at the Scientific and Technical University in Moscow, and a director at the Institute of Control Sciences for the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. However, that has all changed since he applied for and was denied permission to leave the Soviet Union and to emigrate to Israel. We understand that he has been expelled from all of his academic positions, has been barred from doing scholarly work outside the Soviet Union, and has lost his membership in the Communist Party. Apparently, his son and daughter also have been fired from their jobs.

Professor Lerner's situation has been receiving world-wide attention since the arrest of Congressman Scheuer at Lerner's apartment last month. So far, the Soviet authorities have not honored the request of Professor Lerner to leave the country—a request supported by many scientists throughout the world and, we might add, a request supported by common sense. As a prisoner in his own home, Professor Lerner's talent and intellect are being wasted. If the Soviet Union permitted him to leave, it would serve the cause of international scientific cooperation.

There are reports that this year alone the Soviet Union will permit more than 40,000 people to emigrate to Israel. World public opinion was a major factor in the Soviet Union's decision, and it might be helpful again in the case of Professor Lerner.

We know you share our concern, and would urge the State Department to express that concern by inquiring into the status of Professor Lerner and his chances for emigration.

We would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

Bella S. Abzug, Herman Badillo, Alphonzo Bell, Jonathan Bingham, Ronald V. Dellums, Robert F. Drinan, Don Edwards, and Donald M. Fraser.

Mitchell Harrington, Henry Helstoski, Abner J. Mikva, Parren J. Mitchell, Roman C. Pucinski, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James Scheuer, and Sidney R. Yates.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 17, 1972]

STARTS DRIVE TO HELP SOVIET SCIENTIST

(By Dennis D. Fisher)

A Northwestern University mathematics professor is helping mount a drive here and abroad to persuade the Soviet Union to let a Jewish cybernetics expert emigrate to Israel.

Avner Friedman, 39, who was born in Israel, is campaigning with other scientists around the world to obtain permission for Alexander Lerner and his family to leave Russia.

"We are trying to raise world interest in his case so that the man will not be silenced and his work will not be terminated," Friedman said in an interview in his Evanston office.

"He has been denied a visa and has lost his positions, and this is not just," Friedman

VISITED BY CONGRESSMAN

Worldwide interest in Lerner's plight developed last Wednesday when Soviet police arrested U.S. Rep. James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.) in Lerner's Moscow apartment. Scheuer, although detained for only 40 minutes, was expelled Friday from the Soviet Union for engaging in "improper activities" during his visit.

The scientists' campaign has taken the form of letter writing and placing telephone calls supporting Lerner's emigration request to the president of the Academy of Sciences in the U.S.S.R. and to the director of the institute in which Lerner worked.

Friedman and other editorial board members of the journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics are involved in the "moral suasion" drive to get the necessary visas issued.

Lerner had been director of the Department of Large Scale Systems of the Institute of Control Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and a professor at the Scientific and Technical University in Moscow.

But as a result of his requests to leave Russia, he was removed from both positions and he lost his Communist Party membership. In addition, his son and daughter were fired from their jobs.

Friedman said the family has been living with the aid of friends. He said he met Lerner at a scientific conference in Italy 18 months ago.

"We swam together and the day before leaving he told me about his two children and how they were raising his Jewish consciousness. The way he talked the children feel much stronger about their being Jews than he does," Friedman said.

He said the Lerners have lived well in Moscow with a five-room apartment and two cars, "which is unheard of for most professors."

It would seem that Lerner was trusted as well as respected by the Soviet scientific community, Friedman said, because he was allowed to travel freely abroad to conferences and speaking engagements. "Some of their best scientists don't get out of the country," Friedman observed.

In spite of his position and standard of living, Friedman said, "they have not been able to live a Jewish life and that is why they want to leave."

As it is now, he said, the man's productivity has been curtailed. "He is a valuable man and I suppose that is one reason the Soviets don't want to let him go," he said.

Lerner's work in cybernetics, the study of communication and control in living organisms and machines, has been applied in the Soviet Union to predicting supply and demand for steel and to problems associated with the allocation of scarce resources.

Friedman telephoned Lerner early last December in his Moscow apartment and invited him to an unspecified professional gathering in the United States.

At the time, Lerner said that he would be delighted and that he would "come as an Israeli citizen."

Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people of the Soviet Union have a better chance today than they did a year ago to get out from under the yoke of religious persecution. The gains that have been made are due in no small part to humanitarian efforts of people around the world to bring attention and criticism to bear on the actions of the Soviet Government. We must do our part to keep the pressure on. It is the only hope for millions of Soviet Jews, until the Pharaohs of Asia finally agree to "Let my people go."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 471.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

I merely want to respond briefly to my distinguished and extremely able colleague from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The reason why this was brought up under a suspension-of-the-rules procedure was that 162 Members had introduced resolutions of this type, and the principal resolution from which this one flowed was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

It was my sense of the legislative timing that there was general approval of this legislation and an earnest desire on the part of the sponsoring Members to bring it promptly to the floor.

Twelve of the 14 Members of the subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), cosponsored this resolution, and gave the matter, including the style and text, a great deal of attention.

Knowing full well that no amendments could be offered, we believed we had exhausted all remedies.

I believe this resolution is an important tool in the world-opinion contest in which we are constantly engaged. This kind of action by the House of Representatives is an assumption of its responsibility to mankind throughout the world.

What we do here today, I believe, will be a step forward in an enlightened policy in the assumption of a keen and earnest interest in what happens to people all over the world.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 471), as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—360

Abbitt	Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.
Abernethy	Bergland	Cabell
Abourezk	Betts	Caffery
Abzug	Bevill	Camp
Adams	Biaggi	Carey, N.Y.
Addabbo	Biester	Carlson
Anderson, Calif.	Bingham	Carter
	Blackburn	Casey, Tex.
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Cederberg
Anderson, Tenn.	Boland	Celler
	Bolling	Chamberlain
Andrews, Ala.	Brademas	Clancy
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brasco	Clark
	Bray	Clawson, Del
Annunzio	Brinkley	Cleveland
Archer	Brooks	Collier
Arends	Broomfield	Collins, Ill.
Ashbrook	Brotzman	Collins, Tex.
Ashley	Brown, Mich.	Conable
Aspin	Brown, Ohio	Conte
Aspinall	Broyhill, N.C.	Conyers
Badillo	Broyhill, Va.	Cotter
Baker	Buchanan	Daniel, Va.
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Daniels, N.J.
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Danielson
Begich	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, Wis.
Bell	Byrne, Pa.	Delaney

Dellenback	Keith	Rarick
Denholm	Kemp	Rees
Dennis	King	Reid
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Reuss
Dickinson	Koch	Rhodes
Dingell	Kuykendall	Riegle
Donohue	Kyl	Roberts
Dorn	Kyros	Robinson, Va.
Dow	Landrum	Robison, N.Y.
Downing	Latta	Rodino
Drinan	Leggett	Roe
Dulski	Lennon	Rogers
Duncan	Lent	Roncalio
du Pont	Link	Rooney, N.Y.
Edmondson	Lloyd	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Rosenthal
Edwards, Calif.	Lujan	Rostenkowski
Ellberg	McClory	Roush
Esch	McCloskey	Rousselot
Evans, Colo.	McCollister	Roybal
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	Runnels
Fascell	McCulloch	Ruppe
Findley	McDade	Ruth
Fish	McDonald, Mich.	Ryan
Fisher	McEwen	Sandman
Flood	McFall	Sarbanes
Flowers	McKay	Satterfield
Foley	McKevitt	Saylor
Ford, Gerald R.	McKinney	Scherle
Ford, William D.	McMillan	Scheuer
Forsythe	Mahon	Schneebeli
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Scott
Frenzel	Mallary	Sebelius
Frey	Mann	Shipley
Fulton	Martin	Shoup
Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.	Shriver
Garmatz	Mathis, Ga.	Sikes
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Sisk
Gettys	Mayne	Slack
Giaimo	Mazzoli	Smith, Iowa
Gibbons	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Goldwater	Melcher	Snyder
Gonzalez	Metcalfe	Spence
Goodling	Michel	Springer
Grasso	Mikva	Staggers
Gray	Miller, Calif.	Stanton, J. William
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Ohio	Steed
Green, Pa.	Mills, Md.	Steele
Griffin	Minish	Steiger, Ariz.
Griffiths	Mink	Stratton
Gross	Mitchell	Sullivan
Grover	Mizell	Talcott
Gubser	Mollohan	Taylor
Gude	Montgomery	Teague, Calif.
Hagan	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Haley	Morgan	Terry
Halpern	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Hamilton	Moss	Thomson, Wis.
Hammer-schmidt	Murphy, Ill.	Thone
	Murphy, N.Y.	Tiernan
Hanley	Myers	Udall
Hanna	Natcher	Ullman
Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi	Van Deerlin
Harrington	Nelsen	Vander Jagt
Harsha	Nichols	Vanik
Harvey	Obey	Veysey
Hastings	O'Hara	Vigorito
Hathaway	O'Konski	Waggonner
Hawkins	O'Neill	Waldie
Hays	Passman	Wampler
Hechler, W. Va.	Patman	Ware
Heckler, Mass.	Patten	Whalen
Heinz	Pelly	White
Henderson	Pepper	Whitehurst
Hicks, Mass.	Perkins	Whitten
Hicks, Wash.	Pettis	Widnall
Hillis	Peyser	Wiggins
Hogan	Pickle	Williams
Holifield	Pike	Wilson, Charles H.
Horton	Pirnie	
Howard	Poage	Winn
Hull	Podell	Wolff
Hungate	Poff	Wyatt
Hunt	Powell	Wydler
Jacobs	Preyer, N.C.	Wylie
Jarman	Price, Ill.	Wyman
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Tex.	Yates
Jonas	Pucinski	Yatron
Jones, Ala.	Purcell	Young, Fla.
Jones, N.C.	Quie	Young, Tex.
Karth	Quillen	Zablocki
Kastenmeier	Railsback	Zion
Kazen	Randall	Zwach
Keating	Rangel	

NAYS—2

Flynt	Hall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bow

NOT VOTING—70

Alexander	Byron	Clausen, Don H.
Blanton	Carney	Clay
Blatnik	Chappell	Colmer
Burton	Chisholm	Corman
Coughlin	Hansen, Wash.	Roy
Crane	Hébert	St Germain
Culver	Helstoski	Schmitz
Curlin	Hosmer	Schwengel
Davis, S.C.	Hutchinson	Seiberling
de la Garza	Ichord	Skubitz
Dellums	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Dent	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton, James V.
Devine	Kee	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Landgrebe	Stephens
Dowdy	Long, La.	Stokes
Dwyer	McClure	Stubblefield
Eckhardt	Macdonald, Mass.	Stuckey
Edwards, La.	Madden	Symington
Erlenborn	Mills, Ark.	Thompson, Ga.
Eshleman	Minshall	Whalley
Fountain	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
Fraser	Morse	Wright
Galifianakis	Nix	
Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. James Stanton with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Morse.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. de la Garza.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Byron with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Curlin with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Clay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIM NUCLEAR LICENSING

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13752) to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13752

A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 106. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in any proceeding subject to section 102(2)(C) of this Act for the issuance by a Federal agency of a license to operate a thermal electric generating plant, the Federal agency, if—

"(1) the application for such license was filed with such agency on or before September 9, 1971, and

"(2) the application for the permit to construct such plant was filed with such agency on or before January 1, 1970.

may issue an interim license to operate such plant.

"(b) Any interim license issued pursuant to this section—

"(1) may authorize the operation of the plant concerned only—

"(A) to the extent necessary to carry out appropriate testing of the plant, and

"(B) to provide emergency power, but in no case may the plant be operated for this purpose beyond 20 per centum of its rated capacity without the specific prior approval of the head of the agency;

"(2) shall state the period of time for which it is effective and may contain provisions for the extension of such period, but in no event may such permit be valid after (A) completion of the agency's review process with respect to the application for the license referred to in subsection (a)(1) of this section, or (B) October 30, 1973, whichever first occurs; and

"(3) be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Federal agency deems necessary and appropriate to carry out this section.

"(c) No interim license may be issued pursuant to this section until after the Federal agency consults with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to the terms and conditions of the license. The issuance of any such interim license shall be consistent with an appropriate regard for environmental values in accordance with such rules and regulations as the agency may deem necessary, and shall be without prejudice to any subsequent licensing action with respect to the plant concerned which may be taken by the agency. No interim license may be issued unless the Federal agency—

"(1) determines that the issuance of the interim license will not have a significant impact on the quality of the environment; or

"(2) considers and balances—

"(A) whether it is likely that the conduct of the activity under the interim license will give rise to a significant impact on the environment; the nature and extent of such impact, if any; and whether redress of any such environmental impact can reasonably be effected should modification or termination of the interim license be required;

"(B) whether the conduct of the activity under the interim license would foreclose subsequent adoption of alternatives in facility design or operation; and

"(C) the effect of delay in issuance of the interim license upon the public interest."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the bill?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13752 which was introduced after lengthy discussions with the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies.

Briefly, the function of the legislation is to permit the issuance of interim operating licenses for facilities under construction before the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act where the only remaining obstacle to the operation of the facility is the procedural requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, in which event the Atomic Energy Commission could issue interim operating licenses up until the 30th of October, 1973, or until such time as the environmental impact procedures in due and proper form were completed.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the only agency affected by the bill, and it must consult with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency before issuing any interim license.

It was clearly stated in the hearings that the Atomic Energy Commission will require retrofitting of any of the facilities concerned in the legislation to require full compliance with any requirement with regard to the protection of air, water or the environment.

One thing which must be stressed for the benefit of some of the opponents, who apparently have not chosen to read the bill as they should, is that the bill gives no exemption whatsoever from any requirement of any law other than that cited above under the National Environmental Policy Act. In no way does it affect the requirements for radiological safety or anything else under the Atomic Energy Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that the National Environmental Policy Act should not be amended unnecessarily.

I should point out that every executive agency—the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency—testified in favor of the bill.

One thing which should be plain is that we have not given the electric power industry the size exemption which they wanted, but in the view of all who were concerned we have given them all that is necessary to prevent the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act from contributing to blackouts or brownouts.

As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, it has been very clear in the mind of every responsible citizen that there is grave peril of blackouts, brownouts, and significant power shortages in most of the areas of the country, particularly in the Northeast. I therefore urge my colleagues who want to protect the National Environmental Policy Act to recognize that the procedures we are using today are appropriate to assure that the National Environmental Policy Act not be unwisely amended and not be emasculated. It is my hope my colleagues will recognize that there is an emergency impending and that there is a need to move expeditiously toward the enactment of this bill.

This bill does assure the requirements or the National Environmental Policy Act will not be used to prevent full and adequate utilization of power facilities in the country during the summertime and that it will not contribute to any blackouts or brownouts during this coming summer.

The purpose of this legislation is to reaffirm that the National Environmental Policy Act provides sufficient flexibility to permit the issuance of temporary operating licenses to nuclear powerplants prior to completion of the full environmental review under section 102, if temporary licensing is required to meet an unavoidable electric power demand and if the temporary operation of the plants will neither cause substantial injury to the environment nor foreclose future alternatives to minimize adverse environmental impact.

The passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—NEPA—has had a profound and substantial effect upon practically every agency of the Federal Government. The Atomic Energy Commission has been very much involved in discussions on the implications of NEPA, some of them with this committee. The question of the responsibility of the AEC to consider on its own matters covered by State water quality certifications was the subject of considerable comment in the first oversight hearings held by this committee in December of 1970, and our report on those hearings—H. Rept. 92–316—strongly criticized this position taken by that agency.

Less than 1 month later, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia resolved this particular controversy, in the well-known *Calvert Cliffs* opinion—*Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee* v. *AEC*, 499 F 2d 1109, District of Columbia Circuit, 1971. That decision clearly stated that it was the responsibility of the Commission to satisfy the requirements of NEPA, and that this responsibility could not be abdicated.

To its credit, the Commission has accepted the holding of Calvert Cliffs', and has made a sustained effort to conform its policies to that decision. Its revised regulations, published as appendix D on September 9, 1971, attempted to deal with the difficult transition period between the Calvert Cliffs' decision and a future time when the new procedures could be made fully effective as to all projects for which construction permits and operating licenses were sought. Those projects for which construction permits had been granted, and for which hearings had commenced for issuance of operating licenses, were to be treated under the provisions of paragraph D of appendix D of the AEC regulations. The substantive requirements of paragraph D2 and D3 are very similar to the requirements of H.R. 13752.

On December 17, 1971, the District Court for the District of Columbia handed down its opinion in the case of *Izaak Walton League* v. *Schlesinger* (— F. Supp. —, D.D.C., December 17, 1971), also known as the Quad Cities decision. Judge Barrington Parker concluded that the AEC had failed to comply with the statutory mandate of NEPA, and had first, refused to issue an impact statement in that case and, second, had refused to permit public participation in the licensing decision. On the basis of this conclusion, the judge issued a preliminary injunction against the issuance of a temporary operating license for the Quad Cities plant.

The decision involved a plant for which no public hearing on matters of radiological safety was to be held as a prerequisite to issuance of an operating license. Thus, the case arose under paragraph D3 of appendix D but the logic of the decision would apply equally to paragraph D2. Under paragraph D2 the Commission does provide for a hearing prior to issuance of the temporary operating license but only after preparation of the Statement of Environmental considerations for which no formal public comments are permitted prior to its completion. The case was complicated by the fact that the AEC had not yet completed its compliance with the provisions of paragraph D3. In particular, the AEC had not issued its statement of environmental considerations with respect to the temporary operating authority requested. The plaintiffs prevailed in that litigation because the court concluded that the statement of environmental considerations would not comply with NEPA due to the failure to afford any formal opportunity for comment by the public or by Federal and State agencies with special environmental expertise.

The AEC could apparently have relieved itself of the quad cities decision by minor amendments to paragraphs D2 and D3 to insure public participation and consultation with expert agencies within time limits consistent with the urgent electric power needs which were the initiating cause for consideration of the temporary operating authority. The AEC feared that this course of action did not guarantee that it would not be subject to court attack on the validity of the new regulation and possible further delay in its attempt to take prompt action on the temporary operating license request. It, therefore, sought relief in the form of legislation which would confirm the validity of its basic approach to the problem.

The thrust of the AEC position has been that the full NEPA review required prior to the issuance of an operating license might prevent the earliest possible commencement of operation of 13 nuclear powerplants which were now near completion, some of which would be needed in the summer of

1972, the winter of 1972–73 and the summer of 1973. To alleviate these near-at-hand electric demands, the Commission wished to issue temporary operating licenses for relatively short periods.

The testimony received by the committee in the course of the hearings disclosed that both the AEC and environmentalists agreed that—in the words of AEC Chairman Schlesinger:

> The general power situation that we face in this country comes from slippages in schedules which are not a direct consequence of the activities of environmental groups.

There also appeared to be general agreement that the requirements of NEPA do not impose upon the AEC the obligation to ignore legitimate electric power demands in the course of its full NEPA review of the full term operating license application but permit a more limited environmental review consistent with a more limited—in power level or time or both—operating license.

The current AEC regulations—paragraphs D2 and D3 of appendix D—impose an implicit limit on the power level as well as the duration of the license issued. It appeared to the committee that the requirements of section 50.57 of 10 CFR part 50—authorizing operation at less than full power—when read in conjunction with paragraphs D2 and D3 indicate that the AEC was limiting its authority to issue temporary operating licenses to power levels substantially below 100 percent of full power. In discussions with the committee the AEC had urged that legislative relief go further than paragraphs D2 and D3 in this regard and authorize temporary operating licenses at 100 percent power for limited time periods.

The areas of disregard centered around whether there was in fact an energy crisis for which nuclear powerplants—some of which involve new designs not previously operated—could provide a solution. The committee believes there is substantial evidence to contradict AEC and industry claims on this subject but believes the resolution of this issue should be in the context of a specific application for a temporary operating license where the issue can be explored in a full adjudicatory hearing. The committee understands that the AEC intends to hold such hearings—if timely requested—to explore the allegations regarding the need for power as well as all other relevant factors prior to issuance of a temporary operating license.

There has also been substantial controversy about the need for legislative relief.

Environmental lawyers took the unusual step of proposing regulations to the AEC which, if adopted, would in their view render this legislation unnecessary. The core of their proposal rested in shortened hearing procedures, coupled with a liberalized disclosure process, in order to encourage the speedy resolution of issues in dispute between the parties to emergency licensing cases.

To the credit of the AEC, it raised no objection to the theory underlying this proposal; indeed it indicated that it would in any case follow these or similar procedures on a case by case basis without adopting formal regulations to this effect. The Commission did, however, express considerable concern that these or any other proposed regulations would not afford sufficient assurance that court action to have the new regulations declared illegal would not occur and be successful. For this reason, the AEC expressed hope that the Congress could provide a more formal and clear directive in the form of a committee report and/or legislation.

The justification for congressional action is the possible protection against three conditions:

First, the occurrence of a power shortage;

Second, one of the plants covered by the bill being in a position to ease the shortage, and

Third, the time constraints being such that normal NEPA procedures could not be completed in time to permit the plant to operate and the possibility of court action declaring temporary operating license authority to be illegal.

In the event that all three of these conditions were to obtain, the committee expects that the authority provided by this bill would and should be used. In such case, the AEC would be expected to document its findings that the circumstances required action under this authority—i.e. that the three conditions exist—would make public the evidence upon which it proposed to act before the time that it took action and would permit the public, in an adjudicatory hearing, to challenge this finding as well as to contest the issuance of a temporary operating license. This is, we understand, fully consistent with its current regulations, although perhaps not spelled out in detail. The time schedule for such hearings and receipt of the view of expert Federal and State agencies could be controlled in the manner suggested by environmental lawyers with the protections provided therein. We understand the Commission is prepared to accept these proposals in substance.

In the view of the committee, the endorsement of this bill should in no way be taken as implying a lessened sense of importance of the public review process as an integral part of the NEPA review. Full and open public review of the factors that underlie decisions with environmental consequences, is entirely consistent with this bill, just as it is with NEPA as originally passed.

NEPA clearly requires agency consideration of the environmental implications of proposed actions to the fullest extent possible. If, for example, it is proposed to fire up and run a powerplant at a given level of operation, the implications of running that plant at that level both the costs and the benefits must be considered. To the extent that time will permit, the adverse environmental consequences of full and long-term operation must also be considered, but if an emergency exists, it may be necessary to postpone more complete consideration until the emergency is past. Where, as here, the agency retains the authority to go into sufficient detail at a later date, and if necessary, to require additional treatment—backfitting—it does not appear to us to be a violation of the language, history or intent of NEPA to permit the agency to take emergency action on the basis of the best available knowledge at that time. This viewpoint has received judicial approval in *EDF* v. *Corps of Engineers* (E.D. Ark.) 325 F. Supp. 749 and the Calvert Cliffs' case.

In discussing the reasons for H.R. 13752, it is as important to note what it does not do, as what it does. A number of these concepts come immediately to mind:

First, it does not represent an "erosion" of the basic principles of NEPA. In effect, the AEC is told to follow the full NEPA procedures whenever possible, and where this is not possible, to do everything that can be done consistent with the act and with the emergency nature of the problem confronting it. This merely reconfirms what we have always believed NEPA to require.

Second, and no less importantly, H.R. 13752 does not act in any way to relieve the AEC of any responsibilities that it may have to be certain that no safety problems or hazards will be created by operation of the plant at any level. There has been extensive controversy and litigation over this issue, much of it over concerns with the operation or failure to operate of emergency core cooling systems for these plants; passage of this bill should not be construed as approval or disapproval of steps taken to minimize the problem, nor to authorize any level of operation prior to satisfactory resolution of safety problems.

Third, the bill in no way diminishes the authority or responsibility of the AEC to do everything necessary and appropriate to fully comply with NEPA, including providing the full environmental impact statement contemplated under section 102(2)(C) as soon as this can be done. The AEC has made it abundantly clear that they will reserve the power to require backfitting of necessary equipment, such as cooling towers or ponds, even though this necessity might appear after the interim authority granted under H.R. 13752 had been provided.

Fourth, the committee is aware that there is a substantial dispute regarding the proper scope of any environmental review conducted by the AEC. This has centered on, first, questions of the environmental impact of the mining, manufacturing, and reprocessing of fuel, and the ultimate disposal of nuclear wastes and, second, questions of the benefit to be obtained by meeting electric power needs and alternatives to meeting those needs. This legislation does not attempt to resolve these disputes and the committee expresses no opinion on the disputes at this time.

Fifth, this bill in no way affects any substantive requirements of State or Federal law with respect to air and water quality standards and environmental protection generally. If those laws would prevent the plant from operating without the bill, the plant could not operate with it.

We should also note that the record before this committee suggests that there may not be any situations in which the authority here confirmed will have to be exercised and that the three previously discussed conditions will never be met.

If the bill is in fact unnecessary, it will remain unused; if it does prove to be necessary, then in the view of the committee—and indeed of all witnesses at the hearings; Federal agency utility executive and conservationist—it should be used. In short, the legislation provides a form of insurance against such an occurrence, however unlikely this may be.

It is our view that this legislation merely confirms the authority granted by NEPA to the AEC. The temporary operating license represents a limited Federal action for which a less detailed environmental statement is required. However, the statement prepared pursuant to section 106(c) is really no different than a statement pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of NEPA. The section 106(c) statement is merely scaled down to coincide with the limited Federal action being considered and with the limited time available for a full review of the limited action. Thus the statement to be prepared under section 106(c) represents compliance with section 102(c) "to the fullest extent possible." We hope other Federal agencies that feel they need special procedures for compliance with NEPA in emergency situations will focus on the flexibility built into section 102 of NEPA and avoid creating administrative emergencies.

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to enactment of this bill for a number of compelling reasons.

In the first place, I feel this legislation is not necessary. The court challenge to the AEC regulations which immediately prompted this matter, the Quad Cities decision, has now been settled, and we are being asked to pass this bill in order to preclude further challenges to the Atomic Energy Commission's regulations.

In my opinion, this would be an unwise precedent. The Quad Cities holding that the EPA statement must be prepared with respect to the issuance of operating licenses for existing nuclear generating plants today may or not be a proper view on the part of EPA. We should not, however, arbitrarily preclude judicial review of this issue as a matter of congressional policy.

Second, Mr. Speaker, it is unrealistic to assert that suspension of the National Environmental Policy Act even on the limited basis authorized in this bill will not prejudice the outcome of the ongoing environmental review process with respect to these nuclear powerplants. While the committee report stresses that the Atomic Energy Commission will continue to be bound by the National Environmental Policy Act and will be required to order whatever retrofitting the environmental impact statements reveal as necessary to fully protect the environment, it will be infinitely more difficult for the Atomic Energy Commission to shut down a plant which has become an integral part of the power grid than it is to delay the operation of a plant which has not yet made any contribution to our energy needs. We cannot foresee what the environmental impact statements on these plants might conclude in the absence of such pressure to avoid a shutdown.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires a balancing of economic, environmental, and other considerations, and we must not stack the deck in advance against a full, impartial balancing of these statements. Interim licensing of the plants, I fear, may do just that and therefore place an intolerable pressure on the AEC licensing staff to keep these plants on line, no matter what the environmental cost might be.

Mr. Speaker, the House is being asked to protect the Atomic Energy Commission from a potential court challenge which may never come and over which the Atomic Energy Commission may well prevail.

This is not only bad law and bad precedent, but also may not even be necessary. On the other hand, this legislation has the very real potential of undermining the National Environmental Policy Act review process, both during the period of interim licensing for the powerplants involved, and, also, as an example to others who might seek exceptions to the requirements of the act.

The circumstances at present do not support such tampering with the National Environmental Policy Act. This precipitous effort, I believe, should be rejected.

I would, further, point out that the National Environmental Policy Act was adopted in its inception because of the failure of the administration to include the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense in the original Presidential Council on Environmental Quality.

For these reasons, it seems to me that to make an exception to this act at this time is to emasculate the intent of the act and lay it open to future such exceptions whenever any Federal agency may be powerful enough to request it.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California, the senior Democratic member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13752. The bill has the support of the administration.

Enactment of this bill together with an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act are needed to enable the Atomic Energy Commission to license the operation of already constructed nuclear powerplants on a temporary basis, only if the plant is needed to supply energy requirements in the area served by the plant and then only provided the Commission makes the necessary safety and environmental determinations for purposes of the temporary license.

H.R. 13752 would amend the National Environmental Policy Act to provide, in effect, that an interim environmental statement will be satisfactory for purposes of interim operation needs during a period which will expire on October 30, 1973, provided the interim operation is needed to supply emergency power.

Bills are now before the joint committee which would amend the Atomic Energy Act—the source of the Commission's licensing authority—to give the Commission the authority to issue temporary operating licenses; to specify the findings which have to be made by the Commission for purposes of such license; and to give guidance on the procedures which the Commission must follow in deciding whether to issue a temporary operating license.

Bills are now before the Joint Committee, H.R. 14065, complements H.R. 13752. I have consulted with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan and with his staff to assure that each of the bills, which relate to the same problem, deals only with the aspects of the problem in the area of each committee's particular area of jurisdiction. I am satisfied that this goal has been accomplished. I wish to thank Mr. DINGELL and his staff for their splendid cooperation in these matters.

I am confident that the Joint Committee will reach its decision to report out a bill which will be either identical or very simliar to H.R. 14065 later on this week.

Mr. Speaker, until comparatively recently the Atomic Energy Commission's authority was statutorily limited substantially to radiological and common defense and security matters. In recent months the Commission's licensing authority has been extended to cover the consideration of all environmental matters associated with the operation of a nuclear powerplant under the National Environmental Policy Act, which became law on January 1, 1970, and subsequent judicial interpretations thereof.

Dr. Schlesinger, since his appointment as Commission Chairman last fall, has labored to make the Commission's licensing program fully responsive to the new environmental requirements. The question is no longer whether that will be the Commission's policy, but what additional resources are needed to carry out the new responsibilities and the difficult transitional problems associated with the licensing and operation of plants which were substantially constructed before the new requirements were imposed.

The Commission has assured the committee that it will be able to deal with all of these new responsibilities adequately and on a timely basis in the very near future. At the present time, however, the Commission has not been able to complete the final environmental impact statements for full-term, full-power operation for all of the plants which have been constructed and are ready to operate. They will be able to complete an interim environmental statement for the temporary operation of such plants. As a matter of fact, some of the interim statements have been completed.

Before nuclear fuel can be placed in a nuclear powerplant and before it can be operated, the Atomic Energy Commission must issue a license authorizing those activities. Initially after fuel load-

ing, the plant must go through a period of low-power testing which takes at least 2 months. These tests are for the purpose of demonstrating and assuring safety of the reactor.

H.R. 13752 would accommodate that transition problem which will end on October 30, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to the heart of the matter and inform my colleagues why I believe that this authority is urgently needed.

At the hearings conducted by the Joint Committee on March 16 and 17, both the administration and the utility witnesses testified to the threatened power shortages commencing this summer in certain parts of the country. Essentially the same testimony was presented at the joint hearings of the Senate Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs, and before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL REPORT

A February 1972 report of the National Electric Reliability Council presents the results of an assessment of the impact on the adequacy of electric bulk power supply of potential delays of 12 months in the operation of all new nuclear and fossil-fired, steam-generating plants—display the exhibits. The red area on the charts mean that the reserves are critical. The gray area means the reserves are below normal.

Based on a 12-month delay in the operation of new nuclear and fossil-fired steam-generating capacity, an aggregate of 25,000 megawatts, or one-third of the scheduled generation reserves in NERC, would be unavailable during the summer 1972 peak-load period. In the winter 1972–73 peak-load period, 32,000 megawatts or about 30 percent of the scheduled generation reserves would not be available. In the summer 1973 peak-load period, there would be a reduction in scheduled generation reserves of about 29,000 megawatts, or 35 percent of these reserves.

The normal rule is that reserves from 15 percent to 20 percent are required to assure reliability of power supply. For some systems, if the reserves were cut in half—from 20 to 10 percent—the probability of insufficient capacity to carry the load increases sixtyfold. In other words, if a 20-percent reserve level results in only one occasion in 10 years when generating capability might be insufficient to carry the load, a reduction to a 10-percent reserve level would be expected to result in six occasions per year when load curtailment would occur.

The impact of such delays is analyzed for each of the nine regions of the National Electric Reliability Council—NERC—encompassing the entire bulk power supply in the United States and parts of Canada. The study is directed to an evaluation of the adequacy of region reserves for the peak-load periods of summer 1972, winter 1972–73, and summer 1973—see exhibits 1, 2, and 3. The conclusions of this study have been substantially supported by data supplied by the Federal Power Commission and interested State agencies:

SUMMER 1972 (EXHIBIT 1)

The impact of such delays would be considerably more severe in some regions than in others. In five of the nine regions—ECAR, ERCOT, MAIN, MARCA, and SERC—generation reserves would drop to 10% or less in the summer of 1972, reaching levels so low that periodic load curtailment would be expected. Reserves in the Main region would fall to less than 5%, and in SERC to 6.3%, values which are extremely low for any semblance of reliability.

WINTER 1972–73 (EXHIBIT 2)

Reserves during the winter 1972–73 peak-load period, while somewhat higher generally than during the previous summer, would still be critically low at 12% in the SERC region and 10.3% in the Rocky Mountain Power Pool area of the WSCC region. Furthermore, if essential maintenance requirements during the winter period are taken into account, the ECAR and MAIN regions, as well as the New York-New England subregion, would drop to marginal and submarginal reserve levels (see Exhibit 2).

SUMMER 1973 (EXHIBIT 3)

In the summer of 1973, five regions—ECAR, MAAC, MARCA, SERC and SPP—would fall again to 11% or less, with reserves in the MARCA region actually dropping to 4.6%. In addition, the MAIN region and the New York-New England subregion may well be critical in view of the fact that a substantial part of the generating capacity subject to a twelve-month delay would then be scheduled for service just prior to or during the summer of 1973. Should difficulties arise in start-up and this capacity become unavailable, reserves would drop in MAIN and New York-New England to 10.4 and 10.7%, respectively, a level which is critical. (Exhibit 3.)

No one can say with certainty that the expected power shortages in these areas will materialize or, if they do, that they could be avoided by a temporary licensing of these plants. Responsible officials of the Government and officials of the utilities have testified both before the Joint Committee and before other committees that threatened power shortages stand a good chance of being avoided or ameliorated by the passage of this legislation. The administration has recommended the urgent need for the passage of such legislation.

The undisputed testimony received by the committee indicates that at least 2 months' leadtime is needed for testing before completed nuclear powerplants can operate at useful levels.

I would like to again express my support for H.R. 13752 and urge that it be enacted. Also at this point I would like to place in the RECORD excerpts from the NERC February 1972 study and data from the Federal Power Commission on the power shortages which are expected in certain areas of the country commencing in the summer of 1972 and continuing into the winter of 1972–73 and the summer of 1973.

This bill has the support of the administration. It has the support of the Federal Power Commission and the National Environmental Policy Administration as well as the National Environmental Council.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a modification, a temporary modification, and if my friends will just look at these charts here they will see the reasons why.

I am not on Mr. DINGELL's subcommittee, but I am on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and we have a complementary bill that will go with this bill. If both of these bills are passed, we will have an opportunity to stop what I think would be a tremendous hazard this coming summer.

On the far right you see a map of the United States. You see the red part is that part where the reserves are critical. If we have a hot summer we will have brownouts and possibly blackouts in all that part of the United States.

The gray part, which is Texas, is below normal reserves, but not necessarily critical unless a big system goes out, a big generator goes out, or something like that. That is for the summer of 1973 on the far side.

Here is the summer that is approaching this year and you can see it is almost as bad. The red section is where the reserves are below 10 percent—5 percent, 6 percent or 7 percent.

If we have a few days of heat above our normal summer season, a few days of hot weather than we ordinarily have, we are going to have brownouts in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, the hazards that come about as a result of brownouts and blackouts to our economy, both to the industrial use of electricity and the electricity that goes to hospitals and nursing homes and other operations like that, can actually become a severe detriment to the health of the people.

Let me say that this bill, H.R. 13752, and the bill which will shortly be reported out of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, H.R. 14065, are complementary bills.

This will relax some of the environmental requirements on a showing of emergency need. The environmental requirements that it relaxes is the requirement of a complete environmental statement. These are very complicated and it takes months and months for a utility to come up with these environmental impact reports. They are possibly diligently working on their final report, and some of them have been completed, but most of them will need more time this summer to finally complete them so they can be filed.

Mr. Speaker, there are 13 nuclear plants that have been constructed, some of them at a cost of $300 million or $350 million or $250 million each. They represent something like 30,000 megawatts of power when in full operation. However, this bill does not provide for full operation.

This bill provides for partial operation related to the actual needs to keep a generating systems distribution area free from brownouts and blackouts. That is what it does. Now, 20 percent of these plants or 30 percent or even 40 percent of these plants during certain emergency periods—this is not a permanent operating license but temporary, based upon an urgent need established by figures which can be produced so that anyone can see them. These plants have to con-

form to the certification of safety and the level at which the plant is operating and that is all certified to the AEC that there is a dire emergency, an urgency, where these systems will be subject to emergency brownouts and possibly blackouts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of the bill.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is as plain as the nose on your face. Why am I down here at a time like this? Against nuclear power? Nonsense. I was for nuclear power and nuclear energy before these breast-beating proponents of nuclear power could spell uranium, with Admiral Rickover, years on the Department of Defense for nuclear-powered submarines, for nuclear-powered carriers, and for a nuclear-powered fleet. If I am against nuclear power then somebody is out of their mind.

But this is an end run. And when I played fullback end runs were suckers for me, and they are now. And of all people, did you ever think you would live long enough to see this committee, the Committee on Environmental Protection, coming in here to release—to release what this Congress and the Nation want them to have—environmental control.

My friend, the gentleman from California, spoke of power, but not a word about the environment. Power, temporary.

Let me read you this:

> The purpose of this legislation is to provide interim authority to the Atomic Energy Commission to permit the operation of certain nuclear power generating facilities——

So is your old man. Temporary? Temporary what?

What is more permanent in Washington than a temporray building or a temporary agency, or a temporary license? Temporary—oh, dear, dear, dear. They use the words "interim," "temporary," and that they will generate this power in 13 plants. And you know what will happen when they come into a court of equity? Billions are involved. They will break down and cry, and appeal to the conscience of the Chancellor of the Equity Court; they will say, "Save our billions."

Nuclear power? Temporary license?

This is a question of the environment. What I want you to do is to vote this down. These poor fellows on the committee here are in a jam. I know them. They have done more than anybody, but they cannot say what I am saying, for a lot of reasons—and I do not blame them. If I was sitting there so would I.

I am against nuclear power? I am not. But this is an end run.

Do you know when we got this report? The 14th—Friday. All right. When did we get this report on the floor for use? The 15th—Saturday.

Did you ever see such an end run?

And this is no reflection on the gentleman from Michigan. I love him, and he knows it. And I love his whole family. But look at the spot he is in. I am just trying to take him off that spot. So help me help DINGELL knock this thing down.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, and I again direct the attention of the Congress to this document—the report to accompany H.R. 13752—and I quote from that report:

> The purpose of this legislation is to provide interim authority to the Atomic Energy Commission to permit the operation of certain nuclear power generating facilities.

As can be seen by the language of the report, this bill is an attempt to amend the National Environmental Policy Act as a prelude to further action. That further action will take the form of a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to allow the AEC to license temporarily nuclear powerplants—a power which the AEC does not now have.

The bill now before the House is an attempt at an end-around, a means of circumventing the normal careful consideration which such a measure should have and deserves. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has already met in executive session to consider a bill, which I have testified against, to permit temporary licensing—that committee is "waiting in the wings"—waiting for this bill before us to pass so that they might then step in with their bill.

If Machiavelli were here, no matter what your opinion of Machiavelli, I am sure he would look on approvingly at such goings on.

I am not here today to oppose nuclear power—every Member of this body is well aware of the close relationship I have had with Admiral Rickover in my many years as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee. When the matter of nuclear-powered submarines was first brought before the Congress—and that was a thousand years ago—Admiral Rickover and I worked hand-in-glove together to assure that the first consideration in the use of nuclear power is safety.

What I do oppose is the bypassing of the safeguards established by this body to assure that any nuclear powerplant brought into service, temporary or otherwise, is safe and, indeed, in the public interest.

This brings me to the question of what is temporary. As every Member of the Congress well knows, nothing in Washington is as permanent as a temporary building, a temporary committee, a temporary agency, or a temporary license. Though the bill states authorization only through October of 1973, it is a "foot in the door." And would not the power companies love to step through that open door considering their billions of dollars invested in the building of nuclear power facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of the National Environmental Policy Act must be maintained—the regular processes of the House of Representatives for controversial legislation must be followed—and remember I was involved with nuclear power before its current champions could spell uranium.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG).

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 13752, which would amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to permit interim licensing of nuclear powerplants.

I wish to make it clear from the outset that I do not oppose the reasonable use of nuclear energy to meet the Nation's power needs. I am in favor of the safe use of such energy resources.

However, the ultimate issue before us today and the key question in the licensing of nuclear powerplants—on an interim or permanent basis—is the safety of such plants.

This House must not replace the questionable possibility of blackouts and brownouts for the real dangers involved in avoiding the problem of the safe operation of nuclear powerplants.

And, I submit that there is grave cause for concern and serious second thought as to present policy in this area when high level Atomic Energy Commission personnel state that the regulatory staff of the AEC does not have, and I am quoting:

> Knowledge sufficiently adequate to make licensing decisions for the approximately 100 reactors operating or under construction.

This, from Dr. Morris Rosen, technical adviser to the director of the Division of Reactor Licensing and Robert J. Colmar, a senior nuclear engineer in the same Division of the Atomic Energy Commission who testified just this past week at AEC hearings in Bethesda concerned with emergency core cooling systems for nuclear powerplants.

Hazards of nuclear powerplants must be examined from the standpoint of serving the public safety first. This certainly should be above the interests of the power companies.

It is regrettable that, with serious questions concerning the limits for release of radioactive materials into the environment, the safety of emergency core cooling systems, and the siting of nuclear powerplants in populated areas remaining unresolved, this House is being called upon to act under suspension of the rules, with next to no notice to the membership on a measure which proposes to bypass the impact statement required of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I, for one, am not willing to compromise public safety more than our present policy already does, by insuring against an alleged brownout with a potential disaster.

This House ought to realize before passing on this matter that there is far from a united opinion as to the alleged power emergency confronting the country. I have also been informed that with the recent out-of-court settlement of the Quad Cities case at most three plants would be affected by H.R. 13752.

To set the precedent which this amendment implies in order to place a few plants on line this summer—even if the very substantial safety questions I have alluded to did not exist—is rather like using a broad sword where a knitting needle would do. Should a power crisis truly be impending, the two or three

plants this legislation would authorize are not going to meet it.

Then, too, the crisis is not supposed to occur this afternoon, or this weekend, but rather this summer. Now summer is not far off, but surely the House could have been granted a few days to consider this matter and study the committee report—which I have received only hours ago. Why the haste? What is the rush?

It occurred to me in considering this proposal that legislation might not be necessary at all. I have always considered that one of the National Environmental Policy Act's strongest points was its flexibility. It was not drafted to place too heavy and unreasonable a burden upon the agencies of our Government, but rather to be a general policy guide.

I wonder if the committee considered the possibility of regulatory promulgation, with appropriate safeguards, as a means of meeting proven emergency situations. Surely this would be a more fitting way to meet any real but limited emergency—and that is allegedly the situation confronting us.

Certainly this approach would be preferable to needlessly setting the precedent of amending the Environmental Policy Act which process once established could lead to its demise as a useful instrument of policy.

Certainly, I agree with the view expressed by my colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in his letter of last Friday that Congress ought to demonstrate that it can move quickly "when it has to." But I seriously question that it has to in the present matter. It would be better, I think, for the membership to study this proposal and consider its implications.

As was indicated, I feel that the most important issue ultimately before us is the health and safety of the American people. However, it seems that the House should be concerned about the present use of the suspension of the rules procedure. It has been my understanding that the suspension process is intended as a means of expediting noncontroversial legislation with a view to saving the valuable time of this body. I, for one, do not consider H.R. 13752 to be noncontroversial and therefore question the appropriateness of its present consideration. I hardly think that 40 minutes of debate is adequate time in which to intelligently consider this proposal.

I also very much object to this measure being considered on such short notice and the unavailability of the committee print of the bill and the report accompanying it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, during hearings leading to the proposal before the House, the Honorable Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, stated that—

> The National Environmental Policy Act represents one of the most significant policy-making reforms in recent history. We believe it, "he said" most unwise at this time to tamper in any way with the fundamental, substantive provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Mr. Train then somehow went on to indicate that H.R. 13752 was not such a "tampering."

But for those of us, Mr. Speaker, who look upon the environmental impact statement requirement of NEPA as much more than a mere procedural requirement, the proposed legislation amounts to a fundamental and substantive change in the Policy Act. We are not confronted with a "very narrow, limited addition to NEPA," as alleged by the committee.

With substantial questions of public safety surrounding the matter of nuclear powerplants, I respectfully submit that a relaxation of licensing requirements is no minor matter. This House must reject this bill as ill-advised legislation brought before this body in an improper manner.

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

Mr. EILBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me just point out to the gentleman, I would like to have him show me where in this bill, H.R. 13752, there is any exemption that appears from the hearing process under the Atomic Energy Act?

Mr. EILBERG. No where does it refer to that.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman made a flat statement that it does.

For the benefit of the gentleman, I will say that this does not in any way do that and the report so states on page 5, H.R. 13752 does not act in any way to relieve the AEC of its responsibilities to be certain that no safety problems or hazards will be created by operation of the plant at any level of power production.

This is the language in the report.

Mr. EILBERG. If I may respond to the gentleman. The gentleman talks of the responsibility of the agency, but he does not talk of the requirement of public hearings which is what concerns me.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out to my friend from Pennsylvania that there is nothing in the bill before this body that deals with whether or not there should be public hearings. This issue is dealt with in other pieces of legislation before other committees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that there are other pieces of legislation dealing with that matter. This bill does not. I am not prepared to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania what my position may be on other legislation that is pending before any other committee because no such legislation has yet been reported to the House.

This bill does nothing with regard to radiological and safety requirements under the Atomic Energy Act and does nothing with regard to public hearings. That is the mistake that the gentleman is making.

Mr. EILBERG. Would the gentleman say that this law would remain the same if this becomes the law as to the obligation of a public hearing?

Mr. DINGELL I am making that flat statement. If the gentleman would read the report, he would be better informed.

Mr. EILBERG. I read the report and I do not see that anywhere.

Mr. DINGELL. I refer the gentleman to page 5 of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), give his usual rhetorical appeal. The verbiage was far more colorful than the facts.

The facts are that there are 13 of these nuclear plants either finished or in a process of being finished. They are vital to the distribution systems of the various networks on which they have been built.

The hearings for a complete environmental hearing is not waived. There is a temporary order which would be allowed under acts, the two acts, and the other one has yet to be looked at. You can take a look at the atomic bill next week when it is brought to the floor. It would allow in an emergency, when there is impending a brownout or a blackout, the utilization of these almost $1½ billion worth of plants that are on these distributive lines or systems for an emergency period—in the meantime hearings would go on, on the creation of environmental impact for the permanent operational license. H.R. 13752 terminates in October of 1973.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to grant interim operating licenses for certain nuclear power generating facilities has its genesis in the landmark Calvert-Cliffs decision.

In that decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia rejected the AEC's narrow interpretation of the National Environmental Policy Act and, in particular, the Commission's decision to rely totally upon State certification of compliance with applicable water quality standards.

The court rightly held that the National Environmental Policy Act mandates a case-by-case balancing and a judgment on the part of the Federal agencies. In each case, the particular economic and technical benefits of a planned action must be assessed and then weighed against the environmental costs. This process the court held cannot be delegated expressly or implicitly to any other Federal or State agency.

To its credit, the AEC responded to the Calvert-Cliffs decision in a most positive fashion. It adopted detailed regulations governing the evaluation of environmental factors within the context of its overall licensing procedure. The revised AEC regulations make that agency directly responsible for evaluating the total environmental impact, including thermal effects of nuclear powerplants, and for assessing this impact in terms of available alternatives and the need for electric power. This, of course, is the balancing process mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act and the Court of Appeals in Calvert-Cliffs.

The Commission did, however, attempt to distinguish between the procedures to

be applied to future licensing applications and those which would govern nuclear generating facilities already under construction and nearing the operating license stage. The AEC thus attempted to deal with the difficult transitional period between the Calvert Cliffs decision and a future time when these new procedures could be made fully effective as to all projects subject to AEC licensing.

The Calvert-Cliffs decision was followed by the so-called Quad Cities decision, which struck down the AEC's newly adopted regulations insofar as they attempted to bridge this transitional period.

It cannot be disputed that the AEC's delay in recognizing its responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act contributed substantially to the situation which confronts us today. Nevertheless, the AEC during the past 9 months has made an honest attempt to meet its responsibilities, and although it might be argued that by enacting this legislation we are letting the AEC off the hook, and while it may satisfy a number of people to keep the AEC on that hook, the broader national interest requires that the Congress act. While the Calvert-Cliffs decision rightly stressed the fact that the National Environmental Policy Act is a flexible tool designed to insure that environmental factors are given due consideration, the Quad Cities decision tended to cast the National Environmental Policy Act in a much more inflexible role. Those of us who were most intimately involved in the development of the National Enviromental Policy Act must apparently stress again and again that this legislation was not intended to block or frustrate major Federal programs which have a substantial impact upon the environment. The purpose of the act was to insure that the environmental impact be considered fully and in good faith, and that a decision be made weighing all of the factors for and against a given project, including potential adverse impact upon the environment. A corollary of this is that where reasonable steps can be taken to minimize adverse environmental impact, they must be taken, but again I stress the act was not intended to be a roadblock—an insuperable barrier.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a potential power crisis in the United States, particularly in the Midwest. It is pointless to attempt to pinpoint where the responsibility for this crises may lie, nor need we dwell at length on just how bad this crisis may be. The point is we cannot afford to take the chance that one of these nuclear plants will be unavailable to meet an emergency simply because the NEPA review process has not been concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to see the National Environmental Policy Act become the whipping boy should essential public services in the power field have to be cut back. Regardless of where the true responsibility for such a cutback may lie, I am afraid that NEPRA will become the easy scapegoat. It is vital to the long-range protection of our environment that public confidence in the statutory mechanisms that we have created is preserved. Continuing public support for NEPA requires a balanced view which some activists who have done a commendable job in the past seem now to have lost sight of.

The legislation before us in no way diminishes the responsibility of the AEC as so clearly enunciated in the Calvert-Cliffs decision. It in no way alters the AEC's responsibilities with respect to the safety of nuclear generating plants. It in no way absolves the AEC of its responsibility to comply fully with NEPA, including requiring whatever alterations to these plants may be found necessary following completion of the NEPA review process.

The need for this legislation is disputed, and yet I have listened to the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality, all of which support this bill and urge that it is needed. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Mr. DINGELL, has explained clearly the provisions of this bill, and I need not repeat them here. I will only reiterate in closing that the overwhelming weight of evidence presented to the committee is in favor of passage of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to be guided accordingly and support the bill.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the devotion to the environment of the gentleman from Michigan who has brought this legislation before us, but I think he has been pressured into a situation here which is most unfortunate, and I think, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested, we would be doing the gentleman from Michigan a favor by defeating this bill.

The point is that the difference between the legislation here and the administrative procedure that could be taken is very slight. That appears very clearly from page 3 of the committee report, that the Commission could have chosen the administrative route if it had wanted to. It also appears very clearly from a statement made on behalf of the Sierra Club the other day in which it was stated:

> After the agreement was reached at Quad Cities Chairman Schlesinger stated that the pressure was now relieved from the situation. In order to determine precisely the AEC's position on the legislation now several representatives of environmental organizations . . . went down to the H Street Headquarters last Monday and met with Dr. Schlesinger. He told us that the Quad Cities settlement had eliminated the need for an amendment to the National Environmental Policy Act.

The fact is that for the particular plants that are a problem, the settlements have been reached. The two Quad Cities settlements have been reached to a point where they are not being held up. The Point Beach is another one in question. In Point Beach the safety hearings have now been concluded, and the Commission and the Board have the matter under advisement. There is no emergency, Mr. Speaker.

We are faced with an entering wedge in a very dangerous process of breaking down the NEPA Act. That is what we are confronted with, the beginning of a slippery slope. There are lots of bills waiting in the wings to cut down on NEPA. This is the first one. Let us stop it.

The following, Mr. Speaker, are some additional remarks I have prepared in opposition to H.R. 13752:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 13752, a bill which would amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—NEPA—to permit interim licensing of thermonuclear powerplants. This bill represents a regrettable catering to special interests. It is an attempt to rush through the Congress a proposal after only a bare bones consideration of critical environmental policy and public safety issues. It has been pushed through Committee and brought to the House floor with distressing haste—the final version of the bill and its report were available for Members' perusal only this morning. How does the committee expect the House to digest the report, analyze the complex energy issues and vote intelligently on the proposal with one brief morning's thought?

When the Congress passed NEPA, it required that Federal agencies, starting January 1, 1970, evaluate environmental factors and prepare an impact statement prior to taking significant Federal actions which would affect the environment. The AEC, by regulation, delayed implementation of this requirement for nuclear powerplants until mid-1971. The regulations were challenged in several important court cases which overturned those rules and required the AEC to issue an environmental impact statement prior to licensing nuclear plants for operation. It is the holdings of these cases and the policy they enunciated which H.R. 13752 attempts to subvert.

First, and most importantly, although proponents of the legislation claim the crisis which prompted this legislation is extraordinary, and there will no other retreat from NEPA, I see this as but the first step in a backsliding on our commitment to the environment which could render NEPA a hopelessly weak and meaningless document. Already, bills have been introduced to link NEPA to Federal "inaction" during an "emergency" and diminish its influence. For example, one bill would give the President wide discretion to exempt agencies from NEPA's provisions. If the Congress passes this bill, it opens NEPA up to attacks from many special interests, all crying "emergency" while they openly wage war on the environment.

Second, I ask those who propose H.R. 13752: Is this hasty retreat from a clear commitment to protect the environment necessary? Are there not clear and reasonable alternatives to the committee's approach?

NEPA is a flexible law which only requires an agency to prepare an environmental impact statement detailed "to the fullest extent possible." Why has the

AEC not prepared such NEPA reports? I understand that attorneys for some environmental groups have urged the AEC to use NEPA's flexibility and have drafted model AEC regulations which could be employed during an energy crisis and which comply with NEPA while speeding consideration of relevant environmental issues. Rather than adopting a broad interpretation of NEPA, proponents of this legislation have unwisely construed NEPA too narrowly and thus seek legislation to bypass its requirements.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask the supporters of this legislation to tell the Congress and the Nation what plants would go into operation sooner, because of this legislation. As I understand the matter, the only plants which would be affected for this coming summer are three—the two Quad Cities plants and Point Beach 2. Over 2 weeks ago, the Quad Cities case was settled and the Point Beach safety hearings have been concluded and the Commission and the Board have the matter under advisement. These events eliminate the basis for any justification for an amendment to the National Environmental Policy Act. Thus, this legislation is not only unwise, it is unnecessary.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special irony that this bill is being rushed through during the week designated Earth Week, a week during which the American people will be recommitting themselves to the preservation of their environment. Now we are, the House of Representatives, diluting that commitment on the first day of that special week. We are urged to act on the basis of potential emergency. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have ignored for years an accelerating emergency, the emergency of our environmental degradation. Finally, we faced up to that emergency, and now having faced it, are prepared to turn away. We are acting in unseemly haste. We are setting a dangerous precedent. I urge defeat of this bill.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE).

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13752 provides a responsible solution to an unhappy, and difficult situation.

From reading and listening to testimony before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, I am impressed with the power problems facing much of our country.

I can understand the substantial interest the utility industry has in obtaining permission for temporary licensing of some existing power facilities in order to help alleviate this problem.

When legislation was considered by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to issue operating licenses to nuclear powerplants even if the Atomic Energy Commission has not issued detailed environmental impact statements for the plant—as required by law—I was extremely concerned.

I was further disturbed by accompanying provisions which would substantially reduce the right of the public to question the safety and environmental aspects of plants during proceedings concerning applications for operating permits.

I do not like tampering with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, even to the point—the reduced point—of H.R. 13752. But even more dangerous were the restrictions placed in the other legislation concerning public participation.

Our esteemed colleague, Congressman DINGELL, and the other members of our committee who are equally concerned about protecting our environment, have sought to find a way to also provide the electric power that we will need in the months ahead.

The bill before us today has been described by Mr. DINGELL as "a neat surgical incision that would be self-sealing."

What this means, of course, is that interim operating licenses for facilities under construction before the passage of NEPA, for which a license application had been filed as of the date the AEC adopted its new regulations, will automatically expire in October 1973.

This will provide time for some existing plants to help meet the heavy needs of the summer. It will also prevent any lasting effect on NEPA, and it will not jeopardize public participation in proceedings in which the public has a right to participate.

It is my view that H.R. 13752 is needed legislation. It is carefully drawn. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. I rise in opposition to H.R. 13572, despite the fact that this bill comes to us with the hint that, if it is not passed, stronger legislation, more destructive of the principles of the National Environmental Protection Act, will be forthcoming.

The National Environmental Policy Act was a major achievement of the 91st Congress. It established policies and procedures which have come to be understood and accepted by the people of this country. To set it aside in the name of emergencies which are not expected for 3 months would be an unwise precedent which would only encourage further encroachment.

I have already criticized, in this chamber, the dual role of the Atomic Energy Commission as promoter of nuclear energy and setter of nuclear safety standards. The National Environmental Protection Act is the only real backstop for the safety standards solely established by AEC. These standards have been subjected to considerable criticism and, even if that criticism is not wholly justified in every case, it should be investigated through the procedures of NEPA on which the American people have come to rely.

The NEPA procedures are the only way by which the American people can get specific information on nuclear power facilities. To eliminate the compliance with NEPA would take away the public's one tiny method by which it can gain information from the deeply rooted AEC bureaucracy. The public must have information to participate in decisionmaking.

A vote against H.R. 13572 is not a vote against the development of nuclear power. It is simply a vote against short-cutting procedures that have been developed to protect the public interest and the public welfare. This bill should be decisively defeated.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, this measure—H.R. 13752—should not be considered on the Suspension Calendar. This bill involves far too important an issue to be debated under the rule which limits debate to 20 minutes per side. Mr. Speaker, the need for electric power is great—perhaps critical. I support the granting of interim and permanent licenses for nuclear and other types of generating plants. But, Mr. Speaker, to authorize the deferral or omission of steps needed to protect the environment is untenable. It should—and must be possible to produce the additional power requirements—consistent with a clean environment. To push full speed ahead without adequate regard for the effects of water or air pollution—or thermal change—is quite inconsistent with the policy of this Congress and this administration. The time to measure up to our environmental responsibilities is now. Temporary delays, interim licenses and other such devices are a poor way to approach the genuine and permanent power needs of the Nation.

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

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

I rise in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I would preface my opposition to this bill by expressing my deep concern over an adequate and reasonably priced supply of electricity for New York City. As a Representative from that city, I am very much aware of the role that ample electrical power plays in the industrial and commercial future of New York. I can assure you that I wish I could in clear conscience take the easy way out, and remain silent, or even jump onto the nuclear bandwagon. But I cannot. There are good reasons why, given the present state of the art, I doubt the safety of nuclear power and thus doubt the wisdom of any steps that would bypass and weaken legislation for AEC licensing standards and procedures which already are too weak to safely govern the enormous risks of a proliferation of large nuclear powerplants.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING INTERIM LICENSING

Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1970, I was an intervenor before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that held hearings on the construction permit for the Shoreham nuclear powerplant. During the 2 intervening years, the available evidence strongly indicates the reasons for questioning the safety of very large nuclear powerplants are stronger than

ever. For me some of the more disturbing factors include the following:

First. The controversy over emergency core cooling. It is all too evident from the AEC's own hearings on the emergency core cooling issues that many responsible scientists and engineers are substantially divided in opinion on the adequacy of our understanding of what might go on in the core of a very large nuclear powerplant should it suffer a loss-of-coolant accident, and whether present designs for emergency core cooling are anywhere near adequate to deal with the enormous thermal forces that could be loosed by such an accident. The Union of Concerned Scientists at Massachusetts Institute of Technology deserves our lasting gratitude for exposing to the public the questions, the issues, the details that are being smothered within the AEC.

Second. The unacceptable lag in AEC-funded nuclear safety research. Mr. Speaker, today it is commonplace to say that a country which could send a man to the moon to land there, work there, and return safely, should be able to resolve this or that particular problem. It does seem strange to me that, with this demonstration of our technological capabilities and skills, the AEC's loss-of-flow test experiment—LOFT—is nowhere near complete, and keeps slipping further into the future. This very committee heard the AEC in 1964 testify that the experiment was scheduled for test operation in late 1966. That was 8 years ago. Just last year you heard the AEC state that LOFT was 60 percent complete and would not be in operation until late 1973. From what I have heard, the date has slipped again. How can anyone in the AEC, or any Member of Congress, accept AEC assertions of nuclear safety of the enormous new nuclear power reactors when the vital information about loss of flow will not be experimentally available until well after seven or more large reactors come into operation—that is, if this legislation is enacted.

Still worse, we read of discord between the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety and the AEC as to what nuclear safety research is still underfunded in comparison with the money being appropriated to foster design and construction of new nuclear powerplants. Worse than that, the money is not under the direct control of the regulatory staff, but rather under the control of that part of the AEC which has a vested professional and other interests in developing nuclear power. I am well aware of Chairman Schlesinger's strong remarks at the Atomic Industrial Forum in which he disclaimed a promotional role for the AEC. I am also only too well aware of the inner drives of well-established bureaucracies, and I remain to be convinced that the accumulated promotional momentum of the AEC can be so easily diverted from its previous course. For me, there remains a serious, discrediting conflict of interest in keeping the AEC's nuclear safety research and development under the direction and control of the same man whose feet will be held to the fire by nuclear power advocates if he does not quickly produce a breeder reactor demonstration for them. None of us, including Mr. Shaw, are supermen, and we cannot expect an Olympian sense of detachment from him as his right hand plans nuclear power research while his left hand plans the research that could raise new questions, even barriers to further acceleration of commercial nuclear power.

Therefore, this conflict of interest is another good reason not to make licensing of huge nuclear powerplants any easier. If anything their licensing should be made more difficult—ideally there should be a moratorium on licensing until the LOFT is built and has been in operation long enough to obtain valid information. Other safety research has gone far enough to conclusively answer the questions that are generating so much controversy today.

Third. A major accident with a large nuclear powerplant could be an enormous catastrophe.

I know in some circles it is passe to bring up the Brookhaven report on theoretical possibilities and consequences of major accidents in large nuclear powerplants, better known by its report number, WASH-740. Nonetheless, it is the only yardstick we have, for the AEC has persistently refused to update it and to take into account the rapid growth in size of nuclear powerplants well beyond that contemplated in 1957. Fortunately, members of the Union of Concerned Scientists have done their own updating of the Brookhaven report and their findings were published in the Nuclear News of September 1971. I would call attention to the range of possible hazards as shown in their analysis. Under the least dangerous meteorological conditions they estimate lethal injuries could be expected up to 2.5 miles from a power reactor, with radiation injuries likely to 5 miles, assuming only 20 percent of the fission product inventory is released. But under unfavorable weather conditions, lethal effects could extend 75 miles downwind in a strip as wide as 2 miles, with injuries likely up to 100 miles. In some accidents, no evacuation of the neighborhood of a nuclear point might be required. In other cases, urgent evacuation could be required within 15 to 20 miles, and some evacuation up to distances of 80 to 100 miles.

I shudder when I think of those distances in terms of the locations of the many nuclear powerplants being built or planned in crowded New England and New York.

These estimates of what could happen in a nuclear accident provide ample reason to go very slowly upon building and operating large nuclear powerplants near our densely populated areas.

Fourth. Nuclear powerplants are designed to emit radioactive wastes. While the AEC is arguing that its recently published guidelines that nuclear powerplants emit as low levels of radioactive wastes as is possible, these plants will still be increasing the amount of radioactivity in the environment. Additionally, there will be secondary effects at the fuel reprocessing plants, and at the waste disposal facilities. Now I know that proponents of nuclear power assert these amounts are so minuscule as to be unimportant. However, I know too that the scientific community has reservations about adding to nature's existing inventory of radioactive materials.

The National Academy of Sciences warned in 1956 that anything that adds radiation to this naturally occuring background rate causes further mutations and is genetically harmful. The Academy reported:

> There is no minimum amount of radiation which must be exceeded before mutations occur. Any amount, however small, that reaches the reproductive cells can cause a correspondingly small number of mutations.

It emphasized that:

> A little radiation to a lot of people is as harmful as a lot of radiation to a few.

That same year the Medical Research Council in the United Kingdom reported that radiations are potentially dangerous, that their use should be subject of constant and close scrutiny, and that adequate justification should be required for their employment on however small a scale.

Our own Federal Radiation Council, before it was abolished in the name of organizational theory, cautioned in 1960 that—

> Every use of radiation involves the possibility of some biological risk either to the individual or his descendent.

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation in 1966 acknowledged our incomplete understanding of the effects of low level exposure to radiation and cautioned against any increase of radiation levels. It reported:

> Although there are insufficient data for making satisfactory estimates of risk, it is clear that, with any increase of radiation levels on earth, the amount of genetic damage will increase with the accumulated dose.

For me these statements from the scientific community—and note they are not from the "kook and nut contingent"—give good reason to oppose legislation that would make licensing of nuclear powerplants any easier, and that could serve to limit effective intervention in it.

Also, and relevant, I am disturbed by the news report that the Environmental Protection Agency has decided not to issue its own standards for radioactive effluent. This leaves the setting of exposure standards too much to the AEC which for years has been in an untenable position of conflict of interest in its dual role of promoter and regulator of commercial nuclear power.

NEPA REASONS FOR OPPOSING THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

For the past 2 years environmentalists have been fighting an uphill fight against almost unimaginable odds to force the electricity industry to recognize that environmental policy as laid down by Congress in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is here to stay. Agency after agency has sought to impose limitations on their fulfillment

of NEPA obligations. There is no groundswell of Federal agency support for NEPA. Congress was fully aware that many Federal agencies did not want to consider environmental matters in agency decisions. It was in recognition of this situation that section 102 of NEPA was adopted with its action-forcing provisions. Now with 2 years of hard fighting and intervening, there is a body of case law that gives guidance in complying with NEPA and emphasizes that NEPA is here to stay. It would be a major defeat for environmental policy if at this point Congress should succumb to the pressures it resisted in 1969 when it enacted NEPA.

Judge Skelly Wright in his Calvert Cliffs decision was emphatic in his defense of section 102 of NEPA:

> Considerations of administrative difficulty, delay or economic cost will not suffice to strip the section of its fundamental importance.

Going further he said:

> Whether or not the spectre of a national power crisis is as real as the Commission apparently believes, it must not be used to create a blackout of environmental consideration in the agency review process. NEPA compels a case-by-case examination and balancing of discrete factors.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation, in my opinion, would start a most unfortunate chipping away of what we have worked so hard to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I am painfully aware of the inconveniences and the serious problems that could attend a chronic electricity shortage in New York City. My constituents would be right in the center of it. It would be so very easy to yield to short-term expedience and say: "Go ahead, license the nuclear plants," and then pray every night that no accident happens. Yet, if I am to fully represent the long-term interests of the people in my district, then I must conclude that the enormous potential dangers of large nuclear powerplants of unproven safety, outweigh by far the unfortunately real possibilities of power shortage. I hope the day will soon come when nuclear power will come into its own as a safe, reliable, environmentally acceptable source of electricity. But that day is not here as yet and we must pull back before we become so fully committed to unproven nuclear power that we will have to live with its hazards whether we like it or not.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill—H.R. 13752—introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) which would amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for an environmental statement procedure in connection with the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants. The bill is well conceived, timely, and has been reported out by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee following intensive hearings conducted by Mr. DINGELL's subcommittee during which testimony was received from representatives of the Federal agencies concerned, the utility industry, and organizations whose principal interest lies in assuring the protection and enhancement of our environment.

The committee's action in recommending this legislation is founded upon careful study of a special situation which confronts us during a relatively brief period of transition as we continue work toward achieving our goal of a clean environment through careful prestudy of the potential impacts various activities may have on the quality of our environment. It provides for an interim arrangement during a brief, defined period of time.

Specifically, the problem arises in that a number of nuclear powerplants were already sited, designed, and well-advanced in construction in January of 1970 when NEPA became effective. Subsequently, a series of court decisions have caused to be brought into play a broader scope of consideration concerning the factors to be considered by the Atomic Energy Commission during the preparation, processing, and review of environmental impact statements associated with the granting of operating licenses for these nuclear plants. These statements cannot and should not be hastily prepared. They must be preceded by careful indepth study of the present state of the environs of the specific plant site and the potential impacts which may result from plant operation. The applicant for license must perform certain initial studies, technical experts acting on behalf of Federal and State review bodies must perform their own evaluation, and the inputs of all must be weighed and balanced in the final environmental impact statement which must be completed before there can be obtained full conformance with NEPA, in its content and its intent.

H.R. 13752, in recognition of this situation, amends the National Environmental Policy Act to provide that an interim environmental statement will be satisfactory for the purposes of interim operating needs, provided that a determination is made and is fully supportable that the interim operation of the specific plant under consideration is necessary to meet emergency power needs. Enactment of this bill together with an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act—appropriate legislation for the latter is now before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—would make possible temporary licensing of nuclear plants whose electrical supply is urgently needed but only after the required safety and environmental impact determinations are made for the purposes of the proposed temporary operation.

The principal characteristic of the problem before us is one of timing. In many cases under consideration or soon to be considered, conformance with procedural requirements of NEPA rather than dispute over environmental impact could cause continuing delay where such delay would be costly to power availability and would continue little toward improving our environment.

On February 29 before this body—volume 118, page 6094—I discussed the impending shortage of electrical generating reserve capacity which plagues broad regions of our country. I shall not repeat those remarks at this time. I will simply point out that in the operation of electrical generating systems there is a continuing need to perform scheduled maintenance on equipment. This calls for planned outages of the various units on the system. In addition, unanticipated failures of items of equipment—lubricating pumps, relief valves, switchgears, even turbines and generators cause forced outages of individual stations. For these reasons reserve generating capacity is needed to compensate for both types of outages. The rule of thumb is that to meet peak loads adequately one should have almost 20 percent reserve capacity. Some systems, through reliable interconnection to a neighboring system or because of other characteristics can tolerate a lower reserve—say, 15 percent. However, as I pointed out on February 29, one study—by the National Electric Reliability Council—predicts that delays being encountered in bringing new fossil and new nuclear plants on the line might well result in dangerously low reserves throughout our country this summer, next winter, and the following summer. I cited the low 4.9-percent reserve predicted for the network serving my own State of Illinois and neighboring States. The southeast region would have only 6.3-percent reserve and the east central region only 10.1 percent.

Under such conditions brownouts could become common and occasional prolonged blackouts may occur. This situation has serious public health and safety implications. Some are obvious, others less so. In this age of high mechanization and reliance upon electrical energy in dairy farming, poultry farming, and large-lot cattle feeding, intermittent electrical supply could have disastrous impact in farming States.

Most large dairy herds are milked by electrically powered milking machines. Hand milking is impractical except for small herds; it is not a lost art but is rapidly becoming so. Failure to milk cows at normal intervals could cause substantial decrease in milk production as well as diseases such as mastitis in the herd. Milk stored in bulk tanks cn dairy farms would be endangered by loss of electrical supply and the dependence upon reliable pumped water supply could be critical to meeting cattle needs as well as for milk handling operations.

Interruption of electrical service in our large Midwestern feedlot operations could have adverse impact on the full availability of this food source. Power is needed for feed preparation, feeding, water supply, manure disposal and other related activities. Tens of thousands of animals are handled in a typical feedlot and the substitution of hand labor on short notice would result in a virtually unmanageable situation.

The Midwest is a major egg-producing area. The Southwest is a major broiler-producing and egg-producing area. Most hatcheries are semiautomated for auto-

matic feeding, egg collection, egg grading, ventilation, lighting, cooling, et cetera. Loss of electric power for a few hours could result in total mortality of laying hens or broilers.

My point is—many of us think of power shortage or interruptions as having major impact on the health and safety of those in cities and urban areas. Let us not overlook the effects of such shortages on farm operation and income as well as the products of such operations upon which we all have dependence.

In my view this legislation is necessary and I urge its enactment. It is a temporary measure. It sets no precedents. It recognizes the magnitude of the tasks with which we are presently faced and provides that an interim environmental statement can meet the need for the evaluation of the effects of interim operation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I concur wholeheartedly in the views just expressed by my colleague (Mr. HOLIFIELD). It is only prudent to enact this measure since it could help assure that this Nation will not suffer the consequences of serious interruptions of our vital electrical power supplies.

As my colleague stated, enactment of complementary legislation to H.R. 13752 in the form of an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act is also needed to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to license already completed nuclear powerplants on a temporary basis. Such temporary licenses could only be used when critical energy supply conditions are imminent in the region served by the plant, and then only in the event safety and environmental findings are made for purposes of the temporary operation. The opportunity for hearing on the full-term license would be preserved, including an opportunity after the environmental statement is available. The temporary license is just that—a temporary license to deal with an emergency situation—and it is not a substitute for the procedures applicable to the full-term license.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled a meeting for Thursday afternoon to complete consideration of the necessary amendment to the Atomic Energy Act.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and its Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee, which conducted the hearings on this bill. I especially want to commend the chairman of the full committee (Mr. GARMATZ) and the subcommittee chairman (Mr. DINGELL) for their most responsible action in recognizing and offering this solution to such a national problem.

The need for this legislation has not changed because of a recent agreement involving the Quad Cities situation. An explanation of this is contained in the following letter to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from Chairman James Schlesinger of the Atomic Energy Commission:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1972.

MR. EDWARD J. BAUSER,
Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States

DEAR MR. BAUSER: This will respond to your request for a statement of the Commission's position with respect to the interim licensing legislation now before the Joint Committee, and the letter written to the Joint Committee by the Sierra Club dated April 11, 1972.

The need for legislation has not basically changed since the time of our testimony on the pending bills on March 22. The immediate Quad Cities situation has eased, but other plants still remain in uncertain status vis-a-vis the licensing process with respect to availability in the coming summer, the winter of 1972–1973, and the summer of 1973. The cloud on the Commission's *Calvert Cliffs* NEPA regulations remains. And while we continue to take the position that these regulations are, in fact, consistent with NEPA—including continued reliance on them in the licensing process—the Commission believes the need for legislative clarification continues.

Contrary to certain comments or statements attributed to me, my position on the need for legislation is unchanged. I have repeatedly stated that a bill is necessary, and that action on legislation is necessary well before summer. The bill pending in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, while it technically amends NEPA, is not so much an amendment of the basic purpose of NEPA as it is a clarification of the application of NEPA in the interim licensing of nuclear plants. The Commission does not lightly seek legislative relief. Were there alternatives to the passage of a bill that would be as effective in responding to the public interest in this situation, we would not have taken the affirmative position that the legislative course represented by interim licensing proposals is a necessary and proper one.

The implications with respect to the safety hearing process of the AEC inherent in the interim licensing legislation are most salutary, in our view. The interim licensing proposal would allow an enhanced degree of discretion to the Commission in its review of those safety and radiological issues put into issue by an interim operating license application. The procedures can be tailored to the circumstances, to the duration of interim operation sought, and to the power needed, pending the full hearing before the Board on the full operating license. This is a necessary option for the Commission in cases where the public interest may require and the practicalities of an individual case (and the issues raised in connection therewith) may properly allow such interim licensing without detriment to the public health and safety. The basic findings of the Act relating to public health and safety—including the ACRS letter and staff findings—would be made prior to interim operation. This is to say that all relevant findings would be made as a prerequisite to interim operation that would be made in respect to the same operation plant as to which there was no licensing contest.

The amendment in and of itself would not license a plant, and the Commission would regard its responsibilities under the amendment to be no less in respect to interim licensing than they are with respect to any other licensing action taken by the Commission upon which the public health and safety depend.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Chairman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13752. This legislation, which was unanimously approved and ordered reported to the House by my committee, is designed to avoid or minimize the possibility of serious power shortages—in the form of blackouts or brownouts—especially during the coming summer.

I realize that my explanation may be an over-simplification of a complex subject, but I think there is a need for providing a brief and simple explanation of the bill—especially since a more detailed and technical account of this legislation is being provided today by my distinguished colleague, Representative DINGELL, who chaired the hearings on the bill.

Although this legislation would amend the National Environmental Policy Act, it must be emphasized that this amendment is intended to be only temporary in nature, and that it would only be used in an emergency. Testimony presented during our committee hearings indicated it is most unlikely that this legislation would be used—even if enacted; this testimony also verified that, even during an emergency, it would only be used after it has been determined that such action will not have an unnecessarily adverse impact upon the quality of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is strong and sincere opposition to any attempt to open up NEPA to any amendments. But I hasten to add that NEPA originated and emanated from our committee on the House side—and I know for a fact that Congress did not intend for NEPA to be so rigid or so authoritarian that it might ignore or callously brush aside other urgent needs of the Nation.

We must recognize that this new era in which we all find ourselves so profoundly involved with improving and protecting the environment is a transitional era; we are making our first exploratory, fumbling steps. And in our haste to protect and enhance the environment, we must make certain that we remain sufficiently flexible, in order to promote and protect our Nation's total welfare.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13752 is an example of the kind of realistic and flexible approach to complex problems that is needed to cope with the dynamic changes of our times, and I urge its rapid passage.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), a member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13752.

I will be brief.

The bill provides temporary relief to allow utilities which have already constructed electric generating plants to turn these plants on and run them in order to prevent or minimize a power blackout or brownout. There are several plants in this country which might be

affected by this bill; in most cases these are plants in regions of the country that may be dangerously short of power during the next months. If we sit by and prevent these plants from helping out in a potential blackout or brownout situation, the Congress would—and I would say should—be properly blamed as responsible. This I think no one wants.

The AEC will make the ultimate judgment as to when an emergency is so severe as to require one of these plants to operate. The Congress has properly delegated this responsibility to them. Whether the plants are to be operated to provide reserve capacity, or are actually to be put on the line is a matter which must be left to the AEC. I have no doubt that they will consult with the FPC and with the regional reliability agencies in making their determinations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill should be passed, and it should be passed now.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have 1 minute and a half left. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 1½ minutes remaining to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I support this legislation wholeheartedly.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman, has just concluded 6 days of hearings on the matters of energy fuel resources and possible shortages in our current energy situation. We have at least 1 or perhaps 2 more days of hearings to go.

We have been brought to the conclusion, I think almost unanimously, that we believe that we do have the possibility of a serious energy shortage in this Nation; that it is immediate; and, that we do not have to wait for several months or several years elapse in order to realize what is going to happen throughout this country if we do not take some steps, which are sensible and logical, in order to protect ourselves against the damages which may occur to us because of brownouts and blackouts and the consequent injury to facilities on which all of us depend so much.

I see no effort made here whatsoever to lessen the effectiveness of the National Environmental Policy Act. I think by approving this legislation that we are taking advantage of a situation where we can protect ourselves, and at the same time protect the environment and the ecological values, which mean so much to all of us.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the instant legislation.

My primary concern with the legislation is that it authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to issue interim licenses for nuclear power reactors where a full environmental review is not yet complete.

In essence, my objection is that at a time when alarms and doubts about the safety of nuclear reactors are at their peak, this legislation would have us head off in the opposite direction.

While I recognize that under this interim license a plant would only be authorized to operate at 20 percent of capacity, in my mind if there is any threat at all to the environment, the possibility should be fully resolved before we allow the operation to proceed. I doubt if the safety of a nuclear plant operating at 20 percent of capacity is assurance of a happier accident than the accident which might occur at 100 percent.

Now in the spring of 1972, there are 15 large reactors located on the borders of densely populated and industrial areas throughout the country, seeking operating licenses. Citizens groups have time and again shown in contested proceedings that applications have been faulty, quality control deficient, and obvious safeguards to lessen environmental impact omitted in design.

In the Calvert Cliffs, Md. decision it was held that the AEC had not fully explored the putative dangers.

In the instance of the Indian Point Plant No. 2 of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, one of the subcontractors for components of the main structure, has said it was not safe. Valves, too, at Indian Point have been challenged for safety. It was one of the plants which the AEC itself would not clear for operation because of questions about safe functioning.

The need for new power, offered as a reason for licensing before completion hearings by interveners is no criterion of safety. That need does not solve the principal question that must be answered for every reactor. The need may not be gainsaid, but it does not answer the critical question of safety.

There are still dozens of unanswered questions: Can we with 100 percent surety transport these deadly wastes? Can they be reprocessed without widespread environmental pollution and health hazards? Is it realistic to think that salt mine burial solves the problem of ultimate storage? There was little happiness in Kansas when salt mines there were selected for burial of radioactive wastes.

In light of these unanswered questions and the potential danger of putting a nuclear plant on line before its full environmental impact has been revealed in detail, I must oppose the pending bill. It is incumbent on Congress to guard the public's interest and create a process for seeking the real and perhaps painful truth about the dangers that may be associated with nuclear power.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House of Representatives today, H.R. 13752, proposes to exempt nuclear powerplants from standards established by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The exemptions provided by this bill pose potential threats to our country which cannot be authorized.

Proponents of H.R. 13752 have stated that reactors which have been constructed and are ready to begin operations should be given "interim" permission to begin limited operations. These limited operations could possibly be useful if power is needed due to a local blackout. Yet the risks of operating these plants, which have not received full approval, far outweigh the possible benefits, which are tentative at best.

Past performances of nuclear powerplants have been marked by flaws. As recently as March of this year, a Westinghouse subcontractor for the Indian Point No. 2 plant north of New York City urged the AEC to halt operations of the plant until errors in structure could be corrected. Frequent delays in construction of these plants is testimony to our lack of knowledge concerning the total workings of the nuclear process. A few days ago the Department of the Interior stated its dissatisfaction with the safety of such plants. AEC hearings in January revealed that professionals in the nuclear energy field think that there is the possibility of accidents in which the radioactive core of a reactor can melt. If this were to happen, it would release the deadly radioactive fuel material into the environment and create a massive catastrophe. The AEC hearings left unresolved many of the mysteries of nuclear safety.

The safety of nuclear reactors and their impact on the environment remains a grave problem for all of us. The AEC even seems to have doubts about the safety of these powerplants, as indicated in its continued support of the Price-Anderson Act—an act which limits the Government's liability in cases of nuclear accidents.

Should an error in a plant go undetected, the danger to the surrounding population is tremendous. The effects of excess radiation and thermal pollution on humans and on the rest of the environment are well-documented. One nuclear accident could kill hundreds of thousands of humans. A lesser accident could destroy the natural environment. The chances of an accident are small, but the potential for disaster is too great to be put aside.

The claimed benefits of this legislation cannot possibly outweigh the ever-present threat to humans and their surroundings. These decisions on the operations of nuclear powerplants must be delayed until their safety is certified under provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act? We must not rush headlong into operating these plants when their safety and environmental impact is so uncertain.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, over and over again we have heard the utility industry ask for this or that from the Federal Government. At the same time we have heard the environmental groups say that "this or that" was bad for the air, for the water or for the land. The time has come, I believe, for us to see what is good or bad for the people. The proposed legislation is good—I would venture to say absolutely necessary—for the people of this Nation.

We all, by this time, know what Mr. DINGELL'S bill is about. Briefly, it would allow nuclear powerplants to go into operation on a temporary basis if there has been declared an emergency power shortage.

I received this morning a mimeographed letter from some two dozen environmental groups. Were we to vote

based on this, it would be nothing more than total disregard for our constituents and nothing more than "mimeographed legislation." It is interesting to note that two groups were not named on the letter—the Sierra Club and the Izaak Walton League. These are two national organizations that are most qualified and intimately involved in the licensing of nuclear powerplants that did not sign that letter urging us to vote "no." Having been involved with the Sierra Club, I know of their practicality and their interest in insuring that best possible lifestyle for Americans. To deny these 15 plants an interim operating license would not be in accord with the ideals of this largest of all environmental groups.

Unless the summer is mild, we stand the chance of experiencing brownouts and/or blackouts. It would be foolish to try and stop the American public from using all their air conditioners and fans for the next 6 months. It would be just as foolish to deny them their rightful access to an adequate supply of power.

In my district we have a completed nuclear plant. It is within several months of operation. If the expected peak load is exceeded by even 200-thousand kilowatt hours, the reserve capacity of the existing generating facilities would be cut out. That makes very real the possibility that Southeastern Massachusetts will have its streets lighted with brown lights while those thrown out of jobs wait in extended welfare lines. To look at it in another light, if the completed plant is not on the line—even on an interim basis—it will cost consumers over $3 million a month. Absent this legislation, in the New England area alone, consumers will be paying nearly $9 million monthly to keep idle plants.

One of the main contentions against this interim licensing proposal is that the rules of the National Environmental Policy Act would be infringed upon. This is definitely not the case. The provisions of NEPA state that the Atomic Energy Commission must follow the NEPA regulations whenever possible. When it is not possible, the AEC must do everything it can do that is consistent with the act and with the emergency nature of the problem confronting it. I would think a sudden loss of power and of essential services and jobs would be such an emergency situation.

The provisions of the proposed bill state that only plants with construction permits issued before January 1, 1970, and plants that have applied for licensing prior to September 9, 1971, are eligible for interim licensing. There are approximately 15 nuclear plants in this category. If those plants gain the interim license, they can only operate in an emergency situation and at 20 percent of their capacity. Finally, they will not be permitted to operate indefinitely. As soon as the impact statement is released or October 30, 1973, arrives—whichever comes first—plants under this provision must cease operation.

The other area of opposition deals with the question of public hearings. In accord with NEPA, when the impact statement is released there will be public hearings. Asking for a public hearing in an emergency power situation is like asking for a full debate following the bombing of Pearl Harbor. In addition, environmental groups stand to incur the most public wrath when these brownouts and blackouts occur.

I have already stated that two of the most prominent and responsible environmental groups have not initiated action for a "no" vote on this measure. All of the existing laws in this area are being fully complied with. Mr. Speaker, the pending legislation provides safeguards so that our constituents will have the power they need this and next summer and winter. We owe it to our constituents and the Nation as a whole to see to it that they have this power. I therefore ask your support for H.R. 13752.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13752, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FLOOD. 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 285, nays 78, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—285

Abernethy	Celler	Gonzalez
Anderson, Calif.	Chamberlain	Goodling
	Chappell	Grasso
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Gray
Anderson, Tenn.	Clark	Green, Oreg.
	Clawson, Del	Griffin
Andrews, Ala.	Cleveland	Griffiths
Andrews, N. Dak.	Collier	Gross
	Collins, Ill.	Grover
Annunzio	Collins, Tex.	Gubser
Archer	Colmer	Hagan
Arends	Conable	Haley
Ashbrook	Cotter	Hall
Ashley	Curlin	Hamilton
Aspin	Daniel, Va.	Hammer-schmidt
Aspinall	Daniels, N.J.	
Baker	Danielson	Hanley
Baring	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Barrett	Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho
Begich	Denholm	Hansen, Wash.
Belcher	Derwinski	Harsha
Bell	Dickinson	Harvey
Bergland	Dingell	Hastings
Betts	Donohue	Hébert
Bevill	Dorn	Henderson
Blackburn	Downing	Hicks, Mass.
Boggs	Dulski	Hicks, Wash.
Boland	Duncan	Hillis
Bolling	Edmondson	Hogan
Brasco	Edwards, Ala.	Holifield
Brinkley	Esch	Horton
Brooks	Evans, Colo.	Hull
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Hungate
Brotzman	Findley	Hunt
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Jarman
Brown, Ohio	Flowers	Johnson, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.	Flynt	Jonas
Broyhill, Va.	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, N.C.
Burke, Fla.	Ford, William D.	Karth
Burke, Mass.		Kastenmeier
Burlison, Mo.	Forsythe	Kazen
Byrne, Pa.	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton	Keith
Cabell	Fuqua	Kemp
Caffery	Garmatz	King
Camp	Gaydos	Kluczynski
Carlson	Gettys	Kuykendall
Carter	Giaimo	Kyl
Casey, Tex.	Gibbons	Landrum
Cederberg	Goldwater	Latta
Leggett	O'Neill	Slack
Lennon	Passman	Smith, Iowa
Lent	Pelly	Smith, N.Y.
Link	Perkins	Snyder
Lloyd	Pettis	Spence
Lujan	Pickle	Springer
McCollister	Pirnie	Stanton, J. William
McCormack	Poage	
McCulloch	Podell	Steed
McDonald, Mich.	Poff	Steele
	Powell	Steiger, Ariz.
McEwen	Preyer, N.C.	Sullivan
McFall	Price, Ill.	Talcott
McKay	Price, Tex.	Taylor
McKevitt	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
McMillan	Purcell	Teague, Tex.
Mahon	Quie	Terry
Mailliard	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
Mann	Railsback	Thomson, Wis.
Martin	Randall	Thone
Mathias, Calif.	Rarick	Udall
Mathis, Ga.	Reid	Ullman
Matsunaga	Reuss	Van Deerlin
Mayne	Rhodes	Vigorito
Mazzoli	Roberts	Waggonner
Meeds	Robinson, Va.	Wampler
Melcher	Rogers	Ware
Metcalfe	Roncalio	Whalen
Michel	Rooney, N.Y.	White
Miller, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.	Whitehurst
Miller, Ohio	Rostenkowski	Whitten
Mills, Md.	Roush	Widnall
Mizell	Rousselot	Wiggins
Montgomery	Runnels	Williams
Moorhead	Ruppe	Wilson, Charles H.
Mosher	Ruth	
Moss	Satterfield	Winn
Murphy, Ill.	Scherle	Wyatt
Murphy, N.Y.	Schmitz	Wydler
Myers	Schneebeli	Wylie
Natcher	Scott	Wyman
Nedzi	Sebelius	Yatron
Nelsen	Shipley	Young, Fla.
Nichols	Shoup	Young, Tex.
Obey	Shriver	Zablocki
O'Hara	Sikes	Zion
O'Konski	Sisk	

NAYS—78

Abourezk	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Abzug	Gude	Peyser
Adams	Halpern	Pike
Addabbo	Harrington	Rangel
Badillo	Hathaway	Rees
Bennett	Hays	Riegle
Biaggi	Hechler, W. Va.	Robison, N.Y.
Biester	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Bingham	Heinz	Roe
Brademas	Howard	Rosenthal
Bray	Jacobs	Roybal
Conte	Koch	Ryan
Conyers	Kyros	Sandman
Delaney	Long, Md.	Sarbanes
Dellenback	McClory	Saylor
Dennis	McCloskey	Staggers
Dow	McDade	Stratton
Drinan	McKinney	Thompson, N.J.
du Pont	Mallary	Tiernan
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Eilberg	Minish	Vanik
Fascell	Mink	Veysey
Fish	Mitchell	Waldie
Flood	Mollohan	Wolff
Frenzel	Morgan	Yates
Frey	Patten	Zwach

NOT VOTING—70

Abbitt	Dwyer	Monagan
Alexander	Eckhardt	Morse
Blanton	Edwards, La.	Nix
Blatnik	Erlenborn	Patman
Bow	Eshleman	Pryor, Ark.
Burleson, Tex.	Fountain	Roy
Burton	Fraser	St Germain
Byron	Galifianakis	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Gallagher	Schwengel
Carney	Hawkins	Seiberling
Chisholm	Helstoski	Skubitz
Clausen, Don H.	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
	Hutchinson	Stanton, James V.
Clay	Ichord	
Corman	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Wis.
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Stephens
Crane	Kee	Stokes
Culver	Landgrebe	Stubblefield
Davis, S.C.	Long, La.	Stuckey
de la Garza	McClure	Symington
Dellums	Macdonald, Mass.	Whalley
Dent		Wilson, Bob
Devine	Madden	Wright
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	
Dowdy	Minshall	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nix and Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. Carney and Mr. Long of Louisiana, for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Abbitt and Mr. Blanton for, with Mr. Coughlin against.

Mr. Hosmer and Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Burleson of Texas and Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Dowdy and Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee and Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mr. Patman and Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Mr. Stubblefield and Mr. Byron for, with Mr. St Germain against.

Mr. Wright and Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Mr. Crane and Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Smith of California and Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Clay against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Culver with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Madden with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Eschleman.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Symington with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. DELANEY and THOMPSON of New Jersey changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermal electric generating plants, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent when the vote was taken on House Concurrent Resolution 471. Had I been in the Chamber and voting, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 92 I am recorded as absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

EQUITABLE WAGE ADJUSTMENTS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13753) to provide equitable wage adjustments for certain prevailing rate employees of the Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13753

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Prevailing Rate Equalization Adjustment Act of 1972".

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any provision of an Executive order or regulation, a wage schedule adjustment for employees of the Government of the United States whose pay is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates—

(1) if based on a wage survey ordered to be made on or after August 15, 1971, but not placed into effect before November 14, 1971, by reason of the provisions of Executive Order 11615 or Executive Order 11627; or

(2) if based on a wage survey which had been scheduled to be made during the period beginning on September 1, 1971, and ending on January 12, 1972, and which was ordered to be made on or after January 13, 1972;

shall be effective on the date on which such wage schedule adjustment would have been effective under section 5343 of title 5, United States Code, had the fiscal year 1972 schedule for wage surveys for such employees been followed.

(b) Retroactive pay made under the provisions of this section will be made in accordance with section 5344 of title 5, United States Code.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of H.R. 13753 is to authorize retroactive wage adjustments for approximately 214,000 Federal blue-collar employees whose regular pay adjustments were delayed either by the 90-day wage-price freeze or by the President's postponement of blue-collar wage surveys.

I cosponsored this bill with Chairman DULSKI and Mr. HOGAN on the basis of an official recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

On August 15, 1971, the President announced his program for economic stabilization, which included a 90-day freeze on wages and prices. At the same time, the President announced that pay adjustments for all Federal employees would be delayed for a period of 6 months.

Subsequently, the President took the action necessary to delay for 6 months the pay adjustments for Federal employees who are paid under the various statutory pay systems, such as the General Schedule, and to defer for 6 months all wage surveys for blue-collar employees.

On December 22, 1971, Public Law 92–210, the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, was signed into law.

Section 3 of that act had the effect of rescinding the 6-month deferment of salary increases for General Schedule employees and employees paid under other statutory pay systems. Consequently, those employees experienced no delay in pay adjustments.

Section 3 of Public Law 92–210 did not apply to blue-collar employees. However, on January 11, 1972, the President canceled his previously ordered 6-month deferment of blue-collar wage surveys, which had been in effect since September 1, 1971.

Most of the Government's 600,000 blue-collar employees have received or will receive their pay increases as originally scheduled.

However, as a result of the 90-day freeze and the postponement of wage surveys during the period from September 1 to January 12, 1972, there are approximately 214,000 blue-collar employees whose pay adjustments will be delayed for varying periods up to 12 weeks.

Since wage increases cannot be made retroactively effective in the absence of specific statutory authority, this legislation is needed to authorize retroactive pay increases for those 214,000 employees. Such authority will result in a one-time expenditure of $12 million.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was ordered reported by a unanimous voice vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The committee sincerely believes that this legislation is both necessary and proper in view of the previous action taken by the Congress under Public Law 92–210 with respect to General Schedule pay increases.

I urge the passage of this legislation to insure that all of our Federal employees will have received fair and equal treatment with respect to their annual pay adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD, as a part of my statement, a press release of the Civil Service Commission giving background information on this matter:

NEWS RELEASE

The Civil Service Commission has submitted an Administration proposal asking Congress to approve legislation which would remove inequities in the effective dates of pay increases for Federal blue-collar em-

ployees whose pay adjustments were affected by the August 15–November 14 freeze, or by the 6-months deferral of wage surveys which was subsequently rescinded.

Approximately 214,000 workers would receive retroactive pay adjustments for period ranging from two weeks to three months if the proposal is enacted.

The proposed bill provides that whether the wage increases were held up by the freeze itself or by the deferment of surveys, pay adjustments would be made retroactive to their normal effective dates.

BACKGROUND

On February 23, 1972, the Comptroller General ruled that Federal blue-collar workers whose pay adjustments had been held up by the freeze should receive their pay adjustments retroactively, if the wage survey for the local wage area was ordered prior to August 15, 1971.

Of some 35 wage areas involved, eight areas did not qualify for such retroactive payments. The wage areas and dates on which the pay adjustments normally would have been due are: Northwestern Michigan (Oct. 24, 1971); Oscoda-Alpena, Mich. (Oct. 24, 1971); Oklahoma City, Okla. Oct. 24, 1971); Valdosta, Ga. (Oct. 31, 1971); Scranton-Wilkes Barre, Pa. (Oct. 31, 1971); Madison Wisc. (Oct. 31, 1971); Wichita Falls-Southwest Oklahoma (Oct. 31, 1971); and Washington, D.C. (Oct. 31, 1971).

Earlier, on January 11, 1972, the President had cancelled the 6-month deferment of Federal blue-collar wage adjustments and approved the resumption of local wage surveys. Surveys were conducted on an expedited basis in the areas affected, but all increases resulting from the surveys were required by law to be paid prospectively rather than retroactively.

Blue-collar workers in some 39 wage areas where surveys would have been ordered between September 1971 and January 1972 have thus had their increases delayed for periods up to 12 weeks.

Should Congress enact the proposed law, the wage areas and normal effective dates to which retroactive pay increases will be effective are as follows:

Los Angeles, Calif. (Nov. 28, 1971); San Bernardino, Calif. (Nov. 14, 1971); Santa Barbara, Calif. (Nov. 14, 1971); New London, Conn. (Nov. 28, 1971); Cedar Rapids, Iowa (Nov. 14, 1971); Boston, Mass. (Nov. 28, 1971); Las Vegas, Nev. (Nov. 14, 1971); Portsmouth, N.H. (Nov. 28, 1971); Seattle, Wash. (Nov. 14, 1971); San Diego, Calif. (Nov. 28, 1971); San Francisco, Calif. (Nov. 14, 1971); Cocoa Beach, Fla. (Nov. 14, 1971); Orlando, Fla. (Nov. 14, 1971); Panama City, Fla. (Nov. 14, 1971);

Pensacola, Fla. (Nov. 14, 1971); Pittsburgh, Pa. (Nov. 28, 1971); Chicago, Ill. (Dec. 26, 1971); Bloomington, Ind. (Dec. 26, 1971); Indianapolis, Ind. (Dec. 26, 1971); Baltimore, Md. (Dec. 12, 1971); Omaha, Neb. (Dec. 26, 1971); Asheville, N.C. (Dec. 26, 1971); Champaign-Urbana, Ill. (Dec. 12, 1971); Davenport, Iowa (Dec. 12, 1971); Des Moines, Iowa (Dec. 12, 1971); Dubuque, Iowa (Dec. 12, 1971); Biloxi, Miss. (Dec. 26, 1971);

Philadelphia, Pa. (Dec. 26, 1971); Kansas City, Mo. (Jan. 9, 1972); St. Louis, Mo. (Jan. 9, 1972); Southern Missouri (Jan. 9, 1972); Eastern South Dakota (Jan. 9, 1972); Dallas, Tex. (Jan. 9, 1972); Wilmington, Del. (Jan. 16, 1972); Topeka, Kan. (Jan. 16, 1972); Wichita, Kan. (Jan. 16, 1972); Richmond, Va. (Jan. 23, 1972); Roanoke, Va. (Jan. 23, 1972); and Milwaukee, Wisc. (Feb. 6, 1972).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13753 which I sponsored. The bill will authorize retroactive wage adjustments for approximately 214,000 blue-collar employees of the Government. This is a simple but very important piece of legislation that is needed to correct an inequitable situation.

Last August the President announced that pay increases for all Federal employees would be deferred for 6 months. As a part of his plan the President proposed to delay from January 1972 until July 1972, the comparability pay adjustments for all employees paid under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems.

The Congress, however, rejected the President's proposal and enacted legislation authorizing pay increases for all General Schedule employees to become effective in January 1972.

As a result of this action the President canceled his previously ordered postponement of blue-collar wage surveys.

However, since a number of the wage surveys had already been delayed and since some of the blue-collar wage adjustments were caught by the 90-day wage-price freeze, approximately one-third of the Government's blue-collar employees had their pay adjustments delayed for varying periods up to 12 weeks.

This legislation will provide the specific authority that is necessary to authorize retroactive pay adjustments for those employees and thereby place them on a level with all other blue-collar and General Schedule employees.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was recommended by the administration and received the unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of no opposition to the bill, and I trust that it will receive the unanimous support of this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill and I will do so only because it corrects an inequity that now prevents a small group of Federal employees from being treated fairly with respect to the effective dates of their pay raises.

However, I am deeply distressed at the events and circumstances which led to the need for this type legislation—a dismal record in both the Congress and the administration making a complete shambles of a significant part of the so-called "economic initiatives" of last August.

What started last August as a noble and worthy effort by the President to reduce the Federal budget and to hold the line on inflation as it relates to Federal personnel costs has now ended in almost total failure.

The erosion began with the enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments in December of last year which forced the President to set a pay raise 6 months earlier than he had proposed; it continued with a series of orders, regulations and decisions of the Civil Service Commission, the Comptroller General, the Pay Commission, and the Office of Management and Budget—wiping out all previous orders, regulations and decisions which had sought to stabilize Federal pay and reduce the Federal budget; and it ends now with the enactment of this bill which removes the one remaining legal obstacle to relieving every single Federal employee from any possible effects of the wage-price freeze of last August.

From the point of view of the individual Federal employee and as far as Federal employment and the Federal payroll are concerned, the so-called wage-price freeze simply did not exist.

The "bold new economic initiative" as it relates to Federal employment and the reduction of the Federal budget never got off the ground.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13753, a bill to authorize retroactive pay for Federal blue-collar employees whose pay adjustments were delayed by either the 90-day wage price freeze, or by the postponement of wage surveys.

On August 15, 1971, the President announced his 90-day freeze on wages and prices, and also announced that pay adjustments for all Federal employees would be delayed for a 6-month period.

While I initially favored the wage-price freeze, I was opposed to action which discriminated against Federal employees by requiring them to forego wage increases for 6 months while, at the same time, the pay of their brothers and sisters in private industry was frozen for only 90 days.

To partially correct this inequity, the Congress enacted the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971 which rescinded the 6-month deferment of salary increases for General Service employees. Consequently, salary increases for those employees went into effect in January 1972.

In addition, wage increases in 27 wage areas which had wage surveys ordered prior to August 15, 1971, were placed into effect retroactive to their normal effective date.

But, the eight wage areas which did not have a survey pending at the time of the August 15, 1971, announcement, and the 43 other wage areas in which wage surveys were deferred until January 13, 1972, were not specifically authorized retroactive pay adjustments.

The bill before us today, H.R. 13753, would correct this inequity.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the enactment of this bill, blue-collar Federal employees in San Bernardino, San Francisco, and Santa Barbara will receive pay increases retroactive to November 14, 1971.

Those Federal blue-collar employees in Los Angeles and San Diego will receive pay increases retroactive to November 28, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse H.R. 13753, and strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this bill and thus correct the inequities which now exist with respect to the pay of 214,000 Wage Board employees.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13753, which would provide equitable wage adjustments for a large number of Federal blue-collar workers whose regular pay adjustments were delayed, either by the 90-day wage-price freeze or by the administration's postponement of blue-collar wage surveys.

Consideration of the bill now before this body would not be complete without

a word of commendation for the chairman of the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON). If Federal employees throughout the Nation were to be asked to give him a name based on his work in Congress, the name that I am sure they would consider most appropriate would be "Mr. Equity." As he has done so frequently in the past whenever an inequity among Federal employees needed to be rectified, he has again, in spearheading consideration of this bill in committee, sought to correct another inequity—this time, in wage adjustments for certain prevailing rate employees.

The situation marked by inequity was the result of a series of events commencing with the 90-day wage-price freeze ordered under Executive Order No. 11615 of August 15, 1971. Under the order, wage increases for blue-collar employees in 35 local wage areas were frozen until November 14, 1971. Further, under the President's memorandum of September 1, 1971, wage surveys were deferred until January 13, 1972, in 43 other wage areas.

Subsequently, after enactment of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971—Public Law 92–210—the Comptroller General ruled that that law authorized retroactive payment of wage increases which would have gone into effect during the freeze period pursuant to a wage survey that was ordered prior to August 15, 1971. Under this ruling, workers in all but eight of the original 35 local wage areas were paid retroactive wage increases. There is no existing legal authority under which the workers in these eight local wage areas and in the 43 other wage areas in which wage surveys were deferred until January 13, 1973, could be paid.

H.R. 13753 would provide the specific statutory authority that is needed to give retroactive pay increases to the blue-collar employees in these remaining wage areas.

Passage of this measure therefore would help to provide equality of treatment among all blue-collar employees of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a favorable vote for H.R. 13753.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13753. This bill will provide the legislative remedy necessary to assure equitable treatment for certain prevailing rate employees of the Government.

H.R. 13753 will authorize retroactive wage adjustments for approximately 214,000 blue-collar employees whose regular pay adjustments were delayed, either by the 90-day wage-price freeze, or by the administration's postponement of blue-collar wage surveys.

Although both of these actions have been rescinded, the Comptroller General has ruled that increases in these instances cannot be made retroactive except where specifically provided for by law.

Therefore, this bill, if enacted into law would correct an existing inequity created by these situations, and would equalize wage adjustments among the prevailing rate employees of the Government.

This legislation was proposed by the Civil Service Commission, and the Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

I ask for the support of my colleagues on this bill, and trust it will have unanimous approval.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 13753.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13753.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13435) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13435

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1973 through 1977 the sum of $352,195,000 for continuing work on the Upper Colorado River project and participating projects authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs, as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved. No part of the funds hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be available to initiate construction on any participating project not under construction on June 30, 1972; nor to prosecute construction of the Bostwick Park and San Juan-Chama projects authorized by the Act of September 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 852) and the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), respectively.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the chairman of the full committee, such time as he may consume.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) for making the motion and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for asking for a second so that we can explain the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the matter is a simple matter but the amount of money involved is a large amount and I think I should take just a few minutes to explain to my colleagues what is involved in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak in favor of H.R. 13435, to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. This is an important measure yet it is uncomplicated and easy to understand. In short, it will authorize $462,195,000 for appropriation during the 5-year period of fiscal year 1973 through fiscal year 1977 and if the funds are not appropriated during such 5-year period, the authorization will lapse.

The purpose for which these funds wil be utilized will be to prosecute construction on the storage units and participating projects authorized by the act of April 11, 1956, for development in the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin. That legislation authorized four major storage units on the Colorado River and its principal tributaries—and 11 participating projects. The storage units had, as their primary purpose, the regulation of water for delivery to the Lower Colorado River Basin as required by the Colorado River compact—and the production of power as a source of repayment income. The participating projects are multipurpose water resource development projects in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

At the time the authorizing act was passed, it was recognized that the program would cost considerably in excess of the $760,000,000 then authorized to be appropriated. In fact, the estimated cost in 1956 was $850,000,000—excluding the Curecanti unit and ancillary fish and wildlife and recreation facilities. I recite this history to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, that the requirement for this legislation has been in the picture for many years and that, by no means all of the present authorization requirement can be attributed to either inflation or poor estimating. In 1956, the Congress purposely limited the appropriations authority in order to preserve a degree of legislative oversight of the program.

By the same token, we are now only authorizing a five-year program despite the fact that $610,000,000 are required to complete the work remaining to be done under the 1956 legislation. This is, of course, to preserve an option for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to look at the program, from the legislative standpoint, at least one more time before it is completed.

Members will be interested to hear, I think, that our committee has taken a careful look at the quality of management which has gone into the construction of the work thus far. We have noted some changes in plan but they seem to be clearly within the latitude conveyed to the Secretary by the original act. Further, we find that the cost increases, in the overall sense, are well within the range of what we would expect to happen due to inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two other points that may be of concern to my colleagues, particularly as they consider the magnitude of this authoriaztion. We have heard a great deal about the backlog of unfunded water resource development authorizations and can understand the reluctance of many to add to that backlog. This legislation does not contribute to the problem inasmuch as the projects and units for which these funds will be used are already included in the accounting.

It should also be emphasized that the legislation has been drawn to specifically limit the use of these funds to the programs I have described. They may not be applied to other programs which have been authorized since 1956; and there is no compulsion so to use them. Each participating project authorized for the Upper Colorado River Basin in recent years has been provided with appropriations authority in its basic legislation.

In summary, we find that the original legislation which was most carefully drawn has been administered prudently and we have a high level of confidence in the plans for completing the work. The operational facilities which have been built under this legislation are functioning admirably and there is no reason why the remaining facilities will not be equally effective.

My colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, who is handling the bill, will report on the work that has been done and give other details of the pending legislation. Suffice it to say, I strongly endorse this legislation and urge its speedy enactment.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Colorado yielding, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Furthermore, I appreciate his clear and concise statement about the intent of this bill, involving some $352 million of additional authorization.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for limiting the number of new starts on the basis that we can always make additional investigations, study, and authorizations as the Congress may will. Second, for reducing the total amount requested; and third, for recovering back into the Treasury that which was unused.

There is just one thing I would like to ask about as a point of information. Could the distinguished gentleman advise us as to whether or not this is a new clause, a new "catch phrase" so to speak, that we can expect in future legislation where it is stated "plus or minus such amounts as may be required by reason of fluctuating price levels"?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is not a new clause. It is a repetition expressed perhaps in a little different way. Usually we refer to cost indexes, the fluctuation of cost indexes. This phrase gives no more latitude than we have given for many years in the past.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, then, it merely inculcates a cost-of-living increase in the authorization through the effective time of the legislation?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah such time as he may consume.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13435, a bill to increase authorization ceilings of reclamation projects authorized by the Colorado River Storage Act of 1956.

This legislation is necessary to the continuance of work on major water development projects in my own State of Utah which will allow our State to put to beneficial use its entitlement of water from the Colorado River.

Of the total $352 million authorized by this bill over the next 5-year period, Utah will receive approximately $207 million. This breaks down as follows:

Bonneville unit, $184 million. This is the largest reclamation project ever undertaken in the State of Utah, and will supply a new source of water for the rapidly growing Wasatch Front area around Salt Lake City. This unit has been under construction for about 6 years, and is only 10 percent complete.

Jensen unit, $5.4 million.

Upalco unit, $14.7 million.

Vernal unit, $1 million.

Emery County project, $1.6 million.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if approved, will authorize continued construction of these Utah reclamation projects and others in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

While I would like to have seen authorization of the full amount required to complete these projects, I agree with the distinguished committee chairman, Mr. ASPINALL, that the 5-year authorization provided by the bill before us will allow continued congressional oversight and review as these projects move toward completion.

I fully endorse this legislation. It is vitally important to the continued growth and development of my own State, and respectfully urge that the House give its immediate approval.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require to speak in favor of H.R. 13435, to increase the authorization for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. The gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the full committee, has explained the background and need for this legislation. While I shall not repeat the history of this legislation, I think it is important to emphasize that the essential decisions were made on this development 16 years ago when Congress authorized the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects. Except for the fact that the customary language, providing for increasing authorizations as required by changing cost indexes was purposely omitted from that legislation, there would be no requirement for this bill. As the chairman further pointed out, this language was omitted to create the opportunity for our committee and the House to take a look at the implementation of the program from time to time.

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation we were given the opportunity to examine the stewardship of the Department of the Interior over this program.

We received testimony to the effect that two of the three authorized storage units are completely finished and in service. They are Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir on the Green River, near the Wyoming-Utah boundary and Navajo Reservoir on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico. Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, forming the famous Lake Powell astride the Utah-Arizona border, is essentially complete and is gaining storage to enable it to assure delivery of compacted water deliveries to the Lower Colorado River Basin. The fourth storage unit, Curecanti, consists of three dams and reservoirs—two of which, Blue Mesa and Morrow Point, are practically finished and are operational on the Gunnison River in western Colorado. The third element of the Curecanti unit is Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant. This element is just getting underway and constitutes one of the major requirements for construction funds authorized to be appropriated by this legislation.

Of the 11 authorized participating projects contained in the 1956 legislation, two of them—the Pine River extensions in New Mexico and the La Barge in Wyoming—have been found to be lacking in economic justification and work has been discontinued on them. On the remaining nine projects, three projects have been fully completed and placed in operational status. They are Paonia, Fla., and Smith Fork projects in Colorado. Work is underway on all of the other six projects and is essentially complete on the Hammond project in New Mexico, the Silt project in Colorado and the Emery County project in Utah. There is deferred work to be completed on the Seedskadee project and the Lyman project in Wyoming and a major continuing fund requirement on the central Utah project.

The estimated continuing fund requirement for each of the major elements of the program is set forth in detail in our committee report and can be examined there by those who are interested.

Cumulatively, the completed units and projects and operational facilities on partially completed units and projects are capable of delivering irrigation water to 145,300 acres of land—delivering

303,600 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water—and generating 1,248,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power. The works under construction will, when completed, serve an additional 247,900 acres of land—provide an additional 97,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water—and generate 161,500 more kilowatts of power.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that this program is fulfilling the expectations held for it by those who supported it for passage in the Congress in 1956 and is generally on schedule.

It is making a major contribution to the economic and social well-being of a large portion of rural America and is, for these reasons, deserving of the support of all Members who believe as I do that the strength of our Nation lies in continuing wise management and husbandry of our earth resources.

Accordingly, I urge that the House agree to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13434.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work on the Upper Colorado River project and participating projects. The amount being authorized for appropriation is $352,195,000 for fiscal years 1973–77, subject to changes in construction and engineering cost indices.

The act of April 11, 1956, authorized the construction and maintenance of the Upper Colorado River storage projects, comprised of four storage units, the Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navajo units; 11 participating projects being the central Utah—initial phase—Emery County, Fla., Hammond, LaBarge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork units; related power transmission facilities, and recreation and fish and wildlife programs. The initial authorization was for $760 million on an authorized program having an estimated cost of $852 million at that time.

A total of $754,873,000 has been appropriated through fiscal 1972. The appropriation increase of $352,195,000, authorized by this bill, will permit work to be continued or completed on two of the major storage units, six of the participating projects, the power transmission system, and the recreation and fish and wildlife facilities. To complete all the work authorized, a subsequent increase in the appropriation authorization of $257,153,000 will be necessary based upon current estimates.

The bill prohibits use of the funds authorized for appropriation to initiate construction on any project in the Upper Colorado River Basin authorized subsequent to April 11, 1956, and specifically the Bostwick Park and San Juan-Chama projects authorized in other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 13435.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13435, is to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The bill was introduced pursuant to an executive communication to support the administration's request for fiscal 1973 appropriations.

The administration request was for $610 million, based upon a current estimate of the amount required, to complete construction of the storage units, participating projects, and related power transmission facilities authorized by the Colorado River Storage Project Act—Public Law 87–483. An analysis of the Department of the Interior estimate of requirements to complete construction indicates that over 80 percent of the funds required are in five items which will extend over a considerable period of time. Funds to complete the Curecanti unit which is 70 percent complete will be required in the next 4 to 5 years, but completion of the work on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project will require some time before completion. The same is true for completing the power and transmission facilities, the Indian program, and the recreation fish and wildlife programs.

There is also some question as to the need for the funds on the Seedskadee project. A total of $754,873,000 in appropriations have been received to date leaving a balance of $5,127,000 of the present appropriation authorization under the act.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in reporting H.R. 13435 reduced the administration request from $610 million to $352,195,000 for fiscal years 1973–77, in order to continue its legislative oversight responsibility. The amount authorized to be appropriated by this legislation will be used to complete work on the Glen Canyon storage unit and continue work on the Curecanti storage unit; to contiue work on six participating projects, the related power transmission systems and the recreation, fish and wildlife facilities.

The $352,195,000 increase in appropriation authorization provided for in this legislation is limited in that the funds authorized cannot be used on other projects or programs in the Upper Colorado River Basin if authorized subsequent to the act of April 11, 1956. The committee by reducing the level of appropriation requested will retain its legislative oversight of the program and will exercise that responsibility on the request for increased appropriation authorization after fiscal 1977 if not before.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 13435.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, the House has, today, considered a bill of special importance to Utah and the Mountain West. That bill extends the authorization for funds for the Upper Colorado River project. Developing water resources and reclaiming land in the Upper Colorado River Basin area were goals of Utah people long before the Upper Colorado project was authorized in 1956. Since that authorization, the pace of development has been agonizingly slow, and each year Utah people—Members of Congress as well as interested citizens—have stressed this case in hearings on the public works appropriations bill

In recent years, the administration has been reluctant to ask for funds enough to move ahead with the project at a reasonable rate of speed. My first speech in the House dealt with this problem and, thereafter, I pressed the case in committee and elsewhere to the point of being repetitive.

I mention this because the bill before the House was deliberately drafted to authorize less than will be needed to complete the entire project. I understand that this was done, because the Interior Committee is also concerned about the time it is taking to complete this work. The committee, apparently, felt that the administration might be more responsive to congressional desires if, in 5 years, further hearings were certain to be held. The bill also directs that authorized funds which are unused will lapse after 1977. This, also, is a means for enforcing the congressional mandate. If these two projects have the effect of accelerating progress on the project, they deserve our support.

I was concerned about the language in the bill limiting the authorization to participating projects under construction on June 30, 1972. I have been assured by Mr. JOHNSON and other members of the committee that this language means that if any unit of a project is under construction, then all units of that project authorized by the 1956 act are eligible for money under this bill. I have been particularly assured that the bill authorizes appropriations for the Upalco Unit of the Central Utah project, and my support for the committee bill is based on that understanding.

I believe H.R. 13435 is an important piece of legislation. As a decendent of the pioneer group which introduced irrigation to the Great Basin area, I am especially mindful of the value of reclamation projects. It was the goal of our early pioneers to make the desert "blossom as a rose"; they accomplished this task by careful management of water resources: And we continue to reclaim barren lands with far-sighted projects like the Upper Colorado project.

In addition, our cities have shown a need for the water to be conserved by the Central Utah project. Both Provo and Salt Lake City will face shortages of culinary water if we do not complete this work expeditiously.

I am pleased and encouraged by the warm endorsement the Upper Colorado project has received today. It is now our task to see that the project receives the appropriations it deserves.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 13435.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13435, as amended.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BIAGGI. 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. The gentleman's point comes too late. The gentleman should have made that point before the result of the vote was announced.

Mr. BIAGGI. I made it at the completion of the Speaker's remarks.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. 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. 110]

Alexander	Edwards, Calif.	Morse
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, La.	Mosher
Anderson, Tenn.	Erlenborn	Nix
	Eshleman	Patman
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	Poff
Barrett	Ford, Gerald R.	Pryor, Ark.
Blanton	Fountain	Rees
Blatnik	Fraser	Reid
Bow	Fulton	Rosenthal
Burleson, Tex.	Galifianakis	Roy
Burton	Gallagher	Satterfield
Byron	Hansen, Wash.	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Schwengel
Carney	Hébert	Seiberling
Chisholm	Heinz	Skubitz
Clark	Helstoski	Smith, Calif.
Clausen, Don H.	Hosmer	Stanton, James V.
	Hutchinson	
Clay	Ichord	Steed
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Steiger, Wis.
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Stephens
Crane	Kee	Stokes
Culver	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Davis, S.C.	Landgrebe	Stuckey
de la Garza	Long, La.	Symington
Dellums	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Dent	McMillan	Ware
Devine	Macdonald, Mass.	Whalley
Diggs		Widnall
Dowdy	Madden	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	Mikva	Wright
Dwyer	Mills, Ark.	
Eckhardt	Minshall	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REQUESTED CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, on the last rollcall I was on my feet but was not sufficiently in the well to be recognized. But I was on my feet trying to be recognized so that the Clerk could call my name.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman address the Chair and seek recognition?

Mr. HEINZ. Yes; I was trying to do so.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman address the Chair and ask to be recorded?

Mr. HEINZ. I am doing so now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's request comes too late. The Chair has already announced the result of the quorum call.

USE OF REAL PROPERTY FOR WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13025) to amend the Act of May 19, 1948, with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13025

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That clause (2) of the first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes", approved May 19, 1948 (16 U.S.C. 667b), is amended by striking out "chiefly".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13025 is to make more accessible to the States surplus Federal lands that are valuable for wildlife conservation purposes.

Under present law, real property under the jurisdiction and control of a Federal agency no longer required by such agency may be transferred without reimbursement to the appropriate State agency or to the Secretary of the Interior for utilization for wildlife conservation, provided the property is "chiefly valuable" for such use, and if GSA determines it is available for such use.

Consequently, under present law, if the highest value of a particular property is for something other than wildlife conservation—such as for ranching or farming—then the property generally could not be determined by GSA to be "chiefly valuable" for wildlife conservation.

As a result of the retention of this restrictive language under present law, valuable pieces of property which were valuable for wildlife conservation or which could have easily been adaptable to such use were conveyed to other eligible local interests for other uses, such as for health, education, park, or recreation programs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13025 would have the effect of putting wildlife conservation on an equal footing with alternative public uses for the surplus property and each proposed use of the property would then be judged on its merits.

To accomplish this purpose, H.R. 13025 would merely eliminate from present law the word "chiefly," thereby removing the requirement that Federal lands available for transfer to a State under the law would have to be "chiefly valuable" for such purposes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13025 has the support of the Department of the Interior, the General Services Administration, wildlife conservation interests throughout the country, and more than 50 other Members of this distinguished body, who cosponsored this legislation or bills identical to it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13025 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I urge its prompt passage.

The Members who have joined me in sponsorship of this valuable and useful conservation legislation are as follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Baker, Mr. Bevill, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Burton, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Conte, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Dow, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Flynt, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Frey and Mr. Garmatz. An identical bill, H.R. 12334, was also introduced by Mr. Dingell. Another identical bill, H.R. 13026, was introduced by Mr. Dingell and 20 other Members of the House. The cosponsors of the bills are as follows: Mrs. Griffiths, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hicks of Washington, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Karth, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Lent, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Pike, Mr. Rodino, and Mr. Roe.

Also, H.R. 13027, an identical bill was introduced by Mr. Dingell and cosponsored by 11 other Members of the House. The cosponsors are as follows: Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Symington, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Vander Jagt, and Mr. Williams. Another identical bill, H.R. 13149, was introduced by Mr. Dingell and cosponsored by Mr. Saylor and Mr. Aspin. Mr. Brown of Michigan introduced an identical bill, H.R. 13786, and Mr. Ruppe introduced an identical bill, H.R. 13819.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Act of May 19, 1948, authorizes Federal agencies to transfer surplus real property to State wildlife conservation agencies, or to the Department of Interior in the case of migratory bird conservation, when such property is chiefly valuable for wildlife or migratory bird conservation purposes.

H.R. 13025 simply strikes the word "chiefly" from the act so that surplus Federal property can be transferred for wildlife management purposes upon a finding that it is valuable for such purposes.

This determination will continue to be made by the Administrator of General Services, and in the event such property should no longer be used for wildlife management purposes or is needed for national defense, title reverts to the United States.

The effect of this legislation will be to make more surplus Federal property available for wildlife management by placing this use on an equal footing with

other approved public uses of surplus property.

At this time when so much land is being converted to commercial and industrial use, the Federal holdings in military reservations and a variety of other areas constitute major reserves of relatively unspoiled land. This is particularly true in the Eastern States. This act, as amended today, will create an additional tool in our continuing efforts to preserve the greatest possible amount of wildlife refuge and conservation land in the face of ever-increasing commercial competition for our remaining open spaces.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge the passage of H.R. 13025.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13025, which would encourage the more extensive use of Federally owned property for wildlife conservation and recreation purposes. As a cosponsor of this measure and having testified before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee to urge its passage, I want to commend that committee for its prompt approval of this legislation. Commendation is also due the very able chairman of the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee—my good friend and colleague (Mr. DINGELL) for his guidance of this legislation to the floor of the House.

A rather restrictive interpretation by GSA of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act has resulted in the need for this corrective legislation. In the past, when land under the jurisdiction and control of a Federal agency was no longer required by that agency, GSA often proceeded to sell such land to private interests. This action was taken despite the fact that such agencies as the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Fish and Game Commission, and the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission—on which I serve along with Mr. DINGELL—have urged that these lands be set aside for wildlife and recreation purposes.

GSA felt justified in selling off this land because of a supposed requirement imposed by the 1949 act that the land be found to be "chiefly" valuable for wildlife conservation purposes. If no such finding was made, the land was summarily sold. The measure which the committee is considering would eliminate the word "chiefly" from the above mentioned act and thus close a loophole in its administration.

Hence this change will make it easier to transfer surplus land under Federal control to wildlife conservation and recreation uses. In view of the increasing shortage of lands for such purposes, I would hope that my colleagues in the chamber will promptly approve this measure.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13025.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13434) to increase the authorization for appropriation for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, as amended.

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 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1973 through 1977 the sum of $94,000,000 for continuation of work in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the Act approved December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress), as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs, as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved. No part of the funds hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be available to initiate construction of any unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, whether or not included in said comprehensive plan; nor for prosecution of the Garrison diversion unit, reauthorized by the Act of August 5, 1965 (79 Stat. 433).

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1343, to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. This bill is one of a series that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has brought to the House in alternate sessions since 1964—and my colleagues will be pleased to note that we can look forward to the eventual discontinuance of this procedure in the near future with a fairly high degree of assurance.

The measure authorized appropriations in the amount of $94,000,000 for use on a carefully limited number of units and divisions of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program for the fiscal years 1973 to 1977, inclusive. If the amounts authorized are not actually appropriated during this period, the authorization for the unappropriated portion will lapse. The activities for which the authorization is granted by H.R. 13434 are set forth in specific detail in our committee report which also carries the admonition that departures from the individual amounts, by more than 5 percent, must be justified in writing to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will practically complete a venture in water resource development that was characterized by an almost complete lack of responsible legislative overview. The programs that will be funded pursuant to this bill were authorized by name only, in a wartime, omnibus bill in 1944 which contained no plans, responsible estimates or legislative guidelines to control their development. After almost $1 billion was appropriated and spent, the Congress seized the opportunity, in 1964, to limit appropriations to such amounts as would be subsequently authorized in biennial authorizing acts—and to forbid the use of such authorized amounts in the initiation of any more new units. H.R. 13434 is one such biennial measure.

The amount authorized by this act will not completely finish the programs being developed under the 1944 legislation as present estimates indicate that there will be a requirement for approximately $20,000,000 to be authorized, subsequent to fiscal year 1977. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs gave a great deal of consideration to including this added amount in the present bill, as requested by the administration. We felt, however, that it was in the interest of all concerned that the option be preserved to the legislative committee to look at this program one more time; and that the interval of 5 years was a reasonable one in the circumstances.

The chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill will give additional facts concerning this legislation and its justification. Before yielding, however, I would like to emphasize that the legislation is appropriate, it has been carefully reviewed in the subcommittee and the full committee and deserves to be passed. Moreover, it should be passed at an early date to permit the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations to proceed with its work on the fiscal year 1973 budget in a timely manner.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply for a point of information. Recently we passed the Upper Colorado increased authorization for appropriations. It had a savings clause therein as to the cost of living fluctuation about which the gentleman and I remarked. My query is simply why is there no such saving clause in this additional authorization?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my understanding the amounts required are so definite that perhaps this is an exceptional one which is not likely to require during this legislation any need for any additional cost to be considered. However, it is my understanding that the language is identical.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. The purpose of H.R. 13434 is to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. For this purpose, the bill provides an appropriation authorization of $94 million for fiscal years 1973 to 1977.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended and supplemented, authorized a comprehensive plan of development which resulted in the construction of 33 multipurpose water resource development projects, costing $1,105 million to date. This bill provides the increased appropriation authority in the sum of $94 million to continue work on the 19 projects which have work remaining to be done. A further increase in appropriation authorization will be necessary after fiscal 1977, estimated at $20 million, to complete all the work remaining on units under the 1944 authorization.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1964, in the report on similar legislation, adopted the practice of a 2-year appropriation authorization program for projects authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944, for the purpose of legislative oversight, and required all units to be initiated after that date to be specifically authorized. In 1970, the committee requested the Secretary of the Interior to propose a program to complete all work remaining to be done and permit termination of biennial appropriation authorizations.

The administration on February 25, 1972, submitted an executive communication in accordance with the 1970 committee request, asking for an appropriation authorization of $114 million to complete work in the Pick-Sloan portion of the Missouri River Basin program.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in its wisdom, in reporting H.R. 13434, is departing from its 1970 position by authorizing the appropriation of $94 million of the $114 million requested and necessary to complete all work remaining to be done. The committee does so for the purpose of assuring "a measure of continuing legislative oversight with respect to the work—particularly that dealing with the transmission and marketing of hydroelectric power."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the committee recognize, at last, a point which I have continually emphasized and brought up in committee on similar legislation over the years, and that is, that the Federal power rates in the Missouri River Basin are not adequate to repay the Federal investments in the system within the 50-year period required by law. A recent report to the Congress by the General Accounting Office, dated February 28, 1972, on "Improvements Needed in Financial Activity of the Federal Hydroelectric System in the Missouri River Basin" states that the repayment deficiency could be $41.8 million or $131.2 million depending upon the method of amortization. A digest of the General Accounting Office report is as follows:

DIGEST

(Comptroller General's Report to the Congress)

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

In 1962 the General Accounting Office (GAO) made several recommendations for improving the accounting policies and practices of the Federal hydroelectric system in the Missouri River Basin. GAO made this follow-up review of the financial activities of the system to determine the adequacy of the current policies and practices.

The system consists of projects constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers, Civil Functions, Department of the Army.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Rate and repayment studies

Since 1963 the Bureau has not published annual rate and repayment studies showing whether electric power rates are adequate to repay the Federal investments in the system within the required 50 years. These studies should be published and should include comparisons of actual repayments with scheduled repayments established on an orderly basis.

GAO compared actual repayments with what the repayment would have been under two methods of amortization. Under a compound-interest method—requiring the lowest installment in the first year and progresssively increasing installments in each succeeding year—the deficiency in repayment would have been $41.8 million. Under a straight-line method—requiring equal annual installments—the deficiency would have been $131.2 million. (See p. 9.)

Consolidated financial statements

The Bureau does not prepare consolidated financial statements for the hydroelectric system. On the basis of information in the accounting records of the Bureau and the Corps, GAO prepared such statements for projects in the system. In GAO's opinion, however, the statements do not present fairly the financial position of projects in the system or the results of system operations, because the Bureau and the Corps recorded costs of similar items differently (see p. 13), because the Corps did not record revenues of about $138 million that had been allocated to the Corps projects by the Bureau (see p. 21), and because all costs applicable to all project purposes were not recorded (see p. 27).

Consolidated financial statements for the Federal hydroelectric system in the Missouri River Basin are needed for full disclosure of its financial condition and the results of its operations. (See p. 24.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

The Department of the Interior should publish annual rate and repayment studies for the Missouri River Basin Project, which should include comparisons of actual repayments of the Federal investment with scheduled repayments established on an orderly basis. (See p. 12.)

The Departments of the Interior and the Army should develop uniform and consistent accounting practices for the Federal power program.

The Department of the Interior also should prepare annual consolidated financial statements for the Federal hydroelectric system in the Missouri River Basin and should establish a formal departmental policy for all Federal power systems for allocating system revenues for repayment of the Federal investment in the various projects and for determining the investment base for computing interest payable to the U.S. Treasury (See p. 25.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Although the Department of the Interior agreed that consideration should be given to the practicability of publishing annual rate and repayment studies, it did not agree with the need for including comparisons of actual with scheduled repayments of the Federal investments. The Department stated that the additional scheduling of repayments "may or may not be useful to management." (See p. 11.)

GAO believes that a comparison of actual repayments of the Federal investment with scheduled repayments established on an orderly basis is needed for evaluating the adequacy of revenues in meeting repayment requirements. (See p. 12.)

The Army agreed—with one exception—to GAO's recommendations concerning the need for comparable and consistently applied accounting policies and practices (See pp. 18 and 20.)

The Department of the Interior agreed with the need for resolving differences in several accounting practices (see pp. 15, 18, and 22) and appointed a committee, comprising representatives of the Corps and the Bureau, to study financial reporting problems, with a view toward preparing an annual consolidated financial statement. (See p. 25.)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

This report contains no recommendations or suggestions requiring action by the Congress. It is submitted to inform the Congress of the financial operations of the Federal hydroelectric system in the Missouri River Basin and of our recommendations for corrective actions.

Mr. SPEAKER. In anticipation that our continuing legislative oversight will address this deficiency, I urge the rules be suspended and H.R. 13434 be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require to speak on behalf of H.R 13434 to increase the authorization for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

The gentleman from Colorado has explained the purpose of H.R. 13434, its background and its general policy provisions. I would like to endorse his remarks in these regards and point out the additional fact that enactment of the legislation is urgently needed to provide authorization for the amount of $8,840,000 which has been requested in the President's budget for fiscal year 1973—and which is now pending before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation conducted full and complete hearings on this measure. Our record indicates that the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this measure are the minimum amounts required to assure that an impressive inventory of water resource programs are brought to final completion. Hence, this bill could be characterized as representing a modest investment to make certain that the more than one billion dollars already invested by the Secretary of the Interior actually accomplishes the benefits and purposes for which it was spent.

The record shows that we have 19 remaining program elements requiring some additional work—and which will share in the $94,000,000 authorized by H.R. 13434. About two-thirds of this amount will go into completion, refining and strengthening of the power transmission and marketing system. This system is the high-voltage, background grid through which the Bureau of Reclamation distributes, to preference customers and others, more than 1 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power and from which it realizes a return of upward of $40 million annually.

The remaining requirement for about $34 million is needed to accomplish minor cleanup and drainage activities on 18 units of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin

development. This development, which has been under construction for more than 25 years, has resulted in facilities for service to 420,000 acres of irrigated land in nine States; for the delivery of 722,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water; and the generation of more than 400,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power. I believe that it can be said with complete safety that this program has done more to stabilize the economic and social health of the Great Plains and adjacent States than any other public undertaking in our time.

With the funds authorized by this act, other elements will be brought to operational status and the efficient functioning of those units now operational will be underwritten.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe very deeply in programs such as the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin development and therefore unhesitatingly recommend this measure to my colleagues. I therefore respectfully urge that the rules be suspended and that the bill H.R. 13434 be passed.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill H.R. 13434, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, authorizing an increase in appropriations of $94 million, for fiscal years 1973–77, for continuing work in the Pick-Sloan portion of the Missouri River Basin program.

The Pick-Sloan portion of the Missouri River Basin program was initiated by the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946. The Pick-Sloan portion of the Missouri River Basin program has resulted in the construction of 33 multipurpose water resource development projects. Fourteen of these projects are completed and 19 units have some remaining work to be done. The increased appropriations authorized by this legislation will be allocated to complete the work remaining on 19 projects leaving an estimated $20 million to be authorized for appropriation after fiscal 1977, to complete work on all units authorized by the Flood Control Acts.

The bill provides that the appropriation authorization of $94 million is subject to increases or decreases as required by changes in construction and engineering cost indices, and the amount authorized for appropriation will expire if not appropriated within the period authorized. The bill also provides that the appropriations authorized shall not be available to initiate construction or work on the Garrison division unit, authorized by the act of August 5, 1965.

The committee adopted two amendments to the bill. The first amendment reduces the administration request from $114 million over 5 years to $94 million over 5 years. The second amendment is an expansion of the limitation on the use of the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and H.R. 13434 be passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13434, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3284) to increase the authorization for appropriation for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3284

An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representative of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $114,000,000 to provide for completion of work in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the Act approved December 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs, as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved. No part of the funds hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be available to initiate construction of any unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, whether included in said comprehensive plan or not.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: Strike out all after enacting clause of S. 3284 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 13434, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 13434) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include extraneous matter with my remarks and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 978) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the University of Utah, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 978

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish, equip, operate, and maintain a metallurgy research center on approximately 35 acres of land located on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Utah, which facility will serve as a replacement facility for that now located on the campus of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

SEC. 2. To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums not to exceed $6,000,000 as may be necessary for the engineering, design, and construction of the research facility referred to in the first section of this Act, together with such equipment and apparatus, roads, and other improvements as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon completion of the research facility authorized herein, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the University of Utah the following described land situated on the campus of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City: Beginning at a point 480 feet south of the United States stone monument numbered 6 (monument numbered 6 is 876.31 feet south and 2,453.795 feet east, more or less, from the northwest corner of section numbered 4, township I south, range 1 east, Salt Lake meridian), running west 664.5 feet; thence north 640 feet; thence east 864.35 feet; thence south 0 degree, 00 minute, 50 seconds east 503.9 feet; thence south 55 degrees, 45 minutes, 00 second west 241.92 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning and containing 12.39 acres, more or less.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be subject to the condition that the State of Utah pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of the fixed improvements on such land to be conveyed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 978 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain a metallurgical research center on approximately 35 acres of land on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Utah, as a replacement for the present facility now located on the campus of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. The bill also provides for the sale of the fixed improvements, at fair market value, and the conveyance of approximately 12.39 acres of land ad-

jacent to the improvements, at no cost, to the university. The bill also authorizes not more than $6 million for the construction of the replacement facility.

As early as 1913, a Bureau of Mines laboratory and research facility was established on the campus of the University of Utah under a cooperative agreement under which the university provided quarters. In 1939, the Bureau started construction on 5 acres of land donated by the university. Subsequently, an additional 10 acres were obtained from the Department of the Army, and in 1958 the university exchanged 2.3 acres of its land for 5 acres of Federal land from the original 15 acres. The end result was the 12.39 acres on which the present Bureau of Mines facility is now located.

These present facilities are located in the middle of the university campus. The area is congested and provides insufficient space for future expansion. The land is also needed by the university for its own future expansion.

Recently, when certain public land within the Fort Douglas military withdrawal was declared surplus, some 35 acres were reserved as a site for a new research center for the Bureau of Mines. This tract, because of its larger size and better location, is ideally suited for the new facility.

S. 978 provides that upon completion of the new facility on the 35-acre tract, the site presently occupied by the Bureau of Mines, consisting of 12.39 acres, will be conveyed to the university without cost. However, the conveyance is conditioned upon payment by the State of Utah of the fair market value of all fixed improvements.

S. 978 authorizes not more than $6 million for the design and construction of the replacement facility.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly support S. 978, and I recommend its enactment.

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

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I have studied the report thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, and I have had some discussions on the floor and I have listened intently to my distinguished friend from Nevada's usual excellent explanation of what S. 978 does.

As I understand it, it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, acting for the U.S. Government, to establish and maintain a new metallurgical research center on about 5 acres of land at Fort Douglas as a replacement for a facility now located on the campus of the University of Utah which they originally gave to the Government for that purpose, amounting to about 12.39 acres, for which they will replace the cost of buildings at fair market value but for which the Federal taxpayer will spend an initial $6,000 in order to complete.

Is that a fair statement of the situation?

Mr. BARING. If the gentleman from Missouri will permit, I would like for the gentleman from Utah to answer this question for him.

Mr. LLOYD. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri this is land which was originally ceded to the State of Deseret and later the State of Utah and later occupied by Fort Douglas, and little by little this property has gone back to the University of Utah, so that now, instead of 5 acres, all but a 13-acre island is left there, which is very inadequate for the work to be done by the Bureau of Mines.

Fort Douglas itself has now been declared surplus, so that the Bureau of Mines has taken something like 35 acres where Fort Douglas now is and will eventually build a laboratory.

At such time as those facilities are replaced at the present Fort Douglas reservation, then this bill provides that the Federal Government will grant to the University of Utah only the land, which is something under 13 acres, and which originally was given to the State as a grant, anyhow, back in 1885.

However, as to the improvements, which are valued at somewhere in the neighborhood of $6 million, I believe, when that change is made, the fair market value of those improvements, the buildings, and so forth, will be paid to the U.S. Government. Just the fair market value of the improvements.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, quite outside of the question of whether we need to continue this research laboratory or not, in addition to the one at Rifle, Colo., and the institutes such as the University of Missouri School of Mines, and metallurgical research centers, and so forth, all I am interested in is being assured that either in kind or in fair market value the University or the State of Utah shall reimburse the Federal Government for all except the difference in improvements they will have as a result of this transfer.

Mr. LLOYD. That is specifically provided for in the bill, that the fair market value for all improvements will be paid by the State of Utah or by the University of Utah.

Mr. HALL. All we are doing is yielding 13 acres of land for the land which we presently own ourselves and which, of course, the State of Utah will not participate in?

Mr. LLOYD. As a matter of fact, it will not participate.

Mr. HALL. But, nevertheless, there has been fee simple ownership on the part of the U.S. Government and, so, we are making a generous gesture to the great State of Deseret as the gentleman so fondly likes to refer to it or to the State of Utah?

Mr. LLOYD. There may be, although I think there is a legal point that has not been legally contested as to whether or not the Federal Government is entitled to a fee simple title.

Mr. HALL. Is the gentleman claiming that there is a reverter clause herein?

Mr. LLOYD. The bill provides that the fair market value and all improvements, exclusive of the land, will be paid to the Federal Government.

Mr. HALL. I am talking about the fair market value of the land.

Mr. LLOYD. The land itself would be a direct grant.

Mr. HALL. That is what I thought.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 978. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain a metallurgical research center on approximately 35 acres of land of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, in the State of Utah. The new facility will be in lieu of the existing facility on the adjoining University of Utah campus. For the purpose of establishing and maintaining the new metallurgical research center, the bill provides for an appropriation authorization not to exceed $6 million.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, after completion of the new center, to convey to the University of Utah some 12.39 acres, more or less, upon which rests the present Bureau of Mines metallurgy research center. This Bureau of Mines facility was established in 1938 and made possible by a series of land grants between the University and the Federal Government. The bill provides that the conveyance is without compensation for the land but subject to payment of the fair market price of the fixed improvements.

The operation and maintenance of the present Bureau of Mines facility, which is located in a congested area of the university campus, is inhibiting the university's plans for expansion and future development. The conveyance authorized by this legislation will remedy this situation by removing the impediment to the university's future expansion and development plans and by providing the Federal Government with a new, modern, up-to-date metallurgical research facility.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement in support of S. 978. I have sponsored a companion bill in the House authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the University of Utah.

On February 21, 1855, the 33d Congress, Second Session, approved a land grant to the University of the State of Deseret—now the University of Utah. Ten months later the legislature of the territory of Utah granted and confirmed a campus tract of 560 acres for the university. Approximately 7 years later, in 1862, Col. Patrick Edward Connor of the U.S. Army led Federal troops in the Great Salt Lake Valley and established a camp east of Salt Lake City on the university grounds. Although designated by a rock wall and generally spoken of as "the university grounds" no university buildings as yet occupied the site. As the commanding officer of the 3d Infantry of California volunteers, he issued an order establishing Camp Douglas on a 4-square-mile tract at this point. On September 3, 1867 this was officially designated a military reservation by the President of the United States.

In the years since this time the Army and the U.S. Government have relinquished a major portion of this land and a great deal of it has been restored to the University of Utah. However, a small plot of nearly 13 acres located almost in the very center of the present University of Utah campus was retained by the Government for the establishment of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Laboratory facilities were constructed there by the Government in 1939. Supplementary buildings consisting of a garage, a shop building, and a warehouse were subsequently constructed. The U.S. Bureau of Mines facility has been, and still is, a welcome part of the university community. Actually, since 1913 the Bureau of Mines has been on the campus and until 1939 occupied a university building.

However, in the ensuing years since 1939 the university has experienced tremendous growth. It has surrounded the Bureau of Mines property with university buildings on three sides and contemplates additional development on the fourth side. Student automobile traffic contributes to what might be considered engulfment of the Bureau of Mines property by university activity.

In October of 1968 when the Army declared surplus a major portion of its Fort Douglas properties, the U.S. Bureau of Mines acquired 34 acres on what is designated as the Fort Douglas Rifle Range. This site is adjacent to the University of Utah campus and immediately contiguous to property acquired by the university for the establishment of a university research park. The establishment of this research park has the wholehearted cooperation and support of the Governor and the people of the State of Utah. Several industrial organizations are presently negotiating for site locations on the research park area. Planning is proceeding to designate a "mining area" which will lie contiguous to the new U.S. Bureau of Mines property.

The proposed legislation authorizes appropriations for a new Bureau of Mines facility, and provides for the sale of the existing U.S. Bureau of Mines improvements located on the University of Utah campus to the University of Utah at such time as the U.S. Bureau of Mines has obtained new facilities and is removed from its existing site.

Passage of this bill, then authorizes and implements a highly desirable and improved situation for the Bureau of Mines in the new location with adequate development space. The bill also provides for restoration of land to the university which the Government gave to it in 1855 and provides for the sale of existing improvements at a fair market value to the University of Utah.

It should be noted that in the report of the Department of Interior on this legislation, it was pointed out that the present facility is adequate for current program needs of the Bureau of Mines, and that the new facility authorized by this bill is based on anticipated future requirements. The funding of a replacement facility is subject to budget priorities that exist in the future.

I respectfully urge that this be approved by the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 978.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. BARING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 978.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11839) to amend the act of January 8, 1971—Public Law 91–660; 84 Stat. 1967—an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11839

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91–660; 84 Stat. 1967) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 2(a) revise the second sentence by deleting "one hundred thirty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "four hundred" and

(2) In section 11 delete "$3,120,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,462,000" and delete "$14,779,000 (1970 prices)" and insert "$17,774,000 (June 1970 prices)".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House at this time was introduced by our friend and colleague from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER). It is the product of his continuing effort to perfect the Gulf Islands National Seashore as a national outdoor recreation area for the people of the Nation.

BACKGROUND, EXPLANATION AND COST

As the Members of this Chamber will recall, during the last Congress, we approved the initial authorizing legislation for the Gulf Islands National Seashore which is located in the States of Mississippi and Florida. As originally conceived, the seashore included several island units along the Mississippi coast, as well as a small area on the mainland which was needed for administrative purposes.

This legislation focuses exclusively on the Mississippi mainland unit. Present law provides that the maximum size of that unit of the seashore shall not exceed 135 acres. Of that amount, it was anticipated that the State of Mississippi would donate about 59 acres from its parklands located in the Davis Bayou and about 72 acres was to be purchased from private landowners. Instead of donating only 59 acres, however, the State legislature agreed to make available the entire State park—consisting of 266 acres—without cost.

If this donation is accepted, then the acquisition program for this unit would be significantly altered. It would no longer be necessary to acquire the privately owned lands originally needed for the administrative facilities, since they could be constructed on the donated lands, but about 100 acres of land would have to be acquired for the construction of an appropriate access roadway into the area; consequently, while we are increasing the size of the basic unit by donation, there will also be an increased cost for land acquisition. It is estimated that these additional acquisition costs will total $342,000. This money, of course, would be appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The anticipated development of the area would also have to be revised if H.R. 11839 is enacted into law. Instead of locating only the basic administrative facilities at the mainland site, the development concept would be enlarged to include interpretive and other public facilities for visitors in the area. The incremental costs associated with these development changes is expected to total approximately $2,995,000.

The principal advantages of this revised program, Mr. Speaker, are:

First, it will remove all possibility of duplication and conflict of services and facilities in side-by-side Federal-State areas.

Second, it will enable the National Park Service to develop facilities and to provide an interpretive program in an area accessible on a year-round basis for the visiting public.

Third, it will provide a more suitable land base for the mainland unit of the seashore.

CONCLUSION

In short, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11839 offers us an opportunity to improve upon the work of the 91st Congress. Naturally, few worthwhile programs of this kind can be accomplished without increased costs, but in terms of future public needs at this seashore, I am convinced that this will be a great improvement and a sound investment.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am pleased to recommend the enactment of this legislation to my colleagues and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend the act establishing Gulf Islands National Seashore, Public Law 91–660, in order that the Secretary of the Interior will have the requisite authority to accept the State of Mississippi's generous offer to transfer all of the Magnolia State Park to the Federal Government for national seashore purposes.

The State park consists of 266 acres, which is 131 acres more than the Secretary is presently authorized to acquire. In addition to the State park, a National Park Service study indicates that the acquisition of about 100 acres of contiguous private lands would round out the park unit, provide a more manageable unit, and permit the construction of an appropriate parkway connection to U.S. Highway 90 from the park, a distance of about 1 mile. Not incidentally, acquisition of the additional lands here authorized will remove the necessity to acquire five year-round residences and 59 acres, originally planned for acquisition.

The mile long parkway connection will provide safe and easy public access to the park. Donation of the Magnolia State Park will permit development of visitor facilities at a central location and the additional acreage will provide space for the development of environmental educational opportunities at an easily accessible year-round locale.

To accomplish these goals, H.R. 11839 authorizes the appropriation of an additional $342,000 for land acquisition and increases the amount of land authorized to be acquired from 135 to 400 acres.

I think it well to emphasize a point made in the report accompanying this bill—that the lands originally contemplated for acquisition but which will not be acquired if this bill is enacted will offset part of the cost of right-of-way acquisition for the proposed parkway.

Development costs too must be increased in order to construct the necessary highway connection and visitor facilities at the park. H.R. 11839 authorizes an increase in funds to be appropriated for development purposes to $17,774,000, an increase of $2,995,000.

The Department of the Interior has recommended enactment of this legislation. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs carefully considered this legislation and recommends enactment with only minor amendments.

The generosity of the State of Mississippi and development and management of the Seashore by the U.S. Park Service in its usual fine manner will enhance the visitor's experience at Gulf Island National Seashore. I urge that the rules be suspended and the bill do pass.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H.R. 11839 by Representative COLMER) would modify the Gulf Islands National Seashore Act enacted by the 91st Congress.

This legislation is not complex. It simply expands the authorized size of the mainland unit of the Mississippi portion of the seashore from a maximum of 135 acres to 400 acres. In conformity with this change, it authorizes a revised appropriation ceiling for land acquisition and development.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

As the Members of the House will recall, Mr. Speaker, the Gulf Islands National Seashore was to be composed of various island components and mainland bases in the States of Mississippi and Florida. On the Mississippi end of the seashore, the mainland unit was limited to no more than 135 acres—including approximately 59 acres of donated State park land and about 72 acres of adjacent privately owned lands. In this area, essential administrative facilities were to be developed.

At the time that we considered the authorizing legislation, however, the committee recommended and the Congress approved the deletion of an expensive offshore area—Cat Island—from the Mississippi portion of the seashore. Although some of the public facilities contemplated for the area were to be located in that area, no corresponding changes were made in the legislation to locate them elsewhere, because it could not then be determined where they should be relocated.

Since the enactment of the authorizing legislation, the legislature of the State of Mississippi has authorized the donation of its entire State park, rather than just the 59 acres originally contemplated. By that action, the State has made it possible for the Federal Government to install all of the needed public facilities on donated lands in the mainland unit. Not only will this solve the problem of providing the needed interpretive facilities, but it will eliminate the need to acquire the 72 acres which were to be purchased for the administrative facilities. In addition, it will make it possible for the basic public facilities to be located where they will be reasonably accessible throughout the year, instead of on a relatively remote island accessible only by water.

COST

Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, all of the parklands will be donated so that the entire Magnolia State Park—consisting of 266 acres—can be acquired without cost. It will be necessary, however, to improve access to this area from the existing highway network.

While it will be unnecessary for the National Park Service to acquire the 72 acres of privately owned land contemplated originally, it will be necessary to purchase about 100 acres of lands for the construction of the access roadway. For this reason, the bill provides for the appropriation of an additional $342,000 for land acquisition purposes.

The development of the additional public facilities within this unit, including the construction of the access parkway, will undoubtedly be funded over a period of years. At present estimated costs of construction, all of the additional development can be accomplished for $2,995,000. If enacted as recommended, H.R. 11839 will increase the appropriation limitation for development by this amount.

CONCLUSION

I am pleased to support the bill introduced by my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER). He has worked long and hard to make this seashore a reality and I think that we owe him our appreciation for his efforts in successfully convincing the State to donate this additional land.

By increasing the acreage limitation so as to accept the donation of Magnolia State Parks; by improving the road access as planned; by carrying out the development program made possible by the Magnolia Park donation, we are making the Gulf Islands Seashore Area a finer and more useful facility, and we are placing it in position to better serve the visiting public in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 11839, as amended.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to present this statement in behalf of H.R. 11839, which provides for amendments to the Gulf Islands National Seashore authority. This bill, in the nature of an amendment to Public Law 91–660, calls basically for the acquisition of additional State-owned lands and some private lands on the mainland of Mississippi, and for the related minimal additional acquisition and development costs.

It will be recalled that the National Park Service originally requested 135 acres maximum on the Mississippi mainland to be used for the principal visitors center and headquarters. In order to hold down the overall cost of the project, we were able to induce the State of Mississippi to donate, free of cost, some of this necesssary acreage which is located in the vicinity of Ocean Springs, Miss., to the U.S. Government.

However, in so doing, the value of the property, which is Magnolia State Park, as a State facility, would be minimized if not lost as such since the conveyance of the maximum of 135 acres requested by the National Park Service would only include 59 acres of this park property. With this in mind, the Mississippi State Legislature passed a bill authorizing the transfer of the entire Magnolia State Park, consisting of 226 acres to the U.S. Government. It should be noted that this property is beach front acreage and, therefore, some of the more valuable of the gulf coast properties.

This amendment would eliminate the need to acquire some private lands previously included and would include other private lands, not designated in the original 135 acres, necessary for the development of the center, and a safe and adequate access road leading from the park to Mississippi Highway 90. The present owners of the private lands involved have been contacted and they are in agreement with these proposed changes. H.R. 11839 would further provide for the necessary additional acquisition funds in the amount of $342,000 and for the addition of $2,995,000 in development funds.

A great deal of work has been done on the Gulf Islands National Seashore project. The land acquisition work has been listed as a priority matter during 1972, with some of this action being underway. Since the largest portion of the property to be acquired by the National Park Service is owned by the State of Mississippi, particularly as regards the area to be developed as the main visitors center, this legislation is essential to the orderly development of this seashore project.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I request favorable consideration of this bill which will bring to final consummation the preservation of these barrier islands along the Mississippi and Florida coasts for the full enjoyment of the present and future generations as the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11839, a bill which would amend the act establishing the Gulf Islands National Seashore in the States of Florida and Mississippi.

Last Congress, legislation establishing this National seashore became Public Law 91–660. Approximately 18,082 acres of land, including several offshore islands, in both Florida and Mississippi were designated seashore lands to be preserved, developed and used for recreation. At that time, it was estimated that the lands needed to be acquired could be obtained for $3,120,000 and that development of the seashore would require an investment of $14,799,000. The original development plan contemplated that 135 acres on the Mississippi mainland would be acquired to establish a park headquarters and the principal visitor center for the seashore.

The State of Mississippi agreed to donate its lands, but found that in doing so its State Park property would be diminished by 59 acres seriously diminishing the value of the remaining State Park property. The State, therefore, has generously agreed to donate all of its Magnolia State Park to the Federal Government for National Seashore use.

The National Park Service has studied this proposal and has revised its planning for this section of the seashore to include the entire Magnolia State Park. In doing so, planners found that existing road connections from the State Park to a nearby interstate highway were insufficient to accommodate the expected seashore visitation and therefore have proposed the construction of a new 1-mile parkway connection. Incidentally, planners found that 5 year-round homesites, previously slated for acquisition, could remain under this new plan.

Public Law 91–660 limits the Secretary's authority to acquire lands for administrative purposes to 135 acres. One principal purpose of this bill is to amend that law to increase that acreage limitation to 400 acres thereby providing the Secretary with the authority requisite to accept the State's condition of its 266 acre park and to acquire the necessary right of way for the mile long parkway. The other purposes of this bill is to amend Public Law 90–660 to increase the appropriations ceilings therein contained. The ceiling on land acquisitions will be increased by $342,000 and on development by $2,995,000. Development cost increases are due principally to parkway construction costs and increased visitor and administrative facilities.

These amendments to the Gulf Islands National Seashore Act are needed in order that the seashore may be properly developed for projected annual visitations in excess of 10 million people. I am confident that with the additional authority contained in this bill, Gulf Islands National Seashore will be developed in such a manner that visitor experience will be truly exceptional. I therefore urge your support for passage of H.R. 11839.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this legislation, H.R. 11839.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11839, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the futher consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3153) to amend the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91–660; 84 Stat. 1967), an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3153

An act to amend the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91–660; 84 Stat. 1967), an Act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91–660; 84 Stat. 1967), is amended by deleting from the second sentence of section 2(a), "one hundred thirty-five," and inserting in lieu thereof "four hundred," and by deleting from section 11, "$3,120,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,462,000," and by deleting "$14,779,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$17,774,000 (June 1970 prices)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3153, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11839, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11839) was laid on the table.

PUUKOHOLA HEIAU NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, HAWAII

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1462) to provide for the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to restore and preserve in public ownership the historically significant temple associated with Kamehameha the Great, who founded the historic Kingdom of Hawaii, and the property of John Young who fought for Kamehameha the Great during the period of his ascendancy to power, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or purchase with donated funds, such lands and interests in lands, together with structures and improvements thereon, not to exceed one hundred acres, in the vicinity of Kawaihae, Hawaii, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Boundary Map, Proposed Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site," numbered 20,002, dated February 1970, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Washington, District of Columbia. The Secretary of the Interior may from time to time revise the boundaries of the proposed historic site, but the total acreage of the site shall not exceed one hundred acres.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall establish the area as the "Puukhohola Heiau National Historic Site" at such time as he deems sufficient interests in lands have been acquired to constitute an administrable unit. Pending and after establishment, the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site shall be administered, developed, preserved, and maintained in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the acreage limitation contained in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, or exchange, such additional lands and interests therein outside the boundary of the site as he deems necessary to relocate portions of State and county roads which are currently within the boundary of the site, and he may construct roadways on the lands so acquired and convey the same, subject to such terms and conditions as he deems necessary, to the State of Hawaii or its appropriate political subdivision. Any relocation of State and county roads shall be undertaken in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary and the State or county concerned, which shall provide, among other things, for the continued maintenance of the relocated portions of road by such State or county.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed, however, $1,040,600 (May 1971 prices) for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to recommend to the Members of the House a bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

H.R. 1462 provides for the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site on the Island of Hawaii. If approved, this new unit of the National Park System will include three important Hawaiian temples—including Puukohola Heiau, which is perhaps the most famous temple of all of the Islands—and the house which belonged to John Young.

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

This area is closely associated with the life and times of Kamehameha the Great, who rose to power near the end of the 18th century and who succeeded in uniting all of the various chiefdoms in the area into the Kingdom of Hawaii. It is generally concluded that this historic accomplishment made it possible for Hawaii to remain free of foreign domination until its annexation to the United States.

Hawaiian history of the temples in this proposed historic site indicates that King Kamehameha constructed Puukohola Heiau and dedicated it in 1791 to his war god. Subsequent to the dedication—which included the sacrifice of the body of his chief rival for control of the Island of Hawaii—Kamehameha consolidated his control over Hawaii, reconquered the other islands, and ultimately established the kingdom which he and his sons and grandsons ruled successively until 1872.

COST

Because of its association with the history of the people of Hawaii, this area is considered to offer a prime opportunity for the interpretation of the early Hawaiian culture and history. Except perhaps for the modest costs which might arise as the result of the relocation of two roadways that presently traverse the proposed site, land acquisition costs are nil. All of the lands directly involved are owned by the Queen's Medical Center or by the State of Hawaii and are to be made available without cost. Other than the usual costs for operation and maintenance, the investment in this site will be limited to the development of necessary public facilities and to the restoration, stabilization, and protection of the historic improvement located within the historic site. Under the terms of the bill, appropriations for this purpose are limited to no more than $1,040,600.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1462, as amended, offers us an outstanding opportunity to provide for the preservation and interpretation of an area of great historic interest. It will help tell the story of the evolution of this part of our Nation to the visiting public and it will contribute to the overall historic panorama presented in the various units of our national park system.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1462, as amended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this proposal to establish an historic site on the Island of Hawaii in our 50th State—H.R. 1462 seeks to preserve and interpret a significant part of Hawaiian history through restoration and stabilization of a grouping of Heiaus, or temples and associated structures.

There are three temples. Puukohola, the most commanding temple and the one for which this proposed national historic site will be named, and the one built in 1791 by King Kamehameha, stands on a hill overlooking Kawaihae Harbor. Lower on the hill, between Puukohola and the shore, is another temple, Mailekini, which Kamehameha repaired at the time he constructed Puukohola. Just off shore, now under water, is the third temple, dedicated to shark gods. Nearby, are the remains of the home of an Englishman, John Young, an adviser and confidant, who later became Governor of the island.

H.R. 1462 AUTHORIZES THE ACQUISITION OF UP TO 100 ACRES

Not incidentally, the impact of enactment of this bill and establishment of this historic site will be to create a large open space of about 77 acres within a developing resort community on Hawaii's south Kohala coast, adjacent to an established county park.

Major changes proposed and authorized by this bill include removal of roads and other development not in keeping with the purposes of the historic site; construction of facilities for visitor accommodation and interpretation of these unique ruins; and, as has been indicated, restoration and stabilization of the temples and associated structures. Most of the acreage, three-fourths in fact, including the shoreline will remain open space and be restored as nearly as can be to the condition it was in 1791 when King Kamehameha offered his chief opponent for control of the Hawaii Isles as a sacrifice to his war gods at Puukohola.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs carefully considered this legislation, holding hearings here in Washington during December of 1971 and field hearings on Hawaii during January of this year. The committee has recommended enactment of the legislation with its usual amendment limiting the amounts authorized to be appropriated—in this case, authorizations are only necessary for development costs as the owners of the acreage and structures within the boundaries of this proposed site have indicated that they will donate their holdings.

I have seen the good work the National Park Service has done at City of Refuge National Historic Park, in the State of Hawaii. This bill offers the promise of added opportunity to preserve and interpret Hawaii's unique history. More than 250,000 visitors are expected annually at this proposed addition to our national parks system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and that H.R. 1462 do pass.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Just for information, I would like to know if the distinguished gentleman, the ranking minority member, the chairman, or our colleague from Hawaii could locate this particular area, the Puukohola Heiau area? Is it the one down on the big island near the City of Refuge?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is on the big island, it is not near the City of Refuge? It is over on the other side of the island. This place is, as near as history can tell us, probably the most important spot so far as the people of Hawaii themselves are concerned and their historic tying together and becoming a nation, because it was at this point Kamehameha was finally voted King of the entire islands.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it near the city of Hilo itself or is it up on the islands above the waterfalls?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is not, it is on the opposite side or the dry side of the island.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I notice it says that there would be three fish ponds and a toboggan slide. Are these all together or is this another bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; they are all together. This is a part of what has happened in the development of their culture and this is a shining example.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps I have the wrong bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. You have the wrong bill. The next one is the one which discusses the study.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, that is the next bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. The next bill discusses that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House is one which was introduced by our colleague from Hawaii, the Honorable PATSY T. MINK. It provides for the establishment of the Puukohola National Historic Site on the Island of Hawaii.

BACKGROUND

If H.R. 1462 is enacted, it will provide authority for the protection and stabilizatin of Hawaii's most famous Beiau or temple—Puukohola Heiau. This temple is a massive structure built of lava stones. It was constructed or reconstructed by Kamehameha the Great and and dedicated by him to his war god. At the time of its dedication. King Kamehameha consolidated his political control over the Island of Hawaii by offering 11 human sacrifices to the gods—the principal one being the body of his primary rival for control over the island. This event in history is considered to be the beginning of the unification of all of the various chiefdoms, scattered

throughout the islands, into the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Closely flanking Puukohola Heiau are two other temples which were probably constructed in earlier times. In addition the house of John Young, an Englishman closely associated with King Kamehameha, is located nearby and will add a different perspective to the historic interpretation of the area.

The historic value of this site has been recognized for many years. In 1962, the Secretary's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments classified the area as having national significance and in 1966 Puukohola was dedicated as a national historic landmark.

Combining the historical association of the various structures on the site with its commanding view overlooking Kawaihae Harbor will provide the National Park Service with an outstanding opportunity to interpret the early history of the Hawaiian kingdom for the visiting public.

COST

Except for lands which may possibly be acquired for the relocation of roadways that presently cross the proposed historic site, no land acquisition costs are involved. The lands involved are presently owned by the State of Hawaii and by the Queen's Medical Center and will be conveyed to the United States without cost.

There will, however, be some costs associated with the development of the area. The relocation of the roadways, the construction of visitor facilities, and the restoration, rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic structures is expected to require an investment of slightly more than $1 million. Such an investment will, of course, be spread over a period of years and can be justified by its contribution to a site which will add a new dimension to the story being told throughout the country in our National Park System.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of visiting this area and seeing it first hand. In addition, I have seen what the National Park Service can do—and is doing—with sites such as these. I think that this legislation offers the Members of the House an outstanding opportunity to preserve a little bit of the culture of the past which all Americans would like to have an opportunity to better understand.

It is a pleasure for me to support the bill of my friend and colleague from Hawaii and I urge the adoption of H.R. 1462 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1462, legislation to authorize the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site on the Island of Hawaii. The land is to be donated free of charge to the Federal Government.

This site is of great historical importance to the people of Hawaii. Its significance is due to the close association of this area with the rise to power of King Kamehameha the Great. Kamehameha was the great chief who united the entire Hawaiian island chain into one kingdom. He is looked upon as the Father of the Hawaiian Kingdom. He is considered to be the single most important person in the history of the Hawaiian people. His statute may be viewed in our Capitol's Statuary Hall.

The area with which this legislation is concerned contains four significant structures which are in remarkably good condition and will lend themselves well to restoration. Three of the structures are heiaus—or sacred temples—and one is the remains of the historic John Young house which is the finest example of an early Western-type structure constructed in the islands.

Puukohola Heiau is the main temple. It was built by Kamehemeha the Great and dedicated by him to his war god, Kukailimoku, in 1791. According to accounts of the dedication, several human sacrifices were offered to the war god, including Kamehameha's chief rival for power. This temple is one of the most famous in the islands and certainly one of the most important, for it is closely associated with his ascendancy toward power and eventual control of all the islands.

A second heiau or temple is the Mailekini Heiau, located a short distance away. It is mentioned prominently in legends concerning earlier Hawaiian history which was never recorded. In Kamehameha's reign it served as a religious site. Priest and chiefs were situated nearby, and it is said that Kamehameha occasionally retired to these sacred grounds. Human sacrifices were never permitted at this temple. There is also an undersea heiau just off shore which will also be part of this historic site.

A third significant structure, the house of John Young, offers evidence that it was one of the first Western structures in the islands. John Young, an Englishman, became the most important foreign adviser to Kamehameha and helped him to conquer and unite the islands. Kamehameha appointed him Governor of the big Island of Hawaii, which he ruled from 1802 to about 1812.

This bill represents a rare opportunity for the Federal Government to acquire an extremely important historical area at virtually no cost for land acquisition. The land for this site is presently owned by the State of Hawaii and the Queen's Medical Center, a private nonprofit organization. The lands are being offered as a donation since both owners are very interested in seeing this important area preserved for future generations. Adoption of this legislation is necessary to assure acceptance by the Federal Government of the donated lands.

Development costs for the site, including restoration and visitor facilities, are estimated to be $1,040,600, of which $820,600 is programed for expenditure during the first 5 years after enactment. This is an extremely modest investment for such a significant addition to our national historic sites system.

The historical importance of the area has already been attested to by the Federal Government. The area was designated as a Registered National Historic Landmark in 1966. Its designation as a National Historic Site will enable its protection and preservation for future generations.

All those who are in any way associated with this site are enthusiastic in support of the bill. It is supported by the administration. The owners of the land clearly recognize the need for the bill and have generously offered this valuable site as a donation. I urge passage of this measure.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1462 the purpose of which is to restore and preserve a historically significant Heiau, or temple, built by King Kamehameha the Great, the founder of the Kingdom of Hawaii, the property of John Young, an Englishman, who aided Kamehameha in his rise to power, and other assocated structures all of which are in close proximity, located on the Island of Hawaii. I understand that the king, in dedicating his newly constructed temple, offered the remains of his chief rival for control of the Island of Hawaii, as a sacrifice to Kukailimoku, his war god. To paraphrase Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in those days there certainly was no substitute for victory.

The temple is located on a hill, 135 feet high and commands an excellent view of the west coast of Hawaii. It is a massive structure made of piled lava rocks measuring 100 feet by 224 feet. Partial restoration of the structure has been completed and it is open to the general public. From the top of the temple, one can see another temple of the high-walled-court-type, also in good repair, and yet another temple which is partially submerged in the sea.

H.R. 1462 would insure an open space of about 77 acres, encompassing these historical structures, within a developing resort community on Hawaii's south Kohala coast. Significantly, all of the lands within the proposed site will be donated by the Queens Medical Center and the State of Hawaii. The only costs associated with land acquisition will be those required for administrative expenses and the Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 which are estimated at $6,500. H.R. 1462 limits appropriations for development to $1,040,600 plus or minus fluctuations in construction costs indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved. That figure conforms to departmental estimates submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The principal developments proposed for the historical site will be reconstruction of the Puukohola Heiau, stabilization of the other temples and construction of a visitor center. A State highway and a county road now cutting through the proposed site will be relocated.

The historical significance of the proposed site has already been recognized. The principal temple was dedicated as a national historic landmark in 1966. The Secretary of Interior's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Build-

ings and Monuments has reported that it heartily endorses this proposal and believes it to be a splendid opportunity to interpret the military and political ascendancy of Kamehameha the Great and the formation of the Kingdom of Hawaii. In that connection, I understand that the Bishop Museum, which has played a significant role in research and preservation of Hawaiian archaelogical, historical and natural resources, plans to establish a combination interpretive and research center adjacent to Puukohola.

I think this site will be a valuable addition to our National Parks system and I urge the support of my colleagues for the passage of this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 1462.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. TAYLOR), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1462, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING A STUDY OF THE SITE OF HONOKOHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL LANDMARK, HAWAII

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11774) to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11774

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii encompasses unique and nationally significant cultural, historical, and archeological resources and believes that it may be in the national interest for the United States to preserve and interpret those resources for the education and inspiration of present and future generations. The Congress further believes that it is appropriate that the preservation and interpretation at that site be managed and performed by native Hawaiians, to the extent practical, and that training opportunities be provided such persons in management and interpretation of those cultural, historical, and achaeological resources.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall study the feasibility and desirability of establishing as a part of the national park system an area, not to exceed one thousand five hundred acres, comprising the site of Honokohau National Historic Landmark and adjacent waters.

(b) As a part of such study other interested Federal agencies, and State and local bodies and officials shall be consulted, and the study shall be coordinated with other applicable planning activities.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall submit to the President and the Congress within one year after the effective date of this Act, a report of the findings resulting from the study. The report of the Secretary shall contain, but not be limited to, findings with respect to the historic, cultural, archeological, scenic, and natural values of the resources involved and recommendations for preservation and interpretation of those resources, including the role of native Hawaiians relative to the management and performance of that preservation and interpretation and the providing to them of training opportunities in such management and performance.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Honokohau Study Advisory Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist at the time of submission of the Secretary's report to the President and the Congress.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members, at least ten of whom shall be native Hawaiians, appointed by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Two members, one of whom will be appointed from recommendations made by each of the United States Senators representing the State of Hawaii, respectively;

(2) Two members, one of whom will be appointed from recommendations made by each of the United States Representatives for the State of Hawaii, respectively;

(3) Five public members, who shall have knowledge and experience in one or more fields as they pertain to Hawaii, of history, ethnology, anthropology, culture, and folklore and including representatives of the Bishop Museum, the University of Hawaii, and organizations active in the State of Hawaii in the conservation of resources, to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Hawaii;

(4) Five members to be appointed from recommendations made by local organizations representing the native Hawaiian people; and

(5) One member to be appointed from recommendations made by the mayor of the county of Hawaii.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the making of the study.

SEC. 5. During the period commencing with enactment of this Act and ending with submission of the Secretary's report to the President and the Congress and any necessary completion of congressional consideration of recommendations included in that report (1) no department or agency of the United States shall, without prior approval of the Secretary, assist by loan, grant, license, or otherwise in the implementation of any project which, in the determination of the Secretary, would unreasonably diminish the value of cultural, historical, archeological, scenic, or natural resources relating to lands or waters having potential to comprise the area referred to in section 2(a) of this Act and (2) the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall not, without prior approval of the Secretary, undertake or assist by license or otherwise the implementation of any project which, in the determination of the Secretary, would diminish the value of natural resources located within one-quarter mile of the lands and waters having potential to comprise that area.

SEC. 6. The term "native Hawaiian", as used in this Act, means any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to the year 1778.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H.R. 11774) was cosponsored by our colleagues from Hawaii, Representatives MINK and MATSUNAGA.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

This legislation contains three key elements:

First, it authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the area on the Island of Hawaii known as the Honokohau Settlement National Historic Landmark. The purpose of this study is to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in the landmark area.

Second, it creates an advisory commission to consult with the Secretary during the course of study.

Third, it prohibits any Federal agency from aiding by loan, grant, permit, license, or otherwise any activity which would directly affect the values at the site.

NEED

As we all know, specific authorization of studies of this kind is not required; however, from time to time, the Congress has found that this procedure evokes action that would otherwise be delayed. In this case, testimony before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation indicated that it was unlikely that this study would commence in the foreseeable future, notwithstanding the fact that development plans in the area clearly contemplate the disruption of the values found there. The enactment of this legislation does not commit the Congress to any course of action in the future, but it does assure us of an opportunity to consider the merits of a possible program to preserve the values existing in this area.

While no legislation is required in order to conduct a study of this kind, the other two features of the bill could not be accomplished without enabling legislation. It seems highly appropriate for the native Hawaiian people to have an opportunity to contribute to this study and for this reason H.R. 11774

authorizes the creation of an advisory commission whose members would serve without compensation. It also seems logical to establish, in effect, a moratorium on Federal activities which might result in diminishing the historical and cultural values within the landmark area before the Congress has an opportunity to evaluate its potential as a future unit of the national park system.

On this latter point, Mr. Speaker, I might add that I directed a letter to the Secretary of the Army requesting that the Corps of Engineers take no action on any permits which would alter the character of this area until this legislation could be considered. In response, I received from the Secretary a letter agreeing to withhold action while this legislation is under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD at this point my letter to the Secretary and his reply to me:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1971.

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary, U.S. Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On December 2, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation conducted hearings on H.R. 11774. As a result of those hearings, it was learned that an application is pending before the Corps of Army Engineers with respect to certain developments in the vicinity of the Honokohau historic area.

In view of the Congressional interest in conducting a comprehensive study of this area, I am taking this opportunity to request that action on the application be deferred pending a decision on the legislation.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1972.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Secretary of the Army, I am replying to your recent letter regarding an application to the Corps of Engineers for a permit to construct in navigable waters within the Honokohau Historic Area, Hawaii.

I have forwarded your letter to the Division Engineer, Pacific Ocean Division, and requested that he defer action on the application pending a decision on the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. CLARKE,
Lieutenant General, U.S.A.,
Chief of Engineers.

THE AREA

Mr. Speaker, several members of the committee have inspected the area involved in this legislation and field hearings were conducted concerning it. It is my understanding, although I am not personally present, that a large number of witnesses expressed great interest in the preservation of this area. While those who propose to develop these lands apparently have attempted to take into consideration the values of the area in their overall plan, it is apparent that some features of their program would disrupt the historical and cultural values for which the historic landmark was established.

CONCLUSION AND COST

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will be hearing more about this matter in the future, but at the present time the committee does not have—and the Department of the Interior has not developed—the basic data that is necessary in order to determine if a unit of the national park system should be located in this region. This is the information which H.R. 11774 requires the Secretary to develop and to submit to us so that we can make our decision on the basis of solid facts. The cost of the study is limited by the bill to no more than $50,000—a relatively modest investment in comparison with the land values in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to approve H.R. 11774, as amended.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says the establishment of this Commission is in no wise a commitment to anything, and then a few words later my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, says we will probably be hearing more about this.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think, if I may say to my friend, he must keep in mind that we have two commissions involved in this. We have the Board of the U.S. National Park Historic Sites. There is the provision for the Commission in this bill which, as I understand it, will be composed mostly of people of Hawaii who have their wish to find certain information before any decision is made. So two steps will be necessary before there is any direction to the Congress of the United States. The first would be the participation by the Board or Commission referred to in this legislation, and the second would be the study and factfinding decision by the National Historic Sites Board itself before any legislation would come to us.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to observe it will be the reddest letter day in the history of the Congress when we appoint a commission for a purpose of this kind and then that does not involve any kind of commitment, implied or otherwise. I say again that will be a great big red letter day in Congress when we do not hear from them.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have known of one or two commissions making studies, concerning which I wish I could get more emphasis, information, or interest.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11774, a bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the National Park System in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historic Landmark in the State of Hawaii.

The National Historic Landmark for which this bill authorizes a study is located on the west coast of the Island of Hawaii. It was designated as such in December of 1962.

Within the landmark area are a significant number of archeological sites. There are 50 ancient house sites, four heiaus, or temples, one of the few remaining holas or toboggan slides, several tombs, and three fish ponds. One fish pond, Kaloko Fish Pond, because of its size, excellent canoe landings, and sheltered location was in productive use until 1929. One of the heiaus, or temples, consists of two great upright stone slabs. These slabs, I am told, served as fishermen's gods. Scattered among the ruins and ancient lava beds are many petroglyphs and what many today assume were bathing pools. There are also the remains of royal highways traversing the lava beds. In short, there are the tangible remains of a highly civilized ancient culture, unique to this country.

The Kaloka Fish Pond and Honokohau have become the focal point of citizens of Hawaii and of this Nation concerned with preserving the vestiges of ancient Hawaiian culture. The site too has become a focal point of those intent upon developing the residential, commercial, and recreational potentials inherent in the Island of Hawaii.

Parenthetically, you might wonder what historical significance there is in a toboggan slide.

The State of Hawaii has approved plans for a major recreational development which would encompass the Honokohau National Historic Landmark and the lands along the coast have been zoned for such development. Here, progress threatens to destroy that which some think worthy of protection. And, in the minds of others, development is being impeded by overzealous protectors of a long past and heretofore forgotten culture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a comment to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, who asked in some prior bill whether or not it had toboggan slides. I would like to remind the gentleman from Iowa that these slides were used by high-caste or princely Hawaiians to demonstrate their daring and to settle political disputes and rivalry. In the older days these slides were very similar to the ones we might find now in a modern ski area, but with, however, quite a great deal of difference.

A slide was built of stone and was several hundred feet long, much like those used on today's winter games, except that it was covered with straw, greased, in a straight line and ended in the sea. On both sides, there were natural hazards such as sharp lava rock. A winning tobogganer, or survivor, generally was assured that there would be no minority views to distract from his own.

The resolution of the apparent con-

flict is not within the scope of this legislation. The purpose of this legislation is to determine the feasibility and desirability of preserving and interpreting that which is there and is worthy of preserving and interpreting. I feel sure that the passage of this bill and the execution of the study authorized by this bill is the sort of progress that will not and should not unnecessarily impede development of other equally desirable objectives.

The Department of the Interior has stated that the Secretary already has the authority under existing law to conduct studies such as this, and that, therefore, no new legislation is required. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers that passage of this legislation will serve to catalyze that procedure. This bill specifically directs initiation of the study. More importantly, this bill authorizes the appointment of a predominantly Hawaiian advisory committee to advise and consult with the Secretary during the course of the study. This bill also contains a measure of insurance to prevent activities which might adversely affect the site pending determination of the central issue: Whether to add the site as an additional unit of the National Park System—$50,000 is authorized to be appropriated for study purposes and, as is noted on the report accompanying this bill, expenses attributable to the advisory commission would presumably be charged against that ceiling.

I urge that the rules be suspended and that H.R. 11774 do pass.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the chiefs do a little fishing in those ponds on the way down?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, not on the way down. That was only afterward, after they survived.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

The legislation now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 11774 a bill introduced by Representatives MINK and MATSUNAGA. Its basic purpose is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the area generally known as the Honokohau National Historic Landmark in order to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the National Park System at this location.

BACKGROUND

In the early 1960's, an area located on the west coast of the Island of Hawaii was designated by executive action as a national historic landmark. At that time, the historic value of the Honokohau Settlement was recognized as being nationally significant. It contains many ancient house sites, four Hawaiian temples, fishponds, and numerous tombs and petroglyphs are found there.

Unfortunately, the site is now in danger of significant alteration because it has been zoned for urban development and a plan for a large recreation complex on it has been completed. If implemented in its present form, the development plan would alter some of the places considered to be most important to the historic landmark.

National historic landmark designation does not, in itself, assure any Federal control over activities which might adversely affect the site; however, the National Historic Preservation Act does provide a mechanism which guarantees that Federal agencies will not, by their actions, encourage or assist activities which will adversely affect such sites.

THIS LEGISLATION

This legislation requires the Secretary of the Interior to complete the study of the landmark and to report his findings and recommendations to the Congress within 1 year after the date of enactment of the bill. At that time, the Congress can examine the details of the recommendations and determine whether it is in the national interest to establish a unit of the national park system in this area.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior can initiate studies if he has adequate funds available. He could, in fact, undertake this study without this specific legislation; however, during our hearings we were informed that present plans do not call for the initiation of such a study in the foreseeable future. Because of impending developments, it seems reasonable to emphasize the importance of getting this study underway as promptly as possible.

In addition to the importance of having the study completed promptly, the bill provides authority for the creation of an Advisory Commission which is to be available to consult with the Secretary or his designee concerning the study and it establishes a complete moratorium on any activities requiring Federal assistance, licenses, permits, and the like, until it is completed and given a reasonable period of time for consideration by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, along with several other members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I visited this area. We conducted extensive field hearings on the proposed legislation and heard many witnesses argue for its preservation. I think that most of us were convinced that a thorough study of the area is merited and that the relatively modest investment required—$50,000—would provide us with the kind of information that we need in order to make a final determination on the action to ultimately be taken.

I want to emphasize that H.R. 11774 does not in any way commit the Federal Government or the Congress to any specific course of action, but it does indicate our interest in this area. As we have found in the past, this is the only direct method that is available to the Congress to indicate its priorities with respect to studies of this kind.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I am pleased to recommend the enactment of H.R. 11774.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11774, legislation to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the National Park System in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historic Landmark in the State of Hawaii.

As the principal sponsor of this legislation, I can state without qualification that I believe it is the most important bill I have yet had the honor of submitting in the Congress on behalf of the people of Hawaii.

This is a bill to protect a very vital, and very precious piece of property in the State of Hawaii. The land involved is an integral part of the history and the culture of the native Hawaiian people who inhabited these islands long before the advent of the white man and his civilization.

The islands of Hawaii were first united by a great leader, King Kamehameha the Great, whose statue now stands in our Capitol's Statuary Hall.

This famous leader of the Hawaiian people was secretly buried in a sacred fishpond on the shore of the Island of Hawaii, largest island in the Hawaiian chain. The fishpond was used by the native Hawaiians for raising a food supply, using techniques which now have been lost. The fishpond was an indentation in the coast, enclosed by construction of a seawall with lava rocks to block off the ocean waves.

All of this was part of a thriving Hawaiian community on the big island which included other areas going back from the coast to the mountains inland. Adjacent to the fishpond was an area where Hawaiian royalty lived.

Today the rugged seawall still stands, and the fishpond exists intact, one of the finest specimens of Hawaiian culture still left in the islands. In the surrounding area are other prime archaeological specimens including ancient house sites, four heiaus or sacred temples, tombs, and a holua or lava toboggan slide used by royalty for sport.

The historical importance of these sites was recognized by their designation as the Honokohau National Historic Landmark in 1969.

More recently, the area has attracted the attention of a private developer who wishes to build a hotel and resort development in the area. This developer, based in the mainland United States, has purchased the land and is ready to build. But part of his plan includes the tearing down of the seawall so that the cove behind it can be converted into a beach. He states that there is no other suitable beach site on the rugged lava-strewn coastline.

In order to tear down the seawall the developer needed the approval of the Army Corps of Engineers. The proposal involved an alteration to the navigable waters of the United States.

As required by law in the case of an area which has been designated as a national historic site, the Corps of Engineers requested an advisory opinion by the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. After extensive hearings and field trips to inspect the site, the Council found that preservation of the landmark and Kaloko Pond "is in the national interest." It recommended that the Hawaiian people, through Congress, be afforded "reasonable opportunity to provide for the preservation under public ownership for present and future generations."

The purpose of my bill is to permit such an opportunity. The bill calls for a 1-year study by the Department of the Interior, after which the Congress would have the opportunity to consider its recommendations.

In the meantime, the Corps of Engineers is instructed to withhold issuance of the permit for desecration of the seawall.

I consider preservation of this pond, the burial place of the founder of the Hawaiian kingdom, essential if there is to be any remnant of the Hawaiian heritage.

Recently this Congress adopted legislation providing more than $1 billion and thousands of acres of land for the natives of Alaska. I supported this legislation, but let us remember that we have done nothing to help the native Hawaiians.

Today the Hawaiians are declining in numbers. They have been overwhelmed by the intrusion of others. They have lost their land.

The Hawaiians need desperately to maintain their history and culture—the ties to the past that are their birthright. Every destruction of this legacy of achievement erodes their identity. Soon they will be cut off completely in a modern civilization they had no part in forming.

This destruction of history need not be. We can, and we must, preserve the birthright of the Hawaiians, not only for themselves but for us as well. We need to know and appreciate their contributions. They are part of our national history and our heritage.

I fear that the destruction of Kaloko Pond would be a killing blow to this great cause. I earnestly ask my colleagues to adopt this important legislation. It is not large in terms of dollars or area affected. But it is large in terms of the future of the Hawaiian people.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to my colleague from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, which we cosponsored.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift approval of H.R. 11774, of which I am a cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK). As the committee has outlined in its report, the bill would provide for a study of the merits of including as a unit of America's national park system the site of the Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii. It would also prohibit any Federal agency from issuing permission for any commercial development within the designated area during the period of the study.

The primary purpose of the bill is merely to provide a breathing spell during which a proper decision on the ultimate fate of this historical landmark can be reached. The legislation is made necessary by moves to convert major parts of the landmark area into a commercial resort area.

Located on the western coast of the Island of Hawaii, the Honokohau National Landmark area contains what the U.S. Department of the Interior describes as "a significant grouping of archeological sites that are virtually intact and date from prehistoric times." That is a correct, if understated, estimate of this area's historic value.

Mr. Speaker, the entire landmark area, stretching over an area 2 miles long and a half mile wide, is rich in Hawaiian history and lore. Included in the area is ancient Kaloko Fishpond, which was the center of life in the ancient village, the burial site of King Kamehameha the Great, who united all the Hawaiian Islands into one kingdom, and that of his father.

The unique culture and music of Hawaii have been fast disappearing under the onslaught of modern trends. One of the aspects of that ancient culture most endangered is the very history of the native Hawaiian people. The preservation of Kaloko Pond and the entire Honokohau Settlement is imperative if that history is to be properly recorded for ourselves and our posterity.

H.R. 11774 provides the best method for attainment of that objective, and I, therefore, urge its overwhelming approval today.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this study bill and I urge the support of my colleagues for its passage.

H.R. 11774 authorizes the appropriation of $50,000 to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing the Honokohau National Historic Landmark as a unit of the National Park System and directs that the study be completed and a report thereon be submitted to the President and to the Congress within 1 year.

In order that the study will reflect the expertise of native Hawaiians, a Study Advisory Commission consisting of 15 members is established by the bill. That Commission is to have at least 10 members who are native Hawaiians and that means a descendent of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to the year 1778.

The purpose of the Advisory Commission is to advise and assist the Secretary in his study duties.

I do not want to prejudge or influence the Secretary's study. There are conflicting interests in the Honokohau area. Developers own and want to develop the lands on which the several fish ponds, ruins of ancient houses, temples, and a toboggan slide are located.

To many of the people of Hawaii, the fish ponds, ruins, and temples at Honokohau represent a cultural heritage that is fast disappearing. Many believe the bones of Kamehameha the Great, the unifier of the Hawaiian Isles, lie somewhere in the vicinity. Undoubtedly, there are many relics and prehistoric petroglyphs worthy of preservation.

The State of Hawaii, under the land use law of 1961, zoned all land for either urban, rural, agricultural, or conservation uses. In 1969, the Honokohau area was zoned for resort, residential, commercial, and open use. In that same year, the State land use commission approved a plan for the development of a major recreation community on the shore of the Kaloko fish pond at Honokohau. A new coastal highway leading to a new jetport has been constructed a few hundred yards inland from this proposed study area.

In 1962, however, the area was declared eligible to be a national historic landmark.

There certainly will be much to study, and, I suspect, more to resolve.

Although the Secretary of the Interior presently has the authority to conduct the study envisaged by this bill, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was of the opinion that passage of this bill would serve to give this study a measure of priority. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is of the opinion that the study is worthwhile and recommends enactment of H.R. 11774.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11774, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

OBSERVANCE OF VERRAZANO DAY—MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1972

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the birth of that great Florentine navigator, Giovanni da Verrazano whose explorations along our eastern coast pro-

duced the first factual maps and information concerning this rich new hemisphere. Because of his intrepid probing of our shores from South Carolina to Newfoundland in 1524 the world learned of important navigation areas, the most important of which today are known as New York Harbor and Narraganset Bay.

To those of us who were born and reared in Brooklyn, Verrazano has a special place in our gallery of heroes. It was his unusually accurate and detailed charting of the areas which his small ship visited that stimulated the concentrated flow of European shipping for trade and settlement to the New World through the safe waters of New York Harbor and made it a veritable gateway to be used for generations to come.

We are proud of Verrazano. We are proud that the bridge which today spans the narrows between Staten Island and Brooklyn bears his name. We are proud also that largely because of our efforts, a commemorative stamp was issued in tribute to this magnificent navigator whose 492d birthday we observe today.

Mr. Speaker, in 8 short years we will be celebrating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Giovanni da Verrazano. This celebration should be one of great magnitude and widespread observance. It should have adequate preparation and long-range planning, not only on the part of the Italo-American organizations for whom it will hold great interest but by the Congress of the United States. We should begin immediately to consider the types of honors which this body considers fitting for the man who has meant so much to our country's development. Surely, some of the most important coastal areas and waterways which we shall be converting into national parks or sancturaries should bear the name of Verrazano.

Mr. Speaker, as we join our fellow citizens of Italian birth or heritage in observing the birthday of this great citizen of Italy, we should remind ourselves of the scores of other great Italians who have also made great contributions to this Nation.

Members of this body will recall that over a period of time, I have frequently set forth my strong objection to the all too frequent tendency for so many Americans to link the criminal acts of a few Italian mobsters with the great body of loyal American citizens who can justly be proud of their importance and their gifts to all of their fellow Americans. It would do well for all of us to remember the vast number of great Americans—who, proud of their Italian blood, have made heroic contributions to the welfare and successful development of this their country. Let us not lose sight for even a moment of the Femis, the Rizzuttos, the Marchisios, the Peccoras, the La Guardias, the Espositos, the Toscanninis, the Verdis, the Moffos, the Lanzas, or any of the thousands of great people to whom we owe so much. To so remind ourselves of the role Americans of Italian birth or descent have played in our land would be a fitting tribute to Giovanni da Verrazano on this his birthday.

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

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

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the House will take under consideration the 1972 funding appropriation for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

According to the conference report prepared by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we will be asked to appropriate $36 million for the 1972 fiscal year operations of the radios.

Mr. Speaker, I find this sum to be insufficient and at the appropriate time, I will ask that $14 million be added to that figure for a total of $50 million for fiscal 1972.

This request may come as a surprise since in recent weeks doubt has been cast on the continued existence of the two organizations. In some quarters, their function has been described as an "anachronism" of the cold war. I would contend, however, that now more than ever before, there exists a need for truth in the world community.

If, as some would suggest, the cold war has thawed, then the Soviet Union should welcome an expansion in the free flow of information.

If there is to be true meaning to the new détente in Europe, Willy Brandt's "Ostpolitik," it will only come through mutual understanding, a mutual understanding based on truth.

If the President's pursuit of peace in the Eastern Hemisphere is to bear fruit, it can only be accomplished through a two-way exchange of ideas.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, I harbor serious doubts about the aforementioned "ifs." Frankly, I yearn to be proven wrong, but until these Western initiatives are matched by Eastern sincerity, I will continue to hold the doubts I do.

If these beacons of truth are out of date relics, then why does the Soviet Union continue to make every effort to jam their broadcasts. Must the dove of peace be muzzled? We are told that government officials in the Eastern bloc countries find the broadcasts offensive and their continued operation could upset the delicate balance of improved relations. But what of reciprocity? The Communist governments seem to give little thought to Western sensitivity.

By contrast, in terms of international broadcasting, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty beam some 1,000 hours per week toward the Iron Curtain while the transmitters of the Communist nations are on 6,500 hours per week.

And how are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty received? According to the Russian author and Nobel Prize winner, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn:

> If we learn anything about events in our country, it's from them.

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these organizations mimic their competitors by launching a wave of propaganda. They must simply continue to supply the desired commodity: Unfettered information.

The people of the Communist nations have demonstrated this desire time and again. Recent surveys conducted by Austrian, Danish, French, English, and Swedish research firms revealed the following: In response to the question what is the most important function of RFE, the response "to inform" led the list by more then 2 to 1 in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

This trust must be maintained, and as I have indicated, expanded. On-the-air time must be increased. Staffing must be increased and the challenge of jamming must be met.

Mr. Speaker, this is a small price to pay for the voice of freedom.

A FLEECING OF THE PUBLIC

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last night the CBS television program "60 Minutes" showed the disgraceful manner in which transportation cargo theft has been so commonplace that young hoodlums can laugh at lawmakers and the court system.

In the program, "The Great American Train Robbery," Mike Wallace, CBS reporter, showed how boxcars are broken into with complete abandon, goods stolen, and then distributed by young criminals so they can have ready cash.

And the young hoodlums we viewed on the program last night seem to be only the tip of the iceberg costing the American consumer hundreds of millions of dollars each year in higher prices. The public is being fleeced at the loading ramp while we stand idly by.

At the close of the program, Mr. Wallace said, "The Congress seems ready to do something about it." I hope Mr. Wallace is right.

The Senate passed a cargo theft study commission over a year ago, but the House has not yet held any committee hearings on the subject.

Cargo theft tallied a whopping estimated $2 billion in losses for all transportation industries last year. The industry largely has turned its head; the law enforcement officials are frustrated. Let not the Congress add to the snarl.

I hope and urge that the House Commerce Committee will hold immediate hearings on cargo security.

FEDERAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS

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, during the fiscal year 1973, which will begin on July 1, the Federal Government will provide $18,576,630,000 to carry out its numerous research programs. This figure compares with $18,146,918,000 for the fiscal year that has but a little over 2 months left and $16,350,139,000 for fiscal year 1971. Some programs have been omitted inasmuch as the budget does not always separate funds for research from other items, but I am confident that the compilation which I will insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks is about as exhaustive as it is possible to make it.

Over half of the money which the budget obligates for 1973 will be earmarked for the Department of Defense, which will receive $10,409,279,000. Other large amounts will be allotted to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which is down for $3,480,950,000, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will get $2,008,913,000.

One of the reasons our National Government was established was to provide for the common defense. If we are to be able to defend ourselves, we must be the strongest power on earth—not No. 2, but No. 1. In order to be No. 1, we must develop the best means for responding to attacks by enemy powers. Situations may arise where we would be forced to strike first in order to forestall an attack. We cannot successfully defend ourselves with yesterday's weapons—we must have weapons that are as good as and better than those of potential enemies. I want the United States to be first in its ability to defend itself against all enemies.

As a result of the huge sums spent on space exploration, Americans were the first to reach the moon. We must now decide whether we should remain first in this new, exciting, and challenging field of human endeavor, or whether we should rest on our laurels while other nations catch up or surpass us. I want the United States to be first in space exploration.

We have spent and will continue to spend large sums in our war against crippling and killing diseases, in our efforts to mitigate and lessen human suffering, and in our attempts to lengthen the lifespan. While guarding against undue optimism, let us hope that our researchers win a victory over the ancient enemy of mankind called cancer. I want an American to be the first to discover a cure for cancer.

Mr. Speaker, while I feel that we in the Congress should appropriate whatever sums are necessary to provide the best possible defense for our Nation, to enable us to remain first in space exploration, to intensify the campaign against cancer and other major diseases, and to continue other important research programs, this does not mean that I am not concerned about the cost of all this research. While providing the money needed for worthwhile programs, we ought to simultaneously scrutinize each of them, seeking out places where we can economize. Overlapping and duplication of functions must be eliminated and, wherever possible without harm to the Nation, postponements must be ordered for programs that can be deferred until the budget has been balanced. Many research activities can be performed by State and local governments or at the expense of private individuals or organizations.

As the various appropriations measures move through the legislative mill, we ought to keep in mind some words that Dwight D. Eisenhower directed to his fellow Americans on January 17, 1961, but 3 days before he laid down the burdens of the Presidency. Let me read to you the pertinent paragraphs of President Eisenhower's farewell address:

In the technological revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

Mr. Speaker, let us heed Mr. Eisenhower's advice as we act on the appropriations measures during the next few weeks.

The list of research and related programs follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Congressional Research Service, salaries and expenses:			
Policy analysis and research	3,781	4,845	6,538
Documentation and status of legislation	338	500	631
Information and reference services	1,261	1,482	1,773
Administration and support services	270	336	400
Total obligations	5,650	7,163	9,342

Policy analysis and research. The Congressional Research Service provides research, information, and consultative services to Members and committees of Congress, assisting them in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative issues and proposals, and of recommendations submitted to the Congress by the President or executive branch agencies. This support comes in the form of research reports, in-depth policy analyses, consultations, briefings, legal research, assistance with committee hearings, background studies, and related data and materials. Lists of subjects and policy areas which might profitably be pursued are periodically made available to each congressional committee. These services are directed toward assisting Members and committees in determining the advisability of enacting legislative proposals, in estimating the probable results of such proposals and of alternatives to them, and in evaluating methods for accomplishing the results sought.

Documentation and status of legislation. The Services prepares and publishes on a periodic basis for distribution to Members and committees the Digest of Public General Bills, which includes summaries of all public bills and resolutions introduced in the Congress, the changes made therein during the legislative process, the status of bills receiving action, and various pertinent indexes. The Service also prepares and distributes weekly reports on the status of selected major legislation. Upon request from Members and committees, the Service provides legislative history memoranda with respect to measures on which hearings have been announced, and it compiles and makes available to each committee reports on legislatively authorized programs and activities which are within that committee's jurisdiction and which are scheduled to terminate during the current Congress.

Information and reference services. The Service assists Members in the performance of their representative duties. Reference files, containing clippings, pamphlets, and documents, are maintained for rapid informational use. Staff researchers and Members are alerted to current articles and publications in their fields of interest by computer produced citations. Lists of multilithed reports prepared by CRS staff for use of congressional offices providing information on legislative issues are circulated, and reader services are provided by the Congressional Reading Room.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1971 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Congressional Research Service, congressional committees and commissions	46	54	54

THE JUDICIARY—COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1971 estimate	1973 estimate
Administrative Office of the United States Courts:[1] Study of rules of practice and procedure	80	80	90

[1] This Office, among other things, is conducting a continuous study of the rules of practice and procedure in the Federal courts.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Economic studies and analyses	45	9	

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Environmental study contracts		587	

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCTIVITY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Recommend policies to increase productivity, including educational, research, and regional activities	454		4,416
Change in selected resources	80		50
Total obligations	534		4,466

Basic research and statistical projects will include development of price and productivity measures for individual industries and development of a general wage index.

A new research initiative will be oriented to improving the productivity of industry and government within the authority available in the Economic Stabilization Act Amendment of 1971.

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:[1]			
Research and development	833	980	1,205

[1] A contractual program is conducted to provide in-depth studies and research in areas of national importance.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXECUTIVE ORGANIZATION[2]

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Study of the organization of the executive branch of Government	483	21	
Change in selected resources	15	−21	
Total obligations	498		

[2] The Council, which reviewed the organization of the executive branch, completed its work on May 7, 1971.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Economic opportunity program: Research, development, and evaluation	55,337	45,200	68,000

Projects supported under research and development provide the basis for planning national programs to alleviate poverty and promote equality of opportunity. These consist of systematic analyses of the causes of poverty, identification of need, design of social experiments, development of accepted hypotheses into working models, expanding successful concepts to demonstration scale, and developing mechanisms for moving these programs to full-scale operation. The 1973 research and development effort will center around experiments designed to test the effectiveness of private market mechanisms for delivering social services to the poor and continuation of the most promising services begun in prior years.

Evaluation activities included in this component are of two types: those providing an overall assessment of the impact and effectiveness of antipoverty programs, with emphasis on the extent to which programs are successful in achieving basic objectives, and those aimed at assessing the relative effectiveness of different program strategies, approaches, and techniques used by antipoverty programs.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Farm research	119,020	127,158	125,490
Utilization research and development	39,759	40,539	39,947
Nutrition and consumer use research	4,970	5,156	4,902
Marketing research	10,272	10,830	10,747
Research and development on the eradication of narcotic-producing plants		2,100	2,100
Coordination of departmental and interdepartmental activities related to pests and their control	64	158	158
Construction of facilities	3,493	7,740	2,556
Contingencies		1,000	1,000
Total research	177,578	194,681	185,900

The Service conducts basic and applied research in the fields of livestock, plant sciencies, entomology, soil and water conservation, agricultural engineering, utilization and development, nutrition and consumer use, marketing, and on the development of methods to eradicate narcotic-producing plants.

Farm research. Improved breeding, feeding, and management practices, including management of animal wastes, are developed for farm livestock, poultry, and domestic fur animals. Practical methods are sought for control of diseases, parasites, and insect pests affecting them and to protect them from chemical toxicity and other hazards.

Investigations are conducted to improve varieties of food, feed, fiber, and other plants, and to develop new crops; to improve crop-production practices, including methods to control plant diseases, nematodes, and weeds, and reduce cost of production; and to develop safe chemical, biological, and other methods for control of harmful pests affecting farm production.

Investigations are conducted to improve the management of natural resources, including investigations to improve soil and water management (including salinity and saline soils), irrigation, and conservation practices; to study hydrologic problems of agricultural watersheds; to determine the relation of soil types and water to plant, animal, and human nutrition; and to apply engineering principles to improve efficiency and reduce costs of agricultural production.

The research is aimed at the profitable production of an adequate supply of food, feed, fiber, and other agricultural products of desired quality at minimum costs. Increased attention has been given to studies on protection of plants, animals, and natural resources from harmful effects of soil, water, and air pollution. Research also concerns the application of remote sensing techniques in meeting agricultural problems.

The 1973 program provides for complete staffing, equipping, and operation of pesticide laboratories for research on biological and other alternate methods of pest control and for additional testing of nonchemical means of pests control.

Utilization research and development. Chemical, physical, and biological research is conducted to develop increased industrial uses of farm products, and new and improved foods, feeds, and fabrics; and to develop improved methods for processing agricultural commodities.

The research aim is to expand the demand for farm products by developing new and improved products and economical processes tailored to the requirements of the domestic and foreign markets. The research conducted includes studies to protect food and feed products from harmful microbial organisms and naturally occurring toxins and studies of health-related problems of tobacco. Increased effort is being given to the processing of agricultural commodities to minimize waste formation and to utilize waste products to avoid pollution.

Nutrition and consumer use research. Studies are made of human nutritional requirements, composition and nutritive value of foods, and consumer and food economics. The research aim is to determine nutrient requirements and how foods can supply these to best assure nutritional well-being of people throughout their lifespan; to provide up-to-date information about food consumption and nutrition of the population; and to develop improved procedures for household preparation, care, and preservation of foods which will preserve their nutritional, sanitary, and wholesome quality.

Marketing research. Practical answers to reduce costs and maintain product quality in moving products from farm to consumer are sought through research. For farm products as they pass through marketing channels, efforts are made to develop safe methods to determine quality, reduce losses from waste and spoilage, and improve efficiency in physical handling and transportation. The work includes research at each stage of marketing, such as assembly points and storage facilities, and of transportation at terminal or central markets, and at wholesale and retail markets. Research is also concerned with mycotoxins in agricultural products in relation to off-farm handling, conditioning, and storage.

Research and development on the eradication of narcotic-producing plants. Research under this activity was started in 1972 as outlined under the Omnibus Drug Control Message of June 17, 1971. The research conducted under this activity is directed toward the development of technology for the detection and destruction of illicit growth of narcotic-producing plants without adverse ecological effects. The development of this eradication technology is carried out in cooperation with research institutions in foreign countries.

Coordination of departmental and interdepartmental activities related to pests and their control. The 1973 estimates provide for the availability of $158,000 for the use by the Secretary to meet emergency situations relating to the safe use of pesticides. The project provided for coordination with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies of the Federal Government in development of measures to protect the public health, products, and resources.

Construction of facilities. The 1973 estimates include $250,000 for planning an addition to the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory and $1,060,000 for planning and construction of an incinerator and waste water treatment facilities at the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory. The proposed increase is offset by the nonrecurring amount of $70,000 provided for planning a soil and water laboratory at Beckley, West Virginia, in 1972.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program):			
Market development research	987	1,400	2,300
Agricultural and forestry research	4,605	5,600	8,100

Foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States are used for expenses of carrying out programs of the Department of Agriculture as authorized by law. Research is carried on through agreements negotiated with research institutions and organizations in foreign countries. The research must be of importance to American agriculture. It serves to preserve and expand existing markets and develop new ones for agricultural commodities. It provides for research supplementary to domestic programs on problems of farm, forest, marketing, utilization, agricultural economics, and human nutrition, and makes possible the conduct of research on exotic insect pests and diseases of plants and animals which could not be done in the United States.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Research	2,601	3,864	4,298

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Payments to agricultural experiment stations under the Hatch Act	59,856	63,118	67,332
Grants for cooperative forestry research	4,438	4,782	5,172
Contracts and grants for scientific research	1,604	6,506	6,982
Grants for facilities	1,427	446	392
Penalty mail	160	209	264
Federal administration	2,135	2,307	2,235
Total program costs funded	69,620	77,368	82,377
Change in selected resources	−112	5,526	5,464
Total obligations	69,507	82,894	87,841

The Service administers funds for payments and grants to State agricultural experiment stations and other eligible institutions for the support of research in agriculture, the rural home, the rural community, and forestry. This administration involves supervision of the funds, and close advisory relations with the State agricultural experiment stations, schools of forestry, and other institutions eligible to receive funds. The Service participates in the planning and coordination of research programs among the States and between the States and the Department.

Payments to agricultural experiment stations under the Hatch Act. Grants under the Hatch Act are allocated to agricultural experiment stations of the land-grant colleges in the fifty States and Puerto Rico for agricultural research including investigations and experiments to promote a permanent and efficient agricultural industry and improvements in the rural home and rural community. The increase requested for 1973 will provide for increased costs of research.

Grants for cooperative forestry research. These grants are allocated to land-grant colleges or agricultural experiment stations in the fifty States and Puerto Rico and others offering training in the sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. In 1973, additional funds will provide increased costs of research.

Contracts and grants for scientific research. These funds are for the support of grants on specific research problems at nonprofit institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of such research. Every research proposal selected for funding must be evaluated and classified as outstanding and appropriate to the needs of the designated problem area. The increase will be used for pest management research.

Penalty mail. Funds to cover the cost of penalty mailings for State agricultural experiment station directors are provided under this activity.

Federal administration. A coordinating and review staff is maintained to examine research projects and assist State institutions and Federal agenices.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Miscellaneous services to other accounts		28	9
Agency for International Develo pment	43	1	1
Current research information system	172	420	412
Total program costs funded	215	449	422
Change in selected resources	5		
Total obligations	220	449	422

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Miscellaneous contributed funds:[1]			
Program costs funded	3	4	3
Change in selected resources	1	−1	
Total obligations	4	3	3

[1] Miscellaneous funds received from States, local organizations, and others are available for work under cooperative agreements

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Statistical research and service	866	785	830

This work includes review of all statistical forms, survey plans, and reporting and recordkeeping requirements originating in the Department which require Office of Management and Budget approval; liaison within the Department and with other agencies for coordination of statistics; research on and development of sampling, forecasting, and other basic statistical techniques and methods to improve the crop and livestock estimates of the Department; provision of technical consulting services on new or improved statistical techniques to other agencies of the Department; use of and consultation on automatic data processing, to develop and adapt this technology to the improvement of the accuracy and timeliness of crop and livestock estimates; and conduct of special surveys relating to the marketing of agricultural products.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Farm economics	7,625	7,325	8,015
Marketing economics	4,062	3,942	3,993
Domestic and foreign economic analysis	4,546	4,781	5,240
Total program costs funded	16,233	16,048	17,248
Change in selected resources	−299		
Total obligations	15,934	16,048	17,248

The Service develops and carries out a program of economic research designed to provide economic intelligence for the Department of Agriculture and other Federal decisionmakers, farmers and related industries, and the general public. The findings of this research are made available to these users through research reports and through economic outlook and situation reports on major commodities, the national economy, and the international economy. The Service carries out the following major activities:

Farm economics research consists of a nationwide program of research dealing with the economic problems of agricultural production and resource use. Farm production economics research includes analyses of farm production costs and efficiency, use of capital, labor, and other resources in agriculture, profitable adjustments in farming, and financial problems of farmers. Natural resources economics include studies of the use and management of land and water resources, including the quality of these resources, resource institutions, and watershed and river basin development problems. Economic development research includes a broad program of economic studies on development of rural areas, employment opportunities for farm and other rural people, and availability and factors affecting the availability of public and private facilities and services necessary to improve the quality of rural life, including local governments and their organization.

The increases requested in fiscal 1973 will be used for research in design of strategies for rural development projects and research on the cost of controlling and adapting agricultural production to meet environment standards.

Marketing economics research includes economic analyses and research relating to the marketing of agricultural commodities, the organizational structure, practices, and performance of commodity markets from the farm to the consumer, costs and margins involved in the marketing of agricultural products, farmers' bargaining power, the economics of product quality and grade, market potentials, distribution and merchandising of agricultural products, and the economics of transportation.

Domestic and foreign economic analysis. Domestic economic analysis consists of economic and statistical research on agricultural prices, farm income, commodity outlook and situation, supply and consumption of farm products, and agricultural history. Foreign economic analysis includes: Studies of supply and demand and trade in farm products in foreign countries and their effect on prospects for U.S. exports; analysis of farm export programs, progress in economic development and its relationship to sales of farm products, assembly and analysis of agricultural trade statistics; and analysis of international financial monetary programs and policies as they affect the competitive position of U.S. farm products.

The increase requested in fiscal 1973 will be used for research on the comparative advantage of the United States in world agricultural trade.

The Service functions through a central office in Washington, D.C., and a small field staff at each of 64 locations, principally the Land Grant Colleges and Universities, throughout the United States. Much of the research is carried on in cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations.

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Economic research:			
Agriculture	671	756	248
Other agencies	186	194	92

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Technical assistance abroad (Agency for International Development)	589	750	360
Total obligations	1,446	1,700	700

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Miscellaneous Contributed Funds: [1] Obligations	15	17	7

[1] Miscellaneous funds received from States, local organizations, and others are available for economic research and analysis under cooperative agreements.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and technical assistance for agricultural cooperatives	1,736	1,866	1,866
Change in selected resources	79		
Total obligations	1,815	1,866	1,866

Farmer Cooperative Service conducts research, advises directly with cooperative leaders and others, promotes cooperative organization and development through other Federal and State agencies, and publishes reports, *News for Farmer Cooperatives*, and other educational material. This work is aimed to help farmers get better prices for their products and reduce operating expenses, to help rural and small-town residents use cooperatives to develop rural resources, to help these cooperatives expand their services and operate more efficiently, and to help all Americans understand the work of these cooperatives.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Research and technical assistance to cooperatives	34	8	

FOREST SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Forest protection and utilization:			
Forest research:			
Forest and range management	21,446	21,842	21,639
Forest protection	11,870	14,143	16,668
Forest products and engineering	9,859	10,275	10,185
Forest resource economics	6,372	6,775	6,593
Forest research construction	891		
Total forest research	50,438	53,035	55,085

Research is conducted at regional forest experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, and the Institute of Tropical Forestry.

Forest and range management. Research provides land managers and owners with a sound basis for management of timber, forage, wildlife, recreation, and watershed lands. Studies are conducted to maintain a sustained yield of products at least cost; improve forage and habitat for livestock and wildlife without damage to soil, watershed, or other values; assure maximum regular flow of usable water, and reduce floods and sedimentation; improve methods for developing and managing recreation resources; and provide management methods for all uses that will insure environmental protection.

Forest protection. Research is conducted to develop measures for the protection of forests from damage by fire, insects, and diseases. Forest fire and atmospheric science research provides improved methods of preventing fire, predicting fire danger, and preparing for and combating fire by combinations of ground and aerial methods. Insect and disease research develops direct control, cultural measures, and biological agents to combat forest pests.

Forest products and engineering. Studies are conducted to develop new and improved forest products, to reduce and utilize waste, and to use low-quality wood and less-desirable species. Research is also conducted to advance the mechanization and efficiency of forestry operations, and to develop and evaluate machines and similar equipment for such operations as harvesting, planting, timber stand improvement, and protection of forests.

Forest resources economics. Investigations are conducted to inventory and appraise the condition of forest lands, volume and quality of standing timber, ownership of timber resources, annual growth and depletion, and the potential need for timber products. Economic studies are made of forest crop production, resource productivity, and the marketing potentials of forest products.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Construction and land acquisition: Research construction [1]	166	4,932	1,175

[1] This provides for construction, alteration, and improvement of research laboratories and related facilities, and for procurement and installation of necessary initial equipment needed to put the facility into operating condition.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Forest research at experimental forests and ranges, and for foreign countries	1,334	1,440	1,370

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Cooperative work (trust fund): Research investigations	775	800	900

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—BUSINESS ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Social and Economic Statistics Administration:			
Salaries and expenses: Research and development	614	432	433

Research and development is conducted on survey methods and techniques, including sample survey methods and theory, questionnaire design, response errors, equipment design and utilization, computer editing and administrative control, operations, and analytical techniques including techniques of geographic analysis, for the purpose of increasing accuracy, output, and usefulness of statistical data per unit of cost.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Economic research in water resource development	535	560	
Input-output study	103	200	150

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Economic Development Administration: Planning, technical assistance, and research: Research	2,109	2,360	1,528

Economic development research, which focuses on the determination of the causes and remedies of unemployment, underemployment, and low income, is performed through contracts and grants. This permits the use of the best talent available in universities, other governmental agencies, and private institutions. The studies are then made available for use by government and community leaders to help guide the formulation and evaluation of remedial programs.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Research, Development, and Facilities:			
Operating costs:			
Environmental prediction and warnings	13,500	20,667	28,063
Mapping, charting, and marine description	4,508	11,859	11,603
Solid earth monitoring and services	1,666	2,167	2,931
Ocean fisheries and living resources	16,281	35,990	39,956
Environmental satellite	1,928	3,408	3,824
Sea grant	5,271	18,510	22,292
Data buoy	10,899	18,265	14,788
Topical experiment		1,595	4,029
International field year for the Great Lakes	427	2,480	3,541
Executive direction and administration	2,461	3,921	4,453
Total operating costs	56,941	118,862	135,480
Unfunded adjustments to total operating costs:			
Depreciation included above	−2,434	−4,400	−5,500
Total operating costs funded	54,507	114,462	129,980
Capital outlay:			
Environmental prediction and warnings	4,369	3,352	6,903
Mapping, charting, and marine description	3,051	2,087	1,289
Solid earth monitoring and services	586	300	868
Ocean fisheries and living resources	4,471		3,986
Tropical experiment		807	
Executive direction and administration			358
Total capital outlay	12,477	6,546	13,404

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Unfunded adjustments to capital outlay: Depreciation included above	−23	−30	−160
Total capital outlay funded	12,454	6,516	13,244
Total program costs funded	66,961	120,978	143,224
Change in selected resources	16,162	−1,624	
Total obligations	83,123	119,354	143,224

This appropriation provides for the research and development and acquisition of facilities to support the operational programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Environmental prediction and warnings. This activity includes programs to increase understanding of the composition and dynamics of the atmosphere; to develop better instrumentation and techniques for weather observation, analysis, and forecasting; to provide atmospheric and river observational devices and instrumentation; and to equip specialized meteorological and hydrologic laboratories and observatories. Increases for 1973 will provide for field station automation, operation of Kodiak, a fifth-generation computer, Project Stormufry weather modification reporting, aerosol physics and chemistry, airborne mesomets display system, precipitation enhancement, GOES ground equipment, tornado and severe storm research, establishment of three EMSU's flash flood warnings, aircraft instrumentation, and relocation of facilities.

Mapping, charting, and marine description. This activity includes the research and facilities directed toward continued improvement of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's mapping and charting data acquisition, analysis, processing, and production capability and toward increasing our understanding of ocean and lake properties, processes, and environmental interactions. Increases for 1973 will provide for automation of aeronautical and nautical charting, water pollution abatement, tide gages for seaward boundary, tide observations and predictions, trans-Atlantic geotraverse and equatorial plate investigations, environmental impact statements, manned underseas technology, a multi-purpose calibration facility, ship bases and program support, and mid-ocean dynamics experiment.

Solid earth monitoring and services. This activity includes research directed toward understanding the intricate processes and phenomena of the solid earth, such as determining the size and shape of the earth and seismological studies and warnings; also included is the procurement of equipment, facilities, and the equipping of these facilities. Increases for 1973 will provide additional crustal movement investigations, earthquake research and services, activation of Point Barrow, and additional data processing and analysis.

Ocean fisheries and living resources. This activity includes research directed toward living marine resources and toward improved methods of sportfishery management; also the procurement of equipment, facilities, and the equipping of these facilities. The 1973 increase provides for biological research on living marine resources, ecological change and modification, and mariculture. Funds are also requested for grants-in-aid and pollution abatement facilities.

Environmental satellite. This activity provides for research to determine the most beneficial method of obtaining environmental satellite data and using it in environmental service programs. In 1973 emphasis is on application to marine resources and oceanographic service programs.

Sea grant. The talents and knowledge of academic scientists and engineers are utilized in the practical problems of marine resource development and management. Increases in 1973 will provide for expansion of this program.

Data buoy. The data buoy project was established to develop a system of automatic ocean buoys for obtaining oceanic and atmospheric data. This network of automatic buoys throughout the ocean is designed to bridge an information gap. The 1973 increase will provide for hardware development.

Tropical experiment. This project is a part of the Global Atmospheric Research Program—an international research program to provide scientific knowledge to improve the techniques of weather forecasts, to determine the feasibility of large scale weather modification, and to assess the long-term effects of atmospheric pollution. The tropical experiment is designed to provide an understanding of the mechanisms by which energy locked in water vapor of the air is release and then applied to driving the global atmospheric circulation. Increases for 1973 will provide continued planning and procurement of aircraft and shipboard equipment and long lead time supplies.

International file year for the Great Lakes. NOAA is the U. S. lead agency for this special one-time program which is a joint United States-Canadian contribution to the International Hydrologic Decade. Lake Ontario has been chosen for study under the IFYGL program whose central objective is to provide a sound scientific basis for the development of an economical, efficient, and healthy water management plan to meet the needs of the United States and Canadian citizens living within the drainage basin of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region. The 1973 increase provides funds to continue the field operations, technical contracts, and data handling, reduction, and analysis related to the program that was initially funded under NOAA in 1972.

Executive direction and administration. This activity provides for the overall technical leadership and top management functions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and for administrative management and support activities at headquarters and in the field. Increases in 1973 will provide support for the expanded and additional 1973 programs.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Environmental prediction and warnings	284	62	101
Mapping, charting, and marine description	10	140	27
Solid-earth monitoring and services	32	298	71
Ocean fisheries and living resources	49	30	72
Environmental satellite	110		
Total program costs	485	530	271
Change in selected resources	−71		140
Total obligations	414	530	411

This program uses foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States to supplement domestic research and development and to encourage international cooperation in environmental research and allied sciences.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Satellite operations:			
Spacecraft and launching	12,072	20,909	14,450
Operations	14,579	18,631	27,693
Executive direction and administration	487	636	844
Total program costs	27,138	40,176	42,987
Depreciation included above	−1,063	−1,000	−1,000
Total program costs funded	26,075	39,176	41,987
Change in selected resources	−402	−5,874	−1,886
Total obligations	25,673	33,302	40,101

This appropriation provides for the acquisition and operation of a national satellite system to observe worldwide environmental conditions and to process, analyze, and archive the data for use in environmental services and research.

The first operational satellite system, the Tiros operational satellite, began operation in 1966, providing global observations during daylight hours. Replacement of the TOS system by the Improved TOS began in 1970 with the launch of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration's ITOS 1. This satellite added nighttime observing to the system; in 1973 it will add global sounding and high resolution day and night observing. Funds to initiate the geostationary operational environmental satellite were provided in 1970; funding to establish this system continued in 1971 and 1972. This system is designed to provide nearly continuous observation of the earth and its environment, initially of the Western Hemisphere.

Space craft and launching. This covers the design, construction, and launching of operational spacecraft. Funds are required in 1973 to complete procurement of one ITOS spacecraft, continue procurement of two ITOS and one GOES spacecraft, and to initiate procurement of another ITOS spacecraft. Funds are required also in 1973 to complete procurement of one launch vehicle and one launch service and to continue procurement of two launch vehicles.

Operations. Includes establishment and operation of facilities to command the spacecraft, acquire the data, and relay the data to the processing and analysis center; operation and maintenance of facilities for converting satellite signals to forms usable in the environmental service programs and for dissemination, display, and application of the high resolution data from ITOS and GOES; and technical management and engineering support.

The 1973 request provides for continued around-the-clock operation and maintenance of facilities related to the ITOS operation; continued operational use of NASA's synchronous applications technology satellites ATS 1 and ATS 3; personnel and equipment to acquire, apply, and distribute data from a single geostationary operational environmental satellite; and to expand the capability of ground facilities to operate a two-satellite GOES system.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimated	1973 estimated
Research and Technical Services:			
Basic for Nation's physical measurement system:			
Measurement methods, standards, and research	21,511	20,963	22,309
Transfer services	3,632	4,552	4,980

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimated	1973 estimated
Scientific and technological services for industry and Government	9,983	11,790	16,086
Technical basis for equity in trade	1,931	1,759	1,718
Technical services to promote public safety	1,650	2,842	6,807
Technical information services	1,145	1,008	1,124
Central technical support	2,475	2,579	2,616
Experimental technology development and application incentives			14,400
National technical information service	1,244	1,395	1,635
Total program costs funded	43,551	46,888	71,675
Change in selected resources	353	112	394
Total obligations	43,904	47,000	72,069

Basis for Nation's physical measurement system. The purpose of this activity is to insure that the users of science and technology in the United States will be able to make physical measurements which are meaningful (measure the desired property), reliable (measure properly and as accurately as needed), reproducible (yield the same results time after time), and compatible (will be reconcilable with other like measurements made elsewhere at different times).

Measurement methods, standards, and research. Programs include development, maintenance, and improvement of the standards of physical measurement which, by common agreement, are compatible with those of other nations. This involves national standards for measurement of some forty physical quantities (including the "basic six" of physics: mass, length, time, temperature, electric current, and luminous intensity).

Research is conducted to learn new and improved ways to measure the physical and chemical properties of matter, materials, and natural phenomena. The 1973 increases will provide for development of national reference neutron standards and research on reference materials related to clinical analysis, water pollution, and industrial quality control.

Transfer services. This involves developing and making readily available a range of specialized products and services, including calibrations and standard reference data, that will effectively transfer the results of the Bureau's work to other elements of the Nation's measurement system. The 1973 increase will be applied to the standard reference data program for coverage of additional technical areas including pollution abatement technology and failure avoidance engineering.

Scientific and technological services for industry and Government. The purpose of this activity is to facilitate effective use of science and technology by governmental institutions and by industry. In the United States most of the effort devoted to developing and using technology is in the private sector. A variety of problems exist in certain areas of technology, however, where the Government has a substantial investment or where complexity, cost, or scope of impact are such as to require a national-level effort.

Programs in this field include: Biomaterials, metals, alloys, polymers, inorganic, and composite materials technology; evaluation and improvement of measurement methods in support of environmental pollution abatement programs; building science and technology; computer science and technology; electronic technology; cryogenic technology; failure avoidance analysis and engineering; technology utilization analysis; and the application of analytical techniques to operations analysis and the management of research. The 1973 increase will be applied to development of measurement methods and standards related to pollution abatement, services to improve the effective application of computers, applying cryogenic technology to more efficient power generation, and development of methods to reduce material, product, and structural failures.

Technical basis for equity in trade. The purpose of this activity is to provide a common technical basis for a fair exchange between buyers and sellers in commercial dealings with minimum legal regulation at the the Federal level. Programs in this area include: Voluntary engineering standards services to assist private sector groups to develop national and international engineering standards and disseminate information on such standards; measures of quantities important to commerce to insure a proper degree of measurement accuracy in commercial quantity determinations, including development and promotion of better weights and measures technology; standards to measure the performance of industrial and consumer products; test services to promote the application of product standards and standardized product test methods by Federal, State, and commercial testing laboratories; and fair packaging and labeling programs to reduce undue proliferation of commodity package sizes by voluntary means.

Technical services to promote public safety. Programs of this activity provide standards, test methods, information, and specialized services as required by law to protect the public from certain specified hazards. Subjects included are: flammable fabrics, which provides the technical basis for reduction of the hazard of fire involving fabrics and related materials: fire research and safety, which involves research, information, and services aimed at reducing loss of life and property due to fire; product safety, which provides the technical basis of assessing hazards and aids in setting standards for consumer product safety; and radiation safety, which deals with standards for sources of potentially hazardous nonionizing radiation. Increases in 1973 will extend the fire research and safety program in the areas of public education, fire fighting tactics, improved equipment for firemen, and fire protection in buildings. Under the radiation safety program, measurement methods and standards will be developed for control of hazards from laser and electromagnetic radiation.

Technical information services. The purpose of this activity is to disseminate information on research results and services to users through a variety of appropriate, easily accessible channels. Programs employed to achieve this objective are: central reference services, such as National Bureau of Standards information analysis centers which provide highly specialized technical information; symposia, technical meetings, and training courses; research and development in information sciences including employment of experimental hardware/software configurations to improve the response time and adequacy of the Bureau's information-providing services; and consulting and advisory services which are made available, usually at no cost to the user.

Central technical support. The purpose of this activity is to provide technical supporting services to other Bureau programs. These services include operation of research tools such as the NBS research reactor, linear electron accelerator, and other high energy accelerators. Also included are mathemathical and statistical services.

Experimental technology development and application. This activity will encourage private research and development oriented toward attaining national goals, such as increased productivity. Funding will be by contracts with industry, associations, and universities emphasizing demonstrations of technology applications.

The National Technical Information Service collects and distributes scientific, technological, business, and demographic information generated by the Federal Government. The 1973 increase will be applied to the establishment of a central point of easy access to all Department of Commerce information products and development of new ideas.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL SERVICES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Basis for Nation's physical measurement system	645	851	719
Scientific and technological services for industry and Government	135	283	223
Total program costs funded	780	1,134	942
Change in selected resources	−40	−500	58
Total obligations	740	634	1,000

The responsibilities of the National Bureau of Standards for basic and applied research, improvement of standards, collection and dissemination of standard reference data, and the certification and distribution of standard reference materials are of sufficient breadth to encourage utilization of research capabilities in other countries. The foreign currency program supplements the Bureau's existing program, allows an acceleration of research effort in selected areas, and permits economies to the Bureau's regular appropriations over the long term.

Foreign currencies determined by the Treasury Department to be excess to normal requirements of the United States will be used in countries where scientific talent is available to augment the in-house capabilities of the Bureau in the areas of standard reference materials, standard reference data, building research, research to improve measurements on materials, and exploratory research.

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and analysis for policy formulation	151	1,650	2,450

[1] The Office of Telecommunications provides technical and economic research and analyses required by the Office of Telecommunications Policy to develop telecommunications policies and programs that will promote the public interest and to assist in formulation of executive branch views on selected telecommunications policy matters. During 1973 research and analysis will be undertaken.

OCEAN SHIPPING

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Maritime Administration:			
Research and Development:			
Maritime science and technology	913	9,313	7,258
Shipping systems analysis and requirements	993	1,255	1,437
Advanced ship engineering and development	2,780	7,505	10,950
Improvement in ship operations and shipping systems	2,869	7,029	13,013
NS Savannah	2,372	3,229	----------
Total program costs funded	9,927	28,331	32,658
Change in selected resources	13,508	−4,566	−2,658
Total obligations	23,435	23,765	30,000

The 1973 program provides for continuation of a program designed to serve the needs of the entire maritime complex, including Government, shipbuilders, shipowners, and labor. The program will operate in the following areas:

Maritime science and technology. Research conducted herein is planned to raise the level of marine scientific knowledge in order to advance the technological base upon which ships are designed, built, and operated. Primary research will be in hydrodynamics for the development of new naval hull types, new propulsion concepts, ship maneuvering, ship structures, navigation-communications electronics, and facilities and systems to collect and disseminate technical information.

Shipping systems analysis and requirements. This activity is concerned with forecasting trade and technology and with the economics and technical analyses of total transportation systems. Included are studies of transportation demands as a means for projecting ship numbers and characteristics, advanced vehicles, intermodal aspects, and special economic studies.

Advanced ship engineering and development. This activity is concerned with the development of advanced ship concepts and their design as well as construction methods. The nuclear and nonnuclear advanced propulsion systems including new transmission systems and propellers are involved. Improved shipyard operations and management systems are included in the program, as well as development of computer-aided design programs.

Improvement in ship operations and shipping systems. Included in this activity is applied research for all aspects of the maritime field concerned with ship and port operations. Consideration will be given to related operational equipment and procedures for navigation, cargo handling, automated control systems, containerization, manning, training, maintenance and repair, ship generated pollution abatement, and other aspects of the field. Research aspects will include prototype design and construction of offshore terminals for super size vessels.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: [1]			
Research and development administration	917	969	1,140

[1] Provides for the cost of technical and administrative support required for research and development contractual activity.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Vessel operations revolving fund: Experimental ship NS Savannah [1]	1,655	100	----------

[1] The $100,000 represents the finalizing of costs for the operating portion in reference to the layup of the NS Savannah. These costs are reimbursable in full from the research and development appropriation.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Maritime Administration: Research and development	327	450	203

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE —MILITARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Military personnel:			
Army, research and development	65,276	78,661	81,153
Navy, research and development	64,031	68,477	67,572
Marine Corps, research and development	566	561	548
Air Force, research and development	201,022	200,732	195,865

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Programs in this title fund the development, test, and evaluation of new and improved weapon systems and related equipment carried out by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Agencies. They also provide for scientific research supporting defense functions and operations. Work is performed by Government laboratories, universities, industrial contractors, and nonprofit organizations. Research and development programs are as a rule funded so that each year's resources support one year's increment of the total program cost.

The budget plans and estimated obligations under appropriations in this title for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Agencies, and the emergency fund are summarized as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Military sciences	510,428	553,379	551,720
Aircraft and related equipment	1,727,459	2,043,964	1,974,141
Missiles and related equipment	2,050,606	2,052,830	2,370,690
Military astronautics and related equipment	448,127	428,650	459,950
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	285,369	417,000	425,000
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	303,361	356,581	340,470
Other equipment	1,393,775	1,593,394	1,683,341
Programwide management and support	539,823	601,913	637,288
Emergency fund	----------	50,000	50,000
Total obligations	7,258,948	8,097,711	8,492,600

Military sciences. This activity supports research of potential military application in the physical, mathematical, environmental, engineering, biomedical, and behavioral sciences. The objective of this research is to provide the basic understanding necessary to efficiently develop new systems and improve military operations. For example, research in electronics will provide more reliable and higher performance components for sensors, weapons, and communications systems; research in oceanography will increase the effectiveness of antisubmarine warfare systems; research in the behavioral sciences will improve methods of personnel training and selection.

The principal support for in-house organizations such as the Aerospace Research Laboratory and some of the Federal contract research centers is also provided here. In addition to the amounts directly provided for in this activity, applied research is also supported in industry by certain allowable indirect costs which may be permitted under contracts funded by both the research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement appropriations.

Aircraft and related equipment. This activity funds research, development, test, and evaluation related to airframes, engines, avionics, and other installed aircraft equipment, as well as applied research in supporting aeronautical technologies. It also funds the development of major aircraft systems.

In 1973, major increases are programed for prototype development of lightweight fighter candidates for the Air Force, vertical/short takeoff and landing aircraft for the Navy, shot takeoff and landing transports for possible C–130 replacement, and the Air Force SCAD strategic bomber penetration decoy. In addition, prototype development will begin on engines for future transport and fighter aircraft. Systems continuing full scale development in 1973 include the joint service heavy lift helicopter, the Army logistic helicopter, the Navy F–14B fleet air defense fighter/interceptor, and the Air Force F–15 air superiority fighter, B–1 advanced strategic bomber, and A-X close air support aircraft. Programs nearing completion in 1973 include the Navy S–3A antisubmarine warfare carrier-based aircraft, the F–14A intercepter, and the Air Force F–5E international fighter.

Also funded in this activity are research and development centers such as the laboratories located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the Naval Air Test Center at Patuxent River, Maryland, and the Army Air Mobility Centers in Virginia, Ohio, California, and Missouri.

Missiles and related equipment. This activity provides for research, development, test, and evaluation of missile systems of all types. Increases will be provided for improvement of our sea-based deterrent in

order to assure the continued invulnerability of our strategic retaliatory capabilities. To maintain the sufficiency of our strategic forces, effort will continue on the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, the Project Hardsite prototype system for Minuteman defense, and on technology efforts underlying possible future antiballistic missile systems. Tactical missile systems continuing development include the Army SAM–D air defense system, the Navy Aegis fleet defense missile system, Harpoon antiship missile, Agile air-to-air dogfight missile, and the Air Force Hound Dog II nuclear missile. Army prototype terminal homing missile programs will continue to receive emphasis. Systems whose development is nearing completion include the Minuteman and Poseidon ballistic missile systems, the Navy Condor and Air Force Maverick air-to-surface missile systems, the Navy Phoenix air-to-air missile system, and the Army Lance surface-to-surface missile.

In addition to funding contracts with industry in the missle research and development program, this activity is a major source of financial support for the operation of certain test and evaluation facilities such as the Western Test Range, the White Sands Missile Range, the Naval Weapons Center at China Lake, and the research and development programs at the Army's Redstone Arsenal.

Military astronautics and related equipment. This activity provides for programs directed toward the improvement of space technology for military purposes and the development of space vehicles for specific military applications. Major programs include military communications satellite systems and the first spaceborne ballistic missile early warning system. Continued support will be provided for flight experiment programs and for applied research and technology development programs. This includes the development of advanced navigation, guidance, sensor, reentry, and propulsion systems. This activity funds both in-house laboratories such as the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory and contractual efforts related to space technology.

Ships, small craft, and related equipment. This activity provides for applied research, development, test, and evaluation of ship structures and equipment, including propulsion, communications, navigation, and surveillance systems directly affecting ship operations. It includes the design, prototype fabrication, and performance evaluation of new types of ships, sonars, countermeasure devices, marine gas turbines, and nuclear propulsion plants. Increases will be provided for surface effect ship prototypes and for an advanced attack submarine. There will also be increases for antisubmarine warfare sensors, nuclear propulsion plants, and antiship missile countermeasures systems. A significant portion of the effort at the Naval Ships Research and Development Center is funded under this activity.

Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment. This activity provides for the development, test, and evaluation of improved artillery, guns, rocket launchers, mortars, small arms, mines, grenades, torpedoes, nuclear and chemical munitions, and conventional air-launched weapons, as well as exploration and evaluation of new fuzes, propellants, explosives, detonators, dispensers, and armor.

Programs increasing in 1973 include the Army mechanized infantry combat vehicle and the armored reconnaissance scout vehicle. Programs to explore the feasibility of laser applications will continue in the three services. Development will continue on Army mine and countermine systems. Air Force improved aircraft gun systems, and the Navy CAPTOR mine. The Army will pursue development of a new prototype main battle tank. Systems completing development are the MK–48 torpedo and the Dragon antitank weapon.

This activity provides principal support for research and development activities at several Army centers and the Naval Ordnance Laboratory at White Oak, Maryland.

Other equipment. This activity provides for research, development, test, and evaluation of equipment not separately provided for under other activities. Examples of the types of programs funded here are ocean engineering systems and technology development chemical and biological agent detection and protective devices, combat clothing, tactical data processing systems, communications equipment, improved logistics and materiel handling equipment, mapping and geodetic systems, and biomedical projects. Major continuing programs include the airborne warning and control system, electronic countermeasures, tactical sensor systems for battlefield surveillance, and undersea surveillance systems. This activity funds the entire exploratory development effort of the Navy, and also provides much of the support at the Army Electronics Laboratories, the MITRE Corporation, and the Lincoln Laboratory.

Programwide management and support. For the Army and the Navy, this activity provides for those costs of operation, management, and maintenance of research, development, and test facilities which are not distributed directly to other budget activities. This activity also provides for an expanded joint service effort in the initial operational test and evaluation of new systems. For the Air Force, it provides for certain costs of central administration such as the Air Force Systems Command headquarters and divisions, as well as several large research, development, test, and evaluation centers.

The emergency fund enables the Secretary of Defense to support the exploitation of new scientific developments and technological breakthroughs and to provide for other unforeseen contingencies in the research, development, test, and evaluation programs.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION—ARMY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Military sciences	169,324	192,419	178,000
Aircraft and related equipment	73,612	209,722	270,000
Missiles and related equipment	832,602	972,753	960,000
Military astronautics and related equipment	6,843	9,970	14,000
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	100		
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	157,026	169,581	200,000
Other equipment	320,487	369,801	375,000
Programwide management and support	57,510	66,339	54,100
Total direct	1,617,504	1,990,585	2,051,100
Reimbursable (total)	124,871	124,000	115,000
Total obligations	1,742,375	2,114,585	2,166,100
Aircraft and related activities		8,000	
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment		8,000	
Other equipment		12,000	
Total obligations		28,000	

These proposed supplemental appropriations will be used to speed up near term programs aimed at responding to potential challenges, to accelerate operational test and evaluation, to attack the problem of the high cost of weapons, and to strengthen the technology base by initiating exploratory development in particularly promising areas.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION—NAVY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Military sciences	133,762	142,000	149,000
Aircraft and related equipment	779,221	639,842	384,900
Missiles and related equipment	442,164	533,000	950,000
Military astronautics and related equipment	26,609	41,000	90,000
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	285,269	417,000	425,000
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	65,124	64,000	45,000
Other equipment	365,725	450,000	507,000
Programwide management and support	142,290	153,000	156,000
Total direct	2,240,164	2,439,842	2,706,900
Reimbursable (total)	131,931	120,000	54,000
Intrafund obligations	−24,410	−10,000	−10,000
Total obligations	2,347,685	2,549,842	2,750,900
Aircraft and related equipment		4,000	
Missiles and related equipment		44,000	
Military astronautics and related equipment		10,000	
Other equipment		5,800	
Total obligations		63,800	

These proposed supplemental appropriations will be used to speed up near term programs aimed at responding to potential challenges, to accelerate operational test and evaluation, to attack the problem of the high cost of weapons, and to strengthen the technology base by initiating exploratory development in particularly promising areas.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVUALATION—AIR FORCE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Military sciences	133,998	143,100	147,720
Aircraft and related equipment	874,626	1,166,400	1,319,241
Missiles and related equipment	709,141	411,060	382,590
Military astronautics and related equipment	414,675	367,680	355,950
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	81,211	115,000	95,470
Other equipment	403,865	422,606	498,141
Programwide management and support	329,522	362,740	378,288
Total direct	2,947,038	2,988,586	3,177,400
Reimbursable (total)	176,330	211,736	181,200
Total obligations	3,123,368	3,200,322	3,358,600
Aircraft and related equipment		16,000	
Missiles and related equipment		8,000	
Other equipment		15,000	
Tota lobligations		39,000	

These proposed supplemental appropriations will be used to speed up near term programs aimed at responding to potential challenges, to accelerate operational test and evaluation, to attack the problem of the high cost of weapons, and to strengthen the technology base by initiating exploratory development in particularly promising areas.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research, development, test, evaluation, defense agencies:			
Military sciences	73,344	75,860	77,000
Missiles and related equipment	66,699	84,017	78,100
Other equipment	303,698	307,987	303,200
Programwide management and support	10,501	19,834	48,900
Total direct	454,242	487,698	507,200
Reimbursable (total)	3,628	5,675	6,719
Total obligations	457,870	493,373	513,919
Research, development, test, and evaluation, defense agencies: Other equipment			10,200

These proposed supplemental appropriations will be used to speed up near term programs aimed at responding to potential challenges, to accelerate operational test and evaluation, to attack the problem of the high cost of weapons, and to strengthen the technology base by initiating exploratory development in particularly promising areas.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Emergency fund, Defense: Research and development contingencies		50,000	50,000

CIVIL DEFENSE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research, shelter survey, and marking: Research and development [1]	3,027	3,875	3,500

[1] This provides for improvement of the technical basis for ongoing and potential future civil defense programs and operations.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research [1]	1,070	1,300	6,600

[1] This appropriation provides dollars to be used exclusively for purchase from the Treasury of excess foreign currencies to finance undertakings which are of benefit to the Department of Defense.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Navy Industrial Fund: Research	944,920	1,143,201	1,155,743
Air Force industrial fund: Research activities	143,272	140,555	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Corps of Engineers—Civil, general investigations:			
Surveys:			
Navigation studies	4,115	5,938	7,053
Flood control studies	10,014	14,475	12,077
Beach erosion studies	435	445	552
Comprehensive basin studies	3,662	3,550	3,500
Special studies:			
Chesapeake Bay study	535	2,175	4,500
Coordination studies with other agencies	1,040	1,125	1,515
Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Waterway, N.Y.	153	240	120
National shoreline study	268	200	8
Northeastern U.S. water study	985	2,300	2,000
Review of completed projects			400
Texas coast hurricane study	548	730	745
Texas water supply and pollution study	215	490	230
Water levels of the Great Lakes	212	430	365
Studies not budgeted in 1973	9	322	13
Collection and study of basic data:			
Stream gaging	355	480	400
Precipitation studies	487	240	230
Fish and wildlife studies	667	680	1,100
International water studies	189	263	280
Flood plain management services	6,522	6,800	9,840
Research and development:			
Coastal engineering research and development studies	5,385	4,300	4,400
Hydrologic studies	247	300	260
Civil works investigations	1,918	7,000	8,380
Mississippi River basin model:			
Construction	4		
Maintenance	58	74	
Computer application studies	32	131	
International hydrological decade	237		
Studies not budgeted in 1973	1,395	900	88
Total program costs funded	39,687	53,561	58,056
Change in selected resources	−223	−2,482	−407
Total obligations	39,909	51,079	57,649

Surveys. Navigation and flood control studies are made to determine the need and economic justification for proposed water and related land resource developments. Beach erosion control studies are undertaken to determine the need for shore protection and remedial measures at specific localities.

Comprehensive river basin studies provide for broad consideration of water and related land resource needs of river basins. They are coordinated with the related river basin planning efforts of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture and other concerned agencies.

Special studies are made to resolve unique or especially complex water resources problems.

Funds also are provided to review the operation of completed projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers when found advisable due to significantly changed physical or economic conditions. Physical and operational plans for completed projects are reviewed to determine whether structural or operational modifications should be made in the overall public interest and recommendations are made to Congress.

Surveys are made in coordination with Federal, State, and local agencies and interests. They give appropriate consideration to present and future requirements for all beneficial uses of water and related land resources, including navigation, flood control, water supply, irrigation, water quality control, power, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation.

Collection and study of basic data. Funds are transferred to the Geological Survey for installation, operation, and maintenance of stream gaging stations; to the Weather Bureau for hydrometeorlogical studies; and to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for preauthorization studies of the effects of proposed projects upon fish and wildlife. The Corps of Engineers participates on a number of engineering and control boards that study and control international streams mutually affecting the United States and Canada. Information about the flood hazard, advice, and assistance are furnished to the States and local governmental agencies, upon their request, and to other Federal agencies for guidance in the management of flood plain areas to assure the best and safest use of such areas.

Research and development. Coastal engineering research and development studies deal with physical phenomena, techniques, basis principles, and remedial or control measures related to shore protection and improvement. The results of these studies are disseminated to interested Federal, State, and local agencies and individuals.

Civil works investigations are conducted to improve procedures for analysis of engineering data; to conduct research and training activities; to refine design methods; to develop better materials and practices for the construction, operation, and maintenance of water resource facilities; to investigate rapid excavation techniques by use of explosives in the construction of civil works projects; and to improve procedures used in formulating plans for water resources development. A hydrologic engineering center embraces the functions of hydrological research, training, methods systemization, and special project assistance. A scientific and technical information center prepares and distributes literature to scientists and engineers to improve their knowledge of new developments in their fields.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Construction, general: Coordination act studies (Fish and Wildlife Service) [1]	644	648	840

[1] This program provides for detailed studies and reports by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to determine the effects on fish and wildlife resources of water-control projects of the Corps of Engineers.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
General expenses: Coastal Engineering Research Center [1]	246	283	290

[1] The Center plans and conducts research in the field of coastal engineering, develops standards, and reviews technical reports as directed by the Chief of Engineers.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Mental health research:			
Grants	74,134	97,400	101,400
Direct operations	22,964	42,151	43,268
Total	97,098	139,551	144,668

Grants. There are two major grant programs included in this subactivity. First, the regular research grants program provides support on a project basis for behavioral, clinical, psychopharmacology, and applied research. The 1973 increase will support grants in areas of special interest such as drug abuse, alcoholism, child mental health, minority mental health, crime and delinquency, and services development research. Approximately 1,485 grants will be supported in 1973, including 455 grants for the special interest areas. Second, the hospital improvement program supports project grants to State mental hospitals for improvement in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients. This program will support 71 projects in 1973. $6,000,000 formerly included in this category for drug abuse research grants are now included under Direct operations for drug abuse research contracts.

Direct operations. The funds in this subactivity will support laboratory and clinical research in the behavioral and biological sciences; for example, psychiatry, socioeconomic studies, health problems of narcotic addiction, alcoholism, neuropharmacology, and clinical psychopharmacology. This subactivity also supports Institute staff who are responsible for the planning, development, and administration of the grant programs identified in the previous paragraph. A portion of the funds is used to support research on a contract basis. One such activity is the marihuana contract program designed to determine the behavioral and biological effects of marihuana. Payments to the National Institutes of Health management fund are also supported in this subactivity. For 1972 and 1973, funds to operate the Clinical Research Center at Lexington, Kentucky, formerly presented in Rehabilitation of drug abusers, will be included here.

HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health services research and development:			
Grants and contracts	39,105	56,118	58,018
Direct operations	4,869	5,898	6,325

The major problems in the health care delivery system that are given priority in the National Center's research and development program are: Rising costs of medical care, unequal distribution and utilization of health services, inadequate data for health services planning and decision making at local and national levels, and relative shortages or maldistribution of professional health personnel.

Grants and contracts. Research and development. Grants and contracts are awarded to public or private agencies, academic, and other research organizations to conduct analyses of economic, social, and technological factors which affect the organization, financing, and utilization of health services. Large-scale research and development projects are directed primarily at containing the rate of increase of medical care costs, developing community-based systems for delivering health services, improving the availability, utilization, and quality of care, and developing a cooperative Federal-State-local health statistics system.

Research and development training. Grants and contracts are awarded to institutions and to qualified scholars for supporting research and managerial training in the health services field. A major emphasis in 1973 will be the development of training programs and opportunities in health services planning, implementation, and operation.

Direct operations. This activity supports the staff required to design and direct the National Center's strategic program of research and development. The staff obtains high-level evaluation of all proposals, closely monitors contracts, reviews results, informs the professional community of significant progress, and identifies the next steps in research and development.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Preventive Health Services: Disease control: Infectious diseases: Research grants	827	2,144	2,215

Note: Research grants are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals for research concerned with epidemiology, prevention, laboratory diagnosis, and treatment of infectious diseases at the community level. Approximately 52 research projects would be supported in 1973 as compared to 50 in 1972 and 48 in 1971.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Research grants	1,223	1,770	1,228

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

In 1973, the NIH research institutes will initiate or expand activities in several high-priority programs. The National Cancer Institute will expand its efforts in all areas of cancer research, to continue the administration's accelerated cancer research program. The National Cancer Act of 1971 authorizes a national cancer program which will be initiated during 1972 and further developed in 1973 by the National Cancer Institute. The National Heart and Lung Institute will increase research in sickle cell anemia, arteriosclerosis, hypertension, thrombosis, and pulmonary diseases.

The National Institute of Dental Research will enhance the goals of the national caries program through increased research grant funding. The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases will give special emphasis to research in the area of digestive diseases—peptic ulcer, ileitis, and diseases of the liver, gallbladder, and pancreas. The National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke will provide increased support for research in the fields of stroke, acute spinal cord injury, Parkinsonism, and communicative disorders. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases will give increased attention to research concerning cellular and clinical immunology, hepatitis, the biology of the gonococcus, and to allergic diseases. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will strengthen its research programs in the areas of family planning, child health, and aging. The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences will increase research efforts in areas such as chemical mutagenesis, teratology, pesticides, food toxicants, air pollutants, and physical factors such as noise. The National Institute of General Medical Sciences will support research in the basic medical sciences. The National Eye Institute will continue its research efforts in the diseases and disorders of the eye.

The activities of the research institutes and divisions are carried out through extramural grant programs and through operations conducted directly by NIH and through contracts. Extramural grant programs are of three types:

Research grants—the principal activity of the institutes—are awarded to individuals for heath-related research projects which are chosen on the basis of their scientific merit.

Fellowships are awarded to promising individuals preparing for research careers in the biomedical sciences.

Training grants are awarded to academic or research institutions which have demonstrated the ability to design and conduct successful training programs in the biological sciences.

In addition to grants, the NIH research institutes and divisions support biomedical research through direct operations which include the following components:

Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in the institutes' laboratory facilities and in the commonly shared clinical center facility.

Research and development contracts are conducted by NIH researchers in collaboration with other Federal and non-Federal institutions and are strongly oriented toward the solution of specific health problems where the state of knowledge is sufficiently advanced to permit a more directed approach.

Research management and program services provide such operational requirements as program direction, review and approval of grants, and intramural training programs.

Other activities under direct operations include biometry, epidemiology and field studies, biologics standards, and international research.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Biologics standards: Research and development contracts[1]	2,627	2,100	2,100

[1] This activity represents that portion of the total biologics standards program aimed at the acquisition of knowledge for the improvement of standards utilizing the contract method.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research	98,400	126,719	160,874
Fellowships	4,067	3,548	4,750
Training	11,807	12,874	15,750
Total grants	114,274	143,141	181,374

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	19,894	19,443	21,624
Research and development contracts	81,802	122,303	137,787
Collaborative research and support	21,137	27,542	29,882
Research management and program services	4,893	9,276	10,539
Total direct operations	127,726	178,564	199,832
Construction		16,000	49,000
Total program costs funded	242,000	337,705	430,206
Change in selected resources	−9,144		
Total obligations	232,856	337,705	430,206

The National Cancer Institute conducts, fosters, and assists research and training directed toward preventing, diagnosing, treating, and controlling cancer in man. The institute will strengthen the cancer research center program. Expanded research of viruses and chemicals will be effected for the ultimate prevention of cancers in man. Cancer therapy methods will be expanded to utilize to a greater extent those drugs and combinations thereof that have proved effective in the treatment of cancer; and application of knowledge gained in treatment of fast growing tumors to the slow growing ones such as breast, lung, colon, bladder, prostate, and pancreas. Task forces will be emphasized in order to concentrate on the causes and preventions of cancers.

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,574 regular research grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,268 in 1972 and 979 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for cancer research centers (clinical centers and program centers), leukemia research support centers, large bowel and bladder task forces, general research support grants, and cancer control competitive demonstration projects.

Fellowships. Approximately 224 postdoctoral and special fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 151 in 1972 and 191 in 1971. Also, some 100 career award and career development fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 78 in 1972 and 82 in 1971.

Training. Grants are awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction in the curriculum; clinical training grants are awarded for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships. The following table summarizes those grants:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Graduate training	86	90	102
Cancer clinical training	85	102	113

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research includes laboratory research in the fields of biology, biochemistry, and physiology; and clinical research in the fields of surgery, immunology, radiation, dermatology, pathology, and metabolism.

Research and development contracts. This activity includes the funds for that portion of the research programs described under Laboratory and Clinical Research and Collaborative Research and Support, utilizing the contract mechanism.

Collaborative research and support. Research is conducted in the areas of etiology and chemotherapy. Several task forces, for example, breast cancer and lung cancer, are also included within this activity. This activity contains the research effort carried on directly in Government laboratories and clinical facilities for these integrated programs. The programs are focused on the causes of cancers and their occurrence patterns and prevention, as well as funding the best methods of treating cancer through the screening, testing, and clinical evaluation of drugs. That portion of the effort of these targeted programs conducted through the contract mechanism is included in the above activity Research and Development Contracts.

Construction. Cancer research centers will be constructed which are a critical component of the expanded cancer research program. Etiology research facilities will be constructed for the expansion of carcinogenesis and viral oncology research. Plans are being developed for the addition of outpatient and laboratory facilities.

NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	108,370	133,794	141,628
Fellowships	5,094	7,371	7,371
Training	15,630	17,643	17,643
Total grants	129,094	158,808	166,642
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	16,927	17,721	18,132
Research and development contracts	21,872	46,497	59,374
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	1,215	1,506	1,582
Research management and program services	5,861	7,603	8,686
Total direct operations	45,875	73,327	87,774
Total program costs funded	174,969	232,135	254,416
Change in selected resources	19,857		
Total obligations	194,826	232,135	254,416

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,470 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,472 in 1972, and 1,447 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for specialized research centers and the heart cooperative drug study.

Fellowships. Approximately 345 awards will be supported in 1973 as compared with 345 in 1972 and 340 in 1971.

Training. Funds will provide for 250 grants for cardiovascular and pulmonary research and clinical training for 1,000 trainees. Comparable numbers of grants and trainees are 365 and 996 in 1972, and 366 and 1,000 in 1971. The pulmonary academic award was instituted in 1971 to four trainees. It will be continued at this level in 1972 and expanded to 60 trainees in 1973.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research encompasses work which aids in the understanding of the cardiovascular and pulmonary systems and their diseases, with emphasis in therapeutic agents, diagnostic instrumentation, surgery, and clinical medicine.

Research and development contracts. Funds will support programs in the research and development of the application of cardiovascular and pulmonary medical devices, in myocardial infarction, blood resources, sickle cell diseases, lipid research, respiratory diseases, and clinical trials in hypertension and in multiple-risk factors.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity conducts and supports therapeutic evaluations, epidemiological, and biometrics research.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	15,746	21,504	22,152
Fellowships	1,455	1,601	1,601
Training	5,225	5,270	5,270
Total grants	22,426	28,375	29,023
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	6,192	6,751	6,745
Research and development contracts	795	5,500	5,500
Collaborative research and support	260	314	339
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	666	938	977
Research management and program services	1,154	1,382	1,492
Total direct operations	9,067	14,885	15,053
Total program costs funded	31,493	43,260	44,076
Change in selected resources	3,718		
Total obligations	35,211	43,260	44,076

Research grants support fundamental clinical and applied research studies in such areas as dental caries, periodontal disease, oral-facial growth and development, dental restorative materials. Support is furnished for studies designed to advanced scientific frontiers and exploit emerging research opportunities, including: investigation of the interplay of host, dietary, and microbiotic factors in dental caries; development of more effective therapeutic and preventive measures in periodontal disease; development of treatment procedures and determination of preventive measures for oral-facial anomalies; and work on the immediate problems of dental treatment through development of new and improved restorative materials and clinical methods.

The activity in support of dental research institutes (centers) in university settings, now entering its fifth year and requiring support at the current level of $6,200,000, continues to close the gap between dental and other biomedical research, and is significantly influencing the progress of dental education.

The recently initiated Special Dental Research Award program is designed to help newly trained investigators remain active in research during the formative stages of their careers, and thereby assure a vital input to the dental investigator pool. Emphasis will continue to be in the basic and clinical problem areas of dental caries, periodontal and mucosal diseases of the mouth, oral-facial defects of development, and dental pain.

Approximately 248 project grants will be supported in 1973, compared with 249 in 1972, and 217 in 1971.

Fellowships. Funds for fellowships are used for support of clinical and basic research training. Applications under this program are for special fellowships, postdoctoral fellowships, and career development and career awards. In 1973, 91 fellowships will be supported, compared with 96 in 1972 and 95 in 1971.

Training. Training funds are the principal means of meeting the need for dental research and academic personnel in the dental schools to teach clinical and basic sciences, and to conduct research. Increased costs per grant will make it necessary to support only 81 grants in 1973, compared with 85 in 1972 and 93 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research studies conducted in Institute facilities are concerned with the causes, treatment, control, and prevention of such dental diseases and disorders as caries, periodontal disease, oral-facial anomalies, and oral cancer. Three primary approaches are used: Basic research directed at the acquisition of new knowledge as a means of solving dental health problems; field studies and clinical trials of new therapeutic and prevention concepts coming out of basic research; and further studies on the definition and distribution of oral-facial diseases and disorders on an epidemiologic or geographic basis. Much of this research will make direct contributions to the recently initiated National caries program.

Research and development contracts. The programs in this activity involve contracts with public and private research and development organizations. Primary objectives include support of the National caries program and the development of new and improved dental restorative materials.

Collaborative research and support. This activity provides administrative, contract, and clerical personnel necessary to administer the research and development contracts supported by this Institute.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity is concerned with the planning, conduct, and analysis of epidemiological and field investigations concerning such matters as prevalence of oral disease, and effectiveness of new or improved methods of diagnosis, control, and prevention. A number of the studies conducted will be integral parts of the National caries program.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	85,252	101,917	105,903
Fellowships	5,470	5,740	5,740
Training	15,060	15,072	15,072
Total grants	105,782	122,729	126,715
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	18,460	18,235	19,052
Research and development contracts	4,693	5,954	6,224
Collaborative research and support	843	1,128	1,213
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	860	1,146	1,298
Research management and program services	3,069	3,776	3,892
Total direct operations	27,925	30,239	31,679
Total program costs funded	133,707	152,968	158,394
Change in selected resources	4,240		
Total obligations	137,947	152,968	158,394

Grants. Research. Approximately 2,167 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,957 in 1972 and 1,880 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research centers.

Fellowships. Approximately 323 fellowships will be supported in 1973 as compared to 342 in 1972 and 357 in 1971.

Training. During 1973 it is estimated that 246 grants will be awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction. This compares to 260 grants in 1972 and 276 grants in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is conducted in the fields of arthritis, rheumatism, diabetes, and other metabolic disorders, as well as studies in the major disciplines including pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry, nutrition, chemistry, pathology, endrocinology, physical biology, molecular biology, chemical biology, gastroenterology, hematology, and biomathematics.

Research and development contracts. Projects are conducted under contract with individuals and institutions primarily in support of the artificial kidney/chronic uremia, the digestive diseases and nutrition, and the hormonal development programs.

Collaborative research and support. Comprehensive programs are conducted in methods to improve hemodialysis and to develop simpler, more economical, and less cumbersome artificial kidneys in the preparation and distribution of hormonal substances in the analysis and evaluation of Institute programs and in scientific communications, such as the preparation of abstracts on specific areas of research interest.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. Research and epidemiological studies are conducted on arthritis, diabetes, cholecystitis, iodine metabolism, and hyperuremia in special population groups, primarily long range studies in the southwestern United States.

Research management and program services. General direction, coordination, and administration of the resources of the total Institute are provided by the Institute Director, his immediate staff, and the office of administrative management, including contract negotiations and awards. The review and approval of grants functions includes review for scientific merit and program relevance and maintenance of surveillance over each grants project. Scientific information functions are also conducted under this activity.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	56,543	69,460	69,763
Fellowships	2,523	2,782	2,782
Training	12,696	14,300	14,300
Total grants	71,762	86,542	86,845
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	11,474	10,654	10,846
Research and development contracts	5,800	8,219	8,285
Collaborative research and support	6,550	7,936	8,004
Research management and program services	2,809	3,168	3,318
Total direct operations	26,633	29,977	30,453
Total program costs funded	98,395	116,519	117,298
Change in selected resources	5,050		
Total obligations	103,445	116,519	117,298

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,250 grants will be supported in 1973 compared to 1,377 in 1972 and 1,258 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for specialized research center grants.

Fellowships. Approximately 147 fellowships will be supported in 1973 compared to 148 in 1972 and 190 in 1971.

Training. Approximately 187 graduate training grants will be supported in 1973 compared to 198 in 1972 and 221 in 1971. These grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology and otology. Also, approximately 144 traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training in 1973 compared to 153 in 1972 and 195 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is being conducted on disorders of the brain, spinal cord, and peripheral nerves, such as epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, apoplexy, and Parkinson's disease; on communicative disorders and neuromuscular disorders, such as muscular dystrophy.

Research and development contracts. Contracts for directed research are used for collaborative and intramural programs including epilepsy, head injury and sensory prosthesis, and other neurological disorders.

Collaborative research and support. These studies include the coordination and central service activities for the collaborative perinatal project on cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of childhood. Also included are the Institute's research programs on head injury, spinal cord injury, epilepsy, cerebral death, and sensory prosthesis research. In sensory prosthesis research, the goal is to develop devices using suitable sensors, data processors, and stimulating electrode arrays implanted against the brain of a blind or deaf person to permit the subject to abstract meaningful information from his environment.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	56,097	62,986	65,089
Fellowships	3,290	3,579	3,579
Training	8,323	8,922	8,922
Total grants	67,711	75,487	78,090
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	18,275	17,717	18,304
Research and development contracts	7,879	11,050	10,928
Collaborative research and support	2,055	2,153	2,198
Research management and program services	2,144	2,326	2,387
Total direct operations	30,353	33,246	33,817
Total program costs funded	98,064	108,733	111,917
Change in selected resources	3,989		
Total obligations	102,053	108,733	111,917

Grants. Research. Grants are awarded to universities and to other institutions on a project basis to conduct research needs which have been identified as of national importance. Funds available for 1973 will support approximately 1,271 awards compared to 1,185 awards in 1972 and 1,154 awards in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and international centers for medical research and training.

Fellowships. Funds for fellowships are used to train professional researchers in research areas within the categorical interests of the Institute. The program supports postdoctoral, special, career development fellowships, and career awards. An estimated 206 awards will be made in 1973 and 1972, compared to 151 grants and 906 individuals in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research in microbiology and immunology, in its broadest sense, nourishes the entire field of biomedicine and affects the programs of all the other Institutes. The Institute research effort embraces both basic and applied research. Laboratory scientists and clinical investigators at NIH and field installations are directing their efforts to the discovery and exploitation of new knowledge leading to the eventual prevention and treatment of diseases caused by infection

with microorganisms or abnormal immunological mechanisms. The diseases under intensive study are those caused by viruses, bacteria, mycoplasma, fungi, protozoa, and helminths.

Research and development contracts. The activities carried out under this program are through research contracts with industry and other Federal and non-Federal institutions. Primary objectives include translation of significant basic research data into practical achievements of clinical applicability in immunologic and infectious diseases. The program also conducts and supports developmental research in the prevention, control, and treatment of diseases caused by infectious agents including bacteria, viruses, and parasites and abnormalities in the body's immune mechanisms.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	101,321	103,676	105,626
Fellowships	16,951	15,609	15,609
Training	43,746	43,746	43,746
Total grants	162,018	163,031	164,981
Direct operations:			
Research and development contracts	3,263	4,816	5,016
Research management and program services	4,664	5,488	5,719
Total direct operations	7,927	10,304	10,735
Total program costs funded	169,945	173,335	175,716
Change in selected resources	−10,104		
Total obligations	159,841	173,335	175,716

Grants. Research. Approximately 1,278 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 1,277 in 1972 and 1,142 in 1971. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, pharmacology-toxicology research centers and research centers in genetics, diagnostic radiology, and anesthesiology.

Fellowships. Approximately 1,085 fellow ship awards will be made in 1973 as compared to 1,221 in 1972 and 1,735 in 1971.

Training. Approximately 467 grants and 3,952 trainees will be funded in 1973 as compared to 468 grants and 4,160 trainees in 1972 and 521 grants and 4,360 trainees in 1971.

Direct operations. Research and development contracts. This activity supports the research contract program in the biomedical sciences and supportive areas and is utilized to achieve specific research and training objectives that cannot be accomplished appropriately through the research and training grant mechanisms.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actua	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	48,780	63,836	72,001
Fellowships	4,471	3,786	3,786
Training	13,867	10,142	10,142
Total grants	67,118	77,764	85,929
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	7,611	11,685	10,558
Research and deveopment contracts	6,934	21,021	24,242
Collaborative research and development	374	686	797
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	536	602	616
Research management and program services	3,862	4,403	4,554
Total direct operations	19,317	38,397	40,767
Total program costs funded	86,435	116,161	126,696
Change in selected resources	8,309		
Total obligations	94,744	116,161	126,696

Grants. Research. Approximately 965 regular research grants will be supported in 1973. This compares with an anticipated 811 in 1972 and 748 in 1971. Additionally this activity provides funds for general research support grants and mental retardation research centers.

Fellowships. In 1973 approximately 210 awards will be supported as contrasted to 214 in 1972 and 220 in 1971.

Training. In 1973 the Institute will support approximately 98 training grants. This compares with 99 anticipated for 1972 and 112 supported in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. The laboratories of this activity conduct research in five major program areas of child health and human development. Reproduction and population research includes research in reproductive biology, endocrinology, and ecology. Perinatal biology and infant mortality includes research relating to maternal-child interactions, maturation of motor and behavioral systems, nutrition, and development. Growth and development includes research in the areas of neurophysiology, neurochemistry, and nutrition. Adult development and aging includes research in cellular biology, biochemistry, physiology, and psychological development. Mental retardation includes biochemical, neurophysiological, and behavioral research.

Research and development contracts. This activity, primarily through the contract mechanism, supplements the Institute's five research programs. The research conducted is usually Institute initiated and is directed toward gaps in existing research or to expand on current studies of either the intramural program or the research grant program. This activity provides one of the most effective ways for coordinating program development in the Institute's five program areas. The main thrust of the Institute's population research program is accomplished through contract efforts within this activity.

Collaborative research and support. This activity supports the Center for Population Research which was established in 1968 to administer the Institute's population research program. Research and training is conducted in the biomedical and behavioral sciences of population. The goals of such research are to develop and evaluate methods of contraception and fertility regulation and to support acquisition of knowledge on determinants and consequences of population growth.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity supports the Institute's scientific staff in planning and in conducting studies dealing with the incidence, distribution, and control of health problems in certain populations. It supports development of more effective and reliable means for measuring health problems, collects and analyzes health data, and makes statistical studies for use in initiating and evaluating scientific programs.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	12,550	24,984	24,950
Fellowships	1,058	1,676	1,676
Training	2,819	2,998	2,998
Total grants	16,427	29,658	29,624
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	1,454	3,277	3,419
Research and development contracts	425	2,225	2,225
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	305	446	454
Research management and program services	968	1,416	1,479
Total direct operations	3,152	7,364	7,577
Total program costs funded	19,579	37,022	37,201
Change in selected resources	10,406		
Total obligations	29,985	37,022	37,201

Grants. Research. The research grants programs of the National Eye Institute supports the acquisition of new knowledge to combat the widespread incidence of visual disability. Projects range from basic investigations of the visual process to the clinical application of knowledge acquired in the laboratory. Glaucoma, retinal disease, disorders of the cornea and lens, cataract, and infectious eye diseases are among the specific conditions undergoing intensive investigation. In addition, funds are provided for vision clinical research centers and general research support grants. During 1973 the Institute plans to award approximately 418 research grants as compared to 423 awards in 1972 and 411 in 1971.

Fellowships. The fellowship program supports the national vision research effort through the provision of postdoctoral research training to individual investigators working on problems of visual health. Awardees receive training in the wide variety of scientific disciplines associated with vision research. Approximately 101 fellowships will be awarded in 1973 as compared to 101 in 1972 and 88 in 1971.

Training. Training grants are awarded to academic institutions for the establishment, improvement, or expansion of vision research training programs. The grants provide sophisticated training environments for more advanced investigators who wish to pursue academic careers in vision research. Approximately 42 training grants will be awarded in 1973 as compared to 45 in 1972 and 48 in 1971.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. This activity supports laboratory and clinical investigations conducted by staff of the National Eye Institute. Talented investigators representing a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines strive to increase our knowledge and understanding of glaucoma, retinal disorders, inflammatory diseases of the eye, embryology of the retina and cornea, and the coding of visual information from the eye to the brain. A close association between the laboratory and clinic facilities the rapid translation of research findings to the care of eye patients.

Research and development contracts. This program supports research contracts with universities, other Federal agencies, and industrial research organizations for projects that require close direction and surveillance by Institute staff and offer high probability of rapid payoff. Projects have been initiated to improve the diagnosis and treatment of

glaucoma, retinal disease, and developmental abnormalities of the visual system.

Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies. This activity constitutes a program for the collection and analysis of data on the incidence and prevalence of vision disorders in selected population groups, and for the study of environmental and hereditary factors in the etiology of eye disease. The program also provides biometric and epidemiologic support to intramural and collaborative programs, including clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy of various regimens in the prevention of blindness.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	10,093	12,750	14,404
Fellowships	240	264	264
Training	3,233	3,117	3,117
Total grants	13,566	16,131	17,785
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	5,585	7,206	7,673
Research and development contracts	442	2,054	2,354
Research management and program services	818	936	1,005
Total direct operations	6,845	10,196	11,032
Total program costs funded	20,411	26,327	28,817
Change in selected resources	−318		
Total obligations	20,093	26,327	28,817

Grants. Research. Approximately 177 regular research and center grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 146 in 1972 and 118 in 1971. This activity supports research on the phenomena associated with the source, distribution, mode of entry, and the effect of environmental agents on biological systems through grants to universities, research institutes, and other public or private nonprofit institutions.

Fellowships. Approximately 17 awards will be supported in 1973 as compared to 17 in 1972 and 18 in 1971. Under the fellowship program, postdoctoral, special, and research career development awards are made to physicians and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences.

Training grants. Approximately 30 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 35 in 1972 and 42 in 1971. The graduate research training program supports the availability of high quality training opportunities in environmental health. It has a threefold goal: To increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health; to enable training institutions to strengthen and enrich the research training capabilities; and to expand opportunities for environmental health research training in a greater number of graduate institutions throughout the United States.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. This activity constitutes the in-house research programs in environmental health sciences at the National Environmental Health Sciences Center in the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Included are research efforts in cell biology, pharmacology and toxicology, analytical and synthetic chemistry, biophysics and biomedical instrumentation, animal science and technology, pathologic physiology, epidemiology, and biometry. Scientific communication, as well as the supporting services for these laboratories and branches, are also included.

Research and development contracts. This activity supplements and complements the Institute's intramural research program. Research in this activity is supported through contracts in collaboration with other Federal agencies, university research centers, and industrial research organizations.

RESEARCH RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants:			
Research	63,622	71,079	71,079
Fellowships	146	126	126
Training	387	352	352
Total grants	64,155	71,557	71,557
Direct operations:			
Research and development contracts	1,697	1,459	1,430
Research management and program services	1,975	1,912	1,942
Total direct operations	3,672	3,371	3,372
Total program costs funded	67,827	74,928	74,929
Change in selected resources	−1,640		
Total obligations	66,187	74,928	74,929

The programs administered by the Division of Research Resources provide for the creation of specialized research settings for use by grantees and contractors of the National Institutes of Health categorical programs and for the generation of new knowledge to aid the general progress of biomedical science in the treatment of human disease and disability.

The discrete research resources include: general clinical research centers which are prominent features in many of the Nation's leading medical schools and which make extensive, controlled studies of human patients possible; biotechnology resources which bring powerful instrumentation and physical sciences expertise within reach of the biomedical scientist; and animal resources, which not only give investigators access to expertly maintained colonies of rare animals for those studies which cannot realistically be undertaken in humans, but also represent standards for the most advanced facilities and procedures for high quality animal care. The Division also administers the general research support program.

Grants. Research. Funds in 1973 will provide the following special research resources: General clinical research centers—approximately 82 centers will be supported in 1973 including three new high priority centers, with some diversification for further expansion of research on ambulatory subjects, as compared to 82 in 1972 and 81 in 1971; biotechnology resources—approximately 48 resources will be supported in 1973 as compared to 48 in 1972 and 47 in 1971; animal resources—approximately 75 animal resources including seven primate centers will receive support in 1973, the same as 1972, as compared to 71 in 1971.

Fellowships. Approximately 14 fellowships will be supported in 1973, the same as 1972 and 1971.

Training. Grants are awarded to institutions to support training in the field of laboratory animal medicine. Approximately eight training grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to nine in 1972 and 1971.

Direct operations. Research and development contracts. This activity is carried out primarily through research contracts with industry, universities, and other Federal and non-Federal institutions. Included are contracts in the areas of chemical/biological information handling, biotechnology, and laboratory animal care.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants—Research [1]	500	500	500

[1] Research funds will support the Gorgas Memorial Institute.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research facilities	348	1,920	1,300

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Foreign health research	27,094	27,686	25,619

This program is supported by foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been determined by the Treasury to be in excess of normal U.S. needs.

The general objective of this program is to support health research and research related activities overseas that are within the program interests of the Department's health agencies and of mutual interest to the host country, its institutions, and its scientists. The Department anticipates that the support of health research potential overseas will ultimately enhance the status of the health sciences in the United States. To meet these general objectives, approximately 350 projects are currently active in eight excess currency countries: Ceylon, Egypt, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia. Areas of research include: The improvement of the organization and delivery of health services, environmental health, nutrition, manpower development, population and family planning, disease prevention and control, food and drug consumer protection, biomedical research, and health science communications.

Increased involvement in the worldwide problems of environmental health, population and family planning, and disease prevention and control is planned for 1973. Emphasis will be placed on matching high priority U.S. health needs with salient areas of concern in the host countries in order to achieve domestic goals and also promote U.S. foreign policy.

It is planned to support an estimated 170 new projects in 1973. Specific objectives are: $2,250,000 for environmental health, $4,860,000 for studies to improve the organization and delivery of health services, $1,015,000 for population and family planning research, $1,900,000 for nutrition studies, $580,000 for manpower development, $1,930,000 for disease prevention and control, $5,526,000 for studies in food and drug consumer protection, and $7,550,000 for biomedical research and scientific health communications.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
General research support grants: Total obligations	54,200	55,212	54,624

In 1973 funds are provided for the following general research support programs. General research support grants enable institutions heavily engaged in health-related research greater control over the quality, content, emphasis, and direction of their research activities than is possible exclusively under the categorical research project system. Approximately 346 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 338 in 1972 and 326 in 1971. The biomedical science support program provides funds to academic institutions other than health professional schools for support of their health-related research and research training activities. Approximately 117 grants will be supported in 1973 as compared to 115 in 1972 and 112 in 1971. Health sciences advancement awards program—in 1973 continuation awards will be made to two institutions compared to four in 1972 and nine in 1971. The minority schools biomedical support program is designed to strengthen institutional biomedical research and research training capability at institutions where the student enrollment is drawn mainly from minority ethnic groups. Approximately 49 institutions will receive support in 1973 as compared to 26 in 1972 when this program was initiated.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
National Institutes of Health Management Fund: Research services	5,377	5,591	5,714

Research supporting services provide the central administration and operation of services for the conduct of research activities such as providing laboratory animals, culture media, and glassware; design and fabrication of laboratory instrumentation; operating the NIH medical reference library, including the translation of medical literature; scientific photography and medical arts; and environmental engineering services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Service and supply fund: Research animals:			
Cost of goods sold	140	151	163
Other	1,446	1,551	1,578

The National Institutes of Health animal facilities provide small and large research animals to the research laboratories. The facilities include breeding, holding, and conditioning facilities for mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, hamsters, dogs, cats, primates, and ungulate animals. Bleeding services are also provided.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Medical research	883	8,499	8,716

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Education for the handicapped: Innovation and development	11,079	11,255	9,916

Grants and contracts are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, research and development centers, and other research and demonstration projects. The 1973 budget includes additional funds for these activities. The estimate also reflects the transfer of basic research support to the proposed National Institute of Education.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Vocational research:			
Innovation	13,762	21,977	16,000
Curriculum development	4,000	4,000	6,000
Research—Grants to States	35,651	18,000	18,000
Special projects		18,000	

Grants are made to States, colleges, universities, and other institutions to develop new models for upgrading vocational education programs and for stimulating new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for school dropouts and youth who graduate from high school lacking employable skills. Grants are also made for the development of curricula for new and changing occupations and to provide the information essential to make necessary improvements and changes for more effective vocational education programs. In 1973, this activity will be part of a career education demonstration effort. Special projects will be transferred to the National Institute of Education in 1973.

PROJECTS SUPPORTED

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Innovation	197	356	281
Curriculum development	20	25	28
Research: State grants	273	181	186

EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and development:			
Experimental schools	12,000	15,000	
Institutional support	31,996	32,100	
Career education		2,000	
General research and development	15,934	11,000	

In 1973, the existing research and demonstration programs discussed below are to be transferred to the proposed National Institute of Education.

Experimental schools. This program tests, develops, and demonstrates ways to improve the learning of children in actual school situations. Support will be provided to schools which will implement, in a comprehensive manner, ideas already verified as feasible by prior research as well as ideas yet to be evaluated. Over the next several years the program will generate a series of experimental school sites that will represent a full range of alternatives to current educational practice. Three schools were chosen in 1972 and four more will be added in 1973.

Institutional support. This program is building a network of educational research and development institutions capable of solving pressing educational problems by supporting specific research and development efforts. In 1973, eleven educational laboratories and nine research and development centers will be supported.

Career education. Grants and contracts are made to support the research and development for four model career education programs. Career vocational education, and work experience so that all students will understand their potential career choices, have saleable skills, and understand the world of work. The four models are for school, industry, home, and residential vocational programs.

General research and development. These funds support a variety of multidisciplinary research and development activities and also grants for dissemination, and evaluation activities.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1973 estimate	1973 estimate
Grants to States for Public Assistance: Research and training projects	17,080		
Social and Rehabilitation Services: Research	46,318	64,063	64,063

Projects are supported to develop and improve the administration and services of the Social and Rehabilitation Service programs. Research and demonstrations are conducted in the areas of rehabilitation and employability service, community services, medical assistance, child welfare, and services for the aged. Income maintenance experiments are supported to assess the alternative methods of income supplementation. Research and training centers are supported to provide for testing of methods of rehabilitation in critical areas such as stroke, paraplegia, and circulatory problems. Regional research centers provide for analysis of such areas as the factors relating to client dependency, problems of the rural poor, and health delivery systems for the poor. The 1973 program will emphasize methods to provide coordinated services at the local level, testing of methods of rehabilitation of the disabled receiving assistance payments, and improving the health care delivery system under the Medicaid program.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1973 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and demonstrations	4,011	8,629	10,000

Research, demonstrations, and research training programs are supported with foreign currencies accruing to the United States through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and through other sources. The estimate for 1973 proposes an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the purchase of foreign currencies in excess currency countries to support research activities which complement, supplement, and strengthen domestic research and service programs. This program enables the U.S. to benefit from progress that other countries are making in dealing with social and rehabilitation and social security problems, and to utilize the talents of foreign scientists working in these fields.

The request in 1973 will be used to support integrated service delivery systems, testing various combinations of health, welfare, rehabilitation, and other community services and new methods in manpower training and development. Priorities will be continued in fields of rehabilitation medicine, rehabilita-

tion engineering, sensory disorders, mental disabilities, and rehabilitation services for alcoholics and drug addicts. The interchange of U.S. experts and their counterparts in the cooperating countries will also be stressed as an indispensable adjunct to the SRS international research program. Comparative studies abroad will supplement the domestic research efforts in the evaluation of the old-age, survivors, disability, and Medicare provisions of the Social Security Act.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Child Development: Research and demonstration	5,494	11,500	12,500

Support is provided for research projects and grants designed to increase our knowledge of effective early childhood programs, to develop evaluation instruments and norms for young children, to improve foster care and adoption systems, and to develop better statistical reporting on current services provided to young children. Under this same activity, projects will be designed to carry out the child research and reporting mandates of the Children's Bureau Organization Act of 1912 and to follow up on the recommendations of the White House Conference on Children and Youth. In 1973, research will be expanded in the areas of the family and youth.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: National goals research staff	30	----------	----------

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Community planning and management: Comprehensive planning grants: Studies, research, and demonstrations	2,466	2,500	2,500

Studies, research, and demonstration projects are aimed at the development and improvement of techniques and methods used in comprehensive planning, and for advancing the purposes of the Comprehensive Planning Grants program.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANTS (SUPPLEMENTAL NOW REQUESTED)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Studies, research, and demonstrations	----------	----------	1,000

FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
National Insurance Development Fund: Studies and surveys	61	100	100

This item includes expenses of continuing reviews of market availability of basic property insurance and of crime insurance, as required by law.

FLOOD INSURANCE—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Studies and surveys	3,633	5,460	9,195

At this juncture, the major aspect of the program is the studies to determine areas having special flood hazard and to determine appropriate actuarial premimum rates which are conducted by other Federal agencies and, in some instances, by private contractors.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and technology: Operation breakthrough	26,715	16,284	4,500
Other contracts, studies, and performance of research	5,533	32,775	45,070
Administrative expenses	1,824	3,771	3,330
Total program costs funded	34,072	52,830	52,900
Change in selected resources	9,369	−2,046	10,000
Total obligations	43,441	50,784	62,900

Title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 directs the Secretary to undertake programs of research, studies, testing, and demonstrations related to the missions and programs of the Department. These functions may be carried out both through contracts and grants. Additional authority for such a research program is provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Operation Breakthrough is a program designed to develop and test innovations in housing design, construction, land use, financing, management, and marketing. The objective of the program is to improve this Nation's housing process in order to develop a self-sustained mechanism for providing volume production of marketable housing at stable or reduced costs for all income groups. In 1972 the construction and testing of Operation Breakthrough prototype projects will be virtually complete. Marketing of the prototype sites should be essentially completed in 1973. During this period, increasing emphasis will be given to encouraging large volume production of industrialized housing including the systems and methods developed under Operation Breakthrough.

Other contracts, studies, and performance of research. The activities in this category are carried out primarily through contracts with industry, nonprofit research organizations, educational institutions, and agreements with other Federal agencies. In 1973, experimental programs in the areas of housing allowance, abandoned housing, and housing management, all developed in 1972, will be continued, consistent with the results of prior research activity. Other program areas receiving continued emphasis include: Developing municipal and regional information systems, gathering and evaluating data on housing and mortgage markets, applying university resources to urban problems, improving the environment of communities, and strengthening State and local government capabilities to deal with urban problems. The 1973 program also provides for continuation of a demonstration of homeownership counseling for low- and moderate-income families, funded under Housing management in 1972.

Administrative expenses. This activity covers the cost of general planning, supervision, and direction of the research program in the central office and field.

SPECIAL STUDIES AND LOW-INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimated	1973 estimated
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1,646	2,246	----------
Study of housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and edvelopment standards	1	----------	----------
Natural disaster study	----------	17	----------
Total program costs funded	1,647	2,263	----------
Change in selected resources	−1,647	−2,256	----------
Total obligations	----------	7	----------

Low-income housing demonstration programs. The Housing Act of 1961, as amended, authorized $15,000,000 in contract authority for grants to develop and demonstrate new or improved means of providing homes for low-income persons and families, including handicapped families. The unobligated contract authority was rescinded by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

Study of housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as amended, required a study of housing and building codes and zoning and tax policies which was completed by a presidential commission.

Natural disaster study. Section 5 of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, as amended, authorized a study of alternative programs which might help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood and other natural disasters, including alternative insurance programs. These have been completed and an insurance program for flood hazards has been enacted by Congress.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimated	1973 estimated
Urban transportation: Research, development, demonstrations, and technical studies	1,586	713	900
Change in selected resources	−1,586	2,951	−900
Total obligations	----------	3,664	----------

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes grants in support of research, development, and demonstration projects focusing on the relationship of urban transportation systems to the comprehensively planned development of urban areas. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 transferred all but Sections 6, 9, and 11 of the 1964 Act from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Transportation. Subsequent to this, both agencies agreed that the latter shall have responsibility for administering Sections 6, 9, and 11 as well.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses, Model Cities and governmental relations: Special studies	460	----------	----------

The amount shown above for 1971 is for the former Model Cities and governmental

relations organization, the activities of which are included in the new organization for community development programs.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and technology	2,937	3,771	3,330

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Planning and research	2,492	2,083	1,871

Funds are provided for: Nationwide outdoor recreation resources provided by the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector and to assess relative priorities for allocating available public resources to help satisfy unmet demands for outdoor recreation; evaluation of the estimated recreation benefits of proposed Federal water development projects, participation in comprehensive river basin planning studies, and studies of potential wild and scenic rivers, national trails, and wilderness; and review and dissemination of research on factors which influence outdoor recreation demands.

MINERAL RESOURCES—BUREAU OF MINES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources—Research:			
Coal	7,709	8,974	13,351
Petroleum	2,725	3,117	3,080
Oil shale	2,639	2,560	2,526
Metallurgy	13,066	13,967	14,845
Mining	6,979	4,998	4,930
Marine mineral mining	387	----	----
Explosives	672	715	706

Coal. Coal research is carried out to maintain the technological competence necessary to achieve maximum utility from this vast resource and help satisfy increasing national energy requirements. To this end, the research effort is directed toward advancing coal utilization technology, developing economic and more efficient methods of converting coal to cleaner energy forms, and improving methods to manage coal wastes and reduce coal-related pollutants. The 1973 program provides funds to design and begin construction of a demonstration plant to prove the technology and economies of the Bureau's "synthane" process for coal gasification.

Petroleum. Research is devoted to providing more petroleum and natural gas and greater efficiency in the extraction and utilization of these energy resources in the interest of the national welfare. Attention is directed to increasing the resource base through improved technology, developing new uses and products from oil and gas of higher quality and lower cost, and improving the environment by identifying and combating the causes of pollution. A research program will be continued to evaluate the problems and potentials of disposing of industrial wastes by injection underground. Such research is based on knowledge gained in research on recovery of petroleum by fluid injection and investigations of oil and gas reservoir properties.

Oil shale. Oil shale research is conducted to provide the scientific and engineering competence needed to establish and administer a national oil shale policy to insure its efficient development. Additionally, the program will help stimulate industry to initiate the commercial production of shale oil and associated oil shale minerals. Of particular interest are in situ techniques for retorting ungraded shale, problems dealing with the disposal of resultant wastes, and the chemical and physical properties of kerogen and shale oil.

Metallurgy. Research is carried out seeking new and improved processes to extract, recover, purify, fabricate, and recycle metallic and nonmetallic minerals for the most efficient utilization of the Nation's resources attainable through increased production, reduced costs, and a minimum of waste. Of particular interest are research leading to advanced metallurgical technology, abatement of pollution from metallurgical process effluents and gases, management of mineral wastes, improvement of mineral materials, and research on effective recovery and reuse of mineral materials from urban wastes. The 1973 program provides for demonstrating technology and economics for the abatement of SO_x from smelter operations.

Mining. Mining research is conducted to develop improved extractive systems through technological advancement of fundamental subsystems elements to increase significantly total mining output at less cost. An integral part of this objective is provision for the maintenance of health and safety and preservation of the environment.

Explosives. Explosives and explosions research is conducted to provide technologic information and guidance to Federal, State, and local government agencies, and industry on: Safe handling and use of commercial explosives and blasting agents; safety characteristics of explosives certified for use in underground mines where gas/dust explosions might occur; hazards associated with flammable liquids and gases and potentially explosive chemicals of commerce; and the means of combating and controlling fires and explosions occurring in minerals and mineral fuels.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Health and safety: Health safety research	14,752	30,971	30,820

Fundamental and applied research will be conducted to overcome current health and safety problems and future problems that will accompany deeper mining, increased mechanization, and other technological changes in mining methods to meet increasing mineral demands. Research is directed toward mining procedures and devices to avoid, detect, or control those aspects of mining and the working environment which involve potential personal hazards to mine workmen. The continuing effort to assure a much safer environment and working conditions for miners involves research to develop new and improved technology for inherently safe mining methods, equipment, techniques and systems to cope adequately with mining conditions. Research is conducted in the areas of: Support of mine roof and control of overburden, ventilation of mines, methods of allaying harmful and combustible dusts and methane and of coping with other mine air contaminants, prevention of underground fires and explosions, provisions of safe electrical equipment and installations, improvements in mining machine design to reduce noise and optimize other man/machine interrelationships to enhance health and safety, and development of improved postdisaster survival and rescue technology for coal mining.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Helium fund: Research and development	546	53	----

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration and contract supervision	492	598	843
Contact research	17,075	30,472	44,462
Total program costs funded	17,567	31,070	45,305
Change in selected resources	1,183	----	----
Total obligations	18,750	31,070	45,305

The Office of Coal Research contracts for research and development of new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal. It contracts for, sponsors, cosponsors, and promotes the coordination of, research with recognized interested groups (including, but not limited to, coal trade associations, educational institutions, and agencies of States and political subdivisions).

The Office of Coal Research is responsible for developing the full potentiality and versatility of coal as the Nation's largest energy resource to the maximum benefit of the United States. Insuring a clean environment while minimizing or eliminating pollution-causing energy products is an important consideration in all of the research projects. The Office is devoting efforts to expand the existing use of coal through development of new uses. The scientific and technical aspects of the program are performed through a program of contract research.

Administration and contract supervision. This portion of the program performs all necessary functions relating to contracts. This includes drafting, negotiation, and execution of the contracts, together with review and monitoring of technical and administrative phases of the contract work. Proposals are evaluated to ascertain technical and economic feasibility and eliminate possible duplication with other work.

Contract research. The entire research activity cited above as the responsibility of the Office is represented in the contract aspect of its operation. Proposals received from, or discussions with, potential contractors relate to a prospective area of activity in which the proposer has expressed interest, and for which the organization is qualified. Careful review and controls preclude duplicative research efforts. Contract research activities are conducted with profit and nonprofit research organizations and vary from complete Government funding to joint funding. No grant research projects are carried on, and basic research is limited only to projects that support other ongoing research. Only applied research and development projects are undertaken. Several have now reached the pilot plant phase of their development, such as the coal gasification program. In accordance with the President's energy message of June 4, 1971, the administration has initiated a cooperative program with industry to continue funding the Office's three existing pilot plants and to provide additional funding of several new Office of Coal Research projects for develop-

ing more efficient methods of coal gasification in preparation for construction of a large-scale demonstration plant beginning in 1975.

FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS—BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Management and investigations of resources:			
Fishery research	5,128	5,395	6,195
Wildlife research	9,382	9,587	9,787
River basin studies	2,057	3,789	5,956

Fishery research. Research is conducted to provide information needed for improved methods of sport fishery management. The program includes the following studies: factors governing sport fish productivity in the natural environment, how hatchery fish can be produced more efficiently and used more effectively to augment natural production, the effects of environmental contaminants and modifications on fishery resources, and methods of controlling fish that are pests. Results are used by Federal, State, and private fishery managers.

Wildlife research. Research is conducted on game and nongame resident and migratory forms of wildlife. Results are used by the Bureau as well as cooperating Federal, State, and private agencies to improve wildlife management and conservation practices and to determine the effects of pesticides and pollutants on the environment. Wildlife units are also maintained at twenty locations to give technical training in wildlife management, conduct research, and demonstrate improved management practices.

River basin studies. The activity covers studies of the effects on fish and wildlife resources of proposed oil and gas transmission pipelines and of water-use projects of Federal agencies and licensees. Recommendations are made for measures to protect and improve these resources. Emphasis is given to impacts of channelization, dredge, and fill-work performed under Corps of Engineers permits, and nuclear power projects. Additional funds totaling $2,800,000 in 1973, are provided for this activity from the Bureau of Reclamation, Alaska Power Administration, and the Corps of Engineers for water-use studies.

WATER AND POWER RESOURCES—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
General investigations:			
General engineering and research	8,824	10,498	8,900
Fish and wildlife studies	374	431	400

General engineering and research. Studies are directed toward improvements in planning procedures and in engineering methods and materials. Included are studies of atmospheric water resources, of alternative uses and re-use of water, of rapid tunneling techniques, and continuing activities in waste water reclamation opportunities in the Western States.

Fish and wildlife studies. These funds are transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service for studies of the fish and wildlife aspects of reclamation projects in the planning stage, authorized for construction, or under construction.

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
General investigations: Fish and wildlife studies	63	42	10

These funds are transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies of the fish and wildlife aspects of the Alaska Power Administration's general investigations program.

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Saline water conversion:			
Research and developmental expenses:			
Research expense	6,551	5,500	5,800
Development expense	12,327	10,100	8,000
Construction, operation, and maintenance:			
Test beds and facilities	5,863	6,200	7,000
Modules	1,077	4,400	2,800
Administration and coordination	2,428	2,564	2,700
Total program costs funded	28,246	28,764	26,300
Change in selected resources	384	−1,836	680
Total obligations	28,630	26,928	26,980

This program finances the research on and development of low-cost processes for converting saline water to fresh water in quality suitable for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses.

Research and developmental expenses. Both basic and applied research, engineering and development, and evaluation work are accomplished by means of contracts or grants to Federal or non-Federal agencies, institutions, commercial organizations, and consultants.

Construction, operation, and maintenance. This activity provides for the design, construction, acquisition, operation, maintenance, and modification of saline water conversion test bed plants, facilities, and modules to determine the practical application of the conversion processes under development.

Administration and coordination. This activity provides for the necessary planning, supervision, and administration of the saline water conversion program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Research and development	160	103	----------
Change in selected resources	----------	−65	----------
Total obligations	160	38	----------

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Assistance to States for institutes	4,890	5,100	5,100
Matching grants to institutes	3,373	3,000	3,000
Additional water research	2,159	4,300	4,300
Scientific information center	699	925	925
Administration	699	933	932
Total program costs funded	11,820	14,258	14,257
Change in selected resources	1,405	----------	----------
Total obligations	13,225	14,258	14,257

The objective of this program is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water, in order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

Assistance to States for institutes. This activity provides for specific grants to all fifty States and Puerto Rico for assistance in carrying on the work of a competent and qualified water resources research institute at one college or university in each State. The function of such institute is to conduct research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. States may elect to use their grants in support of regional institutes in which several States participate.

Matching grants to institutes. This activity provides for grants to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, funds made available to institutes by States or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken.

Additional water research. This activity provides for grants to, and contracts and matching or other arrangements with, educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which are deemed desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

Scientific information center. This activity provides for the operation of a water resources scientific information center. The objectives of center operations are to be responsive to the needs of water resources officials and organizations by making information available concerning water resources research results and developments, to avoid replication of research, and to improve communications and coordination of efforts among all those engaged in federally sponsored water-related research.

Administration. This activity provides for the administration of the Water Resources Act including the prescribing of rules and regulations, review and appraisal of institute programs and research proposals, making and monitoring of allotments, contracts, and grants; establishment and maintenance of cooperation and coordination among the centers and between the centers and Federal and other organizations concerned with water resources.

SECRETARIAL OFFICES—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program):			
Research		300	1,000
Change in selected resources		200	
Total obligations		500	1,000

Under this program, the Department of the Interior will provide leadership and support in the conduct of selected research projects carried out by foreign nations. Payments will be made in foreign currencies which the Treasury determines to be excess to normal requirements of the United States.

UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC POWER TRANSMISSION RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Administration and contract supervision	25	65	65
Contract research	77	935	1,035
Total program costs funded	102	1,000	1,100
Change in selected resources	51	472	−100
Total obligations	153	1,472	1,000

The Department of the Interior will participate in a joint private-public research program to reduce the costs of placing high-voltage transmission lines underground.

Administration and contract supervision. The Office of the Secretary will perform all necessary functions related to the administration of research contracts.

Contract research, in cooperation with the Electric Research Council, will be conducted with commercial organizations, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and other governmental agencies where expertise may exist.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Buildings and facilities: New construction: Behavioral Research Center, Butner, N.C.	307	8,800	4,000

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Law enforcement: Supporting research	1,096	1,484	1,484

This activity encompasses research programs directly related to enforcement of laws concerning controlled substances and includes, but is not limited to, studies designed to compare the deterrent effects of various enforcement strategies, assess and detect accurately the presence of controlled substances in the human body; evaluate the nature and sources of supply of dangerous substances; develop more effective methods to prevent diversion of controlled substances into illicit channels, develop information necessary to carry out functions of Section 201, Public Law 91-513, Authority and Criteria for Classification of Substances.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Manpower Training Services: Program support: Contractual research, demonstration, and evaluation	442	17,800	19,000

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Economic research	1,295	1,122	1,130

Long-range projections of U.S. economic growth are prepared. Analytic studies of the impact of economic changes on employment are made. Special economic and social studies are undertaken and special reports prepared for the Commission of Labor Statistics, the Secretary of Labor, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other Government agencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 acutal	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Special economic and statistical studies:			
Agriculture	33	41	41
Atomic Energy Commission	66	84	84
Civil Service Commission	85	96	96
Classified	86		
Equal Employment	5		
Health, Education and Welfare	33	2	
Housing and Urban Development	51		
Maritime Commission	23		
Labor:			
Employment Standards Administration	1,284	1,347	1,347
Departmentlmanagement	140	63	63
Labor Management Services Administration	212	400	165
Manpower Administration	1,876	2,966	4,112
Occupational Safety and Health Administration	141	2,400	3,294
National Science Foundation	11	198	
Navy	7	7	7
Office of Emergency Preparedness		148	148
Productivity Commission		450	450
Special statistical work:			
Department store inventory price index	12	44	44
Apartment house operating cost index	51	122	122
Compensation and labor cost studies	76	110	110
Wage surveys		66	
Total obligations	139	342	276

All funds are advanced from sources outside the Federal Government to finance special statistical studies requested. During 1973, the Bureau will collect and analyze store inventory prices for the American Retail Federation, conduct surveys on compensation and labor cost studies for the State of New York, and will develop an index of cost of operating uncontrolled apartment houses for the city of New York.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Transportation planning, research, and development:			
Transportation policy and planning	5,411	9,241	9,475
University research			5,000
Transportation systems development and technology	8,217	20,927	33,100
Transportation facilitation	243	250	350
Special programs	206	441	1,075
Total program costs funded	14,077	30,859	49,000
Change in selected re-sources	1,174	2,000	
Total obligations	15,250	32,859	49,000

The Department of Transportation Act of 1966 assigns to the Secretary broad responsibilities for the development and coordination of national transportation policies and programs. This appropriation finances those research activities and studies which directly support the Secretary's responsibilities and which can more effectively or appropriately be conducted in the Office of the Secretary rather than by the operating administrations within the Department. The program is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and private firms.

Transportation policy and planning. Studies and analyses are conducted on a broad range of transportation policy, economic, and environmental problems to determine national transportation requirements and to provide the Secretary with the information and analyses needed for effective decisionmaking on national transportation policies, plans, and programs. Included are programs to forecast transportation demand, to develop models and other analytical devices that will help assess alternative courses of action, to conduct economic and statistical studies designed to assess the effects of economic regulation, and to examine the interrelationship of transportation with changing economic, social, and environmental programs.

University research. Scientific and technological research and interdisciplinary studies conducted under this activity are designed to assure that resources of the higher education community are effectively brought to bear on transportation problems and to encourage greater involvement of universities and colleges with the Department, State and local governments, and the transportation industry. In addition to mission-oriented research, university based seminars and conferences will bring university, industry, and government representatives together for joint study of transportation needs.

Transportation systems development and technology. Projects are carried out to advance transportation technology generally; to seek solutions to transportation problems which are intermodal in nature; to provide information and forecasts on new technology required as a basis for planning and development of transportation systems, policies, and programs; to conduct research on longer range technical problems in transportation; and to manage research programs of such priority that they demand secretarial emphasis. Funds requested in this activity will continue and expand advanced research and

development efforts to improve air transportation (to be financed from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund), to develop multimodal and intermodal systems and technology, and to promote environmental and ecological improvements. In general, projects are designed to complement research and development programs of the operating administrations and to stimulate industry efforts to advance transportation technology.

Transportation facilitation. Research and studies in this area are aimed at removing the impediments to the rapid and efficient flow of passengers and cargo by modernizing our systems of transportation documentation and procedures.

Special programs. Projects in this activity are chiefly to provide technical studies and other data in support of the Department's programs in the areas of consumer affairs, hazardous materials, pipeline safety, and transportation security.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Transportation research activities overseas (special foreign currency program):			
Overseas research		500	500

Foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States will be used in 1973 to support research projects in Poland and Yugoslavia, such as those relating to improve urban transportation systems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Consolidated working fund, Transportation Systems Center:			
Transportation research	20,230	31,757	46,318
Change in selected resources	3,868	2,500	4,300
Total obligations	24,098	34,257	50,618

The Consolidated Working Fund was established to facilitate the conduct of operations of the Transportation Systems Center. The programs of the Center are funded from advances received from the Office of the Secretary and the operating administrations in the Department of Transportation in accordance with general working agreements and specific project plan agreements.

The Transportation Systems Center serves as a technical resource for the Office of the Secretary and the operating administrations. Its specific projects planned for 1973 are grouped generally along the following lines:

Transportation safety. The chief effort under this heading is in the highway safety field with additional efforts in aviation, marine, and railway safety.

Pollution reduction. This grouping includes both aircraft and automotive pollution, with a smaller effort in marine sources.

Noise abatement. Special problems of noise propagation related to transportation systems are covered in this area, with emphasis on development of right-of-way noise barriers.

Air transportation. This grouping of the Center's projects is primarily directed to air traffic control. The balance of the effort is split between navigation and systems development.

Ground transportation. High utilization and traffic control, new urban transportation systems, advanced high-speed systems, and conventional rail systems are the main project areas under this category.

Marine transportation. This grouping supports the Coast Guard mainly in marine navigation aids.

Multimodal systems. Projects which are not directed towards a single mode of transportation are included here, with the primary effort in modeling, analysis, and intermodal systems technology.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Transportation research	1,772	900	900

COAST GUARD

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research, development, test, and evaluation:			
Direct program:			
Search and rescue	1,265	1,568	2,178
Aids to navigation	798	1,308	1,890
Marine safety	770	1,660	2,500
Marine environmental protection	2,452	8,064	9,402
Ocean operations	3,795	1,015	693
Program support	1,727	1,772	1,937
Total direct program costs funded	10,807	15,387	18,600
Change in selected resources	−1,482	1,863	−500
Total direct obligations	9,325	17,250	18,100
Reimbursable program:			
Search and rescue		156	
Ocean operations	35		
Total reimbursable program costs funded	35	156	
Change in selected resources	54	−54	
Total reimbursable obligations	89	102	
Total obligations	9,414	17,352	18,100

This appropriation provides for the management and conduct of research, development, test, and evaluation, including the necessary support requirements, facilities, services, and personnel.

Search and rescue. The 1973 program continues efforts designed to increase effectiveness of methods to detect, locate, and rescue persons in distress. Major projects include continued development and testing of a prototype distress alerting and location system, final flight testing of a prototype improved search radar, preliminary design and model testing of a high performance surface craft and initiation of the development of a prototype search and rescue helicopter sensor system.

This program area also covers activities which support the Coast Guard's responsibility for maritime commerce in ice-covered waters including those directed toward extending the winter shipping season on the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence Seaway. The 1973 efforts follow prior years' work for tests and evaluation of alternative ice-cutting and ice-handling techniques. This 1973 work will also include ice research to identify ice effects on ship design and transit, and continued work to develop navigation aids for ice-covered waters.

Aids to navigation. The 1973 activities are a continuation of a multiyear program designed to reduce the operation and maintenance costs and to increase the effectiveness of our buoyage system and to provide a precision navigation system for use in harbors and confined waterways.

Development of a lightweight buoyage system will continue in 1973. Emphasis will be on instrumented tests of a number of exposed water buoys of various shapes and materials, tests of various buoy mooring concepts, and development of a fast water buoy for use in the rivers. Work will be continued and expanded to develop new pollution free power supplies and improved lighting components for the total aids to navigation system.

Marine safety. Activities in this program area support both recreational and commercial vessels.

The 1973 research and development efforts in support of recreational boating will concentrate in the following areas: Development of design guidelines and test procedures to support the safety standards such as those relating to powering, fuel systems, and electrical and ventilation systems; testing of selected recreational boats and equipment.

The major work in support of commercial vessel safety during 1973 will include fire safety tests of cargo and pump room extinguishment systems, hazardous materials research on shipboard ventilation systems, chlorine vapor dispersion models, and research and development efforts aimed at providing knowledge in support of regulation and standards affecting ship design and operations.

Maritime environmental protection. A major endeavor in 1973 will be aimed at the elimination of pollution causal incidents. This research and development effort will provide the basic knowledge and prototype components for marine traffic systems for congested ports and waterways.

In 1973 improvements in the performance of the lightweight oil containment system will be carried out as well as initiation of the design and development of a heavy duty containment system. Two prototype high seas oil recovery systems will be completed in 1973 and a prototype oil-water separator system will be designed, contructed, and tested. Development, modification, and testing of a prototype airborne oil surveillance and detection system will continue. Work will also continue on development and testing of alternative chemical and biological techniques for oil spill cleanup and amelioration.

Installation of a prototype marine traffic system will be completed in mid-1973 with the balance of the year devoted to initial test and evaluation. Work will also be started on large screen displays, improved vessel detection identification techniques, and the use of shore to vessel data links.

The second phase of the development of a precision navigation system will be initiated in 1973. This includes tests of subsystem components to resolve technical uncertainties, such as propagation vagaries, special antenna tests, and system control. Environmental pollution research will include continued work to develop a better understanding of the fate, behavior, and dispersion of pollutants (particularly oil) in the marine environment. These efforts will include trends of oil pollution on selected beaches and in major ports, ocean sampling for oil pollution levels and trends, identifying parameters which may be measured as a part of a monitoring system.

Sewage and air pollution abatement efforts in 1973 will include at sea testing of newly developed 50-man and 10- to 20-man sewage treatment plants, further research and development of a 1- to 10-man sewage device, and development of shipboard air pollution and monitoring devices. Hazardous materials research and development in support of our port security functions will continue at an accelerated rate.

Ocean operations. This program includes ongoing research in support of International Ice Patrol, as well as efforts to develop improved techniques and equipment for determining ice conditions and efforts as they relate to ship design and transit of ice-covered waters.

Program support includes administrative and general support personnel at headquarters and all personnel at laboratory facilities.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and development:			
Air traffic control	33,534		
Navigation	6,206		
Aviation weather	637		
Aircraft safety	2,140		
Aviation medicine	2,130		
Systems technology		15,033	
Payment to trust fund	39	353	
Total obligations	44,686	15,386	

This appropriation finances the technology completion program which is defined as the completion of certain projects which represent significant advancements in aircraft technology and which will benefit governmental and private industry groups.

All of the effort involves testing, analyses, test results, and documentation. More specifically, activities include titanium metallurgy, flutter phenomena studies, improved instrumentation and control development, new concepts of generating electrical power, and various noise reduction techniques studies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development: Civil supersonic aircraft research and development	178,119	2,900	
Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development Termination: Civil supersonic aircraft development	85,868	65,426	4,506

This appropriation finances the termination of the supersonic transport development program. Included in these costs were payment of contractor claims and closeouts, airline refunds, and the necessary administrative costs incidental to the activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Safety regulation: Research and development	1,000	10,942	4,200

This account will be phased out in 1972 and the activities will be shown in the Operations account in 1973.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Development, test, and evaluation facilities	1,072	1,500	2,600

This activity provides for the construction and improvement of plan and facilities primarily at the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center in Atlantic City, New Jersey. It also covers the procurement of capital items of equipment for use in the engineering and development program.

ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Air traffic control	18,284	48,998	50,130
Navigation	4,782	11,529	20,485
Aviation weather	203	2,159	2,400
Aviation medicine		675	985
Obligations previously incurred	19,792	14,572	
Total obligations	43,061	77,933	74,000

The Federal Aviation Administration conducts engineering and development programs to improve the national air traffic control system and to increase its capacity to meet air traffic demands of the years 1975 to 1985. The effort to increase capacity is based on exploiting current technology and applying system engineering techniques to the development and integration of new equipment into the total system. The agency also administers aviation medical research aimed at increasing the personal effectiveness of traffic controllers.

These programs are conducted, under the direction of the agency's technical personnel, through contracts with private firms, universities, individuals, and other Government agencies.

Air traffic control. This provides for system improvements and the major upgrading of those systems required to perform modern traffic control functions. This traffic control program also provides for increasing the capacity of major airports to safely and efficiently handle larger, faster aircraft through the development of new computerized airport traffic control systems which will enable more efficient metering and spacing of terminal traffic under all weather conditions. The objective of these development programs is to double airport/airway capacity by 1980.

Navigation. This provides for the development of ground-based systems which insure the precision navigation of aircraft, including new navigation equipment and sophisticated landing systems capable of handling increased air traffic. These activities are an integral part of the effort to double system capacity by 1980.

Aviation weather. This provides for a program, coordinated with the Departments of Defense and Commerce, to modernize the acquisition, processing, dissemination, and display of weather information tailored to the needs of aviation users.

Aviation medicine. This provides for conducting aeromedical research directed toward identifying and eliminating those physiological and psychological factors inimical to personnel engaged in operating the traffic control system.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operations (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): Development direction		10,974	

This account will be phased out in 1972 in accordance with Public Law 92-174. The activities will be shown in the Operations account in 1973.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and Expenses: General program support: Research and development	11,375	11,518	19,833

Conducts direct and contract research and development relating to traffic operations, new construction techniques, highway safety, and the social and environmental aspects of highways.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Other Federal Highway Administration Trust Funds: Contributions for highway research programs	2		

In association with the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense, tests of highway equipment are conducted for the purpose of establishing performance standards upon which to base specifications for use by the Government in purchasing such equipment.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Traffic and Highway Safety: Research and analysis	23,202	26,631	28,000

This activity provides for motor vehicle and highway safety research and development, for the collection of data to determine the relationship between motor vehicle or equipment performance characteristics and crashes or the occurrence of death or personal injury as a result of such crashes, and for operation of the National Driver Register, which provides centralized information on license revocations. Increases are requested to improve the crash survivability features of motor vehicles, to continue research and testing on experimental safety vehicles, and to expand field accident investigation activity.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Trust fund share of highway safety programs (liquidation of contract authorization): Highway safety research and development		25,750	31,900

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Railroad research:			
Railroad research	537	7,327	8,000
Change in selected resources	681	5,421	2,600
Total obligations	1,218	12,748	10,600

This appropriation provides for research which deals exclusively with railroad mat-

ters. The program effort is directed at solving critical safety problems, protecting and enhancing the environment, and promoting national transportation efficiency. During 1973, major emphasis will continue to be placed on conducting research and development related to train accidents caused by highway-rail grade crossings, defective equipment, and human error.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Research and development	11,743	19,400	27,000
Demonstrations	12,000	9,000	17,000
Administration	1,178	1,508	1,900
Total program costs funded	24,921	29,908	45,900
Change in selected resources	−808	−4,368	14,962
Total obligations	24,113	25,540	60,862

This appropriation finances research, development, and demonstration programs in high-speed ground transportation.

Research and development. This includes research of conventional and advanced technology rail systems; including vehicle propulsion, control guidance, communication, guideways, and aerodynamics. The increase is to continue development and testing of an experimental, tracked air cushion research vehicle.

Demonstrations. This provides for conducting demonstrations of improved intercity rail passenger systems to determine the contributions that can be made to more efficient and economical service. The increase is to continue the Metroliner and Turbotrain demonstrations and to modify Metroliner cars to improve ride quality and reduce operating costs.

Administration. This provides for the personnel and related administrative costs for conducting the high-speed program, including the test center at Pueblo, Colorado.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Urban Mass Transportation Fund:			
Capital outlay:			
Technical studies grants	4,847	13,100	22,700
Research, development and demonstration, grants, and contracts	24,165	32,700	92,800

Technical studies grants. Under this activity, State and local public agencies are assisted in carrying out studies relating to management operations, capital requirements, economic feasibility, and conducting similar activities in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facilities, and equipment. In 1973 the program level for new projects will be $33,500,000, with 160 estimated projects. This compares with $25,000,000 in 1972, with 197 projects, and $14,400,000 in 1971, with 163 projects.

Research, development and demonstration, grants, and contracts. This activity involves research, development and demonstration projects, which includes the development, setting, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods which assist in reducing urban transportation needs, improving mass transportation services, or in meeting total urban transportation needs at a minimum cost. In 1973 the program level for new projects will be $115,000,000. This compares with $62,000,000 in 1972 and $39,500,000 in 1971.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating expenses:			
Physical research	270,765	264,800	281,800

This program comprises basic and applied research in the physical sciences. By major categories, the costs are as follows (in thousands of dollars):

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
High energy physics	118,466	116,400	126,400
Medium energy physics	12,990	13,100	16,000
Low energy physics	27,579	25,300	25,300
Mathematics and computer research	5,309	4,800	4,650
Chemistry research	51,403	49,000	46,950
Metallurgy and materials research	26,693	25,200	24,500
Controlled thermonuclear research	28,325	31,000	38,000
Total physical research	270,765	264,800	281,800
Additional amounts for Controlled thermonuclear research included in proposed 1972 supplemental		3,000	1,000

The Commission serves as executive agency for the Nation's high energy physics research. An increase is required for the National Accelerator Laboratory to support some experimental operations of the 200 Bev accelerator. An increase is also provided for partial exploitation of the modified AGS accelerator. Costs for the remainder of the high energy physics program are at about the 1972 level, requiring reductions in other program activities to accommodate these increases.

Support of the medium energy physics program will increase by $2,900,000. Within this total, an increase is required to bring into operation the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility and to proceed with a broad research program utilizing the accelerator. A corresponding increase at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology provides for bringing the 400 Mev electron linear accelerator into operation at full energy. Other activities in medium energy physics will be reduced to offset these increases.

The objective of the controlled thermonuclear research program is to determine whether the energy released by thermonuclear reactions can be controlled and developed into an economical and environmentally attractive source of energy. This research will be increased in 1973 using experimental devices to test recent concepts for improved plasma confinement, density, and temperature necessary to achieve plasma conditions in which fusion can occur.

Other activities of the physical research program—low energy physics, mathematics and computer research, chemistry research, and metallurgy and materials research—are continued at somewhat below the 1972 level.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating expenses (Supplemental now requested):			
Physical research		3,000	1,000

These amounts are needed for additional efforts related to the controlled thermonuclear fusion research program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Plant and capital equipment: Physical research	121,885	91,448	92,050

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operations, research, and facilities: Research and development	134,013	167,966	178,601

Activities deal with causes, sources, transport, fate, and effects of pollutants in ecological systems and development of monitoring technology and pollution control criteria used in establishing standards and regulations. Several new efforts will be undertaken to define pollution control objectives and cost-effective solutions. Research will be expanded in health effects of air pollution and urban-regional scale modeling of relationships among air pollution emissions, atmospheric conditions, and ambient air quality. Funds will also support cost-sharing arrangements with industry to develop sulfur oxide control technology. Solid waste activities are being reoriented to focus upon economic and institutional constraints. A new strategy will be developed to encourage greater private sector involvement in the development and application of pollution control technology. Activities are conducted under grants, contracts, and other agreements involving universities, industry, nonprofit organiaztions, State and local governments, other Federal agencies, and through activities at the Environmental Protection Agency's laboratories and field locations. of environmental pollution.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Foreign environmental pollution research	2,705	7,795	7,000

Excess foreign currencies derived through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and from other sources are used to support research on the sources, effects, and control

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Research and development	300	969	973

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct program:			
Manned space flight:			
Apollo	1,012,379	750,000	257,000
Space flight operations	566,333	641,000	976,100
Advanced manned mission studies	2,416	2,000	1,700

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct program—Continued			
Scientific investigations in space:			
Physics and astronomy	112,891	121,500	160,850
Lunar and planetary exploration	175,524	272,593	322,189
Bioscience	14,758	8,700	----------
Launch vehicle development and support	84,694	91,937	86,000
Space applications	187,267	226,270	205,011
Space and nuclear research and technology:			
Space research and technology	122,852	90,000	79,350
Nuclear power and propulsion	55,300	35,000	26,000
Aeronautical research and technology	109,500	105,000	125,800
Supporting activities:			
Tracking and data acquisition	277,586	265,000	295,700
Sustaining university program	11,553	10,000	3,000
Technology utilization	5,337	5,000	4,700
Total direct program costs funded	2,738,390	2,624,000	2,507,400
Reimbursable program:			
Manned space flight:			
Apollo	1,782	3,727	2,120
Space flight operations	625	631	350
Scientific investigations in space:			
Physics and astronomy	1,942	2,963	900
Lunar and planetary exploration	----------	250	----------
Bioscience	80	----------	----------
Space applications	64,769	110,219	57,530
Space and nuclear research and technology:			
Space research and technology	1,415	1,205	----------
Nuclear power and propulsion	24,883	9,191	----------
Aeronautical research and technology	2,376	12,141	8,800
Supporting activities:			
Tracking and data acquisition	159	371	300
Technology utilization	229	84	----------
Total reimbursable program costs	98,260	140,782	70,000
Total program costs funded	2,836,650	2,764,782	2,577,400
Change in selected resources	−175,392	−23,784	93,500
Total obligations	2,661,258	2,740,998	2,670,900

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established for the conduct of the nonmilitary space programs of the United States, including the exploration of space and its utilization for peaceful purposes, and to conduct and support advanced research and development related to space and aeronautics in support of both civil and military requirements. This appropriation provides for research and development activities of NASA as follows:

Manned space flight. These estimates provide for all manned space flight missions conducted by the United States. These programs include completion of the Apollo mission schedule with Apollo 16 in the spring of 1972 and Apollo 17 in late 1972; completion of Skylab development and beginning of flight operations in the spring of 1973; detailed design and development effort on a manned earth-to-orbit shuttle vehicle; studies and component development on future orbital payload systems; life sciences; and studies and research on future manned missions.

Apollo. The Apollo program will complete the current phase of lunar exploration with Apollos 16 and 17. Apollo 16 is scheduled for launch in the spring of 1972 and is to land in the Descartes area. Exploration of this area will complement data from previous missions with samples from two distinctive lunar formations, by emplacement of another scientific experiment station, and by conducting experiments during lunar orbit and translunar flight. Apollo 17 is scheduled for launch in late 1972. These missions are configured to obtain maximum scientific return since they are the last planned U.S. exploration of the moon for this decade.

Space flight operations. This activity consists of this country's post-Apollo manned flight programs and includes Skylab, space shuttle, work on future manned orbital systems and payloads, space life sciences, and the basic operations and engineering activities required to support the manned and unmanned space flight efforts at manned space flight centers. Skylab represents a major progression into manned earth orbital missions directed toward accomplishing life sciences, astronomy, earth resources, and technology objectives. Flight operations will begin in the spring of 1973 using a Saturn V to launch an unmanned orbital workshop cluster with its associated experiment systems. Three manned missions using Saturn 1B's and modified Apollo command and service modules will be conducted over an eight-month period to activate and operate the workshop cluster. The major scientific focus of Skylab will be directed toward an extensive study of the sun, especially in those wavelength regions not readily visible from the ground; a study of the application of space in surveying and monitoring the resources and environmental interactions of the earth; and the biomedical study of the effects of long-duration flight on man, as individual astronauts remain in orbit for as long as two-month periods.

The development of a space shuttle transportation system is the key element in future space operations in earth orbit. The earth-to-orbit shuttle will provide a recoverable, reusable space vehicle for placement and retrieval of satellites, satellite servicing and maintenance, short-duration manned orbital missions, and delivery of propulsive stages and payloads for high-energy missions. The shuttle will have the capability to support a wide range of future missions, including space station logistics support and rotation of scientific personnel. In addition to radically reducing transportation costs, operational capabilities of the space shuttle are expected to produce significant savings in the cost of design, development, manufacture, and operations of space payloads. These savings will result primarily from maintenance and retrieval capabilities provided by the shuttle system. The 1973 budget provides for proceeding with detailed design and development of a space shuttle based on the definition studies now nearing completion.

Effort on orbital systems and payloads is directed toward definition, preliminary design, and technology verification for experiments and supporting systems to be launched by the earth-to-orbit shuttle. Experiment definition activities will focus on materials science, advanced technology, and experiment integration planning. Definition and preliminary design will be accomplished on systems and subsystems required for advanced manned experiment operations on short-duration earth orbital missions. Life sciences activity includes research and technology efforts on operational requirements for the shuttle and other manned flight systems, definition and development support on flight experiments, and definition effort on a future bioresearch module.

Advanced manned mission studies. This program examines advanced manned space flight program concepts and develops technical information and other data upon which future program decisions can be based.

Scientific investigations in space. This program utilizes a variety of flight systems and ground-based observations to increase man's knowledge of the universe. The earth, sun, moon, interplanetary space, solar system, other stars and galaxies, and the interaction among these bodies and systems are all objects of these investigations.

Physics and astronomy. Coordinated research with national and international participation is conducted through this program and directed toward an increase in our knowledge of the space environment, of the earth and the sun, and the relationship of these bodies to each other and to interplanetary space, other stars, galaxies, and nebulae. Laboratory and theoretical research, ground-based observations, aircraft, balloons, sounding rockets, and explorer and laboratory spacecraft all contribute to this knowledge. The solar observatory program will continue with OSO–I scheduled for a 1973 launch. Interstellar gases will be studied by an Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, OAO–C, to be launched during 1972. The development effort on a High Energy Astronomy Observatory to provide identification and observation of gamma ray, X-ray, and cosmic ray sources will be in progress.

Lunar and planetary exploration. This program concentrates on exploration of the moon, planets, and other bodies in the solar system, such as asteroids and comets, using both ground-based research and observations from automated spacecraft. The current program of lunar investigations includes ground-based and in situ measurements of lunar materials and phenomena and planning for further investigations utilizing the remaining lunar missions in the Apollo series. The 1973 planetary program encompasses effort leading toward observations of a major portion of the solar system including Mercury, the region near the sun, the Asteroid belt, Jupiter and the interplanetary regions beyond Jupiter, while continuing to expand knowledge of Venus and Mars. Mariner 9, launched in May, 1971, was placed in orbit around Mars on November 13, 1971, and is returning information about a variety of Martian characteristics and phenomena.

A single Mariner will be in preparation for a 1973 launch to Venus and Mercury, utilizing a gravity assist from the Venus flyby. The Pioneer F & G missions will be launched in 1972 and 1973 to provide the first observations and measurements of the interplanetary medium beyond Mars. They will fly through the Asteroid belt and continue to the vicinity of Jupiter, providing the first measurements and observations of that planet from space. Work will continue in 1973 on the U.S. experiments to be launched on the West German Helios spacecraft. One Helios spacecraft will be launched by the U.S. in 1974 and one in 1975, to investigate and observe the interplanetary medium two-thirds of the distance from earth to the sun. In 1975, two Viking spacecraft will be launched to Mars. Each spacecraft will include both an Orbiter and a Lander, thus providing additional measurements from Mars orbit as well as making direct measurements of the atmosphere and surface features of Mars. Effort will continue on an outer planets exploration program using a Mariner-class spacecraft.

Bioscience. Activities formerly included in this program have been distributed among other program categories beginning in 1972.

Launch vehicle development and support. This program includes launch vehicle activities such as launch operations, and engineering and maintenance necessary to sustain launch activities. It also includes support for providing specific reliability and performance improvements to existing vehicles. Neither of these types of activities is specifically allocable to automated spacecraft missions.

Space applications. The objective of this activity is to expand the beneficial use of

space. Specific applications areas include meteorology, earth resources, geodesy, communications, and navigation. Activity during 1973 includes continued effort on earth resources technology satellites directed toward providing tests of the spacecraft and sensors which would be required for an operational system to survey the earth's resources from space.

In meteorology, launch of a Synchronous Meteorological Satellite will provide an operational prototype of a geostationary satellite. Work will proceed on additional Nimbus spacecraft to provide for flight experiments with advanced meteorological sensors. Development of Tiros-N, a prototype for a third generation of operational meteorological satellites, will begin focusing toward a 1976 launch. Effort will continue on applications technology satellites, including preparation for the launch of ATS-F in 1973 to flight test a space-erectable, parabolic antenna, and conduct a number of scientific and technology experiments. The Canadian Cooperative Applications Satellite effort will be continued with a launch planned in 1974 to provide data on use of frequency ranges above 10 GHz.

Space and nuclear research and technology. This activity provides for expansion of the technology base for development efforts supporting NASA space mission objectives.

Space research and technology. Research will be conducted in the areas of materials and structures, power and propulsion, information sciences, guidance, control, and communications. Major effort will continue on laser communications and on reliable, long-life and high-speed/density components for space electronics systems. There will also be a strong focus on advancing the technology needed to produce large amounts of electric power in space and to develop high-specific impulse propulsion systems. Specific technology requirements for near-term objectives, including the space shuttle and planetary flight programs, will continue to be supported in the critical areas of thermal protection, aerothermodynamics, entry technology, and long-lifetime componentry.

Nuclear power and propulsion. Nuclear power technology effort will focus on advanced reactor and isotopic power systems. Basic research in electrophysics will continue. In the nuclear propulsion program for 1973, NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission will define a small nuclear rocket system in the 15–20,000 pound thrust class. This effort will be a part of a broader program to define and make trade-off studies of alternative types of advanced propulsion systems, including chemical, solar-electric, nuclear-electric, and nuclear rocket systems for possible future missions to Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. Supporting research and component testing for nuclear systems will also be undertaken. Development of the NERVA 75,000 pound thrust engine is being terminated in favor of the program reoriented as above.

Aeronautical research and technology. The aims of the aeronautics program are to provide and expand the technological base in aeronautical research to facilitate the development and production of improved civil and military aircraft. A technology program coordinated with other Government agencies is being conducted that will increase aeronautical systems safety, reduce undesirable environmental effects, and contribute to future generations of aeronautical vehicles. Program emphasis in 1973 will be on Short Take-Off and Landing and Vertical Take-Off and Landing aircraft systems for short-haul transportation, improvements for medium- and long-haul jet transports, and on improved flight procedures and noise reduction. Work to be undertaken in 1973 includes fabrication of two experimental STOL transport research airplanes employing turbofan power and propulsive lift. The objective of this program is to develop quiet, clean propulsive lift technology for community noise reduction, terminal congestion relief, improved civil short-haul transport, and advanced military tactical airlift.

Supporting activities. The program grouped in this activity provide general support for the attainment of NASA mission objectives.

Tracking and data acquisition. Operation and equipment of the stations of the NASA tracking and data acquisition networks are provided for here, as well as research and development to increase the capability of the specialized ground equipment.

Sustaining university program. This program included grants for graduate studies in interdisciplinary space-related fields. Costs incurred reflect use of funds previously appropriated.

Technology utilization. The objective of this program is to accelerate the transfer into the economy of new advances in technology generated by NASA and NASA contractors.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Construction of facilities:			
Manned space flight	6,738	18,000	20,000
Scientific investigations in space	2,402	4,500	7,500
Space applications	1,695	2,000	2,000
Space and nuclear research and technology	1,966	1,000	1,000
Aeronautical research and technology	3,792	7,500	9,000
Supporting activities	27,150	17,000	22,500
Total program costs funded	43,743	50,000	62,000
Change in selected resources	−3,504	34,000	27,750
Total obligations	40,239	84,000	90,750

This appropriation provides for contractual services for the design, major rehabilitation of facilities; the construction of new facilities; minor construction; the purchase of related equipment and advanced design related to facilities planned for future authorization. The principal projects in the 1973 program are described below:

Manned space flight. This activity includes funds for space shuttle facilities at various locations.

Scientific investigations in space. This activity will provide funds for modifications and additions to the spacecraft assembly facilities and modifications of Titan Centaur facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center, and rehabilitation and modification of aeronautical, airborne science, and support facilities at the Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Space applications. No projects for 1973.

Space and nuclear research and technology. No projects for 1973.

Aeronautical research and technology. This activity includes funding for rehabilitation of unitary plan wind tunnel mode supports, control systems, and model preparation areas at the Ames Research Center; rehabilitation of the full-scale wind tunnel at the Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia; and modification of high temperature and high pressure turbine and combustor research facility at the Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio.

Supporting activities. The estimates for this activity provide for rehabilitation and modification of utility systems at the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland; rehabilitation and modification of the roadway system at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California; modification of central air supply system and environmental modifications for utility operations at the Langley Research Center; modification of fire protection system at the Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas; warehouse replacement at the Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia; rehabilitation and modification of facilities not in excess of $500,000 per project and minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities not in excess of $250,000 per project, at various NASA installations and at Government-owned plants operated by contractors; and facility planning and design.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct program:			
Manned space flight	345,198	338,100	320,600
Scientific investigations in space	91,125	98,300	94,200
Space applications	34,672	43,300	44,900
Space and nuclear research and technology	98,454	87,500	84,300
Aeronautical research and technology	107,517	118,800	118,900
Supporting activities	38,647	39,000	37,900
Total direct program costs funded	715,613	725,000	700,800
Reimbursable program:			
Manned space flight	1,398	2,502	2,500
Space applications	954	1,442	5,100
Space and nuclear research and technology	624	755	800
Supporting activities	132	426	300
Total reimbursable program costs	3,108	5,125	8,700
Total program costs funded	718,721	730,125	709,500
Change in selected resources	6,568	1,387	
Total obligations	725,289	731,512	709,500

This appropriation provides for expenses of research in Government laboratories, management of programs, and other expenses for the operation of NASA installations.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Miscellaneous trust funds:			
International cooperation	9,628	12,740	9,800
Change in selected resources	−1,500		
Total obligations	8,128	12,740	9,800

U.S. dollars are advanced from foreign governments to allow the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to procure, in the United States, nonmilitary space-oriented materials and services on their behalf.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Medical care:			
Direct operating costs funded: Maintenance and operation of VA facilities: Research and development in health services	2,333	2,189	
Capital outlay funded: Maintenance and operation of VA facilities; Research and development in health services	1	1	

In 1973, there will be a $250,000 increase over 1972 to expand and diversify research and development for improved delivery of health care services. The 1973 funds of

$2,541,000 for this activity are included under the appropriation Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses. Medical care appropriation costs for 1973 are reduced by $2,190,000 from 1972.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Direct operating costs funded:			
Medical research	53,088	56,538	62,760
Prosthetic research	2,019	2,078	3,053
Total direct operating costs funded	55,107	58,616	65,723
Capital outlay funded:			
Medical research	6,613	9,079	9,410
Prosthetic research	26	40	160
Total capital outlay	6,640	9,119	9,570
Total direct program costs funded	61,746	67,735	75,293
Reimbursable program:			
Medical research:			
Cancer chemotherapy research	921	1,906	1,950
Other	560	550	550
Total reimbursable program costs	1,481	2,456	2,500
Total program costs funded	63,227	70,191	77,793
Change in selected resources	1,038		
Total obligations	64,265	70,191	77,793

Medical research. In 1973, the funding of Veterans Administration medical research operations will rise to $62,700,000—about 18% higher than the 1971 level. The 1973 program provides for additional research in drug addiction, sickle cell disease, psychiatry, pulmonary disease, and other areas of V.A. specialization.

Prosthetic research. The budget provides a 50% increase in 1973 funding of research, development, and testing of prosthetic, orthopedic, and sensory aids for improving the care and rehabilitation of disabled eligible veterans, including amputees, paraplegics, and the blind.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Operating costs funded: Research and development in health services	99	101	2,301
Capital outlay funded: Research and development in health services			240

This provides for studies designed to facilitate improved delivery of health care services. The major portion of this activity was funded under the appropriation Medical care prior to 1973.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Studies to improve administrative procedure	306	458	480
Change in selected resources	72	−50	−30
Total obligations	378	408	450

The Conference is responsible for conducting studies of the efficiency, adequacy, and fairness of present procedures by which Federal administrative agencies and executive departments determine the rights, privileges, and obligations of private persons.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Arms control and disarmament activities: External research and field testing	1,708	1,567	2,200

These activities are conducted through grants contracts with nongovernmental research organizations and through reimbursement agreements with other U.S. Government departments and agencies. The proposed 1973 program will emphasize the control, limitation, and reduction of strategic offense and defensive weapons systems in support of bilateral and multilateral negotiations on strategic arms limitations.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: External research and field testing	20		

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Studies, Corps of Engineers	8		
Studies, National Air Pollution Control Administration	1		
Studies, Department of Agriculture	5		
Studies, Water Resources Council	5		
Studies, Geological Survey	4		

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: In-depth study of characteristics of a high quality State-local revenue system	29	57	

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Scientific research project support	180,369	246,600	275,300
National and special research programs	49,858	85,600	109,100
National research centers	37,174	40,400	42,500
Research applied to national needs	33,955	55,931	80,000

The principal emphases of the Foundation's programs in 1973 will, among other things, be to: Expand and strengthen basic research efforts which are essential to advancing man's understanding of himself, his society, and his natural environment; and increase basic and applied research efforts to help provide the science and technology needed to enhance environmental quality, improve economic growth and productivity, and deal more effectively with significant social problems.

The increase in funding for the Foundation's basic research program activities in 1973 will permit a continued healthy growth in basic research efforts in the various disciplines, such as chemistry, physics, and biology. The significant expansion in problem-related research activities will permit more intensive and comprehensive research efforts on problems such as improving municipal services, preventing environmental degradation, improving availability of energy through solar power, developing advanced tunneling technology, and designing earthquake-resistant buildings.

A significant new program will be initiated in 1973 to explore ways of increasing industrial and other non-Federal investment in research and development, speed up the application of research and development results to improve products and services, and increase productivity through the application of science and technology. Also, a new national research and development assessment program will be initiated with the principal objective of improving our knowledge of how research and development can improve economic growth and productivity and enhance our international competitive position.

Scientific research project support. This program provides support for research directed at finding answers to unresolved scientific questions concerning fundamental life processes, processes that influence man's environment, and the forces impacting on man as a member of society and on the behavior of societies.

National and special research programs. These programs include large-scale research efforts to understand the physical environment, such as conducting ecological studies under the international biological program and expanding our understanding of the ocean environment under the international decade of ocean exploration. New programs will be started in 1973 to explore ways of encouraging greater research and development efforts applicable to the needs of industry and State and local governments, and to speed up the application of science and technology to improve economic productivity and more effectively deal with social problems. Other programs in this activity include the Arctic and Antarctic research programs and the ocean sediment coring program.

National research centers. The five NSF-sponsored national research centers support advanced research in astronomy and the atmospheric sciences. These centers provide specialized facilities, equipment, staffing, and operational support which are beyond the capabilities of single educational or research institutions to provide.

Research applied to national needs. This program focuses on selected problems of national concern to help provide the scientific knowledge base for their solution. The program supports research and engineering efforts concerning the applications of advanced technology, social systems and human resources, environmental systems and resources, exploratory research, and problem assessment. The program supports the exploration of technological opportunities which may have the potential for increasing economic productivity and creating new industries and marketing for U.S. goods and services.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Institutional investor study	296	----------	----------

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA AND DRUG ABUSE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Conduct of a study of marihuana and the causes of drug abuse	76	1,962	1,090
Change in selected resources	5	85	40
Total obligations	81	1,847	1,120

The Commission will conduct a study of marihuana including the extent of its use, the efficacy of existing laws, its pharmacology and effects, its relationship to crime and other drugs, and its international control. The Commission will also conduct a study and investigation into the causes of drug abuse and their relative significance.

On the basis of its study, the Commission will make recommendations to the President and the Congress, for legislation and administrative action.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Conduct and sponsor studies and research on programs of population growth and their implications for America's future	669	940	----------

Research is being concentrated on population size and distribution, implications for the economy, demands in social service sectors, political and governmental implications of population change, environmental and natural resource problems, moral-ethical considerations, and historical and political aspects of immigration.

COMMISSION ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Study of the railroad retirement system and its financing	256	527	98

The Commission was established to conduct a study of the railroad retirement system and its financing for the purpose of recommending to the Congress changes which would provide adequate levels of benefits on an actuarially sound basis. The Commission is required to submit its final report on or before July 1, 1972, and is allowed sixty days thereafter for orderly termination of its activities. The appropriation for 1973 provides for the termination period.

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Study the organization of the District of Columbia government	47	703	----------
Change in selected resources	87	—87	----------
Total obligations	134	616	----------

The Commission is to study and investigate the organization and operation of the agencies of the District of Columbia in order to promote economy, efficiency, and improved services.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MATERIALS POLICY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Materials policy study		450	1,240
Change in selected resources		50	60
Total obligations		500	1,300

The Commission is conducting a study of domestic and foreign raw materials supplies and requirements for the purpose of developing recommendations for a comprehensive national materials policy. The intent of the policy will be to insure adequate supplies of raw materials for U.S. industry and at the same time preserve environmental quality.

The Commission will submit a report on its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by June 30, 1973, and terminate ninety days thereafter.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CAMPUS UNREST

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Study of dissent, disorder, and violence on the college campuses	676	2	----------
Change in selected resources	2	—2	----------
Total obligations	678	----------	----------

The duties of the Commission were to: Identify the principal causes of campus violence; suggest procedures through which grievances can be resolved by means other than force; suggest ways to obtain an education free from improper interference, and preserve the right of peaceful dissent and protest; and propose practical steps which can be taken to minimize dangers attendant upon expressions of dissent.

The Commission terminated in October, 1970.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Study of existing land laws and procedures	466	96	----------
Change in selected resources	—63	—96	----------
Total obligations	403	----------	----------

The Commission ceased to exist in December, 1970.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority fund: Operating costs funded: Regional development program: Experimental research and development	156	216	160

Environmental research and development utilizes TVA resources and Tennessee Valley research opportunities toward meeting pressing needs of the Nation. The program is designed to deal with the full range of variables which affect environmental quality and utilization of natural resources.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities: Research and development	120	166	100

Research will continue in engineering development, equipment design, and radio propagation techniques specifically applicable to the Voice of America.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Water resources planning: Comprehensive studies	200	120	531
Advances and reimbursements: Comprehensive study (Long Island Sound)	22	78	----------

Funds are transferred from other agencies for the management and coordination of comprehensive studies.

RECAPITULATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Department of Defense	9,135,281	10,238,494	10,409,279
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,434,914	3,569,250	3,480,950
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,610,230	1,945,308	2,008,913
National Science Foundation	301,356	428,531	506,900
Department of Transportation	493,262	418,916	471,119
Atomic Energy Commission	392,650	359,248	374,850
Department of Agriculture	328,325	369,522	369,045
Department of Commerce	183,700	231,306	292,709
Department of the Interior	138,713	171,446	191,919
Environmental Protection Agency	137,018	176,730	186,574
Veterans' Administration	66,698	72,482	80,334
Department of Housing and Urban Development	52,998	66,286	79,025
Office of Economic Opportunity	55,337	45,200	68,000
Department of Labor	5,929	27,466	30,413
Library of Congress	5,696	7,217	9,396
White House (other than Office of Economic Opportunity)	1,376	2,110	5,671
Department of Justice	1,403	10,284	5,484
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	1,728	1,567	2,200
National Commission on Materials Policy		500	1,300
National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse	81	1,847	1,120
Other agencies (none Over $1,000,000 per year)	3,444	3,208	1,429
Grand total obligations	16,350,139	18,146,918	18,576,630

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, in light of this week's conference sponsored jointly by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry and the Women's Interfaith Action for Freedom of Soviet Jewry, I think it appropriate to relate the story of Miss Raiza Palatnik.

Miss Palatnik's sister, Katia, a recent Russian Jewish emigree to Israel, is here in Washington to participate in the conference.

Raiza is presently a prisoner in a slave labor camp in Odessa, Russia. In the latter part of 1970, she applied for an exit visa to Israel. Shortly thereafter, her apartment was searched and Hebrew textbooks were found. Because of possession of these materials, Raiza was arrested in December 1970, and held incommunicado until her trial on June 22, 1971, when she was found guilty of "slander against the regime," and received a 2-year sentence.

Since her imprisonment, Miss Palatnik has suffered severe dental problems, a hearing loss, undernourishment, and a heart attack which resulted in paralysis of her left hand.

Katia visited her sister in August of 1971 before emigrating to Israel and reported her shock and dismay at Raiza's rapidly deteriorating physical condition. Despite having her requests for proper medical attention ignored and her increased disabilities, Raiza is still required to complete her daily work quota—if she fails to do so, her food ration is reduced.

Another complaint of the "prisoners of conscience" is that they are harbored in the same camp with Soviet criminals and ex-Nazis. The Jewish prisoners have requested to be relocated in order to reduce threats to their lives. It is reported that Soviet authorities are making arrangements to comply with this request by deliberately relocating the Jewish prisoners in a slave labor camp in Siberia, where the average temperature is 76° below zero. The relocation imposes an additional hardship by making it virtually impossible for families to visit prisoners since the journey takes 1 week by train, one way.

Katia Palatnik has come to Washington not only to tell of her sister's plight, but also to underline the injustice of a government that makes the desire to live as free Jews a crime punishable by deportation to labor camps. She seeks to draw attention to this deporable situation and to focus American consciousness on it.

After my trip to Russia earlier this year, I believe that Miss Palatnik's poignant description of her sister's plight and that of similar political prisoners should be given thoughtful consideration, and that both women should be noted for their courage and endurance.

SUPPRESSION OF SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress voted upon a measure urging the President to take immediate action to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by all the citizens of the Soviet Union in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; to utilize formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure an end to discrimination against religious minorities; to demand of the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and to call upon the State Department to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the Soviet Union's transgression of the Declaration of Human Rights.

I voted for this resolution, part of which was a concept which I initiated—the right to emigrate as a basic human right. The Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc. wrote to me including a statement by the association in protest against the recent arrests of Ukraine intellectuals. I will include this at the end of my remarks.

We know of the Soviet's brutal record of suppression of dissent. Robert Conquest, author of the authoritative work, "The Great Terror," estimated that 20 million Soviet citizens were killed between 1929 and 1939 alone.

From the beginning, religious groups have been singled out for special treatment. Less well known than the systematic oppression of Soviet Jews, but equally brutal, is the suppression of Catholics in the Soviet-conquered Baltic State of Lithuania.

This oppression has become so intolerable that recently 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics submitted a petition to the U.N. asking for assistance to ease their plight.

The Washington Post recently described this dramatic incident in a March 28 article which I am inserting in this special order at this point.

OVER 17,000 BALTIC CATHOLICS CITE SOVIET PERSECUTION

Moscow, March 27.—More than 17,000 Roman Catholics from Lithuania have sent petitions to the United Nations, charging Soviet religious persecution. It was the largest open protest of its kind in the Soviet Union.

An inch-thick stack of petitions, bearing over 17,000 signatures of "believers," was sent to U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim last month after Soviet officials in Moscow ignored their earlier protests, according to dissident Russian sources who made copies of the papers available to Western newsmen today.

Lithuania, a small republic on the Baltic Sea that was annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, is known as an area where traditional religious beliefs persist despite official harassment by the Communist regime.

The petitions suggest continued strength of the Catholic Church in Lithuania despite steady anti-religious propaganda. It also seems to be a part of a growing effort by religious communities to induce the government to implement religious freedoms guaranteed by the Soviet constitution.

Last September, 2,000 persons from the town of Prenai, which has less than 10,000 population, signed an open letter to the Soviet leadership charging that freedom of religion was being curbed by local authorities in Lithuania.

Three other open letters with a total of 5,000 signatures were sent last fall to Party leader Leonid Brezhnev but police "using threats, arrests and handcuffs prevented the mass collection of signatures," the letter to Waldheim said.

"Such action by the authorities prompted the conviction that the present memorandum, signed by 17,000 believers, will not attain its aim if it is sent by the same means as previous collective declarations," the letter said.

The Catholics were taking their complaints to the United Nations, the letter went on, because "believers in our republic cannot enjoy the rights set out in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." The declaration, passed by the United Nations with the Soviet Union abstaining, calls for the recognition of religious freedom by all countries.

[At the United Nations, a spokesman had no comment on the petitions today.]

In their petition, the Lithuanians complained that Soviet officials limit the number of new priests to be trained and control the assignment of priests to parishes. They said no more than 10 youths a year can enter the seminary.

There are so few priests in Lithuania, the letter charged, that one must often serve two

or three parishes and that "even invalid and aged priests must work."

The Lithuanian authorities do not enforce a law which would punish those who persecute church-goers, the petition claimed.

In addition, Catholics have not been allowed to rebuild churches destroyed during World War II and have difficulty in getting permission to hold services in private homes.

"At the same time, a dance hall was allowed to be built in the parish of Andreivas where the church stood," the petition said.

It repeated charges made last November that two parish priests were sent to labor camps for providing religious instructions to youngsters. Two bishops were also exiled without trial, it said.

More signatures would have been included in the 123 separate, identical typed petitions if the Soviet police had not reacted so strongly against the dissidents, the letter said.

"If in the future, the organs of the State take the same attitude toward believers' complaints as they have until now, we will be obliged to address ourselves to international bodies, the Pope, the head of our church, or the United Nations as an authoritative institution defending human rights."

In addition to repressing religion, the Catholics said, the "forcible atheistic upbringing" of Soviet society has also caused increases in juvenile crime, alcoholism, divorces, abortions and suicides.

The Lithuanians' protest comes at a time of improving relations between Moscow and the Vatican. Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko have called on Pope Paul VI, and the Most Rev. Agontino Casaroli, who is tantamount to a Vatican foreign minister, visited Moscow last year.

There are an estimated 3.5 million Roman Catholics living in the Soviet Union, most of them Lithuanians and Poles. Catholics are situated in Lithuania, and in western parts of Byelorussia and the Ukraine.

Lithuania is the largest single Catholic area, with nearly 500 churches still operating there.

WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE, INC.,
Buffalo, N.Y., March 17, 1972.

Hon. JACK F. KEMP,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: During the years of 1969, 1970, and 1971, we have communicated with you regarding the unrest in Ukraine caused by the Soviet Russia's occupation of Ukrainian territory, and the constant violation of human rights of the Ukrainian citizens.

Once again we are taking the liberty of bringing to your attention the current situation in Ukraine with details contained in the enclosed statement.

We are convinced of your interest in the Captive Nations Freedom movement and consider you a friend of millions of Ukrainian Americans, many of whom are now your own constituents who have relatives in Ukraine and for whom they have great concern.

We appeal to you to raise the question of injustice in Ukraine on the floor of Congress and ask the Secretary of State, Honorable William P. Rogers and United Nations Ambassador George Bush to take proper action toward the Soviet government to release all political prisoners, particularly the intellectuals, ailing, aged, and young mothers who have been torn away from their infants who need them so desperately, restore their full rights of citizenship, and return them to their homes in Ukraine.

Sincerely yours.

KATERYNA MOROZ,
Chairman.
KATERYNA PRYSTAJKO,
Secretary.

WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 27, 1972.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ULANA CELEWYCH, NATIONAL PRESIDENT

On behalf of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Incorporated, of which I have the privilege of being the National President, I hereby state my shock and indignation and protest against the wave of arrests in Ukraine performed by the Russian Secret Police Force (KGB).

In these restless times many individuals, groups, and statesmen, including President Richard M. Nixon, in order to establish long-lasting peace and prosperity for generations to come, are exhibiting a new approach to satisfy human needs, individual and national rights, and identity.

At the same time, the Soviet Russian Colonial government, founder member of the United Nations Organization, signatory of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and so-called "volunteer missionary of good will" for world community, is for Ukrainians, a brutal invader who occupied the Sovereign Ukrainian Republic and by force is holding it in the USSR system.

In conjunction with the existing reality of Russia's constant violation of human rights of the 48 million native Ukrainians on their own territory, (majority of the population, 79%), our organization, in November 1969 presented a petition supported by 5,000 signatures to Ambassador Finger, who accepted on behalf of Ambassador Charles Yost, in which we expressed our concern of the increased terror, russification, restriction for continued education, deprivation of private property, as in the case of Mrs. Valentyn Moroz in Ivano-Frankivsk, a city in West Ukraine, mass arrests of the people in 1961, 1965, 1967, 1969, and 1970, particularly among young scholars who grew up under Soviet occupation and who oppose the Soviet way of life imposed upon them; thus all these things creating an alarming situation in Ukraine for a long time.

In our opinion, Brezhnev is restoring the neostalinism and is again practicing genocide in the Ukrainian nation, particularly on the Ukrainian intellectuals.

Now again, on January 14, 1972, over two million Americans of Ukrainian descent in the U.S.A., as well as all Ukrainians throughout the free world were shocked by the news via the UPI and Reuters Press Agencies about the arrest of 11 leading Ukrainian dissident intellectuals on charges of "nationalistic agitation" and deliberate false fabrications defaming the Soviet State. The arrests were carried out on January 11, in the cities of Kiev, Lviv, and Odessa. Later, reports raised the number of arrested to 19, then to 36, and at the present time the figure has grown to 200, and there are possibilities that the number is much higher and it is questionable if the exact number will ever be known in the free world.

Sources said that the arrests were preceded by a series of raids by the Soviet Secret Police Forces (KGB) on the homes of the dissidents in Kiev, Lviv, and Odessa. Several European newspapers also stated that the KGB had begun a series of raids and interrogations in other large industrial and university cities in Ukraine, including Czernivtsi, Poltava, Kharkiv, Riwne, and Dnipropetrovsk. There the action was directed mainly against younger students, professors and writers, especially those who had been active in demanding Constitutional and national rights for Ukraine.

Because of the censure and russification policy forbidding free expression in existing government sponsored publications and newspapers, the Ukrainians were forced to establish their own news media for the purpose of objective information.

According to reliable sources, the KGB latest arrests were meant to destroy the writing and circulation of the underground newspaper "Ukrainian Herald" which carries information about secret trials and arrests of Ukrainians, russification, intentions of anti-Ukrainianism, national discrimination, and religious persecution. The latest issue of the Herald contained over 100 typewritten pages of detailed information about Soviet repressions in Ukraine.

Among the arrested on January 11, are Vyacheslav Chornovil, writer and author of the Chronovil Papers; Ivan Dziuba, author of Internationalism or Russification (a study in the Soviet nationalities problem); Ivan Switlychnyj, a literary critic; Wasyl Stus, poet; Ihor Kalynec, poet; and others. Among those arrested are also women. Larissa Karavansky, M.D., wife of Swyatoslav Karavansky who was recently sentenced to many years imprisonment; Irene Stasiv-Kalynec, poetess and wife of Ihor Kalynec; Stepheny Shabatura, artist and designer; Stephanie Hulyk, a mother of an 8-month old infant and member of the association to preserve historical monuments; and Raisa Moroz, wife of Valentyn Moroz, whose fate is unknown.

We, the members of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., on behalf of the millions of voiceless Ukrainians in the homeland of Ukraine, and on behalf of Ukrainian prisoners and their families appeal to President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, U.S. Ambassador to United Nations, Honorable George Bush, Secretary General of United Nations Organization, Honorable Kurt Waldheim, to the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, and to the Honorable Senators and Congressmen, to raise their voices in support of rights for Ukrainians, and to take proper action towards the Soviet government to release all political prisoners, particularly the intellectuals, ailing, aged, and young mothers who have been torn away from their infants who need them so desperately. It is time to stop the Russian interference in the way of life and of the Constitutional rights of the people of Ukraine.

WZZM–TV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, when hometown people are honored for a notable achievement, it is natural for the Congressman representing that community to crow with pride.

So it is that I call the attention of not only this House, but the Nation, to the honor bestowed on WZZM–TV, channel 13, Grand Rapids, Mich., by their peers in the television industry—a 1971 Emmy Award for best documentary produced by a television station.

This award should excite particular interest in the Congress, because both Houses recently approved legislation launching a major attack on sickle cell anemia, the terrible hereditary disease which afflicts so many blacks in America. The documentary, which is entitled "Paradox of Neglect," pictures the research being carried out on sickle cell anemia and the work done at Blodgett Memorial Hospital in Grand Rapids by Dr. Robert Nelbandian and his team in devising a simple mass screening method to detect the disease.

To make clear the intense competition for the Emmy Award won by WZZM, I might mention that there were 76 entries

in the best documentary by a television station category and 10 finalists. WZZM received the Emmy at the National Association of Broadcasters Convention last Monday in Chicago.

I would like to single out at this time those WZZM staff members who made up the team that turned "Paradox" into a splendid achievement. They are: William D. Corder, executive producer; John L. Bailey and Bill Prins, directors; Werner Schneider and Robert Cross, cameras; and Jim Jensen and Rod Caszatt, producers-writers. Bailey is manager of the Production 13 team, the WZZM–TV film unit which produced the film.

In view of the action recently taken by the Congress on sickle cell anemia, I wish that every Member of Congress could see the excellent documentary made by WZZM–TV, "Paradox of Neglect."

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, enactment of Public Law 91–248 in 1970, amending the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 has resulted in Federal regulation of the sale of soft drinks in the public schools participating in these programs.

The language in the law from which this situation results states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe regulations "including regulations relating to the service of food in participating school and service institutions in competition with the programs authorized under this act and the National School Lunch Act."

Frankly, I do not think that the sale of items such as soft drinks constitutes a threat to the success of the school lunch programs or that such sales should be subject to Federal regulation. Furthermore, some school officials have complained that the present regulations with respect to competitive food services actually discourage students from eating in the school lunchrooms. Many prefer to bring lunch from home or to eat at establishments off the school grounds. With this diminished participation, some schools find it difficult to sustain the school lunch program, financially. Some school officials in Maryland told me they would have had to discontinue the lunch program completely, because of lack of participation. However when soft drinks and some ala carte options were offered, it resulted in more students eating in the school lunchrooms and increased participation in the school lunch program.

In any case, as long as the students stay away from the lunchrooms in droves, there is little likelihood that they will derive much benefit from the nutritional programs offered under the Child Nutrition Act and the National School Lunch Act.

The bill which I am introducing today, however, by no means mandates the sale of soft drinks or any other specific item in schools or school lunchrooms. Nor does it seek to place the Federal stamp of approval on such items. I realize that there may be different situations from State to State and even among school districts within a State or schools within a district. I believe this proposal takes cognizance of these differences. This bill would simply make more explicit the sort of competitive food services to be regulated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under this proposal a school or an organization within a school could not offer a complete alternative lunch service, could not, for example, open a McDonald's franchise right next to the school cafeteria line, but could have a soft drink vending machine in the cafeteria or its environs if permitted by the school authorities.

I believe that this is reasonable and would in no way interfere with the purpose of the school lunch programs.

PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE TO ESCALATION OF VIETNAM WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time, because I want it known that I am unequivocally in support of the action the President has taken in response to renewed escalation of the Vietnam war by the North Vietnamese army and the Vietcong.

Everyone is screaming about our bombing of military installations in the north. Yet the Communists have been engaging in almost constant mortar attacks on cities and civilian populations throughout the course of the war and no one among those who decry the bombings seems willing even to recognize that fact, let alone talk about it.

The North Vietnamese escalation of the war was a calculated move. They gambled that there would be no retaliation—no consequences. No nation worth its salt can permit that kind of gamble to pay off in the current international climate. The President's action is a restrained and perfectly reasoned—indeed, it is an entirely necessary—response to that calculated move by the North Vietnamese.

It is further necessitated by the upcoming trip to Moscow which those who now decry the bombing have all along been praising. Only a fool would go into negotiations in the weakened kind of bargaining position that would have faced the President if we had made no response to this new escalation of the war by North Vietnam. Our own strategic interests were at stake and required this kind of response, without regard to any obligations of support we may still owe to the Republic of South Vietnam.

Our withdrawal of ground forces from Vietnam never included any kind of commitment on the part of the President not to use our airpower to maintain necessary support for the South Vietnamese army while Vietnamization of the war was being brought to fruition. This is no violation of a pledge, but rather the fulfillment of a pledge resulting from a strategic error on the part of the enemy. I commend and support the President for this forthright response to a tragic failure on the part of the North Vietnamese leaders to understand either their own best interests or the means to peace for the entire world.

TAX WITHHOLDING LAWS NEED REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as most Americans are all too well aware, today is the last day to file their income tax statements with the Internal Revenue Service. For the average American this has meant sleepless nights; consultation with friends, lawyers, and relatives; and worry, frustration, and aggravation as he tried to figure out the amazing complexities and technicalities of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Average American is not the only one to be confronted with and confounded by the difficulties prescribed by our tax laws. Small businessmen, large corporations, charities, State and municipal governments, and even school districts often need a Philadelphia lawyer to wade through the depths of the law.

Because this is a special day, it seems particularly appropriate for me to discuss one of the small, but especially bothersome, technicalities in the tax laws which imposes a significant burden upon the Nation's public schools.

Section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code exempts from income tax of employees of section 501(c) organizations or public schools payments made by the employer to acquire certain annuities for its employees, within specified limitations. In Revenue Ruling 70–453, IRB 1970–35, 18, issued in September 1970, the Internal Revenue Service ruled that withholding of income taxes was required on the costs of life insurance protection under such section 403(b) annuities.

In order to administer a withholding tax system, the schools will have to: first, revise their payroll systems, whether they be by computer or by hand, so as to provide for the additional deduction of withholding taxes from the salary payments; second, incorporate the amount withheld in the receipt to each employee; and third, explain each change in the amount of taxes withheld.

According to one of my Illinois constituents, who has surveyed a representative sample taken from section 403(b) annuities, the annual premium for 173 annuities varied from $50 to $2,772. The average annual cost of life insurance was $40.65. About one-half of the 173 annuities involved annualized premiums ranging from $50 to less than $400 with annual cost of life insurance ranging from $3.05 to $32.12. Based upon withholding at a 14 percent rate from monthly payments of salary over a 12-month school period, this would amount to withholding of taxes on the cost of life insurance protection of 3½ cents to 37 cents per month. Based upon an average

annual payment of $40.65, the withholding tax per month would be about 47 cents.

If the withholding is done once on an annual basis, the amount of tax withheld at a 14-percent rate would vary from $.43 to $6.59 on annual costs of life insurance protection varying from $3.05 to $40.65.

All of this will impose a substantial burden during the year if the withholding must be on a periodic basis, or at the end of the year if the withholding is on a one-short basis at the end of the year. A similar burden would be encountered if a less exact method were allowed of withholding on the basis of the cost for the previous year.

I am told that although the cost of life insurance protection in these cases is almost nominal in amount, it is not static. Since the life insurance element changes each year with a change in risk at the anniversary date of the policy, at least one change would be required each year. Moreover, the anniversary dates of the policies vary—depending on the date the policy was issued—so that changes are required throughout the year. Also, it is estimated that about 25 percent of the policyholders made other changes in life insurance component of the annuities during the year. The changes occur for a variety of reasons, including sabbatical leave, pregnancy, sick leave, financial inability, or greater financial ability. The annuitant can also discontinue the plan at any time, temporarily or permanently, requiring additional changes. Furthermore, since the employee's contract year may run from September 1 to August 31, there may be two contract years during each calendar year.

Each change in the cost of life insurance would require the school to change its payroll reporting to reflect the revised deduction of the amount of income taxes withheld and to report the change in the W–2 forms to the employees. There is also a complication in that there is a lag, which may amount to as long as 2 months, between the application for a change in the coverage and the time when it is approved. If the risk applied for differs from that determined, the amount of coverage for the cost of the life insurance would have to be revised. Any such change would require further adjustments to be made by the school in the amount of taxes already withheld and to be withheld.

It does not seem reasonable to me that the Treasury should require withholding under these circumstances. The costs and administrative burdens in reflecting these changes through withholding can hardly be justified. This is particularly true since it is very unlikely that there is any tax escape. The amount of compensation by way of life insurance costs is reported on the W–2 forms given to each school employee.

Moreover, the additional expense to State and local government agencies, as the employers, runs counter to the policy of the Federal Government to improve their fiscal situations.

In similar instances, tax withholding has not been required. For example, income tax withholding is not required with respect to payments made on behalf of an employee or his beneficiary to a qualified section 401(a) employee trust, and under a qualified employee annuity plan. Payments made under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a) of the Internal Revenue Code are also exempt from withholding under section 3402(a)(12)(c) of the code by a provision adopted in section 7 of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962.

When the present statutory provision for section 403(b) annuities was adopted in 1958, the Congress provided "that the other major benefits accorded in the case of industrial plans should also be made available to the educational, charitable, and religious organizations whose pension payments qualify under the 20 percent rule—or to the extent they qualify under the 20 percent rule." Therefore, it extended three provisions to these annuities: the $5,000 income tax exclusion for amounts paid with respect to an employee's death; an exclusion from the estate tax base of a decedent employee with respect to an employer's contributions; and an exclusion from the gift tax base with respect to an employer's contribution provided in the case of exercise by an employee of an election as to survivor benefits.

The overall congressional intention substantially to equalize the tax benefits of an annuitant of a section 403(b) annuity with those of annuitants under qualified plans should be applied equally to exempt from withholding payments under section 403(b) annuity plans to employees of schools and school districts.

The amount of tax involved in section 403(b) annuities is much smaller than that for qualified annuities, the administrative burdens of withholding under section 403(b) plans are inordinately great, and they fall for the most part on State and local government agencies.

The withholding tax system has its practical limitations. Withholding of income taxes is clearly an important device by which the government insures that taxes are collected. However, where such assurance is otherwise available, withholding should not be required if the administrative burdens of withholding do not yield better tax collection results commensurate with the added burden of withholding. For example, the law does not require withholding on dividends and interest because it was felt that the reporting of such income was adequate and, therefore, that the administrative burden of withholding would not be justified.

Similarly, "unnecessary" withholding burdens have been taken into account by excepting from withholding group term life insurance premiums paid on behalf of employees which would otherwise be subject to withholding because they are in excess of the applicable limitations. Instead, the employer is required to file information returns as to the income element with the Government, and provide a copy to the employee. Again, the insurance component of 403(b) annuities is reflected as other compensation on the W–2 forms to be filed with the Government, with a copy to the employee.

Exemption from withholding on the life insurance component of section 403(b) annuities would be consistent with past practice and would recognize that administrative burdens far outweigh the miniscule protection of the revenue, if any, involved.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt section 403(b) annuities from withholding. I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will act quickly to bring this measure to the floor, and that the Congress will enact it into law.

TV VIOLENCE AS A CAUSE OF CHILD AGGRESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding pieces of research conducted for the Surgeon General's study of the effects of televised violence was conducted by a team headed by Dr. Monroe M. Lefkowitz, principal research scientist of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene. His associates in this effort include Dr. Leonard D. Eron of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Dr. Leopold Walder of Behavior Research Consultants, Greenbelt, Md., and Dr. L. Rowell Huesmann of Yale University.

This was a landmark piece of scientific research. It involved a large number of children over an extended period of time using one of the more sophisticated research techniques in the behavioral sciences. The findings, simply put, found a highly significant relationship between viewing violent television and aggressive behavior in later years. Because such a finding was so damaging to the TV networks, certain members of the Surgeon General's 12-man committee which had been loaded with individuals who worked for or had ties with the TV networks, saw fit to try to denigrate not only the findings of the Lefkowitz team, but actually sought to impeach the scientific capability of one of the team members.

Failing this, the "industry five" as they became known to the other advisory group members wrote the section of the report having to do with the all important question of the relationship of TV aggression to adolescent behavior. Here again, the Lefkowitz study was given short shrift—despite the fact that independent researchers contracted by members of the "industry five" to dismantle the study endorsed it instead. The release of the report of the Surgeon General in January so disturbed Dr. Lefkowitz that he wrote me, other Members of Congress, and those concerned with the Surgeon General's project and characterized the efforts to downgrade his study as "a serious fraud—perpetrated on the American public and particularly on American children."

Fortunately, because of the courage of Dr. Lefkowitz and many of his colleagues, the true findings of the researchers on the disastrous effects nightly televised mayhem, brutality, and savagery are having on our society are being made known to the American public. But he and his colleagues have had to undergo a great deal of embarrassing harassment from the TV industry and the so-called Industry Five on the Surgeon General's panel. For example, Dr. Lefkowitz wrote to me that—

Of the three written critiques I received of my study from committee members the one which was destructive, and in my opinion irresponsible, was rendered by an individual (who had) affiliations with the television industry.

Another member of the Lefkowitz team was Dr. L. Rowell Huesmann, assistant professor of psychology at Yale University. Dr. Huesmann wrote to me when he learned that I was trying as he put it "to see to it that the findings from the studies on television and aggression do not get swept under the rug because of the Surgeon General's wishy-washy report." In referring to the attempts of the industry plants on the committee to disparage him and his qualifications, Dr. Huesmann wrote:

From the start they expressed a great deal of skepticism about our results including questioning my qualifications as a statistician. I feel no need to defend my qualifications, since my background would speak for itself, and I was quite happy to discover that the committee had asked two independent researchers to critique my analyses. (David Kenney of Northwestern and John Neal of Stony Brook). It would have been nice if the committee had told us they were doing this, (we only discovered it when David Kenny called and asked for more data), but that was not too bothersome. What is upsetting is that the two critiques are not mentioned anywhere in the body of this summary. As you might guess, both critiques, while finding some points of contention, were generally very supportive of our techniques and findings. Apparently, the committee ignored them. They are mentioned in the list of reports submitted, but no where else in the summary. At the same time the committee included all sorts of comments about "statistical problems" and innuendos about "methodological difficulties" when discussing our report. Why did they not include their own consultant's comments on these topics?

Dr. Huesmann concluded his letter with a statement with which I find myself in agreement. He wrote:

The biased nature of the committee membership seems to have led to a compromise where the truth was lost.

Mr. Speaker, because the whole effort of the "Industry Five" in my opinion was "destructive" and "irresponsible" I feel the Lefkowitz study should receive wide study in its undiluted form. That is why I insert for the RECORD following my remarks the entire statements of Drs. Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder, and Huesmann in addition to Dr. Lefkowitz's letter of January 27, 1972, to me and Dr. Huesmann's letter to me of March 6, 1972. I am convinced that much more needs to be done to enlighten the American people on the dangers of TV violence and to forcefully impress on the TV networks the idea that Congress is fed up with their 18-year record of selling crime and violence to the Nation's children. To that end, I have asked the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, to call hearings on this subject as quickly as possible by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power.

The items follow:

TELEVISION VIOLENCE AS ONE OF THE CAUSES OF AGGRESSION: OBSERVATIONS ON THE REPORT OF THE SURGEON GENERAL'S SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Our presentation today to the Senate Subcommittee on Communications will consist of a brief statement of the salient aspects of our research: "Television Violence and Child Aggression: A Follow-up Study (Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder and Huesmann, 1971). Subsequently, we will present a critique of the interpretation of our findings by the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Commmittee on Television and Social Behavior. Finally, we will present to the present Committee a recommendation concerning the Surgeon General's Report and some observations and suggestions pertaining to violence on television.

Longitudinal data were collected on 427 teenagers of an original group of 875 children who were participating in a study of third grade children in 1960 (Eron, 1963; Eron, Walder and Lefkowitz, 1971). The original 875 constituted the entire third grade population of a semirural county in New York's Hudson River Valley, while the 427 subjects were those who could be located and interviewed ten years later.

The information collected about these subjects in both time periods falls into two classes: (a) measures of aggression, and (b) potential predictors of aggression. During the third grade interviews four different data sources had been used: the subject, his peers, his mother, and his father. Ten years later, the data sources were the subject and his peers. For convenience this later time period will be designated as the 13th grade.

In the third grade, peer-rated aggression scores were obtained by asking each child to nominate any of his classmates on ten "guess who" items describing aggressive behavior; e.g., "Who pushes and shoves other children?" "Who takes other children's things without asking?" "Who starts a fight over nothing?" These aggression items were interspersed among a series of other peer nomination questions. The validity and reliability of the aggression measure have been discussed elsewhere (Walder, Abelson, Eron, Banta and Laulicht, 1961; Eron et al., 1971).

The peer rating instrument was revised slightly for the 13th grade study. Since the subjects were no longer in school, the procedure was administered individually in a face-to-face interview. The number of posssible peers any subject could nominate was widened beyond his own third grade classroom to include his classmates through high school. Thus each subject was rated by a larger set of raters in the 13th grade which included many of the raters from the third grade.

In the third grade the children's preferences for violent television were obtained by asking each mother for her child's three favorite TV programs. All programs were then categorized as violent or nonviolent by two independent raters with 94% agreement in their ratings. Each subject received a score according to the number of violent TV programs he was reported by his mother as favoring.

In the ten year follow-up study, each subject *himself* was asked for his four current favorite TV programs. All programs were then categorized for presence or absence of violence by two independent raters who agreed on 81% of 125 programs mentioned by the subjects. The score for each subject was the sum of the violence ratings of the four programs mentioned.

The judgments of our raters were in close agreement with the results obtained by Greenberg and Gordon (1970), who did an extensive rating study in which they used as raters both established TV critics (approximately 45) and 300 subjects randomly selected from the Detroit telephone book. Of the 20 programs which Greenberg and Gordon indicated had the highest violence ratings, 19 were selected as violent by our raters. For the 427 cases in the ten year follow-up study, there was a correlation of .94 between the Greenberg-Gordon average ratings and our ratings.

The 427 subjects studied in both the third and 13th grades consisted of 211 males and 216 females whose modal age at the time of the 13th grade interview was 19 years. The sample was at the higher end of the average range in intelligence with a mean IQ of 109 and was somewhat middle class in social status. Preliminary analysis indicated that the measures of aggression distinguished the males from the females. Because of these findings the data for males and females were analyzed separately.

From Figure 1 one can see that there is a highly significant relation between boys' preferences for violent television programs in the third grade (TVVL3) and their peer-rated aggression in the 13th grade (AGG13). Similarly, there is a significant contemporaneous relation between the boys' TV preferences in the third grade and peer-rated aggression in the third grade (AGG3). While the correlation between third grade preferences and 13th grade peer-related aggression "explains" only ten percent of the variance in aggression, ten percent is impressive when one considers the large number of variables affecting aggression and the ten year lag between measurement times. The extremely low likelihood of achieving such a correlation by chance is a good indicator of the strength of the relation between preference for violent TV at age eight years and peer-rated agression at age 19.

When distributions are unusual, an analysis of variance may, more clearly than a correlation, reveal the relation between the two variables. Hence, the male subjects were categorized into low, medium, and high television violence groups, representing approximately the lowest 10%, the middle 80%, and the upper 10%, respectively (see Table 1). This analysis shows that the increase in these mean values of aggression is 59 percent as violence preference increases from low to medium and is 102 percent as violence preference increases from medium to high. Thus, ten years later, the group preferring a small amount of television violence at age 8 was significantly *less* aggressive than the group preferring a moderate amount of television violence. While the group preferring a large amount of television violence was significantly *more* aggressive than the moderate preference group. Rarely, if ever, does a scientific finding hold for every member of a population. In this case the finding holds for *both* the high and low ends of the preference scale amounting to at least 24 percent of the sample.

Having established that there exists a highly significant relation between a preference for violent television in the third grade and aggressive habits in the 13th grade, one can consider the alternative casual explanations for this phenomenon. Of course, one cannot demonstrate that a particular hypothesis is true. One can only reject unten-

able hypotheses and present evidence on the plausibility of the remaining hypotheses.

Consider the pattern of correlations diagramed in Figure 1; the correlations on the diagonals are called cross-lagged correlations. The cross-lagged correlation between a preference for violent television in the third grade and aggression in the 13th grade is highly significant. When coupled with the lack of a relation between third grade aggression and a preference for violent television in the 13th grade, this significant correlation supports the hypothesis that preference for violent television is a cause of aggressive behavior.

Several rival explanations have been offered for this pattern of cross-lagged correlations; however, each of these alternative explanations has been analyzed statistically and found to be less plausible than the above hypotheses. A consultant (Kenny, 1971) retained by the Committee to render a critique of our analysis, concluded that, "However, the data do suggest that watching violent television shows does cause later aggression" (p. 140).

On the basis of the cross-lagged correlations one concludes that the single most plausible casual hypothesis is that a preference for watching violent television in the third grade contributes to the development of aggressive habits. This does not mean that other variables are not of equal or greater importance in stimulating aggression, but only that a preference for TV violence and the viewing behavior that the preference indicates probably are independent and important causes of aggressive habits.

None of the data presented up to this point suggests that another variable such as IQ, social class, parental punishment, or parental aggression, might have stimulated both the child's preference for violent television and his aggressiveness. However, one can test some of these hypotheses by computing the partial correlations between television violence and aggression with such variables controlled. It was found that neither the child's aggression in the third grade, social class, mobility orientation of parent, IQ, parental punishment, parental aspirations for child, nor parental aggression accounts for the relationship. Nor can the relation be explained by the total number of hours of TV watched by the subject in either the third or 13th grades.

Several modern statistical techniques lend further credence to the observation that violent television is a cause of aggressive habits. A multiple regression analysis revealed that among all the third grade variables that were not direct measures of aggression, preference for violent television was the best predictor of 13th grade aggression and the greatest contributor to changes in 13th grade aggression. A path analysis provided even stronger evidence of the causal nature of the relationship between television violence and aggression (Neale, 1971).

The above results indicate that TV habits established by age eight to nine years influence boys' aggressive behaviors at that time and at least through late adolescence. The more violent are the programs preferred by boys in the third grade, the more aggressive is their behavior both at that time and ten years later. This relation between early TV habits and later aggression prevails both for peer-rated aggression and self-ratings of aggression. Actually, these early TV habits seem to be more influential than current viewing patterns since a preference for violent television in the 13th grade is not at all related to concurrent aggressive behavior.

Our criticism of the Committee's presentation and interpretation of our data pertains to the tone, style, and substance of the report (1972). Our opinion of the report is that it is misleading, watered down and contains inaccuracies. Generally, statements about data concerned with the causal effect on aggression of television violence are over qualified whereas statements supporting the point of view that television violence and aggression are related to a third variable are presented in a straightforward manner without qualification.

For example, on page 75 of the report are the following statements:

"*Under certain circumstances* television violence *can* instigate an increase in aggressive acts. The accumulated evidence, however, does not warrant the conclusion that televised violence has a *uniformly adverse effect* on the majority of children. It cannot *even* be said that the majority of the children in the various studies we have reviewed showed an increase in aggressive behavior in response to the violent fare to which they were exposed. The evidence does indicate that televised violence *may* lead to increased aggressive behavior *in certain subgroups* of children, who *might* constitute a small portion or a substantial portion of the total population of young television viewers." (Italics mine.)

In the foregoing quotation, seven qualifying words or phrases were used. But on the same page (75) a statement implicating a third variable is as follows:

"There is evidence that among young children (ages four to six) those most responsive to television violence are those who are highly aggressive to start with—who are prone to engage in spontaneous aggressive actions against their playmates and, in the case of boys who display pleasure in viewing violence being inflicted on others."

Not a qualifier in this statement. Another example of over qualification is given on page 94 of the report:

"The correlation coefficient between the index based on mother's report of program preference when the child was about 8 years old and the peer rating of past aggressive behavior when the boy was about 18 years old depends *almost entirely* on a *small* number of boys at the *extreme* high end of the preference scale who scored *extremely* high on the peer rated measure of aggressive behavior (a measure with *virtually* no upper limit). Without question, these boys would justify individual case study, but there *appears* to be *hardly* any relationship elsewhere in the range." (Italics mine.)

This statement of our findings is so over qualified that its meaning becomes vague if not lost. Moreover, it is incorrect! There is a very definite upper limit to the measure of aggression, namely, one. The Committee fails to cite in their report the analysis of variance of these data (see Table 1) which shows that mean scores of aggresive behavior at age 19 increase significantly from low through medium to high as preference for violent television increases along the same dimension. The Committee claims that the relationship between television violence and later aggressive behavior "depends almost entirely on a small number of boys." The question is how small is small? In this case approximately 24 percent of the sample is affected by watching television. Considering the phenomenon under study and placed within the context of social responsibility what does small mean when approximately 1 out of every 4 boys is influenced to behave aggressively by early viewing of violent television. If cigarette smoking were to cause lung cancer in 20 to 25 percent of the population would that number be termed small?

The omission of the analysis of variance just mentioned is related to the larger issue of the inclusion and exclusion of data from our study on a seemingly arbitrary basis. From the time we submitted our report in March of 1971 to about December of 1971, a period of approximately 9 months, the Committee asked many questions about the data. These questions were raised during telephone conversations and in writing. Whenever possible we answered the questions either from our knowledge of the research findings or by performing more statistical analyses. At one point the Committee even raised questions about the qualifications of our statistical consultant. Since we tried as best we could to respond to all questions raised by the Committee, certain statements in the report can only be viewed as pejorative and as an attempt to derogate the findings. For example on page 80 of the report the Committee states "the father's reports were apparently not used but reason for this is not stated" there are indeed very good reasons but the Committee never asked. Another example of such innuendo is presented on page 83 of the report as follows: "Lefkowitz et al. report, without citing supporting data . . . ." The Committee could have had such supporting data had they only requested it. With only 11 months to complete this study including the report to the Committee, we could hardly have included the voluminous body of data and the tables of thousands of correlation coefficients we had generated.

At one point towards the end of requests made for more data by the Committee, we were asked for the cross-lagged correlations between TV violence and aggression for subjects in the eighth grade. Although these data are of questionable validity and reliability we complied with this request. In a letter dated November 2, 1971 to Dr. George A. Comstock in which I describe the data being forwarded I say,

"Because of the absence of support during the eighth grade phase of this study, data collection methods were used which were not in direct control of the investigators; moreover, the sampling was spotty and unsystematic. Consequently, the eighth grade data are of dubious quality and proper caution should be used in their interpretation. I am not sure how the Committee plans to use these data but I hope some of their questions are answered. If I can be of further help please let me know."

The Committee then reports the eighth grade data and uses them in an attempt to show inconsistencies in our measures. Nowhere in the report is it stated that these data are of highly dubious quality, or that they should be interpreted with caution. Moreover, the Committee gave us no opportunity to answer any of the questions they raise in the presentation of these eighth grade data on pages 93–95 of their report.

Another example of important data being omitted or ignored relates to the Committee's observations on predisposition to aggression. The Committee states "that any such causal relation operates only on some children (who are predisposed to be aggressive; . . ." With respect to our data the only information the Committee could have had—as concerns predisposition to aggression—was just in the opposite direction. Specifically we showed that childhood aggressiveness was unrelated to preference for violent television ten years later. If our subjects were predisposed to be aggressive, one would expect a significant positive relationship to have occurred between these two variables. Furthermore, when aggressiveness is statistically controlled for the third grade subjects by partial correlation technique, the relationship between preference for television violence at age 8 and aggressive behavior at age 19 still remains significant. These data, which argue against predisposition to aggression for the subjects in our study, are ignored by the Committee.

It is small wonder, therefore, that even educated laymen such as newspaper reporters would misinterpret the Surgeon General's Report, or excerpts from that report, as was done in a front page headline of the New

York Times on January 11, 1972. This headline stated "TV Violence Held Unharmful to Youth." The same article published in the Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, Massachusetts, January 11, 1972 was headlined "It's Safe to Let Kiddies Watch TV Mayhem Study Finds."

Taken by itself any one of these criticisms of the Committee's report could be termed picayune, out of context or nit-picking. When taken as a whole, however, it is our unmistakable impression that the report systematically includes and excludes certain kinds of data. It ignores other data completely and dilutes and over qualifies certain research results. Moreover, the report contains inaccuracies. Whether or not these actions can be attributed to inadvertent bias, deliberate bias or for that matter bias at all is really immaterial. The salient question is really the effect of the report on the behavior of parents and children as concern the watching of violence on television. A report which had treated the data straightforwardly may have had a restraining influence on the television diet permitted to children by their parents. When parents are led to believe that only children already predisposed toward aggression will be adversely affected by TV violence, the restraints on a violent television diet have, in effect, been lifted. How many parents are ready to believe that their children are predisposed towards aggression?

For the reasons we have stated we do not believe that the Committee's Report accurately represents the research findings. Therefore, we would suggest that the body of data generated by the 23 principal investigators be reevaluated. Such a reevaluation should be done by a group whose credentials are unimpeachable. The group we suggest is the National Academy of Science.

Television violence is only one of a large number of substances in our society which has noxious effects. Methods, with varying degrees of success, have been developed to control substances which have proven harmful. Generally, in our pluralistic society, censorship is becoming less and less respectable as a form of control. In this particular case we are in unanimous agreement that Government censorship is undesirable. The television industry must police itself but will do so, we feel, only when the public exerts sufficient pressure. Rigorous consumer action would probably have a maximum effect. If parents do not permit their children to watch the objectionable programs which portray unnecessary violence and refuse to buy products advertised by such programs, the networks will quickly receive this message and develop programs which are more acceptable. But no consumer action will occur, we fear, as long as the public continues to be misinformed by misleading Government reports.

Other approaches which might effect a change in a child's television diet should be considered. One would be the presentation of spot announcements on television about the deleterious effects of violence viewing on a child's development. Another would be a systematic effort—probably by the U.S. Public Health Service—to educate parents about the deleterious effects on children of television violence.

All portrayal of violence should not be eliminated, since violence is indeed part of life. However the violence portrayed on the television screen both during prime time and childrens' hours is usually far removed from what happens in real life. TV violence is much more sanitary and clean cut. Both heroes and villains acquire material possessions, vent their frustrations, and mete out punishment by use of violence. But the real life consequences of violence are never portrayed: the guts and gore, the mangled bodies and dismembered limbs, and the long term misery and suffering perpetrated on the victim of violence and his family. Children, thus, eventually become satiated without becoming aware of the real and persistent consequences of violence. Their threshold for violent acts is raised and their sensitivity to cues of violence is diminished. That children retain their sensitivity to violence is essential. Less saturation and more measured doses of exposure both to TV violence and its real life consequences should work to maintain a sensitivity to cues of violence and to their repelling implications.

Further recommendations are to provide violence ratings of all TV programs and require that broad TV offerings, violent and nonviolent, be made available without regard to the profit earned by the TV station. Persons with child development responsibilities should be provided with methods for determining their child's aggression level. These persons should be helped to understand, or assess, the supports, i.e., payoffs, for aggression in the child's natural environment. Behavior management should be treated as important an academic subject at all levels of compulsory school as are the required subjects.

The foregoing recommendations are immediately relevant to the child, his parent, and to television programing. Yet, there are broader actions that could and should be taken. It is clear that the TV industry has great power, both financial and educational. It seems that the interests of the citizenry are poorly protected by the regulatory agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission. The composition and/or the functions of the FCC should be modified to represent better the citizenry whose airways the TV stations borrow.

Another set of actions deals with seeking additional information. We need to have an annual social report which might answer the question "Are we becoming a more violent society?" This annual report could explore how our society, or segments of it, responds to violence on the national and local level as well as on the international level. What are societies' values with respect to nonviolent solutions? Do we offer the potentially violent person a reward for nonviolence or for prosocial behavior?

The foregoing recommendations are both general and specific. We are aware that certain of these proposals, at this point in time may be idealistic. But if concerned citizens are serious in their attempt to stem the tide of violence which pervades our society nothing less than such a program and very likely much more are necessary. Inaccurate and misleading Government documents such as the Surgeon General's Report, serve only to misinform the public and circumvent needed action.

TABLE 1.—MEAN AGGRESSION SCORES AS A FUNCTION OF TV VIOLENCE RATINGS OF PROGRAMS PREFERRED BY BOYS IN 3D GRADE

AGG13

TVVL3	N	Mean	Percent increase
Low	31	51.39	
Medium	139	81.39	59
High	14	164.64	102
Total	184	82.67	

REFERENCES

Eron, L. D. Relationship of TV viewing habits and aggressive children. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, 67, 193–196.

Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Lefkowitz, M. M. *Learning of Aggression in Children*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Feshbach, S. Aggression. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.) *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology* (3rd Ed.), Vol. 2, New York: Wiley, 1970, pp. 159–260.

Feshbach, S., & Singer, R. D. *Television and Aggression*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Greenberg, B. S., & Gordon, T. F. *Critics and Public Perceptions of Violence in TV Programs*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1970.

Kenny, D. Threats to the internal validity of cross-lagged panel inference, as related to "Television violence and child aggression: a follow-up study." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Television and Social Behavior*. Vol. 3. *Television and Adolescent Aggressiveness*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Lefkowitz, M. M., Eron, L., Walder, L. & Huesmann, L. R. Television violence and child aggression: a follow-up study. In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Television and Social Behavior*. Vol. 3. *Television and Adolescent Aggressiveness*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Neale, J. Comment on "Television violence and child aggression: a follow-up study." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Television and Social Behavior*. Vol. 3. *Television and Adolescent Aggressiveness*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. *Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence*. Report to the Surgeon General United States Public Health Service. DHEW Publication No. HSM 72–9090, 1972.

Walder, L. O., Abelson, R. P., Eron, L. D., Banta, T. J., & Laulicht, J. H. Development of a peer-rating measure of aggression. *Psychological Reports*, 1961, 9, 497–556 (*Monogr. Suppl.*, 4–49).

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE,
Albany, N.Y., January 27, 1972.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: The Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior in my opinion ignores, dilutes, and distorts the research findings in their report "Television and Growing Up: the Impact of Televised Violence." As a contributor of one of the technical reports whose study dealt with television violence and aggressive behavior in a causal context, I feel that the Committee's conclusions about the causal nature of television violence are hedged by erroneous statements, are overqualified, and are potentially damaging to children and society. In its treatment of my study, the Committee seemingly includes and excludes data contingent upon whether the data support the Committee's viewpoint.

I was distressed to find that the Committee apparently employs innuendo and insinuation in an attempt to discredit the research findings. More astonishing however, was the Committee's attempt to downgrade the magnitude of the relationship between a diet of early television violence and later adolescent aggression by claiming that the statistical relationship ". . . depends almost entirely on a small number of boys at the extreme high end of the preference scale who scored extremely high on the poor-rated measure of aggressive behavior (p. 154)." The Committee failed to note, avoided, or misinterpreted an analysis of variance of the same data in which mean scores of aggressive behavior in late adolescence are significantly related to preferences for low, meduim and high levels of television violence during childhood. The increase in these mean values of aggression is 58 percent as violence preference increases from low to medium and is 102 percent from medium to high. Thus, ten years later, the group preferring a small amount of television violence at age 8 was significantly *less* agressive than the group preferring a moderate amount of television violence. While the group preferring a large amount of television violence

was significantly *more* aggressive than the moderate preference group. Rarely, if ever, does a scientific finding hold for every member of a population. In this case the finding holds for *both* the high and low ends of the preference scale amounting to at least 24 percent of the sample. It is simply untrue, therefore, that the relationship between preferred television violence and aggressive behavior holds only for an extremely small number of boys at the high end of the preference scale for television violence.

The Committee's conclusion ". . . that any such causal relation operates only on some children (who are predisposed to be aggressive;) (p. 19)" is unwarranted in the face of the evidence and potentially harmful in its effect. The data demonstrate that not only is preference for television violence synchronously related to the expression of aggressive behavior but also longitudinally. Now, if predisposition to aggression were involved in these results, one would expect to find a significant relationship between two particular variables in this study: childhood aggressiveness and preference for violent television ten years later. The fact is that this relationship did not occur (r=.01) which argues against an hypothesis of predisposition. However, at no point in the Committee's discussion of predisposition to aggression was this lack of relationship between these two variables noted. Furthermore, when aggressiveness at age 8 is statistically controlled (by partial correlation technique) the correlation between preference for television violence at age 8 and aggressive behavior at age 19 still remains significant. Thus, it is unlikely that predisposition to aggression enters into the causal relation. The danger to children from the Committee's conclusion is that mothers—understandably ready to believe that their children are not predisposed to be aggressive—now have "scientific" license to permit their children a violent televsion diet.

The first question which must be faced is what event or condition would best account for the Committee's behavior. Since its formation, the Committee has been surrounded by controversy. The spectre of bias in favor of the television industry has been raised and given substance by a well-documented article in *Science*.* A former Committee staff member believed that ". . . the scientific independence of this study has obviously been subverted to some kind of political consideration (p. 949)." The article points out that 5 of the 12 appointees to the Committee have close ties with the television industry whereas the industry, seemingly, was able to veto the Committee membership of seven candidates on the basis of their presumed lack of objectivity. In this respect it seems more than coincidental that of the three written critiques I received of my study from Committee members the one which was destructive, and in my opinion irresponsible, was rendered by an individual mentioned in the article in *Science* as having affiliations with the television industry.

If deliberate bias has indeed entered into the Committee's interpretation and reporting of the research findings, then a serious fraud has been perpetrated on the American public and particularly on American children.

Sincerely yours,
MONROE M. LEFKOWITZ, Ph.D.,
Principal Research Scientist.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., March 6, 1972.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: In talking to Monroe Lefkowitz on the telephone this week, I learned that you are trying to see to it that the findings from the studies on television and aggression do not get swept under the rug because of the Surgeon General's wishy-washy report. I am very happy to have taken up this cause and would like to offer whatever assistance I can. If the New York Time's has quoted you correctly, you have expressed many of the thoughts that I have had.

I am enclosing a copy of a short article about our study which Len Eron and I prepared for *American Psychologist*. You may find this somewhat easier to follow than the more technical full report that Monroe has sent you.

My speciality is multivariate statistics, and my role in the research has been primarily that of a mathematician and computer scientist. Hence, if you have questions regarding the mathematical technique invoked in extracting implications about causation from correlational data, I might be able to help you.

Incidently, Monroe may not have mentioned one of the particularly frustrating experiences we had with the Surgeon General's committee. *From the start they expressed a great deal of skepticism about our results including questioning my qualifications as a statistician. I feel no need to defend my qualifications, since my background would speak for itself, and I was quite happy to discover that the committee had asked two independent researchers to critique my analyses* (David Kenny of Northwestern and John Neal of Stony Brook). *It would have been nice if the committee had told us they were doing this,* (we only discovered it when David Kenny called and asked for more data), *but that was not too bothersome. What is upsetting is that the two critiques are not mentioned anywhere in the body of this summary. As you might guess, both critiques, while finding some points of contention, were generally very supportive of our techniques and findings. Apparently, the committee ignored them. They are mentioned in the list of reports submitted, but no where else in the summary. At the same time the committee included all sorts of comments about "statistical problems" and innuendoes about "methodological difficulties" when discussing our report. Why did they not include their own consultant's comment on these topics?*

I do not mean to impugn the integrity of the committee. I am sure they were all trying to do the best they could. However, *the biased nature of the committee membership seems to have led to a compromise where the truth was lost.*

Sincerely,
L. ROWELL HUESMANN,
Assistant Professor of Psychology.

*Boffey, P. M., Walsh, J. Study of TV Violence: Seven Top Researchers Blackballed from Panel. *Science*, 1970, 168, 949–952.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1972, I was honored to address a rally before the Lincoln Memorial dedicated to the proposition that Formosans—Taiwanese—should be allowed to determine their own political destiny.

My brief remarks on that occasion were based upon a simple proposition—the United States ought not be in the business of bargaining away other people's rights.

My statement echoes what many other Members of this body have said about many other peoples on many other occasions. But in the case of the Taiwanese, U.S. policies can directly affect how the Taiwanese are governed in the immediate future. I look for growing congressional support for a Taiwan for the Taiwanese. And by this I mean just that—not a Taiwan for Americans, nor a Taiwan for the Japanese, nor a Taiwan for the Chinese, either Communist or Nationalist. And in preparation for giving the people of Taiwan a free choice and a Taiwanese Government if that is what they want—and I think it is—we should encourage the political liberalization of the Chiang regime.

My April 1 remarks follow:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE DONALD M. FRASER

Many call the Republic of China "Free China." But we know that "Free China" is neither "free" nor "China." A rally like this could not be held today on the island of Formosa. This fact alone tells us that Taiwan is not free. Neither the People's Republic of China, nor the present government of the Republic of China favors letting the citizens of Taiwan freely determine their own political future. These governments fear what we strongly suspect—the Taiwanese, given a free choice, may well choose a political future separate from China and separate from the Chinese regime that now oppresses them.

I strongly support self-determiation for the Taiwanese. We must permit the people of Taiwan to express themselves on their political future. We must not deal over their heads as the Nixon administration appears willing to do. And in preparation for a free choice we should encourage the political liberalization of the Chiang regime.

It should not surprise us that the Taiwanese, given the choice, may choose a destiny separate from China and the Chinese. The link between the mainland and Formosa has never been strong. During the past seventy-five years, Taiwan has been ruled for only a few years by a Chinese regime concurrently ruling the mainland. Consider the bloody events immediately following February 28, 1947, and the years of Nationalist misrule that followed. With these events in mind, the recent few years of political linkage with China or the Chiang years are hardly justification for rule from the mainland or for continued rule by the Nationalist Chinese.

The fate of Taiwan has become a more urgent matter on the agenda of the world community. The recent visit by the President to Peking has concluded with an assertion by the President that since both Chinese governments accept the view that Taiwan belongs to China, it is to those governments that the future of Taiwan should be entrusted.

The attitude of the present U.S. government is spelled out in the President's 1972 Report to the Congress. In that report he says that "With the Republic of China, we shall maintain our friendship, our diplomatic ties, and our defense commitment. The ultimate relationship between Taiwan and the mainland is not a matter for the United States to decide." I fully agree with this last proposition. The President goes on to say, "A peaceful resolution of this problem by the parties would do much to reduce tension in the Far East." One cannot quarrel with the President's prescription for peace. But one of the parties directly involved is the Taiwanese people. No American President ought to suggest the issue can be resolved without recourse to Taiwanese opinion. Neither the government of the PRC nor the Chinese dominated Nationalist government on Taiwan can represent the Taiwanese in any negotiations between the Chinese and Taiwan.

Unfortunately President Nixon has not been the only American policy maker who has ignored the Taiwanese. The Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China contains a pledge that "The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with each

other in the development of economic progress and social well-being and to further their individual and collective efforts toward these ends."

Free institutions have *not* been strengthened in Taiwan since the defense pact was ratified by the United States in 1955. And the social health of Taiwanese society cannot be said to be good while Taiwan's sons and daughters languish in Chinese Nationalist jails because they dissent from existing policies and question the legitimacy of the existing rulers.

The United States has little voice or influence on the manner by which the PRC is governed. But the United States bears responsibility for helping to establish and perpetuate on Taiwan the existing repressive Nationalist Chinese government.

We continued massive support for this totalitarian government in the face of a solemn treaty commitment to foster free government. It is time that all the terms of the U.S.-Nationalist China mutual-defense treaty be complied with. It is time for this nation to meet its obligations to the Taiwanese people by encouraging the establishment and growth of free institutions in Taiwan.

Some argue that we shouldn't worry about the Taiwanese. They say that PRC rule of Taiwan would be benign. Others say it would not be worse than the existing dictatorial rule. None of this is very clear. What is perfectly clear, however, is that the President of the United States should not support, as he apparently has, the idea that Taiwan belongs to China without consulting the people whose political fate he proposes to dispose of.

Until such time as the people of Taiwan are given full political rights, we should reconsider continuance of aid to the regime which denies these rights.

It is not necessary to American national security to provide moral and material support to dictatorships of the right. It is, in fact, destructive of the fundamental strength of those parts of the world not subject to Communist rule for the U.S. to give support to regimes such as those that presently misrule Greece, Spain, Portugal and Formosa. Support for these regimes ignores the citizens of these nations who support social progress and the well-being of the common people.

Many of you here today are self-exiled from Taiwan. Your appearance here today, if known to Nationalist authorities, would subject you, if you were lucky, to harassment, or more likely, imprisonment if you returned to your homeland. The government that would inflict this harm upon you, that keeps you from Taiwan, is the government whose friendship President Nixon seeks to maintain.

No resolution of the political impasse now extsting between China and Taiwan can be considered peaceful if it is accomplished by two Chinese regimes that refuse to acknowledge that thirteen million Taiwanese are entitled to determine their destiny. I cannot believe that peaceful U.S.-Chinese relations depend upon our surrendering these thirteen million to a rule they do not want. The United States must make clear that our interest in the Taiwanese is humanitarian. It is not aimed at subverting the PRC.

But we ought not support a deal that ignores the Taiwanese for the sake of limited American foreign policy interests. Nor ought we continue to support the present regime that rules Taiwan. Taiwan for the Taiwanese means just that. It is not Taiwan for the Americans. It is not Taiwan for the Japanese. It is not Taiwan for the Chinese, either Communist or Nationalist. Taiwan for the Taiwanese means that a long suffering people should now be given a chance to govern with their own considerable talents the land they have so long occupied under the cloud of foreign domination.

Only when the Taiwanese are truly represented at a negotiating table will this problem be resolved, not only peacefully, but also in a manner consonant with America's historical commitment to freedom and justice.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS: SELECTIONS FROM HEARINGS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of Earth Week, 1972, and it is, therefore, appropriate that I call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives and Senate an unusual document.

The publication to which I refer is entitled, "The Environmental Problem: Selections From Hearings on the Environmental Education Act of 1970."

The volume is published by the Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, Boulder, Colo.

The editors explained their reasons for publishing these hearings in the following words:

The editors undertook to prepare this volume in the belief that the extensive reservoir of government documents in this country could provide a valuable learning resource. Unfortunately, such documents, in their original forms are quite unmanageable for normal classroom and study group use. They are exceedingly voluminous and lack detailed reading aids such as indices and content summaries. The editors have attempted to develop an example of how such documents—in this case, the record of the hearings before a House Subcommittee on Education on the Environmental Education Act of 1970—might be made more usable. They have pared the original 856-page document to a more readable length while taking care to retain its essential ideas and flavor. Through summaries in the general and chapter introductions, and by indexing the content of the volume they have sought to give the reader additional help in using the record of the hearings.

The editors of this volume were Irving Morrisett and Karen B. Wiley of the Social Science Education Consortium.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT: WHY

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the subcommittee which considered the legislation which resulted in the Environmental Education Act, I should like to explain, in the same words I used in a preface to "The Environmental Problem," why members of our subcommittee and, ultimately, the Congress of the United States wrote this significant new law.

Mr. Speaker, the awakening concern, especially among young people, of the dangers to our environment goes far beyond protests against the pollution of land, air, and water. I believe that the rapidly rising awareness of the environmental crisis in America today reflects a deepening sensitivity to the fundamental values of human life.

Indeed, it seems to me not too much to say that if we do not allow the current intense preoccupation with the issues of ecology to fizzle out and wither away, the new awareness of the deteriorating environment and of its implications for the future of human life can have a profoundly regenerative effect on every aspect of our society.

There have been many descriptions of the ways in which we have befouled the environment of which we are a part. Yet few persons have so eloquently summed up the situation than did the distinguished contemporary American painter, Robert Motherwell, when he testified before my congressional subcommittee during the hearings which are the subject of this book. Here is what Mr. Motherwell said:

I suppose America began as a few people on a vast tract of land, so vast that one could be as greedy and wasteful as one wanted, and there was still more. That time is gone. Now there are millions of people and millions more in the offing, and the vast land is a park filled with waste—rusting cars, bottles, garbage, enormous signs seducing you to buy what you don't want or need, housing projects that don't show a rudimentary sense of proportion in any shape or line or material—suburbs that are a parody of the barrenness of the Bronx and the gaudiness of Las Vegas.

Indeed, if God had said to a group of men, "Here is a vast park of millions of square miles. Let's see how quickly you can cover it with everything that is an affront to the human spirit, and above all be certain that it is done on a scale of such extravagance and waste and lack of regard for the sensibilities of the inhabitants of the other parks in the world," then we might by definition call that group of men that God so addressed Americans.

No wonder our youth are up in arms!

Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Congress of the United States and successive Presidents have moved to respond to this frontal assault on what Kenneth Boulding has called spaceship earth. Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine and GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin and many others in Congress have helped write a whole series of measures aimed at enhancing our capacity to protect the environment and prevent its pollution.

Yet I believe—and I do not think that champions of clean air, land, and water would disagree—that if we are to be able to make substantial progress in meeting our ecological crisis, we are going to need a citizenry informed and educated about the whole spectrum of issues that are called environmental; and we are going to require as well changes in basic attitudes toward the environment and man's place in it.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1970, several colleagues and I in the House of Representatives introduced the Environmental Education Act, a bill to authorize Federal funds to support elementary and secondary school courses on ecology, as well as curriculum development and teacher training for environmental studies.

On October 30, 1970, President Nixon signed this measure into law, but not until after 13 days of the public hearings, which are the subject of this book and after several more "markup" sessions on

the part of the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the process by which an idea for a legislative proposal finally becomes a law varies from measure to measure but within broad outlines the steps are similar.

Initiatives for new bills come from many sources: someone in the executive branch of the Government, a spokesman for an interest group, a professor, or a businessman. In the case of the Environmental Education Act, however, the concept was generated from within Congress. Four Members of the House of Representatives—two Democrats, JAMES SCHEUER of New York and I, and two Republicans, OGDEN REID of New York and ORVAL HANSEN of Idaho—collaborated to draft the bill. The four of us, all concerned about the environmental crisis and all members of the congressional committee with responsibility for education legislation, became convinced that new approaches and new content in education could play a significant role in producing the informed citizenry we need to meet the spectrum of problems we call environmental.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, who has established himself as a principal spokesman in the Senate on environmental questions, introduced an identical bill for to become law, of course, a bill must be passed by both Houses of Congress.

The House bill was referred to the Education and Labor Committee and by its distinguished chairman, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS of Kentucky, to the Select Education Subcommittee, which I chair.

Because the bill originated in the House, we gave it extended consideration, starting with hearings in Washington on March 24, 1970, and continuing in New York City, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

These hearings, like other congressional hearings, serve to inform the committee members of key issues raised by the legislative proposals; afford a forum for suggestions for improvement by expert witnesses; and give public visibility to a significant national problem.

OUTSTANDING WITNESSES

Mr. Speaker, among those testifying on the Environmental Education Act were ecologists like LaMont Cole; educators such as Edward Weidner; the economist, Kenneth Boulding; the anthropologist, Margaret Mead; and students like Karen Buxbaum, Bryce Hamilton, and Denis Hayes, for young people have contributed richly to the new sensitivity to ecology.

We listened as well to some voices that might not have been expected to testify before Congress on such a bill. The painter, Robert Motherwell, and Joseph Sittler, a theologian from the University of Chicago, were invited to lead off the hearings because we wanted to establish at the outset that in discussing the environmental crisis, we were talking about far more than dirty air, land, and water. Rather, we were discussing the fundamental values of human life.

As Professor Sittler said:

What man does with the world-as-nature is a result of what he thinks about nature; it is shaped in the profoundest care of what he feels about the natural world, what evaluation he has of the world of things and plants and animals.

And when man so uses nature as to deny her integrity, defile her cleanliness, disrupt her order, or ignore her needs—the reprisals of insulated nature often take a slow but terribly certain form. Nature's protest against defilement is ecological reprisal.

If there was one theme, then, that emerged again and again during our hearings, it was that we must have basic changes in our values and in our attitudes toward the environment of which we are a part, and that education, especially in schools, could play a significant part in shaping those values and attitudes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like here to pay tribute to the able legislators whose initiative and effort were chiefly responsible for writing the Environmental Education Act into law—to Congressmen JAMES SCHEUER and OGDEN REID of New York, one an urban, the other a suburban legislator, but both men deeply sensitive to the environmental challenge, as were two other outstanding Representatives, both from the West, LLOYD MEEDS of Washington and ORVAL HANSEN of Idaho. As I have said, principal credit for Senate approval of the legislation must be assigned to Senator NELSON.

I must also here not fail to pay tribute to the splendid work of the staff of the Select Education Subcommittee, in particular to the subcommittee counsel, Jack Duncan, and to Arlene Horowitz, Ronald Katz, Martin LaVor, and Maureen Orth. Miss Orth made an especially valuable contribution through her imaginative scheduling of witnesses for the hearings.

The actions of congressmen in hearing testimony before the subcommittee and then in amending and modifying the original bill where necessary and appropriate during "markup" sessions are usually the most detailed work done in writing new laws.

STRONG BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN CONGRESS

After a subcommittee has approved a bill, as the Select Education Subcommittee approved the Environmental Education Act on June 24, 1970, the measure is "reported out" to the full committee, which can further amend it. A favorable vote by the Committee on Education and Labor sent this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, which passed it by a vote of 228 to 28, on August 3, 1970. The Senate approved it, 68 to 0, on September 9, 1970.

When the Senate and House pass different versions of a bill, it is common for a conference committee, composed of members of the Senate and House committees which handled the legislation, to write a compromise bill. In the case of the Environmental Education Act, however, the Senate accepted the House bill in its entirety, and it became the law of the land with the President's signature.

I should here make clear that the signing of a law authorizing a program does not mean that funds to carry it out automatically become available. Congess must then pass a seperate bill appropriating the money.

Mr. Speaker, last year Congress approved an expenditure of $2 million for the current 1971 fiscal year for programs authorized by the Environmental Education Act. The administration of President Nixon, which originally opposed passage of the Environmental Education Act and subsequently opposed any appropriations for it, is now, I am pleased to say, considering applications for grants under the new law.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Speaker, the present administration has not yet given any evidence of long-term commitment to adequate financial support of environmental education. It is also, however, accurate to state that we in Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, have, with passage of the Environmental Education Act, made clear our conviction that sound environmental action presupposes a citizenry informed and educated about the environment.

But, even given adequate funds, a law to be effective must be more than ink on paper. The efforts of business and industry and government on all levels, the commitment of citizen groups and the actions of concerned individuals, are what make laws have real effect on the society in which we live.

I hope, therefore, that this book of selections from the hearings will encourage and inspire its readers to make their own contributions to the education of Americans about our environment.

THE VOLUME

Mr. Speaker, I should like here to note that those who wish to purchase "The Environmental Education Problem: Selections From Hearings on the Environmental Education Act of 1970" may do so—paperback, $6.95; hard cover, $8.95—from either of its publishers, both nonprofit organizations:

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302, Order No.: Publication No. 140.

ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer 0, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

SIXTY-NINE DAYS, AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 months ago, on February 7, Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee wrote President Nixon asking him to forward to the Congress by no later than March 15, a comprehensive tax reform package that would eliminate "preferences and so-called loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift tax system." Without whole-

hearted Presidential leadership there is great doubt that such a package could be enacted.

March 15 has come and gone, without a word from the President on tax reform.

We are left with the worst budget deficit since World War II, with continued unemployment and inflation, with a request to increase the national debt by $50 billion, and with a taxpayers' revolt clearly brewing. That taxpayers' revolt comes from the realization by the average taxpayer that while the burden of local property taxes, State sales taxes, and Federal payroll taxes gets constantly worse, a few well-to-do taxpayers are able to escape their just share of taxes—and then some—by taking advantage of various loopholes in the Federal tax structure.

The voters must judge whether Mr. Nixon really wants to plug tax loopholes.

The voters must judge whether the contributions Mr. Nixon's campaign has received from the very interests which benefit by tax loopholes leave him in a position to decide fairly and objectively whether to close those loopholes, at the risk of biting the hand that has just fed him.

Let us take a look at some of the most flagrant tax loopholes, at some of the special interests that benefit from them, and at some of the campaign contributions those special interests have made to Mr. Nixon's campaign. It may help the voter determine whether they can afford Mr. Nixon as their President for the next 4 years.

Not long ago, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover testified before the House Appropriations Committee:

> The events that led to the French Revolution can teach us a lesson.

America today may not have noblemen as in the time of Louis XVI, but it does have "privileged segments of the population" who enjoy great wealth while bearing only "a small share of the burdens of citizenship."

Rickover declared:

> Capital gains, depletion allowances, and tax-free bonds provide loopholes for the upper class taxpayer who is able to take advantage of them. The middle classes rarely can . . . Those who benefit most from present tax laws are also those best able to make large campaign contributions.

Let us see whether Admiral Rickover is on the right track:

CAPITAL GAINS

Well-to-do taxpayers deprive the Treasury of at least $3 billion a year by taking advantage of the capital gains at death loophole. Under this loophole, someone who has bought stock in a corporation for $10 which is now selling at $100, of course must pay a tax on the $90 gain if he sells it. But if he holds it to his death, he escapes entirely any taxation whatever on the $90 gain, and whoever inherits the stock from him can later sell it for $100 without any tax whatever. It is this loophole which is of particular value to the wealthiest people of this country.

In the 1968 campaign, 40 out of 66 individuals with a net worth of $150 million or more contributed to Republican campaigns, totaling $1,377,313 as opposed to 12 contributing to Democratic campaigns, totaling $106,488. That is 13 to 1.

The following list includes many of the largest GOP contributors, according to net worth. This and later data is taken from campaign contribution records compiled by the Citizens' Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J., and from Congressional Quarterly. As Congressional Quarterly notes:

> Because of loopholes in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, these figures must be considered the minimum contribution for each individual. The Act does not apply to state elections, primary campaigns or campaign committees operating within one state.

Name	GOP contribution for 1968
Those worth $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 (4)	
H. L. Hunt	$4,000
Asa Melon Bruce (dec)	30,000
Paul Mellon	47,000
R. King Mellon	65,000
$3,000,000 to $5,000,000 (1)	
William L. McKnight (Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing)	44,000
$200,000,000 to $300,000,000 (16)	
Mrs. W. Van Alan Clark (Avon)	6,000
John T. Dorrance, Jr. (Campbell Soup)	20,101
David Packard	11,000
Amory Houghton (Corning Glass)	19,500
Forrest E. Mars (Mars Candy)	4,000
Mrs. Jean Mauze (Abby Rockefeller)	8,000
David Rockefeller (Chase Manhattan)	20,500
John D. Rockefeller III	17,500
Laurence Rockefeller	23,500
Nelson Rockefeller (includes $356,000 to own campaign)	483,500
Winthrop Rockefeller	6,500
Cornelia Scaife Mey (Melon)	52,000
Richard Mellon Scaife	55,462
DeWitt Wallace (Reader's Digest)	35,900
Mrs. Charles Payson (Joan Whitney)	28,000
John Hay Whitney	57,500
$150,000,000 to $200,000,000 (11)	
Lammot DuPont Copeland	14,000
Henry B. DuPont	3,000
Benson Ford	41,000
Mrs. W. Bihl Ford II	4,500
Helen Clay Frick	19,500
William T. Grant (W. T. Grant)	4,000
Bob Hope	16,000
Peter Kiewit (construction)	9,000
Mrs. Lester J. Norris (Dellora F. Angel)	7,000
E. Claiborne Robbins (A. H. Robbins Drugs)	2,500
W. Clement Stone (insurance)	200,000

The 1,013 officers and directors of the 25 largest industrial corporations listed in the 1968 Fortune Directory favored the GOP by a 6-to-1 margin in 1968 campaign contributions. The GOP received a total of $782,839 from these tycoons, while the Democrats got $132,150.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

The depletion allowances given the oil and other extractive industries continue to be a scandal. In 1970—after the Tax Reform Act of 1969—Gulf Oil Co. had an income before taxes of almost $1 billion—$990 million. On this it paid a tax at the rate of 1.5 percent, because of the depletion allowance and other tax loopholes. Meanwhile, the widow at Gulf who cleans the president's office, and makes $6,500 a year, pays a Federal income tax at a rate of around 7 percent—nearly 5 times higher. How is that for tax justice?

The oil industry's 1968 campaign contributions to the Republicans were very substantial.

Three of Standard of California's board members contributed a total of $5,500 to the 1968 GOP campaign—treating the contributions of wives as attributable to their husbands—with the largest contribution $3,500 from Mr. and Mrs. J. A. McCone of San Francisco.

Two Mobil directors contributed $1,000 each to the GOP campaign.

Seven of Texaco's directors contributed a total of $31,500 to the GOP, including contributions of $18,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Phipps, of New York, and $7,500 from George Parker, Jr., of San Antonio, Tex.

Three of Gulf's directors contributed a total of $13,500 to the GOP, including contributions of $10,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Singer and $2,500 from J. M. Walton. All told, Gulf executives contributed $73,800 to Republicans and nothing to Democrats.

In addition to the above, 52 directors and honorary directors of the American Petroleum Institute contributed a total of $429,366 to the 1968 GOP campaign, while 13 directors and honorary directors contributed $30,606 to the Democrats.

Of particular interest, Robert O. Anderson, board chairman of ARCO—the company with the most critical interest in developing Alaska's North Slope—contributed $44,000 to the GOP in 1968, nothing to the Democrats. ARCO directors contributed a total of $65,000 to GOP committees that year and nothing to the Democrats.

Mr. Anderson shares the honor of top GOP contributor in 1968 with another oilman, Californian Henry Salvatori, who—with wife—contributed $90,000 to the GOP, nothing to the Democrats.

TAX-FREE BONDS

A particular bonanza to wealthy investors is the tax-free municipal bond. This loophole could be plugged under legislation proposed by House and Senate Democrats whereby the municipalities would retain their exemptions if they wished, but an additional option would be open to them of issuing taxable interest-subsidized bonds. Such a reform would, it is estimated, save the Treasury $100 million a year by cutting down on this preference for wealthy taxpayers.

Treasury Secretary John Connally recently denounced tax reform, specifically defending the oil depletion allowance and the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds.

By far the largest holders of municipal bonds are the banks, particularly the big ones.

The 12 largest banks in the country from the standpoint of their holdings

of tax-free State and municipal obligations as of December 31, 1970 are:

State and municipal obligations (12)

Bank	Millions
Bank of America, San Francisco	$2,488,846
Chase Manhattan Bank, New York	1,591,108
First National City Bank, New York	1,117,995
Security Pacific National Bank, Los Angeles	800,158
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Company, Chicago	765,664
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, New York	719,180
Chemical Bank, New York	688,470
First National Bank of Chicago	662,789
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York	659,271
Mellon National Bank and Trust Co., Pittsburgh	642,338
Crocker-Citizens National Bank, San Francisco	607,334
Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco	574,302

Recorded contributions of $500 or more to the Democratic and Republican campaigns of 1968 by the directors and principal officers of these 12 banks total:

Bank	Contributions— Democratic	GOP
Bank of America	0	$15,500
Chase Manhattan Bank	$2,500	113,266
First National City	4,000	43,100
Security Pacific National	1,000	29,500
Continental Illinois	500	18,000
Morgan Guaranty Trust	0	44,601
Chemical Bank	0	36,232
First National Bank of Chicago	0	25,000
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co	0	8,000
Mellon National Bank & Trust Co	0	131,062
Crocker-Citizens National Bank & Trust Co	5,000	24,000
Wells Fargo Bank	1,450	19,500
Total	14,450	478,261

Other prime beneficiaries from the municipal bond business are the law firms which assist the underwriters of such bonds.

The most active such law firm is the New York firm of Mudge, Rose, Guthrie, and Alexander, whose partners until 1968 included Mr. Nixon and John Mitchell, later Attorney General.

For doing the legal work on bonds issued by the new Post Office, according to Time magazine for April 10, 1972:

> Mudge, Rose may collect $1 million or more in fees over ten years if it acts as counsel for all $10 billion of bond offerings. What the whole affairs seems to illustrate is an old-school-tie network in operation among financiers, Wall Streets lawyers, and Administration officials.

These Post Office bonds, incidentally, were not tax-exempt.

With Mr. Nixon running again, and with Mr. Mitchell as his campaign manager, any threat from the White House to the tax-exempt bond loophole is remote.

One could go on to many other loopholes. Another loophole which is in the various Democratic loophole-plugging packages has to do with the present law, whereby a foreign subsidiary of a U.S. corporation pays a U.S. income tax only on that portion of its income which is repatriated to the United States. Thus, the XYZ electronics plant in Philadelphia is tempted to close down its plant, there and set up a plant making the same widgets across the Rio Grande in Mexico; in Europe; or in Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, or Singapore. Machines and know-how are readily transferred, and the wage rate there is a fraction of the U.S. rate. But the last straw is the tax law. If the XYZ electronics company operates in Philadelphia, it must pay a U.S. corporate income tax, at 48 percent, on all its net income, whether paid in dividends or not. To the extent that it operates abroad, and allows its income to accumulate there, it pays no U.S. income tax whatever.

The large multinational corporations which benefit by this loophole were especially generous to the 1968 Republican campaign. Thus, officials of General Motors gave $114,675 to the Republicans and $1,000 to the Democrats. DuPont officials gave $42,800 to the Republicans, nothing to the Democrats. International Business Machine officials gave $140,250 to the Republicans, $32,000 to the Democrats. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. officials gave $58,300 to the Republicans, $3,000 to the Democrats. Pan American World Airways officials gave $34,500 to the Republicans, nothing to the Democrats. Standard Oil of New Jersey officials gave $12,000 to the Republicans, nothing to the Democrats. Trans World Airlines officials gave $45,200 to the Republicans, $2,500 to the Democrats.

A vote for Mr. Nixon looks like a vote for leaving tax loopholes unplugged.

LITTON SHIP PROGRAMS IN TROUBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am asking the General Accounting Office to undertake an investigation of a claim by Litton Industries for $455 million in inflation charges on the 30 ship DD–963 destroyer program. Currently, the Navy estimates that escalation and other cost growth will account for a $310 million increase in the program. However, Litton says that the total on its contract alone will be $455 million.

Thus, there is a discrepancy of at least $145 million between the Navy's estimate and Litton's estimate. In addition, it is important to note that the Navy's estimate of $310 million is all inclusive. It takes into account not only the contract with Litton but other contracts and costs incurred inside the Navy. Thus, $145 million is, in fact, the minimum discrepancy between the claims of Litton and the estimate of the Navy.

The original contract price for 30 ships to be built at Litton signed on June 23, 1970, was for $1,789.2 million. That cost has now risen according to Litton to $2,244.2 million. Apparently Litton Industries is asking for a 25 percent increase in the cost of each ship based on inflation only. As a result I am requesting that the General Accounting Office thoroughly investigate the possibility that Litton Industries is planning to request some unjustified escalation claims.

As many of my colleagues may already know, the Defense Department's own audit agency discovered that between 1969 and 1971 Litton charged to the Government $7 million worth of work that was actually done on commercial vessels.

This 25-percent increase is also in marked contrast to very recent estimates by the Navy. Last November, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Frosch, estimated that 14 percent of the program cost would be the result of escalation. What is even more disturbing is that the 25-percent increase is more than eight times the escalation charges on the DE–1052 class, the newest destroyers in the Navy's fleet.

As many of my colleagues know, the House Armed Services Committee, today is beginning a series of hearings on shipbuilding costs particularly at Litton Industries, Pascagoula, Miss., yard. I am pleased the Armed Services Committee had decided to conduct this investigation. The decision by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee (Mr. HÉBERT) and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the committee Mr. (ARENDS) is a very wise one. I have been most concerned that these costly and important Navy programs were running into serious difficulty at Litton's facility in Mississippi.

On this first day of hearings by the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to take the opportunity to review with my colleagues some of the major problems with these programs.

The original landing helicopter assault ship—LHA—contract provided for the building of nine ships at an estimated program unit cost of $153.4 million. The Navy estimated that the total cost of the program would be $1,380.3 billion. In January 1971, the Navy decided to cut back the number of LHA ships from nine to five. The Navy claims that the cutback was the result of changes in force level requirements. However, it is clear that when the Navy made its decision in January 1971 that major problems were developing at Litton Industries, Pascagoula, Miss., shipyard.

As the result of the Navy's cut, the total estimates cost of the program has decreased to $960 million but the cost per copy of the LHA ship has risen to $192 million. The Congress last year appropriated $109.7 million as a cancellation fee for not building four ships.

Thus far the Congress has appropriated $941.7 million for the LHA program. However, the Congress must now appropriate at least an additional $19 million to cover the estimated program cost of $960 million. In addition, Litton Industries has informed the Navy that they expect to reach ceiling on the LHA contracts incurring additional costs totaling $104 million. Thus, the Congress will be required to appropriate at least an additional $123 million.

There are also significant delays in the delivery of the LHA ship. Adm. I. C. Kidd, the Chief of Naval Materiel Command, has told Sen. PROXMIRE's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, that

the first LHA ship will be 19 months late. The latest information provided by the selected acquisition reports indicates the program will be 18 months late. There are reliable reports that the last and fifth LHA will be delivered 2 years late. Original plans called for delivery of the first ship in November 1973 and now the ship may not be delivered until late 1975.

In its staff study in February 1972, the General Accounting Office reported that the Navy had undertaken an independent audit to determine exactly how late the LHA ships would be because the information provided by Litton Industries was—in the Navy's view—not satisfactory. The report of that audit was due last month but the results have not been announced.

At the beginning of this month Litton Industries submitted a proposal to the Navy concerning changes in the LHA contract. Subject to negotiation are late deliveries, claims, increased escalation costs, and all events that had an impact on the cost of the LHA. At the moment it is not clear what Litton Industries negotiating position is or what the position of the Navy is. According to the current contract, the Navy may collect up to $600,000 for each ship that is delayed beyond the contractors proposed guaranteed delivery dates. However, guaranteed delivery dates are not entered into until 9 months prior to the original dates contained in the contract. Also during that 9-month period guaranteed delivery dates are established. Failure to meet those dates can result in a charge of $20,000 per day up to a maximum of $1.2 million per vessel. The original date for LHA 1 was March 30, 1973 but that date has been change to April 1, 1974 through an interim memorandum of agreement between the Navy and Litton Industries. Thus, according to the contract itself, the Navy will only be able to collect delivery delay charges if a specific date is set 9 months before the dates contained in the memorandum of agreement and the ship is not delivered on time.

The result of the memorandum of agreement has been to provide a giant cushion of more than a year protecting Litton from paying the Government liquidated damages.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that Litton Industries must compensate for its delays in the LHA program. I hope that the Navy will require that Litton Industries propose guaranteed delivery dates 9 months prior to the original dates in the contract not the dates contained in the memorandum of agreement. This would mean that on June 30, 1972 Litton would be required to propose a guaranteed delivery date on LHA 1. The failure to meet that proposed guaranteed delivery date or a guaranteed delivery date would result in the payment of liquidated damages totaling at least $600,000 and possibly $1.2 million.

Rather than scramble the dates and provide additional time to the contractor, the Navy must make Litton Industries compensate for its own inability to perform the job as outlined in the contract.

It is my hope that during these hearings before the House Armed Services Committee the Navy will fully inform the Congress of its position and Litton's position in the current negotiations. Furthermore the Navy should provide the committee with a proposed final settlement between the two parties for the committee's review.

Having discussed delay deliveries and cost problems on the LHA program, I would now like to turn my attention to the DD–963 program.

As I stated earlier, the most shocking development in that program is the $145 million discrepancy between Litton's estimated escalation cost and escalation cost estimated by the government. As a result, I have asked the General Accounting Office to investigate.

As with the LHA program, Litton Industries is accounting both cost problems and delays on the DD–963. The Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Zumwalt, has told me that he guesses that the DD–963 will be 6 months behind schedule. Litton Industries, despite the delays on the LHA program and problems at its Pascagoula yard, maintains that it can meet the schedule on the DD–963. One of the major questions that I hope the hearings before the Armed Services Committee will disclose, is exactly how great the delay on the DD–963 program will be. The Navy has readily admitted that delays on the LHA program might easily impact on the DD–963 program, creating significant delays possibly even greater than 6 months.

The design phase of the DD–963 was scheduled to be complete in August 1971. At the moment all of the design phase has not yet been ended. This kind of delay could easily impact on the actual production of the ship and the DD–963 could wind up as late or possibly later than the LHA.

The first DD–963 is scheduled for completion in October 1974. From October 1974 to July 1976, 9 DD–963's are scheduled to be launched. Then during the period July 1976 to July 1978—that is 2 years—21 ships are scheduled to be completed. The problems that the Pascagoula shipyard have encountered thus far raise serious doubts about the ability of Litton Industries during a 2-year period to produce 21 ships. The Navy should inform the Armed Services Committee whether the current schedule for the DD–963 is realistic or not.

The DD–963 has also encountered serious cost problems. Original estimates of the cost of the DD–963 was as low as $19.7 million. Presently the ship is estimated to cost $90.5 million. The original contract price of the DD–963 was $86 million. Thus, the price of the ship has already risen by $4.5 million per copy since the contract was signed with Litton Industry in June 1970.

Careful study of the DD–963 program also indicates that there may be additional problems developing. According to Assistant Secretary Frosh, $75 million was originally set aside for the electronic warfare suit on the DD–963. On August 12, 1971, the Navy signed a letter contract with Hughes Aircraft in Fulerton, Calif. for research and development and the purchase of two ANSQL–17 threat reactive subsystems. This threat reactive subsystem will be one of three major components in the electronic warfare suit. The cost of the first two SANSQL–17 subsystems is $6.5 million. If this per copy cost on the SQL–17 holds then it will take $97.5 million to pay for this one subsystem. When R and D money is added, the total cost comes to $108 million. Hence, the Navy's original estimate of $75 million for electronic warfare is incorrect and a $24 million cost overrun has already occurred.

In addition, the electronic warfare suit will consist of 2 other systems—the AN–WLR–8 surveillance receiver and the Mark 48 mod Four CHAFFROC system. The cost of these items are not known and the Navy has not yet signed any contract for the purchase of this equipment for the DD–963. Hence, electronic warfare suit which according to the latest selected acquisition report, has not been finalized will be the victim of a major cost overrun. In fact, that report indicates that the Navy has "a funding reservation" about the inclusion of the CHAFFROC system.

The Navy also may wish to backfit certain systems on the DD–963 which are not currently included in the cost. Among them are the Standard Missile and a heavier gun. The Navy has not announced any definite plans about the Standard but its inclusion could further raise the cost of the DD–963. The original plans for a DX which was the original designation of the DD–963, called for an eight inch gun. Now the ship is mounted with two five inch guns. There is a real possibility that the Navy hopes to backfit an eight gun on the ship which again would increase costs.

When the original contracts for the DD–963 were in negotiations, it was clear that the cost of the ship might rise far beyond what the Navy hoped to pay. In order to keep costs down, the Navy switched a great deal of material for the ship from contractor furnished to government furnished equipment. While there was a temporary savings in the original cost of the contract as a result of this switch, the Navy undertakes a series of risks. If the Navy fails to deliver any single piece of equipment on a given day for a given ship, either the cost will rise or Litton will be entitled to file a claim against the Navy. Hence, the Navy has set up for itself hundreds of delivery dates. Missing any one of these dates could result in increased cost and claims. The following items were switched from contractor furnish to Government furnished equipment: guided missile launching system, guided missile fire control system, ship board ASROC launching system, radar air search, and underwater command set. The total savings involved between these switches was $1.8 million according to the GAO. Any single slippage could probably wipe out that savings overnight and result in huge cost overruns.

Delays and cost problems on both the LHA and the DD–963 have been the result of startup problems at Litton's new facility. In terms of concept and design,

Litton has taken a revolutionary approach to shipbuilding that if successful, would greatly improve both efficiency and costs in our shipbuilding industry. However thus far the experience of Litton has resulted in neither increased efficiency or lower costs.

In October 1968 Litton won a contract for 7 merchant marine ships including four container ships for the Farrel Line. Three weeks after launching, the superstructure of the first Farrel container ship sank by ½ inch. There is no doubt the Farrel Line is very dissatisfied with the shoddy construction on the ship and delays in its delivery.

There have also been significant labor problems at the Pascagoula facility. Difficulty has been accounted in recruiting both skilled labor and managerial personnel. The turnover rate at the new west bank facility has been twice that at the old east bank facility reaching levels as high as 50 percent per year. Litton has also undertaken a major recruitment program of skilled managerial personnel which I understand has been quite successful.

In addition to labor problems, there have been production problems at the yard forcing the movement of some ships from the new west bank yard to the east bank facility. Several of the merchant marine ships which initially were scheduled to be built in the west bank yard are now being constructed on the other side of the river. In addition, some of the LHA ships have been moved to the old yard and some DD–963's may be constructed in the older and traditional facility.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, we have a huge mess on our hands. The Navy chose during a 13-month period to pour more than $3 billion for 39 ships into a brand new and untested shipyard. The result thus far has been nothing less than disastrous. Cost overruns, delays, and now a series of complex negotiations between the Navy and Litton have been the result. It is no secret that now Litton expects a major increase in the cost of the LHA program.

It is my hope that the Navy will answer all these serious questions that I have raised during the next several weeks. It is also my hope that the Navy will hold Litton to its original contract, and not grant huge price increases to Litton. The Navy and the Congress must resist the temptation to bail Litton out.

The letter to Mr. Staats follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1972.

Mr. ELMER STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: I am writing to you to request the General Accounting Office undertake a study of escalation charges in the 30 ship DD–963 program. In its latest Selected Acquisition Report (SAR) for the DD–963, the Navy estimates that the cost of escalation will be $309.6 million. In the same report the Navy also indicates that it has revised its method of computing escalation and the result has been an increase of $136.5 million in estimated cost growth. Later in the same report an increase of $455 million as recorded "due to including contractors estimate of escalation". Apparently there is a discrepancy in the estimate of escalation cost by the Navy and Litton of approximately $145 million.

Specifically, I hope that the General Accounting Office will evaluate:

1. Has Litton Industries realistically evaluated the escalation charges for the DD–963 program? Are all the costs reflected in the $455 million the result of escalation and cost growth?

2. Why is there a discrepancy of $145 million between the Navy's estimate of escalation and Litton's estimate of escalation? Is the Navy including escalation charges under other items in the Selected Acquisition Report (SAR)?

I also hope that the General Accounting Office will be able to determine if all of the escalation estimates by both the Navy and Litton Industries seem to be reasonable and within guidelines established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A member of my staff, William Broydrick, is ready to discuss details of the studies with any member of your staff.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the American people have made it clear time and time again that they want this Nation to get out of Vietnam and to get out now.

They want this withdrawal to include not only our men, but our planes, and our bombs, too.

They want it to be contingent solely upon the release of our prisoners of war.

They do not want it to be contingent upon the continued existence of the corrupt Thieu dictatorship or upon the destruction of the North Vietnamese people and nation.

It has been so long since the will of the American people became apparent that it is truly incredible to see this administration reescalating the death and destruction and returning us to the dark days of 1967 and 1968.

The Pentagon's own studies have stated that massive bombing of the North has no noticeable effect upon the flow of supplies to the South. Why then are we bombing? The fact of the matter is that Vietnamization has been an abject failure, as it was doomed to be from the beginning. The South Vietnamese military is no better able to defend itself from the people of Vietnam than it was 2, or 3, or 10 years ago. Mr. Nixon, recognizing the political impossibility of recommitting American ground forces to this futile conflict, thinks that if he devastates North Vietnam from the air, he will somehow secure the position of the Thieu government. There is no other conceivable reason for his action. The Defense Department's own studies show that the bombing will not stop the flow of supplies, and will, therefore, be of no use in "protecting" the American troops who remain in Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried an editorial which notes that:

Every new air raid means more pilots shot down and captured.

Since it is clear at this point that our prisoners will not be returned while we bomb North Vietnam and maintain a substantial military presence in the South, it is plain that Mr. Nixon's primary interest in the POW's is their use as pawns, for his actions only serve to prolong their detention and to increase their numbers. The Times editorial is an excellent one, and I wish to read it in full at this time:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1971]

OF BLOOD AND SLOGANS

Slogans can have a fateful significance.

Taking office in 1969 on a pledge "to end the war and win the peace," President Nixon made a fateful decision concerning the true content of that vague but beguiling campaign slogan. "Winning the peace," he decided, meant that an anti-Communist Government had to be consolidated in power in South Vietnam. Otherwise the "peace" would be lost because additional military effort by the Communists would soon bring them the victory they have long sought.

Since the United States and its South Vietnamese allies had not conclusively defeated the Communists on the field of battle, there was no immediate visible way to "win the peace" in Mr. Nixon's special sense of that term. As a result, "ending the war" had to be indefinitely postponed and the subtly but significantly different objective of "winding down the war" had to be substituted. Even this phase had to be defined in a special sense. The war itself was not wound down; on the contrary, it was extended to Cambodia and Laos and American bombing greatly increased. What was "wound down" was the scale of American involvement in the ground fighting.

When these special Nixonian interpretations have been decoded, that 1968 promise "to end the war and win the peace" translates into ordinary English as a promise "to continue the war until the enemy concedes defeat and accepts American peace terms."

Would the American people have accepted Mr. Nixon's leadership four years ago if they had understood the true import of his slogan? The question is unanswerable. What can be said is that the Communist forces in Vietnam are not prepared to accept Mr. Nixon's special definitions. The bloody fighting of the last ten days demonstrates that the war was not ended.

South Vietnam's Army has been able to achieve at least a temporary stalemate but on terms that have ominous implications for long-term American involvement. Only massive American bombing, including heavy raids in North Vietnam itself, enabled the South Vietnam forces to halt the Communist advance. And it is the precarious position of South Vietnam's embattled forces that has led to the weekend's American escalation of the air war near Haiphong and Hanoi.

If American air support on a large scale is the essential prerequisite for staving off a South Vietnam defeat, the United States may be fighting an air war in Southeast Asia for several more years—on and on into the indefinite future in an elusive effort to "win" an ever-receding "peace."

America's involvement in the Vietnam war cannot be satisfactorily ended until this country obtains the release of its prisoners of war. Every new air raid means more pilots shot down and captured. The number of American prisoners steadily grows. Thus, every raid not only brings death and devastation to Vietnam but postpones the end of the war.

The war is being fought to determine the political future of South Vietnam. Since the United States cannot win the war by means acceptable to the American people, it has to achieve peace by a political compromise with its Communist adversary. A negotiated settlement is the only alternative to more bombing, more bloodshed, more prisoners. Deceptive slogans can no longer obscure that harsh choice.

I regret that Secretary Rogers has refused to accept the proposal made by the Vietnamese today that they would negotiate if the United States would stop the bombing.

Even if past air raids had proved effective in interdicting the flow of military supplies to the South, which they most emphatically have not, the latest raids cannot be justified. A study of the new raids, prepared by the staff of Project Air War, notes that while the Johnson raids were directed at certain prohibited areas and were carried out by relatively low-flying, accurate jets, the new attacks are being carried on by dozens of high-flying B–52 bombers and carried on over a wide area at a saturation level. As this study points out:

Bombing from 30–35,000 feet, B–52s leave craters 35 feet deep by 45 feet in diameter. . . . A typical B–52 strike involves 6 B–52s saturating a selected grid square, leaving a swath of destruction half a mile wide by 3 miles long.

With this kind of attack, it is plain that thousands of civilians will be killed or wounded in such heavily populated areas as Haiphong and Hanoi. In fact, this is the only reason why the attacks are being carried on. Having failed to break the will of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese by less direct means, the Nixon administration is determined to do it by the senseless slaughter of their women and their young children. No more pretenses about "military targets" or "protective reaction strikes." Mr. Nixon is going directly after the civilian population of North Vietnam and is making no bones about it.

For the sake of humanity, we must make him stop.

There are a number of steps that we can and should take immediately. The Gravel-Drinan bill, H.R. 14055, which would end the bombing upon enactment and require final withdrawal within a month thereafter, conditioned only upon the release of the prisoners of war, must be brought to the floor of this House and passed. I note in this connection that when the Democratic caucus meets on Wednesday, a number of us will ask it to take a firm position in support of this legislation.

I hope and trust that the Democrats will truly respond to the majority of the people and the majority of Democrats and will pass this resolution in the Democratic caucus.

As we are all aware, the Constitution gives Congress the exclusive power to declare war. With the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which occurred some time ago, the only conceivable justification for an action such as this would be the protection of our troops. It is obvious that that is not part of the reason for this vicious bombing, and it is equally obvious that in initiating these new attacks, the President is violating the Constitution. He has no legal authority whatsoever to bomb North Vietnam, and we must make him stop by asserting our constitutional powers immediately.

My resolution of inquiry, House Resolution 918, which seeks information on the scope of the raids, the target date—if any—for South Vietnamese independence of American military might, the additional number of POW's taken as the result of our new escalation, and the steps which the administration has taken to comply with the mandate of section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971, will be considered tomorrow before the Armed Services Committee. I would hope that when this resolution comes to the floor next week, we will pass it, so that we can get the facts and act accordingly.

Congress has a right to know. The American people have a right to know why in the face of three-quarters of the American people saying that they want to be out of the war in Vietnam, we have an escalation of war in Vietnam.

I might add that the censure of the President, which I proposed back in January, is even more in order now than it was then. We must let the President know that we, as the representatives of the American people, will not stand for his violation of their will and of the law of the land.

The bombing must be stopped.

The troops must be withdrawn.

Once these two steps are taken, our prisoners of war will be permitted to return to their families, and we will be able to turn our attention to the desperate needs of our people here at home.

I include the following:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1972]

BOMBING HOTLY DEBATED IN THE JOHNSON PERIOD

(By Terence Smith)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The merits of the air war over North Vietnam, and particularly the question whether to bomb targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, were fiercely debated within the Johnson Administration from the outset of the air strikes in the spring of 1965.

The Pentagon's history of the Vietnam war reveals that there was a constant tugging match at the highest levels in the Administration between those who doubted the value of the bombing and feared its political repercussions and those who regarded it as an invaluable weapon that should be employed to the fullest.

The Pentagon history, an account of which was published by The New York Times in a series of articles last year, disclosed that the intelligence community was generally skeptical about the efficacy of the bombing while the military and others supported it and urged its expansion.

Ultimately, President Lyndon B. Johnson, resolved the debate by suspending the entire bombing campaign, known as Operation Rolling Thunder, on Oct. 31, 1968.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

The question whether to strike at Hanoi and Haiphong, the so-called "top of the funnel" through which North Vietnam's war materiel flowed, was always at the center of the debate.

As early as October, 1966, Robert S. McNamara, then Secretary of Defense, was urging that the United States end its bombing of North Vietnam or at least shift the targets from the capital and its port to the staging areas and infiltration routes to the South.

In a memorandum to the President on Oct. 14, he argued that shifting the targets "would narrow the bombing down directly to the objectionable infiltration areas and would reduce the international heat on the U.S."

To support his argument, Mr. McNamara appended an appraisal of the bombing by the Central Intelligence Agency and the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency that asserted: "As of July, 1966, the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam had had no measurable direct affect on Hanoi's ability to mount and support military operations in the South."

The intelligence estimate concluded that this situation was "not likely to be altered by reducing the present geographic constraints, mining Haiphong and the principal harbors of North Vietnam or otherwise expanding the U.S. air offensive along the lines now contemplated in military recommendations and planning studies."

JOINT CHIEFS DISAGREE

In a memorandum to Mr. McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff took direct objection to this assessment and to his recommendations. They argued that "to be effective, the air campaign should be conducted with only those minimum constraints necessary to avoid indiscriminate killing of population."

Specifically, the Joint Chiefs recommended an expansion of the campaign that "would decrease the Hanoi and Haiphong sanctuary areas, authorize attacks against the steel plant, the Hanoi railyards, the thermal power plants, selected areas within Haiphong port and other ports."

BUNDY OPPOSED EXPANSION

The Joint Chiefs maintained that the air campaign was "an integral and indispensible part of our over-all effort."

Mr. McNamara was not persuaded. In a memorandum to the President a month later, on Nov. 17, 1966, he observed that "at the scale we are now operating, I believe our bombing is yielding very small marginal returns, not worth the cost in pilot lives and aircraft."

Another significant voice in the debate was that of McGeorge Bundy, the President's national security adviser, who was not opposed to the bombing, but objected to its expansion. He argued in a memorandum to the President in May, 1967, that the real value of the campaign had been its detrimental effect on North Vietnamese infiltration and beneficial effect on South Vietnamese morale and concluded that "Ho Chi Minh and his colleagues simply are not going to change their policy on the basis of losses from the air in North Vietnam."

Noting that "There is certainly a point at which such bombing does increase the risk of conflict with the Soviet Union and China," he added, "I think it is clear that the case against going after Haiphong harbor is so strong that a majority would back the Government in rejecting that course."

Mr. Bundy's successor as national security adviser, Walt W. Rostow, picked up the debate in a subsequent memorandum entitled "United States strategy in Vietnam," which circulated throughout the top level of the Administration. Sensitive to the criticisms of the bombing, Mr. Rostow wrote of the North Vietnamese."

"We have never held the view that bombing of the Hanoi-Haiphong area alone would lead them to abandon their effort in the South. We have never held the view that bombing Hanoi-Haiphong would directly cut back infiltration. We have held the view that the degree of military and civilian cost felt in the North and the diversion of resources to deal with our bombing could contribute marginally—and perhaps significantly—to the timing of a decision to end the war."

THREE OPTIONS CITED

As Mr. Rostow saw it, the United States had three options.

"Closing the top of the funnel" was the first. He wrote that "Under this strategy, we would mine the major harbors and, perhaps bomb port facilities and even consider a blockade."

"Attacking what is inside the funnel," was second. This option included continued bombing of the Hanoi-Haiphong area, which was underway at the time.

"Concentration on route packages 1 and 2 the infiltration routes to the South."

Mr. Rostow, rejected No. 1 as incurring too many risks with too little return and urged the adoption of No. 3, while holding open the option of raids on Hanoi and Haiphong "when they make sense." He added the comment, "I believe we are wasting a good many pilots in the Hanoi-Haiphong area without commensurate results."

Secretary McNamara's disenchantment with the bombing campaign continued to grow. In a draft memorandum written for Mr. Johnson in 1967, he observed: "There continues to be no sign that the bombing has reduced Hanoi's will to resist, or her ability to ship the necessary supplies south."

M'NAMARA NOTES THE COST

Mr. McNamara rejected the various suggestions for expanded air activity as involving unacceptable risk and urged, once again, a staged reduction of the bombing of North Vietnam above the 20th Parallel in an effort to persuade Hanoi to compromise. It argued.

"The air campaign against heavily defended areas costs us one pilot in every 40 sorties. In addition, an important but hard-to-measure cost is domestic and world opinion: there may be a limit beyond which many Americans and much of the world will not permit the United States to go.

"The picture of the world's greatest superpower killing or seriously injuring 1,000 noncombatants a week, while trying to pound a tiny backward nation into submission on an issue whose merits are hotly disputed, is not a pretty one."

INDOCHINA RESOURCE CENTER

The current high level of fighting in Indochina is an inevitable consequence of U.S. policies. As long as both sides continue to pursue a military solution, the fighting will continue and will escalate. The Nixon administration's answer to the insurgents' protracted struggle is air war and Vietnamization. It is logical that the other side will work to defeat both of these. It is also logical in this narrow military context for the Nixon administration to escalate the air war to prevent such a defeat. But this is precisely the same sort of logic that led us into Indochina and trapped us there. It can only lead to more war when the American people want peace. A March 13, 1972 Harris Survey shows that "by better than two to one, Americans say they are opposed to leaving U.S. bombers and fighters to (provide) air support for the South Vietnamese."

In the 39 months since Nixon took office, 3.2 million tons of bombs have been dropped on Indochina; 20,000 Americans have died and another 110,000 wounded; 340,000 Asians have died; and there have been more than 600,000 civilian casualties and 4,000,000 people made refugees. These 5,000,000 people have not seen the war winding down.

It is true that the Nixon administration has nearly ended American ground combat involvement and reduced the scale of the bombing somewhat. Secretary of the Air Force Robert Seamans said on December 16, "No matter how you look at the air activity of the U.S. over there, the trend is downward." He pointed with pride to the fact that during 1971 the U.S. dropped only three-quarters of a million tons of bombs versus 1.4 million during the peak in 1968 and 1969. But this downward trend stopped in July of 1971, stabilized for 5 months at 5,000 tons per month, and has begun again to grow, 68,000 tons were dropped in February, 1972, and there has been a dramatic escalation in April. The number of bombing attacks ("protective reaction strikes") on North Vietnam increased 600 percent in 1971 over 1970 (121 vs. 20) and the first three months of 1972 show a 500 percent increase over the first three months of 1971 (102 vs. 20). It is important to note that both of these escalations occurred well before the current moves by the other side.

The current offensive is used to justify a further dramatic escalation and the resumption of sustained large scale bombing of North Vietnam which President Johnson halted in 1968.

The number of U.S. warplanes deployed in Southeast Asia has increased from slightly more than 400 in November, 1971 to more than 700 today. There are now four aircraft carriers off the coast of Vietnam—equal to the maximum at the peak of the war. Two more carriers have been ordered to Indochina. Several American-based squadrons of F–4 Phantom jets have been put on alert for Indochina duty.

What can this massive amount of airpower do? If experience is any indicator, the answer is, very little. It can only stave off defeat, but at what cost? On December 16, Secretary Seamans spoke of the great success of the bombing in interdicting supplies needed to wage large-scale war, but now large-scale war is being waged. Many government studies have shown that the bombing alienates the uncommitted and, rather than demoralizing the other side, it serves as a rallying point and helps them recruit more soldiers. A RAND Corporation report concludes that the North Vietnamese cannot be defeated at a cost acceptable to the U.S.

The current offensive points out the failure of the U.S. intelligence apparatus. DoD intelligence was predicting an offensive in the Central Highlands, first at Tet, and later timed for Nixon's visit to China. DoD was wrong on the timing and the locale of the attacks as well as on ARVN's ability to defend its territory. The scope of the offensive on four fronts indicates that both men and material have been transported in large quantities despite the bombing.

Recently the administration has been putting much of the blame for the fighting on the Russians for supplying the North Vietnamese with military equipment and aid. It is instructive to note that, as the Nov. 22, 1971 Newsweek reports, the total military aid to North Vietnam for this year is estimated by the Pentagon to be $170 million. This is to be compared to more than $1.5 billion in U.S. military aid to South Vietnam. In addition, according to the Cornell study on the air war, another $11 billion will be spent for American forces, including up to $4 billion for the air war.

On April 7, Secretary of Defense Laird called the North Vietnamese offensive a "massive invasion" across the DMZ. He gave three reasons to justify the resumption of the bombing of the North. The NVA offensive was a "flagrant violation" not only of the 1954 Geneva Accords, but also of the "understandings" which led to the bombing halt in November, 1968. He also said that the bombing was to protect the remaining American forces as they withdrew.

It is worthwhile to examine this reasoning. First, the Geneva Accords of 1954 established the 17th Parallel as a "provisional military demarcation line" which should not in any way be interpreted as constituting "a political or territorial boundary." This provisional separation was to be erased by free elections to be held in July, 1956 to reunify the country. The U.S.-supported Diem government violated these agreements by refusing to hold the elections. From that point on, their value has been very limited. The Geneva Accords do not substantiate an "invasion" for they do not recognize a frontier. The use of the term "invasion" seems to be a dramatic device. When the U.S. "invaded" Cambodia, it was downplayed as an "incursion."

Second, according to Maxwell Taylor in his memoirs, *Swords and Plowshares*, the 1968 "understandings" on the bombing halt were "unilateral understandings on our part" and that the North Vietnamese never gave "any indication of accepting these understandings."

Third, the justification of bombing to protect the remaining American troops is becoming ludicrous. On May 1, 1972 there will be 69,000 U.S. men in Vietnam. Of these, 16,000 will be airmen and 53,000 ground forces. In Thailand there are 32,000 Americans, 26,000 of them airmen. Presently there are 15–30,000 men assigned to the Seventh Fleet off Vietnam 11–26,000 of them on aircraft carriers. Extrapolating this picture to May 1, there will be more airmen in the theater than ground forces.

Since the stated justifications for the bombing do not stand up under even preliminary scrutiny, it must be assumed that there are other unspoken reasons that are even less palatable to the public. The most obvious unspoken reason for continuing and escalating the bombing is to continue to prop up the Thieu government.

The recent upsurge in fighting has cost a heavy toll in Americans killed, missing or captured. Although only sketchy information is available, the incomplete tally totals 40 U.S. airmen in the last two weeks. This is the largest number of U.S. casualties in more than 6 months. The price tag in dollars for the last 12 days of bombing is more than $200 million (based on $15 million per day operating costs, plus plane losses). Each fighter-bomber sortie carries 2 to 3 tons of bombs and cost $9,400. Each fighter-bomber shot down costs more than $2 million to replace. B–52 sorties carry 25 to 30 tons of bombs and cost more than $41,000 each. Two AC–130 electronic gunships have been lost at a cost of $7 million each.

The costs in American lives and dollars is great, but the cost to the peoples and lands of Indochina is far greater. What benefit is reaped that justifies such a price?

U.S. AIRCRAFT DEPLOYMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	November 1971	April 1972
Attack fighter-bombers	730	1,000	1,000	1,140	950	590	355+	600–900
B–52's	NA	NA	NA	100+	NA	NA	45+	120+

Sources: The Air War in Indochina, Cornell University; New York Times, Apr. 10, 1972; Evening Star Apr. 10, 1972.

AIR WAR: THE THIRD INDOCHINA WAR

OVERVIEW

A giant apparatus of destruction is today firmly installed in and around Indochina. Fifty thousand American airmen and 500 strike aircraft ranging from the huge B–52 to the killer gunship, located at a dozen mammoth airbases and aircraft carriers, are waging full-scale aerial warfare.

The Nixon Administration, while removing U.S. foot soldiers, remains fully committed to a 20-year-old goal of American leaders: keeping U.S.-supported regimes in power in Indochina.

For this reason the Administration has invaded Cambodia and southern Laos, doubled the bombing of Laos and introduced 10,000 new Thai soldiers there, renewed the bombing of North Vietnam, dropped over 3 million tons of bombs on Indochina and killed, wounded or made homeless over 3 million civilians (source: SRS). For the same reason the Administration's newest negotiating stance still insists that the U.S. government have a say in determining who will rule in Indochina, the very reason the war has been fought for over two decades.

Tactics have changed, but the goals have not. The Nixon Administration took office committed both to maintain pro-American Indochinese governments and to withdraw American ground troops from Vietnam. Under the Nixon Doctrine the Third Indochina War (1969–?) began, substituting American air power for American ground troops. The First Indochina War (1946–54) was primarily a French colonial war; the Second Indochina War (1961–68) was the Kennedy-Johnson commitment of American ground troops. The Second Indochina War proved too costly to maintain.

The Nixon Administration has thus turned to a new form of war, one in which machines do most of the killing and destruction, unknown to the American people; a war in which an American President can claim to be bringing peace even as he continues to wage a full-scale and bloody war from the air.

Militarily, this new war is a variation of former Gen. James Gavin's "enclave" strategy. A majority of the people of Indochina has been concentrated in and around the major towns and bases. Within these American-controlled zones, a wide variety of political, economic and cultural measures are undertaken to break the spirit and culture of resistance which has thus far proved the main obstacle to U.S. military success. The vast regions outside the American-controlled zones—including two-thirds of Laos, three-quarters of Cambodia, all of North Vietnam, and much of South Vietnam—are basically free-fire zones, subject to American bombing any time of the day or night. Well over two-thirds of Indochina has thus been turned into a virtual free-fire zone where the new warfare is being tested.

This new war is automated war, waged by machine with ground troops playing a secondary role; it is total war, making no distinction between military and civilian targets, destroying everything below; and it is secret war, carried out without the knowledge of the American people.

This new war is the air war, the Third Indochina War.

Automated war

Always in the past air power has been used to supplement a large expeditionary ground force sent abroad. Substantial bombing has, of course, been carried out before: during World War II, the Korean War, the Second Indochina War. But in the past such bombing has always been meant to support an expeditionary ground army which did the bulk of the fighting and dying. Between 1965 and 1968, for example, most American bombing was employed to aid the half million strong American ground force in South Vietnam by weakening NIF rear bases, supply lines, and strike teams.

What is new today is that bombing is the heart of American military policy; ground forces play a secondary, though still important, role. American air power today does more fighting, costs more, and involves more men than the dwindling force of U.S. foot soldiers still engaged in combat. Asian foot soldiers are used to support American bombers by: (1) "showing the flag" when going in after bombing has caused guerrilla retreat and taking out supplies and refugees; (2) providing static defense for the major towns and bases; and (3) serving as "live bait" to draw guerrilla fire so American pilots will have some idea where to bomb.

Total war

The air war, by its very nature, is destroying everything below: homes, schools, gardens, pagodas, rice fields, forests, animal life and, of course, any people caught in the open.

When American leaders chose to massively bomb the poor, rural lands of Indochina, they inevitably undertook war against the society as a whole. The only strictly "military" targets regularly locateable from the air were roads and bridges, with the exception of a few North Vietnamese factories destroyed early in 1965. Other "military" targets, such as soldiers, trucks, arms depots, or anti-aircraft batteries, are but sporadically found and are assumed to be intermixed with the civilian population. The Air Force and Navy have introduced hundreds of aircraft into the skies of Indochina, ordering that aircraft must be used as often as possible and cannot return to base without dropping their bombs. As a result, pilots inevitably wind up systematically destroying the civilian and social infrastructure.

One of the most striking examples of this total war from the air is the Plain of Jars in northeastern Laos. The Plain of Jars was a thriving, vibrant community of 50,000 when the Pathet Lao guerrilla movement occupied it in May 1964. The United States then began bombing it, striking in ever-increasing intensity until September, 1969, when U.S.-supported Meo guerrillas took the survivors off the Plain. During these years, everything on the Plain was leveled. Today it is a deserted wasteland. There was almost no ground fighting on the Plain during those 5½ years. It is the first society in history to be erased from the map by total, automated war.

Secret war

Through blatant news management, the Nixon Administration has been able to wage a full-scale war while convincing most Americans that it is attempting to end the war. Secrecy is the means of keeping the war politically "acceptable."

The public was first informed of the Laos air strikes in March, 1970, six years and 350,000 sorties after they began. Sen William Fulbright complained at that time that, "The President does not have the authority, nor has the Congress given authority to engage in combat operations in Laos, whether on the land or in the air." The Nixon Administration has unilaterally expanded the air war into Cambodia and recently reinitiated massive bombing of North Vietnam. With the air war's funding scattered in the general budgets of the services and the CIA, it eludes effective control by Congress.

The Nixon Administration has prohibited the press from observing most of the air war first-hand, by refusing to allow newsmen to go on bombing raids outside South Vietnam, keeping unsympathetic journalists off Thai airbases, and not allowing free access to American pilots in Udorn, Thailand. Since such censorship was not practiced in Vietnam (newsmen were always permitted to go out on bombing raids, and have free access to bases and pilots there), it is clearly not due to any need for military security. Rather, the goal seems to be to keep the truth from the American people.

Before 1969, 70 percent of the tonnage fell within South Vietnam (source: Cornell study) and most of the bombing was carried out from South Vietnamese airbases. Since 1969, two-thirds of the tonnage has fallen outside South Vietnam (*Ibid.*), mostly from Thai airbases. The Administration has refused to fly newsmen to scenes of battle in Laos and Cambodia, where most of the fighting has taken place. Newsmen are only infrequently taken in on short, packaged tours, and are invariably kept away from freshly bombed areas. Thus newsmen usually have been unable to observe newly bombed regions taken by American-supported troops. Once again, this was not the policy in South Vietnam, where first-hand reports of aerial devastation did much to create sentiment against the war in this country.

Administration officials have successfully created the illusion of a sterile, antiseptic air war waged only against "military" targets. They have done this by: (1) classifying all information about the air war besides overall tonnage and numbers of airmen out of public and congressional reach; (2) coining such euphemisms as "protective reaction" and "limited duration protective reaction" strikes to mask massive and sustained bombing raids; and (3) maintaining time and time again, in press conferences, speeches, and congressional hearings, that civilian targets are never bombed.

Reports are filtering back to the states that the U.S. has begun clandestine bombing in northern Thailand. The reports may or may not be true, but the point is that unless Congress and the press are permitted to investigate such claims, there can be no effective check on the President's power to bomb anywhere, at any time.

The future

The Nixon Administration has made it clear on numerous occasions that it has no intention of ending this automated, total, and secret war.

Indeed, all prospects are for further intensification and escalation of the Third Indochina War. In February, 1972, for example, it was revealed that the number of B–52s and aircraft carriers in the Indochinese theater would be doubled.

By November, 1972, the Third Indochina War will be the second longest in American history (surpassed only by Johnson's ground war). Unless Americans elect a President committed to total withdrawal, there is no end in sight.

The agony of Indochina may have only begun.

* * * * *

DIMENSIONS

The air war continues at a high level. During 1971, 763,000 tons—the equivalent of 35% of all American air ordnance expended during World War II—were dropped on Indochina (DoD). The potential for sudden escalation remains great, as exemplified by the 5-day Christmas raids against North Vietnam and the more than ten-fold increase in strikes within South Vietnam during February.

The Cornell study cites Pentagon plans to continue the air war at the current level. B–52 sorties, for example, down from a peak of 1,600 a month to 1,000 a month, are programmed to continue indefinitely at the current rate. In defending the bombing, Administration spokesmen invariably point to reductions from 1969 levels, thus laying the groundwork for permanent prosecution of an air war at "acceptable levels."

The operational heart of the bombing has shifted from South Vietnam to land bases in Thailand and aircraft carriers in the South China Sea. Already 45,000 of the 73,000 U.S. air personnel directly involved with the bombing are located outside of Indochina proper. May 1, 1972 will mark the first time that the number of American airmen and American ground troops in Indochina will be equal in the history of this war or perhaps any war.

Geographically, the brunt of the bombing has shifted from inside North and South

Vietnam to Laos and Cambodia. Under Nixon the bombing of Laos has doubled, and all of the 150,000 tons over Cambodia have fallen since May 1970. Recently, for all practical purposes, the Johnson bombing halt over North Vietnam has ended.

During the last three years the technology of the automated battlefield has escalated and the size of the South Vietnamese Air Force has been increased until it now stands as the sixth largest air force in the world.

The ¾ million tons of bombs dropped on Indochina in 1971 represent:

a) The explosive equivalent of 38 Hiroshimas (one Hiroshima = 20,000 tons);

b) 80% of the air ordnance expended during the 3 year Korean War (966,000 tons);

c) 5 times the tonnage dropped on Japan during World War II (154,000 tons);

d) 23 times the total tonnage dropped by the British during their successful ten year counter-insurgency in Malaya (33,000 tons).

(Library of Congress Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, *Impact of the Vietnam War*, 6/71, and the Cornell study)

The total of 6.3 million tons of bombs (DoD) dropped on Indochina from 1965–1971 represents:

a) 250 pounds for every man, woman, and child in Indochina (population 49 million);

b) 22 tons for every square mile of territory in Indochina (area 284,000 square miles or about the size of Texas);

c) More than twice the 3.1 million tons of bombs dropped during World War II and the Korean War combined.

(*Impact of the Vietnam War*)

The majority of the bombs dropped on Indochina have been dropped since President Nixon took office (3.2 million tons since 1969—DoD). The current bombing rate, 50,000 tons during November and 61,000 tons during December represents:

a) More than 2½ Hiroshimas a month;

b) More than 3 million pounds a day;

c) More than 2,000 pounds or a ton a minute.

• • • • •

ORDNANCE

The 2,000 tons of bombs dropped daily on Indochina constitute an unparalleled and sophisticated variety of weapons designed to maim and kill those below. These bombs can be divided into five distinct categories:

1. High explosives, ranging in weight from 250 pounds to the massive "Commando Vault" 15,000 pound bomb. (See also "Environmental Destruction")

2. Anti-personnel bombs are designed for use against unprotected human flesh. According to a paper delivered to the American Association for the Advancement of Science by Prof. E. W. Pfeiffer and Prof. Arthur Westing, at least 50 percent of all bombs dropped on Indochina are anti-personnel bombs:

A. 1,000 Pine Bomblets can be dropped by one aircraft in a single flight. When dropped, the pineapples send 250,000 steel pellets spewing in a horizontal pattern across the land.

B. The Guava can explode on impact, in the air, or with a time delay fuse, with each aircraft throwing 400–500,000 ball bearing pellets in a 360 degree pattern. The guava can inflict casualties on those who are hiding in holes, or in bunker or cave entrances because of this spraying pattern. The equivalent fire power in terms of conventional land war would make the 1,000 pineapples equal to 13,160 infantrymen each firing one clip from an M–16 rifle; the guavas are equivalent to twice that, or 26,320 infantrymen firing a standard clip from an M–16.

C. The Flechette, or "nail" bombs, contain several hundred 1 inch barbed nails in each 3 inch bomblet. The flechette is designed to enter the body, shredding muscles and body organs as it passes through the body, by the path of least resistance, i.e. the ricochet effect. Both pellets and flechettes are difficult to remove, sometimes necessitating exploratory surgery in order to insure removal.

"Often the nails [flechettes] will knife right through the target, although at certain angles they do have a tendency to tumble immediately on impact, and after piercing the skin a tumbling nail can cause a gaping wound." (Dean Morton, CBS News, 3–29–71).

3. Incendiary bombs, designed to burn their victims, vary as to temperature, adhesiveness, and effective range. These include napalm, super napalm, napalm B, napalm paragel, thermite, magnesium, white phosphorus, and NPT.

A. Napalm variants are characterized by their large range of effectiveness—sheets of flame envelop everything for hundreds of yards.

B. White Phosphorus is characterized by the fact that it burns on contact with oxygen. "Willie Peter," as pilots refer to it, cannot be extinguished, which means that it usually has to burn its way to the bone before it goes out, and has more localized dispersal pattern than napalm.

C. NPT, napalm-phosphorus-thermite, dispersed over a wide area, burns at a high temperature, and is difficult to extinguish. It is a combination of the deadliest characteristics of the other incendiary agents.

"In the civilian hospital at Can Tho, I saw a man who had a piece of white phosphorus in his flesh. It was still burning." (Harvey)

4. Air to ground missiles have come into greater use in recent years. The most common are either laser guided or teleguided missiles, called "smart bombs." Conventional bombs with laser guidance systems are dropped from an aircraft, and then home in on a beam that guides the bomb to its target. Teleguided missiles include the "Walleye" and "Bullpup," which fall on the image projected on the pilot's screen. The latter are used particularly against caves or suspected underground complexes, and are accurate within 6 feet when dropped from 4 miles away.

5. Area denial mines are designed to make large areas of land uninhabitable for human life. These weapons include:

A. The Dragontooth and Gravel mines, which are camouflaged to blend in with the land, and are dropped by the thousands every month. The gravel and dragontooth are designed to blow the foot off the person who steps on it, or the hand off anyone who picks it up, but neither one will destroy a truck tire if rolled over.

B. The Spider Mine or the WAAPM (Wide Area Anti-Personnel Mine) has eight fine wires that extend from it. When a wire is tripped, ball bearing-like pellets are thrown for a distance of 60 meters. Unlike other weapons, area denial weapons are not dropped on a specific target, but rather entire areas are flooded with them.

"It [the gravel mine] is purely anti-personnel. If a person steps on it, it will blow his foot off. If a truck rolls over it, it won't blow the tire." (Maj. R. D. Anderson, USAF, Electronic Battlefield Hearings, 11/70.)

Examples of ordnance used in Indochina

BLU 24/26: Guava bomblets, each holding 260–300 pellets, and 50 grams of explosive. Different fuses determine if the bomblet will detonate on impact, in the air, or with time delay. 360 degree spray pattern when detonated.

BLU 31: 750 pound mine dropped from a plane, armed with a seismatic sensitive fuse. The mine buries itself on impact, and can be detonated by the vibrations from a single truck.

BLU 52: 270 pounds of CS II riot control agent. The chemical CS causes vomiting, nausea, tears, and muscle spasms. It can cause death to the elderly, infants, and the sick.

M–36: 800 pound casing containing 182 incendiary bomblets.

PAVE PAT II: 2,500 pound propane gas bomb, used as an incendiary device.

CBU 28: Dragontooth mine. Anti-personnel, area denial mine.

CBU 34/42: WAAPM, Wide Area Anti-Personnel Mine. WAAPM is an area denial weapon with a spraying pattern of 60 meters.

CBU 24/49: Anti-vehicular bombs. The CBU 24 detonates on impact; the 49 is dropped ahead of a convoy and uses a time delay fuse.

CBU 46: Flechette bomblets. Each bomblet has hundreds of 1 inch barbed "nails" that are designed to enlarge wounds and shred body organs. Hundreds of bomblets can be dropped in a single sortie.

XM–41E: Gravel mine. 3 inch cloth bag containing explosive powder and two plastic pellets. Operation is similar to the dragontooth. An added feature is the use of plastic, which necessitates exploratory surgery.

(The above data was gathered from the hearings of the Electronic Battlefield Subcommittee of the Preparedness Subcommittee, of the Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Nov., 1970.)

• • • • •

COSTS

Conservative estimates place the annual costs of the air war at some $3 billion. Actual costs probably run much higher.

However, in terms of the cost of the air war to the Indochinese people and compared to pre-1970 war costs for the U.S., this is a relatively inexpensive war, intended to be a protracted and perhaps a "permanent" war.

Costs have shifted from maintenance of a ground army to military aid and development of electronic counterinsurgency weaponry. "Smart bombs cost . . . $12,500 for T.V. bomb kit. Conventional bombs cost anywhere from $224 for a 500 pounder to $1,864 for a 3,000 pounder" (AP dispatch in the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, 1/14/72). One Walleye missile costs $25,000. The Pentagon acknowledged that the cost of the sensor detection system alone had reached $1.6 billion by November 1970.

Some figures

1966–71: *Total Air War Costs.* $27.5 billion, or approximately ¼ of the war's overall costs. (Cornell study.)

1971: $2.79 billion, or approximately $60 per family of four. Operating costs: $2.2 billion. Aircraft attrition: $.6 billion, (*ibid.*)

Cost per day, 1971: $7.64 million.

Projected costs: $2 to 4 billion annually (Cornell study).

Production costs

1 B–52: $8 million (AP dispatch, 1/9/72).

1 F–4: $4 million (Sec. Seamans, 1972 Air Force Appropriations Hearings).

1 Huey Helicopter: $250,000 (*Ibid.*).

1 Shrike air-delivered missile: $35,000 (CBS News, 1972).

1 aircraft carrier: $960 million (Sen. Allen Ellender, *CR*, 1/25/72).

Operational costs (average costs)

1 B–52 sortie: $41,000 (Cornell study).

1 fighter-bomber sortie: $8,500 (*Ibid.*)

1 truck destroyed on Ho Chi Minh Trail: Over $100,000 (Sen. Mike Gravel, *CR*, 10/5/71).

Christmas raids against North Vietnam

Estimated cost of plane losses Dec. 17–Jan. 1: $24 million (conservatively tallied at $2 million/plane, 12 planes lost, DoD).

Sortie costs: $8.5 million (based on DoD figure of 1,000 sorties).

Electronic battlefield

Total costs: $3.25 billion (Sen. William Proxmire, *CR*, 3/23/71, based on Senate Electronic Battlefield Hearings).

Future costs: As high as $20 billion (Sen. William Proxmire, *CR*, 7/13/70).

DoD acknowledged cost of sensor program, FY 1967–71: $1.68 billion (Senate Electronic Battlefield Hearings, 11/70).

Operating cost of Thai based computers:

$625 million (Orville Schell, *AmRep*, 9/24/71).

Developmental cost of Wide Area Antipersonnel Cluster Bomb (WAAPM): $86.3 million (*Ibid.*).

COST OF AMERICAN AID TO INDOCHINESE AIR FORCES

[In millions of dollars]

	VNAF	RLAF
Fiscal year 1970	245	46
Fiscal year 1971	340	79
Fiscal year 1972	337	83

Source: DOD, CR, Aug. 3, 1971, p. 12938.

Some trade-offs

The cost of one month's 1,000 B–52 sorties would approximate the Administration's 1971 attempted $47 million cutback in the school lunch program, reducing the number of students assisted by nearly 600,000. (PAW)

The cost of one fighter bomber sortie equals the annual salary of one teacher. One week of no fighter bombing would reserve enough funds (approx. $24 million) to reopen the Dayton public schools, and finance for one year the Independence, Missouri public schools, both closed last November for lack of money (SANE)

The $52.5 million cost of the helicopters lost in the Laos invasion in 1971 equals the cost of 17 local health centers, each treating 40,000 patients annually. (*Ibid.*)

The air war's $350 million helicopter operating costs for 1971 (Cornell study) represent twice the estimated federal outlays in 1971 for the operation and support of the Federal Court System, assistance to state and local courts, and legal aid to low income citizens. (The Urban Coalition)

The fuel for one jet for one hour equals 2½ months of food for a family of four. (*Science for the People*, 11/71.)

One aircraft carrier costs the same amount as public housing for 270,000 people. (Sen. George McGovern, *NYT*, (12/6/71)

On the other hand

While the Administration spent nearly $3 billion on the air war in 1971, the President:

(1) Vetoed the $2.1 billion daycare-child-care bill;

(2) Vetoed the Public Works Bill due to its allocation of $2 billion for federally financed jobs in areas of high unemployment;

(3) Called for an OEO cutback of $545 million in its FY 1972 budget;

(4) Called for a cutback of $50 million in aid to elementary and secondary schools in its FY 1972 budget;

(5) Called for a cutback of $88 million for the school milk program in its FY 1972 budget;

(6) Called for a cutback of $28 million in aid to public health centers and clinics in its FY 1972 budget;

(7) Called for $132 million less than Congress had previously authorized for solid waste disposal programs in its FY 1972 budget;

(8) Called for $129 million less than Congress previously authorized for the fight against air pollution in its FY 1972 budget;

(9) Called for $92 million less than Congress previously authorized to combat alcoholism in its FY 1972 budget;

(10) Announced that it had spent only $422 million of the $1.25 billion allocated by Congress in FY 1971 for the construction of solid waste treatment facilities;

(11) Called for expenditures of $900 million less than recommended by the Urban Coalition for federal assistance to urban areas in its FY 1972 budget.

The above figures are less timely now due to the Administration's recent release of its proposed FY 1973 budget. While this budget contains generally moderate increases for domestic programs, it still allocated only $430 million for the war on cancer. "[The] National Cancer Institute got far less than it felt it needed." (Post, 1/25/72.)

HUD's budget for 1973 was below its 1972 level, containing a $50 million cut in federal subsidies for private apartment rentals.

The FY 1973 budget contained no new money requests for water and sewer grants. Congress has appropriated $850 million since mid-1970, of which only $550 million has been spent by the Executive branch.

Implications—War on the cheap

"A continuing air war, largely conducted and entirely supported by the U.S., will inflict ever-widening costs on the peoples of Indochina while reducing U.S. costs to little more than a normal peacetime readiness level for 'permanent war.' When one takes into account the future technological possibilities for warfare-from-a-distance and when one considers the relative cheapness of this kind of mechanized war for the U.S., there emerge far-reaching implications for the possible future conduct of American foreign policy." (Cornell study.)

* * * * *

POW'S—PAWNS OF WAR

An American has been shot out of the sky and captured or listed as missing in action once every three days since President Nixon took office. Hundreds more were prisoners when he began his administration. None will be freed as long as the air war continues.

There are those in this country who argue that the POW's must remain in prison, rather than be released through some "unglorious" total withdrawal, so that others will not have fought in vain. But this argument assumes that we can "win" some sort of victory that will make our sacrifices in Indochina justifiable.

What if we must at some time withdraw anyway? We will at such a point have subjected these men and others yet uncaptured to more unnecessary years of imprisonment.

It is clear that further air raids will only increase the numbers and prolong the imprisonment of American POWs. One thing is certain: As long as the air war continues, more men now free will be shot out of the sky, killed, wounded, or captured until the bombing ends.

INEFFECTIVENESS

The bombing does not stop guerilla advances on the ground or significantly impair the flow of supplies. It is militarily and politically counterproductive because of its tendency to alienate civilians and assist insurgent recruitment.

The guerrilla nature of the fighting neutralizes much of the traditional combat role of air power. American planes can rarely locate enemy forces who move in small groups by night under the cover of the forest. The number of stationary "military" targets in a guerrilla war are relatively few and strategically unimportant. Those that are struck are quickly repaired. DoD statistics indicate that less than 10 percent of all sorties are flown in close air support of embattled troops. The vast majority of the raids involve "harassment and interdiction" missions against an unidentifiable enemy and elusive logistical networks.

Efforts at interdiction have proven extremely costly and ineffective, undermined by the very low level of externally supplied materials necessary to fuel the insurgency and by the willingness of the Russians and the Chinese to provide the level of aid necessary to replace any losses. The DoD has estimated that the insurgency requires only 15–30 tons daily of imported material to maintain a moderate level of activity. This amount of supplies can be transported in 10–15 trucks or on 75–150 bicycles each fitted with an A-frame. As Dr. Marvin Golderberger director of the 1966 DoD evaluation of the air war, has pointed out, it is impossible to prevent 150 bicycles from moving through the jungle.

Secret Jason study conclusions—1967

"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.

"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 second objective of the bombing, to raise South Vietnamese morale, has 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.

"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." (*Pentagon Paper summary of 1967*, Gravel edition, reprinted in F.A.S. newsletter, 2/72)

CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

The air war causes a high degree of civilian casualties

The heavy civilian toll taken by the bombing in the past has been well-documented, though the Department of Defense said in April, 1971 that it had never attempted to study the number of civilians wounded or killed by American bombing. Although there is no way of knowing actual numbers of killed and wounded at the present moment, we may assume that they are quite high. There are still several million civilians living in areas under bombardment, and still 50,000 tons of bombs falling monthly. The drop in monthly bombing tonnages which has taken place under Nixon does not reflect a decline in civilian casualties. His Administration has switched the focus of the bombing to Laos and Cambodia, where there are even fewer military targets than in Vietnam.

A recent Government Accounting Office report shows that the air war has been a major factor in producing nearly 2 million refugees in Cambodia, or one-third of the population. The Cornell study shows that the U.S. has dropped 140,000 tons on Cambodia, compared with over 1.5 million tons on Laos, where nearly a fourth of the population, or 700,000 have been refuged.

The air war causes far more civilian than military casualties

The U.S. bombers cannot locate guerrilla soldiers who sleep by day and move through the forest at night in small groups. Bombers usually wind up striking at the only signs of human life they can see from the air: fires, cultivated fields, footprints, cut or trampled grass, etc. These are located in and around villages. They are most often produced by civilians, who are tied down by their families and cannot live a life on the move. Those fixed targets designated as "military"—roads, ferry crossings, bridges—are precisely where the highest concentrations of civilians are. In rural lands such as Indochina, it is the roads, bridges and ferry crossings which attract civilian concentrations.

THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Americans are losing confidence in the ability of their Government to govern and their leaders to lead. They just are not sure that government today can act with the force and the imagination necessary to meet current problems. They know that government is not working as well as it should.

This loss of confidence in government may be the most serious problem facing government today.

There are many recent indications that public confidence in government is lacking:

First. Only about one-third of American citizens indicate satisfaction with the way this Nation is being governed, according to a February, 1972, Gallup poll.

Second. In early 1971, another Gallup poll showed urgent public concern about national unrest and leadership. Many of those polled felt that governmental leaders were not trying hard enough to solve the problems the country faces.

Third. A survey last fall by the Washington Post showed that our political system faces a crisis of confidence, with voters complaining that public officials are unresponsive, unpredictable, and untrustworthy.

Fourth. A recent Harris poll indicated that the public believes, by a 65 to 25 percent margin, that "only a few men in politics are dedicated public servants." They also believe, by an 81 to 11 percent margin, that most elected officials promise one thing and do something different once in office. Almost 60 percent believe that most politicians take graft. Harris poll results over a period of 4 years reveal a diminishing trust in politics and politicians.

The current attitude toward our political leadership is typified by the comment made by the midwestern farmer:

I wouldn't trust a politician if he told me the sun rose in the East.

This distrustful attitude extends not only to the men who exercise power, but also to the quality of the information upon which they act, and the efficiency of the organizations they direct.

Any public official can confirm that people are suspicious of his motives, wary of his words, and cynical about getting action on their own requests.

Columnist Joseph Kraft has commented that:

The crisis of confidence is probably the prevailing fact of American public life.

Reporter David S. Broder writes:

What must concern us now is the rising level of public frustration with government-and-politics-as-usual. For it is not just a few radical students who say and believe that the political system is not working. Millions of ordinary, hardworking Americans recognize that government is not dealing with the problems that are uppermost in their lives: crime and drugs and war and inflation and unfair tax loads and fear of unemployment.

The President put it more bluntly when he said that people are simply fed up with government.

The gravity of this public attitude toward government is that a democratic government depends on people who believe in it. Without an attitude of trust and confidence toward the government, a democratic government will not work. Our tax collection system depends primarily upon people willingly assessing themselves; it will collapse if people come to believe that taxes are basically unfair.

This Government is based on the consent of the governed. If the American people lose confidence in their Government, believing it is unfair or unresponsive or just plain incompetent, they will soon withdraw their consent to be governed. Clearly, public distrust, suspicion, and cynicism about government corrode the foundations of free government.

WHY IS CONFIDENCE LACKING?

There are several reasons for the people's lack of confidence in government.

First, few people really feel a part of the political system. They feel that the system has passed them by, and that they no longer have an impact on decisions. A feeling of powerlessness grips them.

One evidence of their feeling is the high number of non-voters in the United States. The United States, the leader of the free world and the world's greatest democracy, lags far behind many other free countries in voter participation.

Any public official is familiar with the remark, "What difference does it make whether I vote or not? It doesn't seem to do any good." A favorite story of many politicians is about the lady who responded to the question about why she did not vote by saying that she did not want to encourage any of the candidates.

People no longer see a clear relationship between what they think, support, and work for, and what actually happens. They doubt the responsiveness of the system.

Second, people believe that government officials do not tell them the whole truth. This apparent inability of political leaders to come clean with the public is another reason for their distrust of government. Anxious to espouse popular rather than effective solutions, politicians are strong on rhetoric, weak on candor, and skillful at half truths.

Credibility is a favorite word in politics today because of the long list of recent experiences which have taught the American people to doubt the statements of their political leaders.

Third, government has become too big for understanding or efficiency. Government is no longer plain, simple, and intelligible. Its vastness defies comprehension; it baffles and confuses people. Not understanding it, they do not have confidence in it.

And no wonder. The Federal Government spends a quarter trillion dollars a year, employs one out of every 16 working Americans, administers one-third of the Nation's land, occupies over 42,000 buildings, consumes over 1 trillion pieces of paper a year, and operates according to 12,000 pages of laws.

No one expects it to run as smoothly as the neighborhood grocery, but even making allowances, the public sees too much bureaucratic confusion, delay, and general mismanagement.

Fourth, the Government operates too secretly. Any reasonable person recognizes the necessity of secrecy in Government in a number of situations, including intelligence information, diplomatic negotiations, military plans, and secret weapons. But secrecy has become an accepted way of doing business in Washington, with a presumption of nondisclosure of Government papers, and an absurd classification system. The Nixon administration, not the first offender, is currently denying the public World War II documents of 27 years vintage.

The people do not like secrecy or a government that practices it.

Fifth, people expect more of government.

Their standards of performance for integrity, efficiency, accountability, responsiveness, and results have soared. People expect government to solve most problems, and when action does not come, or is ineffective, they become critical because their expectations are not met. As the gap between the people's expectation and the government's performance widens, distrust of government escalates.

With the long and difficult agenda of national problems, the democratic process is in for some rugged testing in the years ahead. That process cannot succeed if people lack confidence in it.

Like most things these days, the remedy for the people's distrust of government is complex, but these several steps would help restore public confidence.

STEPS TO RESTORE CONFIDENCE

First, increased voter participation. The single most critical, personal act in a democracy is when individuals elect their public officials to shape the broad outlines of government policy.

The more people vote, the more government reflects their wishes and satisfies their needs, and the more vital is the principle of the consent of the governed. New strength can be brought to the democratic process by broadening participation in it. This is the key to the future vitality and vibrancy of the system. People who are involved in the process have a stake in the system, and they are not so quick to yield to cynicism, despair, or distrust.

Persons who do not vote are often

alienated from the system, and, by their simple act of not voting, they threaten the survival of democracy itself.

The distasteful fact is, of course, that millions of Americans do not vote:

First, in the 1968 presidential election 31.8 million people voted for Richard Nixon, 31.3 million for HUBERT HUMPHREY, and 47 million—or 40 percent of the electorate—did not vote at all.

Second, the number of nonvoters has been increasing sharply, from 39 million in 1960, to 43 million in 1964, to 47 million in 1968. If this trend continues, in 20 years we will have from 70 to 90 million nonvoters in an election for President.

Dissolving voter apathy will not be easy, but, at the very least, the barriers between the citizen and the voting booth must be removed.

Richard Scammon, the elections analyst, has said that "voting ought to be as simple as making a telephone call." Today it certainly is not.

Residential requirements for voting, registration procedures, and election day inconveniences are the major barriers that can be reduced or removed.

RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

Five million citizens were prevented from voting in 1968 in the Presidential election merely because they moved from one State to another just before the election.

The Supreme Court has now ruled that it is unconstitutional to deny the vote to anyone merely because he has not lived for a particular period of time in the State or locality where he seeks to vote. The decision may enfranchise millions of citizens, and it is a major step in increasing voter participation in the electoral process.

REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

The finest voting system in the world would not work if registration procedures discourage voters.

Present registration procedures can require registration at the Court House, or some other office miles from home, or allow registration only occasionally.

In Indiana, it takes a rather sophisticated student of politics to know when, where, and with whom to register.

Registration becomes an obstacle course for the voter rather than an assistance to voting. In 1968 over 3 million people did not get the chance to vote because they found registration procelures too inconvenient.

A universal voter enrollment plan would get more people registered, and, since almost 90 percent of the Americans registered to vote cast their ballots in 1968, such a plan would sharply increase voting participation.

ELECTION DAY INCONVENIENCES

In 1968, an estimated 6 million Americans did not vote because they could not leave work or they were away from home. We make it tough to vote by:

Voting in the middle of the work week.

Voting the same hours we always have, even though the population has doubled.

Shortening the hours for voting from time to time in some States, including Indiana.

Voting in places that are often jammed with voters, that are often cold or wet, and with no places for the old or disabled to sit down while they wait.

Voting should not be a burden, and most of these inconveniences could be easily removed. Designating Federal Election Day a national holiday would also help.

OPEN AND MORE HONEST CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The most important facts about campaigning today are that political campaigns are frightfully expensive and that most of the expenditures go unreported. From the public record, people cannot tell where the money comes from or how it is spent.

The democratic process requires a system that is open and honest. The present system is neither.

Campaigning costs have reached the stage where they threaten the lifeblood of the democratic system. They simply must be gotten under control.

The outstanding political upsets of 1970 were made by men of great wealth, using television and spending their way from obscurity to fame in a matter of weeks; candidates like Ottinger, Metzenbaum, Buckley, Bentsen, and Shapp.

Fifteen candidates ran in the 1970 Senate races in seven large States. Eleven of the 15 were millionaires, and all of the seven winners were millionaires.

The amount of money spent per vote cast in presidential campaigns has more than doubled in the past decade:

In 1960, 32 cents per vote cast.

In 1968, 67 cents was spent for each vote.

While the costs of campaigns has exploded, the number of contributions shrinks with 90 percent of all campaign funds contributed by less than 1 percent of the American population.

Honest and open elections for public offices will restore public respect for the political processes.

The new campaign finance reform law, providing for limitations on the amount candidates can spend on the news media, disclosure of contributions and expenditures, and frequent reports by candidates will, if strictly enforced, be a major step forward, and hopefully will begin to restore integrity to the financing of political campaigns. The recent example of presidential candidates making known their contributions is heartening and hopefully will encourage other candidates to do the same.

INCREASED CANDOR

Examples of lack of candor by public officials can be gathered almost daily:

President Nixon spoke publicly of neutralism toward India and Pakistan in their war last December, when his instructions to his military and intelligence heads were to "tilt" toward Pakistan.

Secretary Connally repeatedly said prior to last December 18 that the dollar would not be devalued, when that was precisely what he was planning to do.

President Nixon indicated on June 17, 1970, that "I will not take this country down the road of wage and price controls." A little over a year later, that was the road the Nation was on.

A Secretary of Defense blandly explained why the President escalated bombing of North Vietnam in December 1971, by stating that it was done to reduce American casualties and protect American troops. That week only one American had been killed.

A Secretary of Commerce, and the chief fundraiser for the President, innocently stated on nationwide TV, that he had no knowledge of large contributions to the President's campaign fund from dairy associations shortly after the President sharply increased the price support for milk.

These examples are chosen because they are recent. The Nixon administration, however, has no monopoly on a lack of candor.

The Pentagon papers of last June jolted public confidence in the utterances of the leaders of the Johnson administration. Those papers demonstrated that Government did not act in a manner to earn the confidence of the people. While policymakers were involved in raging debates over the Vietnam conflict, very little of it surfaced. The American people, who had the most at stake, were given little or no opportunity to understand the stakes, the difficulties, and the options.

When elected leaders hesitate to deal with the difficult issues of the day with candor and honesty, the opportunity for the dialog upon which a democracy depends is denied. Under such circumstances the people do not get reliable information and cannot perform their rolls in a democratic society. The Pentagon papers showed that Vietnam policy was made by so few officials that it was not sufficiently exposed to debate and discussion, especially on the fundamental question of objectives.

Soaring rhetoric by public officials often contributes to the lack of candor. In their enthusiasm for a proposal, and in an effort to sell it, their words ensnare them into exaggerations. All of us in public life should know by now that poverty, discrimination, and polluted water will not yield to fancy words, and we should focus on the really pertinent question of whether we are willing, or able, to provide the resources, both human and material, over a long period of time to achieve our exalted goals.

It is not being candid with people to proclaim unlimited goals and then use limited resources to try to achieve them. So long as public officials are not candid with the people about the size and difficulty of the problems, and the cost of solving them, people will be misled and their distrust of government will grow.

The sentiment is building that no high official in Washington is to be taken at his word. With the record of performance in recent years, the average citizen cannot really be blamed if he doubts the candor of American officials.

The remedy for all this is to reaffirm the fundamental aspects of a democracy: its openness and its reliance on public discussion.

Candor means to acknowledge that we do not have all the answers to all the problems that beset us, that we acknowl-

edge the difficulties and the costs of the advocated proposal, that we admit errors, that we use experimentation and pilot programs more extensively, and that we restrain our rhetoric. Candor by public officials requires an act of faith in the ability and the judgment of the people, but it is essential to the proper functioning of the democratic system.

INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Another step to improve public confidence in Government is to increase the accessibility of public officials. Public officials unfortunately enjoy being in the public eye, but not under public scrutiny.

Government is responsible only if the decisionmakers are accessible to the people and accountable for their decisions. They must be where they can be asked tough questions, and made to give the best answers they can.

The President's press conferences are a good example of executive isolation. The President held only nine press conferences in 1971, and four of these were called on short notice and attended by only the regular White House press corps. By comparison, Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson averaged 21 each year. The decline of the use of press conferences deprives the public of its best opportunity to examine the President at close range.

Many top policymakers simply are not accessible or accountable to the people in any direct way. The doctrine of executive privilege cloaks from view many of the Government's most important officials. Dr. Henry Kissinger is widely acknowledged to be the President's foremost foreign policy adviser, yet he is not available to appear before congressional committees, and only rarely is available to the press. Mr. Peter Flanigan, a Presidential adviser, who is apparently intimately involved in the Government's antitrust policy, likewise is not available to public scrutiny.

In their conduct of the public's business congressional leaders as well are often inaccessible to the public. Part of the problem in the Congress is that power is anonymous, resting in the hands of few men who, so far as the public is concerned, are unknown. The chairmen of the most important committees could walk into most gatherings in America and be unrecognized. If we are to have open decisions, openly arrived at, men with such vast power must be open to public view, accountable to the public, and the opportunities for free exchange of opinions between the people and their leaders must be maximized.

LESS SECRECY

A government that prefers to do its business in secret will not have the public's confidence.

Over the past decade, Congress has appropriated an average of more than $130 billion a year to run the Federal Government, fund public programs, and carry out national priorities. In each instance, the appropriations process has been dominated by secrecy, from closed committee hearings to secret House and Senate conferences. This process makes a farce of the principle of open government.

Fortunately, some reforms have occurred, which are beginning to open the congressional appropriations process to public examination. The House Appropriations Committee held a few open hearings last year, although 92 percent of its hearings were closed. With the recorded teller vote the House is recording publicly more of its votes; 320 record votes occurred in 1971; the largest number ever taken in a single year.

In the executive, a comprehensive classification system for public documents keeps information from the people. This perverse system lessens the flow of full information and inhibits the public's understanding of current events. It allows policymakers to operate with blinders on. The historical record offers no proof that officials protected from public scrutiny by the classification system make wiser decisions than they would otherwise, and the democratic process argues just the opposite.

Distinctive marks of democracy are its commitment to an open society, and the assumptions that policy can be improved by steady public examination and debate.

Few things should be immune from public scrutiny and criticism, because only by such examination and criticism can mistakes be corrected.

To achieve these objectives of a democratic society, several basic alterations should be made in the classification system. Some propose that any paper stamped secret should become public in 2 years, and top secret papers should be made public in 3 years, with a congressionally appointed commission to make exceptions. Others suggest a more extended period of 5 to 10 years.

At the very least, disclosure should be the rule, not the exception, and the burden should be placed on the Federal agency, not on the party seeking disclosure, to justify denying information to the public.

The recent Executive order to limit secrecy in Federal documents states some salutary principles, urging that classification be used with utmost restraint, but the real test will come in the administration of the order to see if the tendency of the bureaucracy to overclassify can be corrected.

INCREASE FAIRNESS IN GOVERNMENT

Many people have lost confidence in government because they feel that their Government does not give them a fair shake. They are right.

Our laws are full of provisions that result in special treatment for special interests. A recent congressional report showed that direct and indirect Government subsidies cost the American taxpayer at least $63 billion a year, an amount equal to $308 for each citizen, and about one-fourth of all the Federal Government spends each year. More than half the total, or $38 billion, is in tax subsidies, indicating the extent to which special privileges dominate our tax laws.

Although tax burdens for individuals are thought to vary according to an individual's ability to pay, the reality is vastly different because a variety of special exemptions, incentives, and privileges weaken the progressive nature of the income tax, and fill the tax law with inequities:

The stated tax rates are from 14 to 70 percent, but the real rates range from less than 2 percent to a maximum of 32 percent of income at levels of $1 million and over—112 persons with incomes of $200,000 and over paid no taxes at all in 1970.

While the ordinary taxpayer pays around 20 percent of his wages in taxes, the oil companies paid an average of 8.7 percent of their income in taxes in 1970.

People earning less than $2,000 annually pay about 50 percent of their income in all types of taxes while people earning over $50,000 pay a lower rate of 45 percent.

Studies show that the higher a taxpayer climbs above the middle income brackets, the better chance he has of paying no income tax at all.

In 1970, 1,338 persons with incomes above $50,000 paid no Federal income tax and the percentage of people who escape all taxes rose steadily in every income bracket from $15,000 to $1 million.

In addition to the tax subsidies, there are cash, credit, and benefit-in-kind subsidies. All of these special provisions are not detrimental, just as all of the tax subsidies are not. But there are enough of them to arouse growing feelings among more and more Americans that their Government is not as "fair" as it ought to be.

A concern for fairness requires a searching and continuing examination into these subsidies, asking the tough questions about their economic benefits and real costs, whether alternative approaches can do the job better, and whether more reliance on the marketplace would be a more efficient way to achieve the goals.

Most Americans would feel better about the fairness of their Government if they knew that this kind of examination was taking place on a sustained basis.

At the very least Government should launch a major effort to bring fairness and equity to the tax and subsidy programs.

STRENGTHEN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Part of the reason people lack confidence in government is because government is too big, complex, and inefficient. To recapture that confidence an unrelenting effort must be made to make government and all its various institutions work better.

A distinguishing feature of the federal system has been its remarkable capacity to adapt to changing circumstances, because the rate of change is so swift today we face problems of totally different magnitudes. Many institutions of government cling to policies and practices that hardly satisfy the modest requirements of the 1930's and 1940's and are grossly unsuited to cope with the kinds of challenges we have today. The result is that our federal system is on trial as never before.

All levels of government in the federal system must be strengthened and reformed. Exclusive action by any one level of government will simply not solve the problems. The burden of governing is too big and too complex for one branch of government to handle efficiently.

The basic question is how to organize to deal efficiently and effectively with the complexities and the burdens of a dynamic America.

State governments need to be modernized and strengthened. In 1967, the Committee for Economic Development compiled a list of outmoded State government structures which has changed little in recent years:

Only a handful of States have adopted new constitutions since 1945. Most of the State constitutions were drafted in the 1800's—Indiana's was adopted in 1851.

More than half of the State legislatures still meet at regular sessions once each 2 years, and under wholly inadequate time limits in most cases.

Many State legislatures are unwieldy in size. Less than half of lower chambers have fewer than 100 members.

Only a few States give their Governors sufficient administrative authority to meet fully the responsibilities of the office.

Almost half the States, including Indiana, deny their Governors a second or third consecutive term, which reduces the Governor's ability to provide political, as well as administrative, leadership.

To strengthen State governments several steps should be taken to:

Reduce the number of elected officials.

Provide Governors with the authority they need to deal with their responsibilities, and sufficient staff to meet the responsibilities.

Limit the size of State legislatures and upgrade their facilities, strengthen their staffs and improve their sources of information.

Local governments, too, need to be reshaped, including steps to:

Reduce the number of elected officials.

Enlarge the areas served to provide the resources for effective action.

Strengthen their authority to act.

State and local governments have made progress in increasing their effectiveness and strengthening their ability to act, but the question remains whether they have moved ahead rapidly enough in view of the problems.

Reform is also needed in the U.S. Congress. Although it is one of the more successful political legislatures in the world, it has not faced the demands upon it, and unless major changes are made in the way it operates, it will become increasingly ineffective. The objective must be to make it more responsive to the majority of its Members, more efficient by abolishing obsolete procedures, and more deliberative by strengthening democratic procedures.

Procedures of the House and Senate are time-consuming and antiquated; they encourage delay and discourage deliberation. The filibuster allows a minority of Senators to talk a bill to death.

Committee jurisdictions are seemingly set in concrete with no review of the divisions of work to assure that the committee jurisdictions correspond with the actual problems facing the Congress.

The Congress has committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, Interior and Insular Affairs, but none on environment, health, population, and economic affairs.

Today at least 10 committees work on the environment; over 17 committees work on foreign affairs. And about one-half of the 268 House subcommittees claim some share of urban policy issues.

There is no organized procedure for the Congress to systematically review the entire national budget. Although expenditures are examined in detail by subcommittees, no full committee spends more than 2 days reviewing the complete revenue and expenditure proposals of the President.

The work schedule of the Congress wastes time, causes conflict, inconvenience, and delay.

The Congress needs to strengthen its leadership, reduce anonymous power, and develop a system which chooses its leadership on the basis of merit rather than political survival. It also needs to adopt modern business practices in employment, office management, use of computers, and data processing machines.

The people's confidence in government will rise to the extent that the institutions of government become more responsive, efficient, and effective.

CONCLUSION

These several suggestions by no means exhaust the steps government should take to restore the confidence of the people. It is not required that government take all these steps at once, but it is necessary that people know about government's concern for their lack of confidence and its willingness to take some of the steps needed to restore confidence.

My observation is that people generally are rather understanding of the complexity of the problems with which the government deals, and tolerant of government's lack of success in solving them. But there are limits to the margin of tolerance people extend to their Government, and my feeling is we are approaching these limits today.

The danger signals are apparent for all to see, and it is the time for the Congress, and all public officials, to first think seriously about what steps must be taken to restore the confidence of the people in democratic government, and then to act with the force and the resolution needed to accomplish them.

THE CONTINUING TRAGEDY IN VIETNAM: BRINKMANSHIP IS A DANGEROUS AND AWFUL RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of bombing sorties against Hanoi and Haiphong yesterday are a mockery of what President Nixon calls "Vietnamization." The U.S. role in the war, steadily diminishing up to a month ago, has taken on almost astonishing new dimensions. Indeed, the weekend bombing missions recall the mid-1960's—an era when the American high command still entertained illusions about a "military victory," still clung to the hope that North Vietnam could be pummelled into submission. At the very least, we were then assured, the bombing would halt the enemy's infiltration into South Vietnam. Like most of the military's comforting assurances during that era, this one proved false—almost wholly false.

Yet, President Nixon has now exhumed the corpse of that thinking, using war tactics that have long since been recognized as futile. Significantly, Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen have abandoned the jargon they have been using to describe air strikes against North Vietnam—cryptic phrases such as "limited duration protective reaction." They now speak bluntly of "reducing the enemy's capability to continue military activities in South Vietnam," language chillingly reminiscent of that used at the peak of the conflict 6 years ago.

It has already been demonstrated—plainly and indisputably—that bombing North Vietnam merely steels its resolve to continue pressing the war effort. A tiny agrarian country, North Vietnam can easily weather bombing attacks that would devastate an industrial nation. The targets of yesterday's missions—petroleum depots, warehouses, truck yards, other logistic facilities—can be shifted to new sites virtually overnight. Once camouflaged and scattered about the countryside, they would be all but invulnerable to air attack.

Beyond the palpable futility of such bombing, President Nixon's new strategy broadens the U.S. role in the war. What ever happened to "Vietnamization?" America has already done everything that could be expected of her to assure South Vietnam's self-sufficiency, sacrificing 45,000 lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. As Senator MIKE MANSFIELD has said, South Vietnam must now "fish or cut bait."

Almost an entire generation of American youth has shed its blood on Vietnam's battlefields.

It must stop, Mr. Speaker.

We must get out.

The renewed bombing of North Vietnam not only threatens to slow—perhaps stop altogether—our disengagement from the war. It is also brinksmanship of the most unsettling kind, bringing the United States and the Soviet Union close to a direct confrontation. The Washington Post, in an editorial published today, said this:

> What President Johnson and his predecessors steadfastly tried not to do over 15 years or more, President Nixon has managed to do almost overnight: he has brought the war in Indochina to the brink of a head-on confrontation with the Soviet Union by his decision to send American bombers over the suburbs of Hanoi and the port of Haiphong and to amass an American naval armada off the North Vietnamese coast . . .

The Post argued further:

> You have to assume that he, President Nixon, is prepared, for lack of any other leverage, to throw Soviet-American relations into the scales, to put the SALT talks and the European detente and Russia's alleged

anxiety over China and East-West relations in general on the table, for the sake of salvaging whatever precisely it is that Mr. Nixon would conceive of as an "honorable" way out of the war . . .

It seems clear, Mr. Speaker, that this approach is a flirtation with disaster.

I am today joining other Members of the House in introducing a resolution calling for these actions:

First. All American military activities, whether land, sea or air, against the territory of North Vietnam, be terminated at once;

Second. The President now order our representatives at the Paris peace talks to resume negotiations, in order to achieve the return of our personnel held captive in Indochina and an accounting for all those missing there, in return for the total withdrawal of American military forces from Indochina and the cessation of all American military activity in that region; and

Third. Meanwhile there be no interruption in the withdrawal of American military forces from Indochina.

THE U.S. BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, for almost 10 years now, this country has been entangled in an immoral and reprehensive war in Southeast Asia—a "dirty little war" that has become very big, demanding a very high price. More than 50,000 Americans have died there since 1963, untold Vietnamese lives have been lost, billions of dollars have been wasted, and the moral fabric of this country has been torn—its soul sacrificed for expediency and a terrible refusal to admit that, as a country, we have been wrong. Several years ago, it became apparent that the people knew a tragic mistake had been made, and they wanted out of Southeast Asia—soon. The President was elected on the strength of that sentiment. He had a plan, a secret plan, to end the war. Soon, American troops started coming home and, every so often, there was another televised announcement to say how many would be leaving—to say how well Vietnamization was working—to talk about a generation of peace.

Saturday night, less than 48 hours ago, we found out that something was terribly wrong. The war was not winding down. Instead, it was spreading out—spreading like it did in 1965 and 1966. Saturday night, U.S. B–52 bombers struck deep inside North Vietnam. For the first time in the long and sad history of the Vietnam war, U.S. planes indiscriminately attacked targets near the port of Haiphong. Sunday, they struck targets in Hanoi. The North Vietnamese said hundreds of civilians were killed, and the Soviet Union said two of its ships in Haiphong harbor were damaged. It was an eerie reminder of an earlier time when U.S. planes bombed cities in North Vietnam—after the incident in Tonkin Gulf. The repercussions from those first raids were devastating—to the chances for peace, to the safety of American troops—and the repercussions from the new raids over the weekend could be far more tragic.

As long as a year ago, there were signs that as the ground war "wound down," the air war was escalating. The dirty war on the ground was being replaced with a cleaner, automated war, that dealt in white phosphorous, tiny steel fleshettes, and giant "Daisycutter" bombs. As the troops came home, more planes and more bombs came to Southeast Asia for more "interdiction" and "protective reaction" strikes. Of course, the victims did not change. The civilians continued to die, much as they died at Mylai. No one replaced them.

All of this became quite obvious over the last few weeks, since the North Vietnamese invasion of the south. The South Vietnamese Army is fighting back, and the Army has won a stalemate, however tentative. It is clear, however, that "Vietnamization" is a hollow phrase without the massive and unprecedented use of American air power that props it up. As a result, the air war has become as intense and as deadly as the ground war. It has expanded the war, taking it to the north and increasing the civilian casualties.

The American people have been cruelly deceived. The war is not winding down. Vietnamization has not worked as the administration said it would. The American presence in Southeast Asia is not going to end soon. The pledge to end the war—to deescalate, to work for peace—has been a forgery. Despite the rhetoric, the last 48 hours have shown that this country is very much in the war—more than ever. The people of Vietnam do not want it. The people of the United States do not want it, and we have the right to ask "Why?" More than that, we have the right to an answer, not from the U.S. Command, not from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not from the Pentagon—but from the President.

The bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong is a reckless, unreasoned, immoral act that jeopardizes not only the chances for peace in Southeast Asia—it jeopardizes world peace. For years the Pentagon urged the large scale bombing of these two cities but the Johnson administration, for all its stubbornness, did not order the attacks because it knew the attacks would escalate the war. Now, 6 years later and theoretically on our way to a generation of peace, we have ignored once again the terrible lessons of the past. Once again, the Government has committed the sin of pride, the sin the Bible tells us is the fundamental weakness of mankind. The bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, the escalation of the air war, the increase in civilian death and destruction—they have set this country back 7 years—to 1965 and the insanity of military escalation.

The bombing must stop now. As a nation, we cannot tolerate it if only because so much is at stake:

There are no pretenses about this latest round of bombing. It is not protecting American troops. There is no guise of "protective reaction." Instead, the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong is likely to jeopardize even more the safety of U.S. troops because the North Vietnamese now have a cover to increase their attacks on U.S. military installations.

From a military standpoint, the bombing is not effective. After Tonkin, this Government vowed to "bomb the North Vietnamese into submission." It did not work. It generated more fighting and death, more resistance and delay. It was a waste of money—and it killed a great many civilians. Incredible as this may seem—after all we have learned in the last 10 years about the ineffectiveness of massive airpower in a guerrilla war—the Pentagon continues to promote and employ World War II tactics. The sin of ignorance compounds the sin of pride.

The bombing cannot be restricted to the military targets on the map. Millions of people live close to the targets. The Pentagon's avowed pledge to avoid civilian areas is little consolation to the civilians who are killed or injured by the bombing. An attack on Hanoi and Haiphong by B–52's is quite different from an attack by lower flying planes on trucks and SAM missile sites in theoretically unpopulated areas. When the decision was made to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, it was done with the knowledge that there would be extensive civilian casualties.

The bombing may well generate an international crisis. There is speculation that the administration ordered the attacks to "convince" the Soviet Union to stop supplying weapons to the North Vietnamese. With the President's mission to the Soviet Union only 5 weeks from now, it is a curious way of asking the Soviets to stop. The bombing is sending them a message, but it is not the right one. It has created an incredible and totally unjustified risk of nuclear confrontation.

The bombing has jeopardized once again the safety and the chances of release for our prisoners of war. North Vietnam is not likely to consider the plight of the POW's when its cities are being bombed, while its civilians are being killed, however inadvertently. As more planes attack the north, more planes are shot down, and the number of POW's increases. In the process, we are moving away from peace—and release of our prisoners—with a vengeance.

The bombing is yet another indicator of the Military Establishment's overwhelming control over the administration. The Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs now have their way and, when peace hangs in the balance, that is not a comforting thought.

Instead of peace, instead of winding down the war, we have been given another example of the vengeance, venality, and viciousness that has characterized this country's presence in Southeast Asia for so long. By any standards—moral, political or military—the events of the last weekend give us little basis for pride or hope.

There may be one positive result from the President's latest exhibition of brinkmanship. It may convince some of our doubting colleagues in Congress that we can no longer evade our clear respon-

sibility to end the war now. Time and time again, the Congress has deferred respectfully to the judgment of the President. But if bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and escalating the air war represent this administration's best judgment, that judgment simply is not good enough.

We have the ability to stop the bombing, to end the war. In the past, we have lacked only the will. Three weeks ago, I joined the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) in introducing H.R. 14055 which calls for an immediately end to the bombing and the withdrawal of all U.S. military personnel from Southeast Asia, conditioned only on the release of our prisoners of war. This represents the will of most of the people in this country and, as Congress, we have a responsibility to carry out the people's will. We have deliberated long enough. We have deferred long enough. Now, we must have the courage to do what the President will not.

On Wednesday, Congressman DRINAN will place a resolution before the Democratic caucus calling for prompt legislative action on H.R. 14055. That resolution ought to have the support of every Democratic member who believes the war must end and that Congress ought to end it. We owe the American people that much—after all these years, after all the lives that have been lost. Supporting the Drinan resolution is the first step. It is time we took it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD three newspaper editorials on the escalating air war in Southeast Asia and this country's position there. The editorials in this morning's Washington Post and New York Times discuss the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. The third editorial, from the Des Plaines Herald, was written before the new air strikes. The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1972]

VIETNAM: "GETTING OUT" BY WAY OF THE BRINK

What President Johnson and his predecessors steadfastly tried not to do over 15 years or more, President Nixon has managed to do almost overnight: he has brought the war in Indochina to the brink of a head-on confrontation with the Soviet Union by his decision to send American bombers over the suburbs of Hanoi and the port of Haiphong and to amass an American naval armada off the North Vietnamese coast.

There does not seem to be any other way to interpret what he has done. One could understand—if not accept—the monumental air support given to the South Vietnamese during the ongoing North Vietnamese offensive of the past few weeks, and the systematic substitution of our air power for our manpower in the months before that. One could see this as having something to do with bolstering the South Vietnamese forces, and even with "saving the lives" of our remaining troops. Leaving aside the cynical euphemism of "protective reaction," there were enemy tanks to be hit, and SAM missile sites to be taken out and trucks and roads and bridges to be blown up. You could even believe, but just barely, that most of this was being carried on in remote, unpopulated areas so that civilians were pretty much out of the way of it.

But you cannot believe that anymore about a reversion to bombing tactics which plainly endanger population centers and which cannot be related in any immediate sense to the fighting now under way south of the Demilitarized Zone and in the Central Highlands and around Saigon. Nothing that is blown up in Hanoi or Haiphong today is going to influence, in any direct way, the course of battle in the South for a good many months, pehaps even a year; we have ample evidence of that, out of long experience.

And you cannot seriously believe that this revival of the thumbscrew is directed at "the will of Hanoi" for we have more than enough evidence on this score, too: the thumbscrew, sometimes called "rolling thunder" (by the military) or "graduated response" (by the professors in residence in government), has never really worked. In the days of Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow, it didn't persuade the North Vietnamese to "leave their neighbors alone"—if anything it stiffened them—and there is no reason to believe that the effect would be any different now. Moreover, there is nothing "graduated" about what is going on.

So you have to assume that the Russians who are the main suppliers of the heavy weaponry now in use by the North Vietnamese, are the main object of the weekend bombing strikes around Hanoi and Haiphong; that the President is reviving and applying what John Foster Dulles described as "the necessary art" and which his critics called "brinkmanship"; that he is seeking to persuade the Russians to use their benefactor's influence on Hanoi either to slow down the current offensive or to promote negotiations, or both; and that he is prepared, for lack of any other leverage, to throw Soviet-American relations into the scales, to put the SALT talks and the European detente and Russia's alleged anxiety over China and East-West relations in general on the table, for the sake of salvaging whatever precisely it is that Mr. Nixon would conceive of as an "honorable" way out of the war.

There is a grim logic in this assessment. It fits the President's long-standing concepts about the utility of air power, particularly in Indochina; it is quite in keeping with his oft-expressed admiration for the way President Eisenhower supposedly achieved a Korean truce—by threatening the Chinese with nuclear attack. It accords with the Administration's own proud account of how Jordan was saved and a Middle East conflagration averted—by the maneuvering of American sea power in the eastern Mediterranean. It would be, in short, almost a classic exercise in balance-of-power politics of the sort that Mr. Nixon and Dr. Henry Kissinger have long espoused.

In other words, it figures—which leaves you to wonder only by what set of values, or what sense of American obligations or security interests, or what reading of American sentiment, it is necessary at this stage of the game to go to the brink with the Russians over Vietnam?

We were told long ago of a plan "to end the war." Can this be it? Can the Russians, in fact, maintain their position in the world while telling their sister socialists in North Vietnam to abandon what they have been fighting for these forty years?

We were told that the South Vietnamese could "hack it by themselves." Are we now to believe that what this really means is that this country must not only continue to provide massive combat air support but also to confront the Russians with the twin threats of aerial and naval blockades against North Vietnam? Is this what "Vietnamization" is all about? Or isn't the real meaning of the Hanoi-Haiphong raids that "Vietnamization" doesn't work well enough to guarantee the President the kind of outcome of the current Vietnam fighting he could feel comfortable with, either in Moscow at next month's summit, or in the election campaign next fall?

This, in our view, is the nub of it—the sort of outcome the President wants and the risks that are worth taking to bring it about, for the risks involved do not seem to us to bear any relationship to the possible gains. If the President's "Vietnamization" policy is as successful as he would have us believe, we have done all that we could reasonably have been expected to do for the Saigon government and we ought to fix a date for our total military disengagement, negotiate as best we can for the return of our prisoners, and get out.

If "Vietnamization" turns out, in fact, to be less than it has been proclaimed to be, the end of it all in Vietnam may then be something well short of what we set out to accomplish, and some might even see it as "dishonorable." Against that ultimate, and still hypothetical judgment, however, you have to weigh the honor, not to say the sanity of trying to influence the outcome in Vietnam at this late date by resuming bombing in or around population centers in North Vietnam for the indirect and largely theoretical effect this may have on the actions of the men in power in Moscow or Peking or Hanoi.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1972]

OF BLOOD AND SLOGANS

Slogans can have a fateful significance.

Taking office in 1969 on a pledge "to end the war and win the peace," President Nixon made a fateful decision concerning the true content of that vague but beguiling campaign slogan. "Winning the peace," he decided, meant that an anti-Communist Government had to be consolidated in power in South Vietnam. Otherwise the "peace" would be lost because additional military effort by the Communists would soon bring them the victory they have long sought.

Since the United States and its South Vietnamese allies had not conclusively defeated the Communists on the field of battle, there was no immediate visible way to "win the peace" in Mr. Nixon's special sense of that term. As a result, "ending the war" had to be indefinitely postponed and the subtly but significantly different objective of "winding down the war" had to be substituted. Even this phase had to be defined in a special sense. The war itself was not wound down; on the contrary, it was extended to Cambodia and Laos and American bombing greatly increased. What was "wound down" was the scale of American involvement in the ground fighting.

When these special Nixonian interpretations have been decoded, that 1968 promise "to end the war and win the peace" translates into ordinary English as a promise "to continue the war until the enemy concedes defeat and accepts American peace terms."

Would the American people have accepted Mr. Nixon's leadership four years ago if they had understood the true import of his slogan? The question is unanswerable. What can be said is that the Communist forces in Vietnam are not prepared to accept Mr. Nixon's special definitions. The bloody fighting of the last ten days demonstrates that the war was not ended.

South Vietnam's Army has been able to achieve at least a temporary stalemate but on terms that have ominous implications for long-term American involvement. Only massive American bombing, including heavy raids in North Vietnam itself, enabled the South Vietnam forces to halt the Communist advance. And it is the precarious position of South Vietnam's embattled forces that has led to the weekend's American escalation of the air war near Haiphong and Hanoi.

If American air support on a large scale is the essential prerequisite for staving off a South Vietnam defeat, the United States may be fighting an air war in Southeast Asia for several more years—on and on into the indefinite future in an elusive effort to "win" an ever-receding "peace."

America's involvement in the Vietnam war cannot be satisfactorily ended until this country obtains the release of its prisoners of war. Every new air raid means more pilots shot down and captured. The number of American prisoners steadily grows. Thus, every raid not only brings death and devastation to Vietnam but postpones the end of the war.

The war is being fought to determine the political future of South Vietnam. Since the United States cannot win the war by means acceptable to the American people, it has to achieve peace by a political compromise with its Communist adversary. A negotiated settlement is the only alternative to more bombing, more bloodshed, more prisoners. Deceptive slogans can no longer obscure that harsh choice.

(From the Des Plaines Herald, Apr. 13, 1972)

IT MUST BE THEIR WAR

The current four-front Communist offensive in South Vietnam—which sharply threatens the security and well-being of that country—again points out an often-evident contradiction in American foreign policy.

On one hand, the United States has maintained a military presence in South Vietnam—but a presence which has been sharply reduced in recent years. Currently there are 95,000 American troops in that country—a figure which could drop to 35,000 men by Election Day in November.

In the meantime we have aggressively promoted the Vietnamization concept—the development of a self-sufficient South Vietnamese fighting force. Such development has been based on the belief that a friendly South Vietnamese government is vital to our self-interest.

Military, there is no contradiction if peace comes to Vietnam and we can continue to withdraw our troops.

Today, however, Vietnamization is beginning to appear as a partial failure. In the past two weeks the North Vietnamese offensive has pushed the South Vietnamese troops in some cases into a wild retreat. It would be generous to say that the performance of the South Vietnamese military has been unimpressive.

American air power is the only element which has had an obvious effect in stemming the onslaught of Communist tanks and firepower. Our air power even failed during the first three days of the invasion; bad weather cut into our flight schedule and allowed 10,000 men and Communist tanks to flood across the DMZ.

Is more American troops the answer to stemming the floodtide? President Nixon has steadfastly rejected "more troops" as an option, but it is unclear what are his other options.

But if the invasion continues to be successful, will the pressure for help from the South Vietnamese government be too great to resist? We doubt it; political pressure in this country against reescalation is all-powerful in this election year.

Nonetheless, the United States military machine is still in Vietnam, through its troops and its massive air power—and still it is not the South Vietnamese war to win or lose. There will still be American casualties, whether through the loss of aircraft or through the occasional deaths of some of our 95,000 "military advisers" (a term which takes us ominously back to 1961 and 1962.)

We termed Vietnam a "quagmire" in a Herald editorial on Feb. 3, because the U.S. foreign policy logic held us in Vietnam as a dominant military and political force. It is a logic which continues to pull us inexorably further and further back into the conflict.

Withdrawal is the only realistic solution for us. We should not allow our basic sympathy for the South Vietnamese government (a sympathy which has allowed us to prop it up time after time) to confuse us about the basic nature of the conflict.

Today, it is South Vietnam's war to win or lose. American air support will only result in deeper American involvement (although it may temporarily ease the military pressure on the south).

In short, Vietnamization must rise or fall on its own. Americanization—in any military sense—will not aid the people or the government of South Vietnam. It is their war, to win or lose.

HAZARDOUS OPEN CANALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would have the Interior Department fund up to 50 percent of the cost of converting existing open canals in urban areas to closed conduits or of providing safety fencing along these canals.

The Bureau of Reclamation has recognized the need for improving safety conditions on federally constructed canals but has failed to recommend appropriate legislation which would fulfill this need. Meanwhile, children continue to drown in these waterways.

This month, two young New Mexico children drowned in a canal operated by the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. Forty-one other New Mexicans have drowned in canals operated by this district in the last 13 years. I understand that similar deaths across the Nation now number in the hundreds. The time is long overdue for action to be taken to eliminate the safety hazard these reclamation projects present to our children.

The costs of implementing the bill I am introducing today may be high; however, when this Nation can spend over $400 million to send three astronauts to the moon, it can also afford to spend what is needed to save the lives of hundreds of its children.

I am not wedded to the 50–50 cost sharing formula in my bill and will wholeheartedly welcome any reasonable amendments which the Bureau of Reclamation or anybody else has to offer relating to this proposal.

In closing, let me point out that our children will soon be out of school for the summer vacations. Time is of the essence and I urge that this legislation be acted upon as soon as is reasonably possible.

The following is the text of the bill I am introducing today:

H.R. 14403

A bill to authorize Federal cost sharing in promoting public safety through the elimination of hazardous open canals by converting them to closed conduits and by fencing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the intent of Congress that the United States encourage safety to the public in urban areas by sharing in the cost of converting open canals to closed conduits and of safety fencing of large canals which are economically infeasible to enclose in conduits.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may provide funds not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of converting existing open canals in or adjacent to urban areas to closed conduits or of providing for safety fencing of large canals in or adjacent to urban areas. Except as provided in subsection (b), the assistance provided under this Act shall be under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The portion of the cost of projects described in subsection (a) not provided by the United States may be provided by labor and materials, as well as by money. The costs of labor and material so provided shall be determined by their fair market value.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

THE CONTINUING VIETNAM DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 I have been communicating to American Presidents my deep belief that it was not in America's self-interest to continue the war in Vietnam. I suggested many years ago that we would now be able to obtain our prisoners of war and account for our missing in action as part of a total withdrawal from the Vietnam war.

Those of us who have followed the progress of the fighting in Vietnam closely for the past 5 years have repeatedly indicated that Vietnamization was not a viable military policy because a stalemate which involved the South Vietnamese supported by 500,000 American troops and massive air power would certainly deteriorate once the American military forces were reduced. It has also been clear that massive bombing would not stop the war since we have dropped over 2½ times the tonnage of bombs on Vietnam than was used in both the European and Pacific theaters of World War II.

This is also unconstitutional, because it exceeds the President's constitutional powers. Any possible authorization for a new war in North Vietnam by the President was withdrawn with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution by the Congress.

I have tried during the past 2 years to make these views known both by public statements and by my votes on the various resolutions designed to provide for withdrawal of our troops, the return of our prisoners of war, and a termination of our participation in this war.

I shall this week participate in those activities in Congress which are designed to remove the United States from the war in Vietnam. This is the only way I know to stop further killing of Americans and Vietnamese and the horrible devastation of the whole Vietnam countryside. This will also achieve the release of our prisoners of war.

I have this day communicated these views by letter to the President of the United States.

Whether Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam will be under one form of government or another will be decided by the people indigenous to those areas as was true in the beginning, is now and ever shall be.

POSTAL SERVICE IN ALASKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I submit into the RECORD a transcript of my testimony before the House Subcommittee on Postal Service. The State of Alaska has been the forgotten child of the Postal Service and as a result has had inadequate service. My remarks describe a number of specific problems and an expression of the general needs for improvement. I hope my colleagues and my constituents will be interested in these remarks:

STATEMENTS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman: I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to express my feelings on the problems and progress of the new U.S. Postal Service. It was my hope that the new service would be able to avoid the mistakes and difficulties of the old. Unfortunately, they have not.

I believe that a basic problem of the Post Office Department, under the old system in the State of Alaska, was aligning the various agencies and private interests responsible for service and coordinating their activities. Among other agencies, postal service in Alaska depends upon the Coast Guard for delivery to island and coastal villages; upon the many commercial carriers under Post Office contract, and upon the Federal Aviation Administration for a wide variety of services. It was in the realm of the postal service to overcome these inter-agency difficulties, seek to eliminate unnecessary red tape and provide the kind of service that Alaskans deserve. However, after almost a full year of existence, the United States Postal Service has not managed to substantially alter the pattern of bureaucratic non-cooperation among contract carriers or to secure dependable branch-post office operation.

There are villages that get mail only one in three months during the winter. Mail from the outskirts of Anchorage and Fairbanks can take as long as ten days to reach the city. In a state virtually without television and very limited radio facilities, mail takes on unprecedented importance. The residents of many communities have an even greater dependence on the mails than just communication. For them, the mails are the only source of medicine and the major source of groceries and other essentials.

This new agency gives the same excuses as the old. "Alaska is too far, too large and too cold," they tell us. "Alaska does not have enough customers, so it is not good business sense to spend money there." I wonder if this agency was designed to exert good business sense at the cost of good service? Must Alaskans be denied regular communication because it isn't profitable? I should say that the old excuses have some merit. Alaska is indeed far away, and very large and very cold in the winter months. While this can serve as the basis for some adjustments, I believe mail service in Alaska must be as nearly equal as possible.

In spite of the difficulties, the need for tremendously improved service cannot be disputed. I would hope that the imagination of the Postal Service could be directed towards coping with those difficulties, using the increased freedom of the new service!

From a file of scores of complaints, I have selected a few cases that serve to show the general situation.

(1) St. George Island—Bering Sea:

One example of service difficulty is the Island of St. George, population 250. Last year, direct service was by a two-engined carrier under contract with the Post Office Department. It made direct deliveries from the mainland a total of four times. All other deliveries were either by air drop or by boat from St. Paul Island. The Federal Aviation Administration then decided to limit carrier service from the mainland to four engined crafts, too big for St. George's runway. Thus, all air service, including airdrops, abruptly ended. Now, St. George receives no direct mail at all and must await boat delivery from St. Paul. In bad weather, service does not exist. In all, St. George receives letters and parcels about ten times a year, mostly in summer months. This is far more distressing considering that the residents of the island depend upon parcel deliveries as their main source of fruit and groceries, and their only source of medicine. Meanwhile, according to the Postal Service, it would cost only $12,000 to increase service to twice a month, and $25,000 to make delivery once a week.

(2) Ketchikan—Southeastern Alaska:

The following letter was received in my office from a resident of Ketchikan:

"DECEMBER 6, 1971.

"DEAR NICK: Could you please tell us what has gone so completely wrong with our mail system?

"Why can't the postal system operate with at least the efficiency that it did 15 to 20 years ago? Now we realize that in the winter airmail is delayed 2 or 3 days at a time between Seattle and Alaska. We know when the planes land here and when they don't, and we take this into consideration.

"In the old days of the steamships every week or ten days we had first class mail the day after the steamer arrived and packages and the like the second day.

"Now days they get 3 vans of mail a week and the vans are seldom full. The transfer company takes the mail to the post office in a smaller truck yet it sits in the post office for several days.

"One of the Avon dealers in town went to the post office and asked why her order was not delivered as she knew when it was shipped. The postal clerk told her that when it arrived it would be delivered. This woman could see Avon packages with her name on from the counter where she stood asking about them.

"The zip code numbers were supposed to speed up delivery. We have noticed that letters without the zip code numbers get to us quicker, and we get more of other peoples mail in our box than before the zip code numbers were used.

"Now for the local mail such as council, borough, lodge and special meeting notices mailed in the post office from 3 days to a week ahead of time arrive after the meeting night. In days past, these notices mailed one day were delivered or in the PO boxes the next day.

"As far as we are concerned, we would rather have the mail handled in the P.O. the same as it was 38 years ago when we came here. We have always been under the impression that modernizing a system was not to slow down or make it inefficient.

"If a letter with a few hundred names on it to someone in the postal system would help straighten this matter out I assure you it will be quite easy to get.

"Yours truly,

"JEAN and EDWIN MEADOR.

"KETCHIKAN, ALASKA."

[The village of Alakanuk—Southwestern Alaska—article from the Tundra Times, Jan. 26, 1972]

"RAIN, SNOW, SLEET, HAIL DELAY MAIL—ALAKANUK ACCUSES WIEN FOR NOT DELIVERING MAIL

"Traditionally, neither rain, snow, sleet or hail will keep the postman from his appointed rounds but something sure is delaying him in Alakanuk.

"Villagers are so concerned they've passed a resolution on the subject.

"During the last several weeks and many period before that, Wein Consolidated Airlines has been seemingly neglecting regular mail and air freight services to Alakanuk.

" 'There have been many times when the airfield here was open during good weather but Wein didn't come or would send a small chartered plane with the mail instead.

" 'For an example: On January 4, 1972, a council member and about 11 other passengers were waiting for transportation to Bethel. Some had urgent meetings to attend and others were going to the hospital, etc. The airlines canceled the flight for no apparent reason.

" 'That same day, January 4, 1972, there was a flight into Emmonak and they left the mail. This is a distance of about eight miles to the north.

" 'On many occasions when the mail has been left off at Emmonak, thereby laying up for sometimes a week at a time, and the Postmaster here has made many trips up to bring mail back by snowmobile and sled, which he is doing at his own will so the people can get the much needed mail. If he did not do this, the backlog of mail would be very great.

" 'This does not make any sense when Wien Consolidated Airlines has the mail contract from the U.S. Postal Service to service the village at a regular schedule.

" 'This is a small example of the very irregular air-service this village has been getting during the past, and this village feels that it is past due for some changes in our service.' "

"This resolution is dated January 8, 1972 and arrived at the Tundra Times post office box in Fairbanks on January 21."

The story of these three villages reflects the situation in much of Alaska. It not only effects general communications, but can seriously impair business operations such as "Pictures, Inc." A letter from Dick Norman General Manager, explains his difficulties and those of other Alaskans similarly situated.

"PICTURES, INC.,

"Anchorage, Alaska, February 15, 1972.

"DEAR NICK: Not wanting to hound you with repetitious information, I have not written you in months regarding the deteriorated U.S. Mail service in Alaska. My silence, however, should not be taken as an indication of improvement in this service. Mail service in the bush continues to be the worst we have experienced since the improvement that followed the end of World II. It is not uncommon for a motion picture to take four to eight weeks to reach a village after mailing from Anchorage. I attach a copy of the Tundra Times article regarding mail service at Alakanuk, which I feel to be a fair description of the situation in many villages today.

"We regularly provide the Anchorage Post Office with information on specific cases of mail delay and with copies of complaint letters from our customers. On February 9, 1972, we provided a list of *110* motion pictures which had been out more than five weeks to fill a one-day playdate and still had not returned. A few of these had been out more than ten weeks.

"I think it wrong to criticize individuals in the postal system in Alaska in connection with this breakdown in service. Postal officials here, for the most part, are trying their best under nearly impossible conditions. It seems to be the system itself which has broken down. With no postal service officers in Alaska to monitor carrier performance, with postal officials having neither the manpower nor the authority to penalize the carriers for letting mail sit day after day, sometimes week

after week, at bush transfer points, how can one blame the postal officials within Alaska for the collapse in service? I wish to add my voice to those of the people of Alakanuk and other communities in praying that action be taken by the U.S. Postal Service in Washington to give postal officials in Alaska the *means* to render adequate service.

"Sincerely yours,

"DICK NORMAN,
"General Manager."

Other villages and businesses raise similar complaints with carriers and post offices. Miss Patricia Oakes of Circle City writes to complain about post office window hours being completely incongruous with the needs of the community. She also complains that Star Route services were cut in mid-winter, cutting the central area of Alaska without warning. Harry K. Evon, President of the Kwigillingok Village Council, complained on January 20th that the air carrier was not only missing pick-ups and deliveries, but that agreed airdrop policies were not being enforced in "freeze-up" conditions. The carrier contracted by the Post Service was refusing to perform its responsibilities to make drops when landing was impossible.

It is apparent that the postal service is trying to improve on its predecessor's record. In a letter to my office dated March 21, 1972, John W. Powell, Congressional Liaison for the Postal Service, informed me that

["The Postmaster General has stated that the U.S. Postal Service exists to serve its customers . . . Toward this end, a pilot program known as 'Operational Speedy' has been launched in the Western Region, including Alaska, for improvement in our special delivery service."] In an enclosed information booklet, items stated that this speed-up project began on February 14, 1972, and that 'Operation Speedy' is expected to provide immediate improvements in the processing and delivery of Special Delivery mail in the Western Region."

Much to my disappointment, the following appeared in an article in the February 28th U.S. News and World Report. "Particularly frustrating, some mailers say, is that special delivery seldom seems to speed-up letters." "A West Coast firm recently mailed 68 special delivery letters, matched by first class and air mail letters to the same address. Only two of the 68 specials beat the regular first-class or air mail and 38 arrived in the same delivery with the regular mail. Twenty-eight came later, with two special delivery letters taking two days longer."

Mr. Chairman, the theme of my remarks is simple and straightforward. I applaud and support the new Postal Service; I believe it promises better postal service in the future. My hope is that improvement comes at the earliest possible time, and I pledge my own cooperation toward that end. Further, I am convinced that, in Alaska and elsewhere, the personnel of the Postal Service is dedicated and hardworking.

Still, I must in all honesty report to this committee that, in my view, the mail service to and within Alaska has not appreciably improved under the new system. In two specific cases, I find this particularly disappointing. First, I believe postal service in Alaska requires flexibility and unique methods, things that a private and independent service should be able to provide.

Second, I believe postal service for Alaska requires a sensitive understanding of the special role mail has in areas where there are no roads, no telephones, and no radios. Again, I believe such an understanding should be forthcoming from the new private and independent service.

Alaskans find it difficult to continue to hear that Alaska is "too far, too large and too cold" to get proper service. They are expecting improvements, and so am I.

HEARINGS ON NONIMMIGRANT VISA ACT

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, I wish to announce to my colleagues that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold 1 day of hearings on H.R. 6366, a bill to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists to the United States.

These hearings will be held on Thursday, April 20, in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building and will begin at 10 a.m.

H.R. 6366 would authorize the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to issue regulations exempting visitors to the United States for 90 days or less from the visa requirement and from certain grounds of ineligibility.

Governmental and private witnesses have been scheduled to testify at the hearing.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, during the past year and a half, whenever the subject of Vietnam arose in this House, I warned my colleagues that we must not let Richard Nixon lull the American people into believing that the war was over, that it was no longer an issue. I pointed out time and again that only the nature of the U.S. role in that war had changed, not the substance of our policy and certainly not our open-ended commitment to keep the Thieu regime in power. I argued that the so-called Vietnamization program was not a means for ending American involvement in Indochina, but rather a cynical vehicle for perpetuating our military presence in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand.

Recent events in Vietnam and the administration's response to them have provided ample proof of the validity of my assessment and the urgency of the need for Congress to legislate an immediate end to our costly and tragic role in the war.

First, the North Vietnamese offensive demonstrated beyond any doubt that despite our massive military support and active involvement with the Government of South Vietnam, the capability of the North to carry on the war is undiminished. While I profess no great military expertise, it seems apparent that the sole result of our expenditure of American lives and dollars has been to merely postpone the inevitable.

Second, President Nixon's decision to resume the massive bombing of North Vietnam demonstrates that his policy is not to get out of the war, but to win it militarily. Bombing Haiphong and other targets in North Vietnam really gives no added protection to the U.S. troops being withdrawn. The bombing has little if any connection to the North Vietnamese offensive, since that was aimed primarily at areas held by the South Vietnamese Army. And it has no connection with protecting either our ground troops, our pilots, or our prisoners of war.

It is interesting that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at a closed briefing for certain Members of Congress last week revived the discredited theory that if the United States just turned loose its military might we could end the war in short order. This is a terrifying development, not because Congress or the American people would stand for a return to that line of thought, but because it is still being advocated at the very highest levels of this administration.

Finally, it seems incredible to me that some administration sources have justified the bombing attacks on the ground that they are intended to be a warning to the Soviets against increasing military support to North Vietnam. The fact of the matter is that the United States, on the basis of those figures the White House has not kept classified, is actually providing South Vietnam with 10 times the military aid being given North Vietnam by the Soviet Union and Communist China combined. And it seems to me that our renewal of the bombing can contribute nothing to establishing a receptive atmosphere for the President's trip to Russia or to progress in reaching agreement on strategic arms limitation.

And so we find ourselves back where we were 4 years ago—inextricably caught up in a war in which we have no real national security interest, pouring billions of American dollars down an Asian rathole and further widening the credibility gap between our Government and the people.

It is past time to reawaken the American people to this war. It is time to mobilize again the armies of peace. It is time for Congress to assert its constitutional responsibilities. It is time to end the war.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) yield?

Mr. BADILLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 I have been communicating to American Presidents my deep belief that it was not in America's self-interest to continue the war in Vietnam. I suggested many years ago that we would now be able to obtain our prisoners of war and account for our missing in action as part of a total withdrawal from the Vietnam war.

Those of us who have followed the progress of the fighting in Vietnam closely for the past 5 years have repeatedly indicated that Vietnamization was not a viable military policy because a stalemate which involved the South Vietnamese supported by 500,000 American troops and massive air power would certainly deteriorate once the American military forces were reduced. It has also been clear that massive bombing would not stop the war since we have dropped over 2½ times the tonnage of bombs on Vietnam than was used in both the European and Pacific theaters of World War II.

This is also unconstitutional, because it exceeds the President's constitutional powers. Any possible authorization for a new war in North Vietnam by the President was withdrawn with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution by the Congress.

I have tried during the past 2 years to make these views known both by public statements and by my votes on the various resolutions designed to provide for withdrawal of our troops, and the return of our prisoners of war, and a termination of our participation in this war.

I shall this week participate in those activities in Congress which are designed to remove the United States from the war in Vitnam. This is the only way I know to stop further killing of Americans and Vietnamese and the horrible devastation of the whole Vietnam countryside. This will also achieve the release of our prisoners of war.

I have this day communicated these views by letter to the President of the United States.

Whether Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam will be under one form of government or another will be decided by the people indigenous to those areas as was true in the beginning, is now and ever shall be.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order because it is essential at this time to demonstrate that there are people within the American Government who have not lost all connection with the reality that exists in Southeast Asia today.

By ordering one of the most massive air armadas in human history to resume the bombing of North Vietnam, the administration has destroyed the last vestige of pretense that it is interested in getting out of our military involvement in Indochina. It has demonstrated beyond dispute that Vietnamization is a fraud; that neither in the White House nor in Saigon is there any serious intention of withdrawing our massive military presence from Indochina. If there were any who failed to perceive the growing gap between the rhetoric of Vietnamization and the reality of our involvement in the fighting, they must now see that the President has no more intention of withdrawing from Indochina than he has of withdrawing from Florida or California.

The tragic fact is that the President—ignoring the overwhelming lesson of the past 10 years—remains determined to impose a political settlement of his own devising in South Vietnam. Ten years, more than $100 billion, the lives of more than 50,000 young Americans and millions of Asians have failed to impress this administration. Not until the American Government accepts the fact that the future political complexion of South Vietnam is beyond our capacity to determine will there be an end to the war in Indochina, and it is now clear beyond any dispute that not until the Congress of the United States asserts its constitutional right as a coequal branch will be Government take that position.

As Members of Congress, we are complicit in the devastation of Indochina as long as we fail to exercise our unquestioned right to end our participation in the war. The reckless and senseless reescalation of the bombing should bring home to all of us the need for legislating an end to the war immediately. Our obligation as the representative branch of Government cannot be met by anything else.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's Vietnamization program has not only been a failure—it has been a fraud. While the President has attempted to reassure the American people with a scene of a war dwindling away, the truth is that the administration is engaged in a massive escalation of the war in Southeast Asia.

Behind the facade of such terms as "Vietnamization" and "protective reaction," the facts of Vietnam remain as brutal and ugly as ever.

No amount of Presidential rhetoric can mask the fact that the President's policy is not one of peace—but of continued death and destruction.

We have not prevented a bloodbath in Vietnam. We have created one.

This dreadful war has drained our resources and stained our conscience. It has sacrificed thousands of our most precious possessions—our young men—to the jaws of death. It has warped our priorities. It has brought the twin plagues of unemployment and inflation to our economy. It has brought alienation, division, and bitterness to our people.

The President's policy of military adventurism is in direct violation of the will of the people and the letter of the law.

Section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971—Public Law 92-156—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.

Not only has the President ignored this—the law of the land—but he has embarked upon a policy in direct opposition to it.

As we meet here today, American war planes are ravaging Southeast Asia, spreading the conflict to the North including Hanoi and Haiphong. An American armada is being assembled off the coast of North Vietnam. As the Washington Post editorialized in this morning's paper:

> What President Johnson and his predecessors steadfastly tried not to do over 15 years or more, President Nixon has managed to do almost overnight: he has brought the war in Indochina to the brink of a head-on confrontation with the Soviet Union.

The people of this Nation have repeatedly demonstrated their steadfast opposition to such a policy: in the public opinion polls, in the voting booth, and in the streets. They want peace, and they want it now.

Yet the President—as deaf as his so-called majority is silent—continues to fuel the fires of conflict, involving us ever deeper in the devastation of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Such callous disregard for the will of the people and the laws of the United States cannot be countenanced.

As I have pointed out time and time again since I stood on this very floor and cast my vote against the very first appropriation bill to support American military intervention in Indochina in May of 1965, it is the Congress which has the constitutional responsibility over war and peace. And the Congress must exercise that responsibility—now.

We are the elected representatives of the American people. This House cannot close its eyes to their desires any longer.

This House cannot close its eyes to the horrors of war any longer.

This House cannot shirk its responsibilities any longer.

The war must end. And we must end it.

We have an obligation to our country and to ourselves to do everything within our power to bring the bloodshed and devastation in Vietnam to an immediate halt. I call upon my colleagues to join with me in demanding that the President order an immediate halt to all American air strikes in Southeast Asia; that he immediately order a resumption of the Paris negotiations and instruct our delegates to offer a commitment for the total withdrawal of all American troops by a prompt date certain in return for the release of our prisoners of war. And I ask my colleagues to join with me in supporting any and all legislation to cut off funding for this immoral and brutal war.

As I stated on May 5, 1965:

> We cannot bomb people into democracy, nor can we bomb people into negotiations.

It is high time that our policy in Southeast Asia reflect this fact.

The President's policy is only perpetuating the mistakes of the past, the horrors of the past. That policy must change. And it is the Congress that must change it.

On Saturday, April 15, I sent a telegram to the President on behalf of myself and the over 1,000 citizens participating in the Twelfth Annual West Side Community Conference which I sponsored. I include the text of that telegram at this point in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Over 1,000 citizens assembled for the 12th Annual West Side Community Conference, sponsored by the Democratic and Liberal Clubs of Manhattan's West Side and Representative William F. Ryan, demand the immediate cessation of all American bombing in South East Asia, the immediate resumption of the Paris peace talks, the immediate end of all American military adventurism, and the immediate withdrawal of all American forces from South East Asia.

Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN.
(Member of Congress on behalf of participants of the 12th Annual West Side Community Conference and himself.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S. air strikes on Hanoi and Haiphong are strange phenomena, indeed. On the one hand, the Congress and the public have been informed by the Nixon administration that the so-called Vietnamization program has been highly

successful, an assertion which has been repeated with each announcement of American troop withdrawal from Vietnam. On the other hand, we have been unwilling parties de facto to periodic escalations of the war. Winding down a war by taking the United States "to the brink of a head-on confrontation with the Soviet Union," to use a phrase from today's Washington Post lead editorial, demonstrates once again the underlying fallacy and weakness of the administration's Vietnam policy.

Mr. Nixon's highly touted plan of 4-years ago to end the war must today be relegated to the Emperor's new clothes—simply nonexistent. The hopes of the American people for the promised end of U.S. military involvement can be fulfilled only by complete cessation of our military participation. Peace in Vietnam will be attained not by the might of arms but by negotiation at the conference table. Why did President Nixon order our withdrawal from the peace talks in Paris? Is he oblivious to the lessons we learned from bombing North Vietnam during the Johnson administration? He must realize that we must talk peace and act peace if we are to attain peace.

Since President Nixon's professed march toward total military disengagement from Vietnam seems to falter with every seeming though indecisive step forward, and we find ourselves engaged in the greatest bombing raids in the war with great risks of greater involvement, the Congress must now take the initiative to end the war. I believe that H.R. 14055, a bill that I cosponsored, would do this. Subject to certain conditions regarding the release of prisoners of war and the accounting of the missing in action, the proposed legislation would, immediately upon enactment, terminate funds for air and naval bombardment of North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, and also terminate funds for bombing in South Vietnam unless the President determines such missions necessary to protect American troops during withdrawal and informs the Congress within 48 hours of such missions.

The proposed legislation deserves speedy and favorable consideration by the Congress.

"Brinkmanship," as evidenced by the recent Hanoi-Haiphong air strikes, is perilous at best. It also ignores the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, who just do not want any part of the continued war in Vietnam. As their representatives let us take the ball away from the President, who seems to be running the wrong way, and end a war which nobody wants.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, for four reasons, the President's newest escalation of the Indochina war—his decision to bomb the North Vietnamese cities of Hanoi and Haiphong—is tactically disastrous and unspeakably immoral.

These four reasons are outlined in "The Bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong: Beyond the Brink," a paper prepared by Project Air War, an information and research center in Washington, D.C.

First, the massive American B–52 bombing raids against these cities mark a dramatic and unprecedented increase in the level of violence in this war. The air raids over Haiphong on April 15, 1972, were the first time B–52's were ever used in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, and were also the first saturation bombing raids ever launched by American warplanes in that area.

Second, the use of B–52's against the heavily populated cities of Hanoi and Haiphong has necessarily led to the slaughter of civilians—a slaughter which it was our intention to avoid even at the height of American air involvement in North Vietnam in 1966 to 1968. Evidence from the Pentagon Papers shows that air bombing of North Vietnam results in casualties which are "about 80 percent civilians."

Third, the increased level of bombing in North Vietnam serves no useful military objective whatsoever. A front-page story in this morning's Baltimore Sun quotes American officials as acknowledging that the bombing of Haiphong "will have little impact on the current battlefield situation. U.S. officers say that the Hanoi-Haiphong area would have to be bombed continuously on a saturation basis for several months to cripple North Vietnam's war-making capabilities in the South perceptibly."

As early as 1967, a CIA study concluded that—

> Prospects are dim that an air interdiction campaign against LOC's (lines of communication) leading out of Haiphong alone could cut off the flow of seaborne imports and isolate Haiphong.

Fourth and finally, far from performing an essential military function or bringing our involvement in Indochina any closer to an end, the use of B–52 bombers in an escalated air war over North Vietnam prolongs the war, produces new prisoners of war, jeopardizes the well-being of Americans already held captive, and raises the prospect of additional, uncontrollable escalation by both sides, as well as military intervention by other countries. Can we honestly believe, after 10 years of every conceivable kind of evidence to the contrary, that we can defeat North Vietnam or settle this war by escalating the bombing? Obviously, this administration has learned nothing from the Pentagon Papers, which observed that—

> 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.

Why, then, has President Nixon ignored the lessons of our involvement in Indochina and ignored the overwhelming public sentiment against escalating the air war?

Because Vietnamization has turned out to be an unmitigated failure.

Because the political and military integrity of South Vietnam are apparently untenable.

Because the administration's abandonment of the peace negotiations in Paris has left the President no recourse except military escalation.

Because the President believes he can capitalize on what he apparently imagines to be a pervasive mood of apathy and unconcern among the American voting population.

Because of a decade of immorality and violence in our dealings with the nations of Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to insert in the RECORD the transcript of Project Air War's paper "The Bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong: Beyond the Brink." I urge every Member of Congress to consider the evidence offered herein. We must now act.

THE BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG: BEYOND THE BRINK

(A paper prepared by Project Air War, April 16, 1972)

Project Air War, 1322 18th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. is one of the major information centers in the country studying and analyzing the ongoing war, a conflict which has escalated in the air even as U.S. foot-soldiers have been withdrawn. Project Director is Fred Branfman, who spent four years in Laos and interviewed several thousand refugees from the bombs as well as dozens of American pilots and air war officials.

The Nixon Administration's decision to carry out surprise B52 raids in and around Haiphong is one of the most reckless and serious escalations of the war in the last 25 years. It is not only that the sudden, high-level, night-time, carpet bombing of an area inhabited by 300,000 people is an act of uncommon savagery, necessarily bringing death and injury to thousands. It is that until now Haiphong has stood as a symbol of ultimate American restraint in the face of intense domestic and worldwide criticism of the U.S. air war against Vietnam. By bombing Haiphong, the Nixon Administration is serving clear notice that it will stop at nothing in its attempt to maintain its position in Indochina.

Until now conventional wisdom has held that the Administration would keep to a low profile in Vietnam in this crucial Presidential election year. The bombing of Haiphong, however, makes it clear that Nixon places a far greater priority on victory in Vietnam. It is no longer unrealistic to suggest that only massive domestic and international protest and resistance may halt the total destruction of Hanoi and Haiphong, the mining of Haiphong harbor, devastation of the North's dike system, or even more blatant acts of mass murder.

The following facts must be noted:

1. *The B52 bombing of Haiphong was massive, indiscriminate and unprecedented.*

The Johnson Administration bombed Haiphong regularly from 1966 through 1968. But these strikes were limited in the "Prohibited Areas" of 4 nautical miles around Haiphong center. As a March 1968 Joint Chiefs of Staff memo noted, "The prohibited areas were created in December, 1966. Numerous strikes, however, have been permitted in these areas over the past two and one-half years, e.g., dispersed POL, SAM and AAA sites . . ." (Source: Pentagon Papers, Gravel Ed., IV, p. 255)

These past raids, however, were carried out by jet bombers with a relatively limited radius of bombing destruction. April 15, 1972 was not only the first time that B52s were sent over Haiphong, the use of dozens of these giant bombers ensured that saturation bombing occurred for the first time in the Haiphong area.

B52s are huge 8-engined aircraft with a crew of 6 and two 2,500 gallon wing tanks. Each sortie carries 25–30 tons of bombs, either as 108 five hundred pound bombs or 66 seven hundred fifty pound bombs or some combination thereof. Bombing from 30–35,000 feet, B52s leave craters 35 feet deep by 45 feet in diameter with their 500 pounders. A typical

B52 strike involves 6 B52s saturating a selected grid square, leaving a swath of destruction half a mile wide by 3 miles long. On April 14, the New York Times reported that about 150 B52s were in the Indochina theater, 50% more than were present at the very peak of the air war in 1968.

It may not be unreasonable to assume that at least 100 of these, along with dozens of assorted jet aircraft, were loosed on Haiphong on the night of April 14th.

The fact that these raids were carried out at night ensured that saturation and indiscriminate bombing of this heavily populated area was carried out. For at night, even the light spotter planes which sometimes guide B52 raids in the daytime for greater precision were unavailable. Neither, of course, were the ground spotters who made more precise B52 bombing possible during the siege of Khe Sanh.

2. *The use of B52s over Haiphong has necessarily led to the large-scale slaughter of civilians.*

Even when the air war against North Vietnam was carried out only by jets, the bombing caused heavy civilian casualties. As the Cornell Air War Study notes, "Targets . . . in a strategic bombing campaign are situated near predominately civilian areas. . . . The bombing inflicted severe civilian damage on the civilian society as a whole. . . . In 1967 the noncombatant casualty rate was quoted at 1,000 per week (Robert MacNamara) . . . and the equivalent casualty rate in the U.S. would be more than 600,000 per year."

The official population of Haiphong and its suburbs in 1960 was 369,248. Although many children and others were removed from the city during the mid-60s, many returned after the November, 1968 bombing halt. Given the population growth and surprise of the April 14th bombing attack, there may have been well over 300,000 people in the area hit by the B52s.

The Pentagon Papers make clear, moreover, that the heavy civilian casualties expected to occur from bombing Haiphong—and the worldwide protest they would entail—were the main reasons that Johnson did not agree to level it. As a memo of the ISA, prepared in Under Secretary of Defense Warnke's office reported: "Experience has indicated that systematic operations particularly against road and rail routes (in the Hanoi-Haiphong area) adds simply and slightly to repair burdens, while at the same time involving substantial civilian casualties in the many suburban civilian areas located along these routes."

Civilian casualties from the bombing, moreover, are by far the greatest portion. As a summary of the bombing of North Vietnam noted in 1966, "Estimated civilian and military casualties in NVN *also went up from 13,000 to 23–24,000. (About 80% civilians.)*" (Emphasis added, Pentagon Papers, Gravel Edition, IV, p. 136)

But although the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not dispute the heavy damage to civilians, they did not stop pushing for bombing Haiphong in any event. As the Pentagon Papers reported in October, 1967, "In addition to mining the harbors, the chiefs requested that the comprehensive prohibition in the Hanoi/Haiphong areas be removed with the expected increase in civilian casualties to be accepted as militarily justified and necessary."

The attitude of the military was put somewhat more pungently by Marine Commandant Gen. Wallace Greene in testimony before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, October 23, 1967: "We are at war with North Vietnam right now, today, and we shouldn't be so much interested in their anger as we are in bringing the war home to everyone of them up there." Army Chief of Staff Harold Johnson, testifying at the same hearing, was even more explicit: "I put 'innocent' civilians in quotation marks," he stated.

The B52 bombing of Haiphong clearly illustrates that the military has succeeded beyond its wildest dreams. Even at the height of the air war in 1968, there was no talk of loosing B52s on the Hanoi/Haiphong area.

There is no need to wait several months for the inevitable reports by American visitors to Haiphong of heavy civilian casualties from the April 14th raids. The official report of widespread use of B52s in the most heavily populated area of Indochina is evidence enough.

3. The B52ing of Haiphong serves no useful military end; its primary goal is to terrorize the Vietnamese into submission.

Preliminary reports on the Haiphong bombing indicate that the harbor itself was hit; however, it would be of limited military significance and have little effect on the fighting in the South.

An October 1967 CIA study clearly stated that a bombing campaign against lines of communication (LOCs)—such as roads and railroads—leading out of Haiphong would be useless. "Prospects are dim that an air interdiction campaign against LOC's leading out of Haiphong alone could cut off the flow of seaborne imports and isolate Haiphong."

The same report went on to conclude that even mining Haiphong Harbor would be militarily ineffective: ". . . The combined interdiction of land and water routes, including the mining of the water approaches to the major ports and the bombing of ports and transshipment facilities. . . . would . . . not be able to cut off the flow of essential supplies and, by itself, would not be the determining factor in shaping Hanoi's outlook to the war."

The reason is simple. Most of North Vietnam's military supplies do not come through Haiphong, but through China. As a study carried out under Defense Secretary Clifford noted in March, 1968, "The remaining issue on interdiction of supplies had to do with the closing of the port of Haiphong. Although this is the route by which some 80% of NVN imports come into the country, it is not the point of entry for most of the military supplies and ammunition. These materials predominately enter via the rail routes from China . . . the closing of Haiphong port would not prevent the continued supply of sufficient materials to maintain North Vietnam military operations in the South."

Indeed, the Clifford group concluded that an attack on Haiphong would actually be counter-productive: "Apprehensions about bombing attacks that would destroy Hanoi and Haiphong may at some time help move them toward productive negotiations. Actual destruction of these areas would eliminate a threat that could influence them to seek a political settlement on terms acceptable to us."

Why then was Haiphong attacked by B52s on April 14th?

The answer was put rather delicately by a New York Times article of April 14, 1972: "In a comment on the report of B52s going north: 'administration officials disclosed today that . . . the objectives were diplomatic and political as well as military.' "

Since the evidence is overwhelming that the attacks against Hanoi serve little useful military purpose, the only conclusion is that they are primarily "diplomatic" and "political".

In fact, John McNaughton put it more clearly in a January 18, 1966 memo: "To avoid the allegation that we are practising 'pure blackmail' the targets should be military targets and the declaratory policy . . . should be that our objective is only to destroy military targets." (Pentagon Papers, Gravel Edition, Volume IV, p. 45).

The B52ing of Haiphong and the later attacks against Hanoi are clearly little more than "pure blackmail".

Faced with a deteriorating military situation in South Vietnam, the Nixon Administration has responded by launching sneak terror attacks against Haiphong and Hanoi in an attempt to terrorize the Vietnamese into submission.

4. There is no evidence whatsoever that these attacks can succeed; On the contrary, they prolong the war, bring more POWs, and open up the prospect of far greater escalation.

The notion that bombing Hanoi and Haiphong will break the will of the Vietnamese is patently absurd. In October 1967, after the United States had already dropped nearly 300,000 tons of bombs on North Vietnam, a top-level Jason study of the bombing concluded: "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 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. (Pentagon Papers, Gravel Ed. IV, p. 223, 224.)

It must be understood that Nixon has left the Vietnamese no choice but to continue their present offensive. He has already dropped over 3.2 million tons of bombs on Indochina, more than any other leader in history; he has invaded Cambodia, doubled the bombing of Laos while invading it with 10,000 Thai soldiers in the North and 20,000 ARVN in the south, and had already hit North Vietnam on 328 admitted occasions before the March 30th offensive began; clearly he had no intention of negotiating an end to American involvement in Indochina, and had instead settled into a stable air war which extended indefinitely into the future. The Vietnamese have clearly concluded that they have no alternative to a military offensive to see the United States leave Indochina. To suggest that they will halt their offensive now that it has begun under the threat of bombing strains the imagination.

The desperate and reckless quality of the bombing is, moreover, no more dramatically illustrated than by its effect on the sensitive issue of captured American pilots.

To begin with, such bombing drastically increased the number of American pilots who are shot down and captured. Over 350 men who were alive and well when Richard Nixon took office are now listed as captured or missing in action. The great escalation in bombing over Hanoi and Haiphong—a heavily defended area—greatly enlarges their number. On April 15 alone Hanoi radio reported shooting down 4 jets and one B52, for a total of 14 men. In the week ending April 11, 19 men were listed as missing in action, most of them airmen.

In addition, an escalation of the bombing like this ensures the prolongation of internment of those men already captured, men who could be brought home were the Nixon Administration to negotiate an end to American involvement in Indochina.

And, most seriously, attacks against Hanoi/Haiphong greatly endanger the lives of those pilots now in captivity. As the study prepared under Clark Clifford reported in March 1968 states: "Although the NVN do not

mark the camps where American prisoners are kept . . . heavy and indiscriminate attacks in the Hanoi area would jeopardize the lives of these prisoners and alarm their wives and parents into vocal opposition." (Pentagon Papers, Gravel Ed., IV, p. 251–252).

The Nixon Administration's willingness to even risk drastically inflaming the delicate POW issue in this Presidential election year ominously suggests that it has abandoned reason.

In this situation, anything is possible.

The most frightening but real prospect at this point is that it may go so far as to bomb North Vietnam's dike system.

Within a few weeks, the waters of the Red River Delta will be swollen by rains, and the danger of flooding will be at its greatest. North Vietnam's greatest vulnerability has always been the ease with which the U.S. bombing could flood the country's rice-growing area and cause massive famine which could kill millions of people. High Air Force officers pressed hard for the bombing of the dike systems in the North during the Johnson Administration, and although bombing policy never went so far as an all-out effort against the system, the dikes were often hit as part of the effort to raise the cost for the civilian population. In May and July, 1966, for example, authorities of Nam Dinh city told New York Times correspondent Harrison Salisbury that U.S. planes had dropped 6 bombs on 2 kilometers of dikes which protected the city against floods, causing damage to many sections. Asked to comment later, the Defense Department did not deny the charge. According to Christopher Beal of the moderate Republican Ripon Society, some "punitive bombing" of Red River delta dikes was reported to him by "reputable non-Communist sources" in the summer of 1967, when the waters were at their seasonal high.

Whether or not this happens, however, present realities are ugly enough. A dramatic escalation has taken place, with American B52s and jets carrying out no-holds-barred bombing against the North.

Much of what will happen will be blacked out. On April 12, the Pentagon announced that from now on it would "probably not" give information to the public on U.S. bombing raids on any "regular" basis.

But unless public pressure is raised, when we do find out it may well tear this country apart.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese and the subsequent intensification and expansion of bombing by the United States make it necessary to define again our goals and policies in Indochina and to ask some pertinent questions about their very nature. Is our current reaction—the massive introduction of B–52 bombing raids on major populated centers of North Vietnam—likely to further our goals as they have been articulated by the President? Or are we in danger of falling into a pattern of actions whose implications are radically revising those goals?

In his third annual foreign policy report to Congress in February of this year, the President described his vision of U.S. policies designed "to shape a new American role in the world—to move from confrontation to negotiation with our opponents."

In a statement of April 7, 1971, he said that—

The American involvement is coming to an end. The day the South Vietnamese can take over their own defense is in sight. Our goal is a total American withdrawal from Vietnam. We can and will reach that goal through our program of Vietnamization.

He also stated upon entering office the realization that—

Further escalation of our military efforts would deepen the division in our society, could not assure success in a conflict which was as much political as military, and could risk a wider war.

Are the current bombing attacks on Hanoi and Haiphong designed to fulfill this vision of a new role in the world, to implement the goal of withdrawal via Vietnamization, to prevent a deepening of the divisions in our society, to assure success in a political conflict, or to avoid the risk of a wider war? Clearly they are not; indeed quite the opposite would appear to be the case. Rather than moving from confrontation to negotiation, the U.S. ambassador to the Paris peace talks unilaterally suspended further meetings at the end of March. Resumption of the talks, he said, would only be considered by the United States at such time as the North Vietnamese would express a sufficiently "serious" desire to negotiate on a meaningful basis. As a result, the only publicly known negotiating forum has ceased to exist for consideration of issues on any basis, meaningful or otherwise.

Rather than implementing our goal of withdrawal accompanied by Vietnamization, the degree of concentration of bombing and the return to those areas which had not been bombed since 1968 cannot help but give the observer a sense of déjà vu. Are we once again using the kind of rationale given at that time—that these strikes will "help reduce the enemy's capability to continue military activity in South Vietnam?" If so, how many years will it be until the enemy's capability is finally reduced, and how is this decreasing South Vietnam's continued dependency on U.S. military power?

Rather than preventing further division of our society, this latest reescalation of bombing will serve only to heighten the already widespread cynicism and distrust felt by major portions of our population. It is difficult for people to accept ground combat troop reduction figures as a reliable index of our disinvolvement when at the same time aircraft carriers and hundreds of airplanes are being deployed from other areas to Vietnam. It is difficult for families of prisoners of war to take to heart statements of concern for their relatives' plight when each plane that is shot down over North Vietnam adds a few more to the prisoner of war count. We can only hope that the statement promised by the President before May 1 will not call for a freeze on the process of troop withdrawals and will in fact announce continued withdrawals at the previous rate.

Rather than assuring success in a conflict which is political as well as military, our calling off of the Paris talks coupled with the bombings of the North is only producing an excruciating prolongation of the military aspect of the struggle. Failures of previous efforts to cut off the supplies, or to thwart the will of the North Vietnamese to fight, have shown that the other side is prepared to bear much greater sacrifices than are we in this war. Furthermore, it must be obvious to the South Vietnamese that all they have to do to insure our continued military presence is to make a few strategic withdrawals in the face of the Communist troops. It should be obvious to all that any political settlement must be negotiated between the North and the South. Our current actions are doing anything but encouraging that type of settlement.

Rather than avoiding the risk of a wider war, our bombing of the harbor of Haiphong seems to be dragging us close to the "brinkmanship" methods of the 1950's. As pointed out in a Washington Post editorial of April 17, the Russians and their aid to North Vietnam are undoubtedly the real target of the bombing strikes around Hanoi and Haiphong. And it appears quite possible that the President is willing to jeopardize Soviet-American relations, the SALT talks, the Europe detente, and Russia's alleged anxiety over China and East-West relations, all for the sake of salvaging whatever he envisions as an "honorable" way out of the war.

Thus, in comparing the fit of the current reescalation of hostilities with the goals which we must assume the reescalation is supposed to further, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the fit is a poor one at best. It the goals which the President has declared are indeed to be further, it is necessary for us to deescalate and to continue the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam. In the words of the President's February message to Congress:

It is long past time to still the sound of war, to return the men of both sides to their families, and to devote the energies of all to the fruitful tasks of peace.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MINK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the water resources development community of the country has rarely been in such ferment as we find it at this time. This is typified by the confusion, claims and counter-claims surrounding the standards and principles for evaluating water and related land resources projects.

This issue, of course, has been with us—in one form or another—for many years but never before has it gained the visibility and attention that has been shown to it in the last 2 years during the hearings held by the Water Resources Council in San Francisco, St. Louis and Washington, D.C.

I cannot remember when anything has so polarized the water resources

community as the question of discount rates as they are used in the "benefit-cost" analysis of water programs.

I doubt if there is a Member of this body who has not been approached on the question of whether the "opportunity cost of money" should be adopted for measuring benefits. So far as this Member is concerned, such a concept has no place in public decisionmaking and should be abandoned forthwith. One of the better and more cogent explanations of why this is so may be found in the statement prepared by Mr. Fred G. Simonton, executive director, Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, and by Mr. Ken Holum, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

I subscribe completely to the thrust and detail of this statement and commend it to my colleagues for careful consideration.

Mr. Simonton's statement along with comments by Mr. Ken Holum and a resolution adopted by the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association follow.

STATEMENT OF MID-WEST ELECTRIC CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association is the service organization of the rural electric cooperatives, municipal electric utilities and public power districts of the Missouri River Basin states. On December 7, 8 and 9 of 1971, the Association conducted its annual meeting in Denver, Colorado.

The 500 delegates in attendance considered the Administration's apparent attitudes towards water resource development projects. As a result of their deliberations, they unanimously adopted a resolution entitled "National Water Resources Development". Copies of that resolution are attached to this statement.

On February 10, 1972, the directors of the Association reconvened in special emergency session. At that time they reaffirmed their opposition to the proposed principles and standards, particularly as these standards recommend a 7% discount rate. They directed us to make that opposition known to the Water Resources Council with all of the force and vigor available to our Association.

The consumer-owned electric utilities affiliated with the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association support resource development because they know what these splendid programs have accomplished in the past and because they know what they can mean in the future for the social and economic well being of the High Plains States.

You understand, of course, that the members of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association maintain a keen interest in water resource development because the hydroelectric power generated at multi-purpose projects is an essential element of our power supply. In much of our area, rural electrification was not feasible until the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The decision to build the great dams on the Missouri River, together with the preference clause in the Flood Control Act, assured the Rural Electrification Administration that bulk power would be available to REA cooperatives at reasonable cost. With these assurances, rural electrification became a reality.

Similarly, our many small municipal members depend upon the Federal hydro program for bulk power supply. While it is true that the Federal System cannot meet their total needs after 1977, the Bureau of Reclamation program and the leadership available from that power marketing agency will be a real asset as they seek ways to meet growth needs economically and on a basis that is consistent with good environmental practices.

The Corps of Army Engineers is currently studying the potential addition of a million kilowatts of generation to the Federal System. Naturally, we are keenly interested in this substantial amount of completely clean and environmentally attractive electric power. We want this potential evaluated under standards and procedures and at discount rates that encourage the development and use of the resources.

We believe that proper evaluation is in the national interest and that construction of these facilities is an essential element of a good, environmentally sound conservation program.

Having identified Mid-West's power supply interest in the proposed standards and procedures and the 7% discount rate, let me hasten to add that our deepest concerns are related to economic and social problems in our region and across the country. We will not have served the region well if we concentrate our effort on low cost power supply while permitting the economy of the region to collapse as a result of ill-conceived Federal resource policies.

Because the electric utilities that make up our membership are all owned by their customers, they have a real commitment to economic growth, social well-being and healthy and attractive surroundings. We are completely convinced that policies and discount rates that unreasonably inhibit resource development adversely affect all three objectives.

Although we speak for an economically distressed, under developed region of the country, we are convinced that the proposals under consideration here today represent disaster both for the High Plains States and the congested areas of the country.

The seaboard states already have more people and higher level of economic development than their resources can support, producing social and economic problems in the central cities and polluted air, dirty water and generally unattractive living conditions.

The High Plains States have under-utilized resources and a declining economy. The two Dakotas have both lost population during the last decade, as did the entire region if you exclude three or four major metropolitan centers. More people live in the District of Columbia than live in either Dakota, and twice as many people live in Washington, D.C., as make their home in Wyoming.

The Council has proposed that the future benefits from water resource development be discounted at a 7% annual rate. You speak of the cost of money to the Treasury and the opportunity cost of money. The whole effort assumes that projects will not be built unless they can produce a favorable benefit-cost ratio, with future benefits discounted at a 7% rate.

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association disagrees completely with the Council's entire approach to economic evaluation. We believe that decisions to proceed or not to proceed with publicly-financed projects and programs should be based on social and economic needs and the total national interest—not contrived economic evaluations.

We fail to understand why the future benefits from Federal investments in water resource projects should be discounted at rates substantially higher than the actual cost of money to the Treasury. Why is our generation, and particularly this Administration, so reluctant to make significant investments in the country's future well being?

We have no quarrel with economic evaluations if Federal decision makers understand that the economic evaluations are one of many tools that can and should be utilized to determine the public programs that will go forward and the level at which they should be financed.

Speaking for our Association, former Assistant Secretary of Interior Ken Holum discussed economic evaluation of water resource projects at a hearing conducted by the Water Resource Council in Omaha, Nebraska, August 14, 1969. To refresh your memory, we want to make that entire statement a part of this record and we wish to call particular attention to one statement:

"We must understand, before we even begin the calculations, that it is possible, and in fact quite likely, that projects with marginally favorable or even unfavorable benefit cost ratios are meritorious from the standpoint of the total national good. The total good includes social effects such as employment, more equitable income, gains for all groups, community stability, small business opportunity, and improved prospects for orderly growth among all basins, regions, and states."

Frankly, we consider the Council's approach to resource related decision making quite unsophisticated. Apparently you wish to rely on complicated and imprecise economic evaluations because you have been unable to develop more appropriate guidelines for policy development and decision making. You require economic evaluations because you lack confidence in your ability to identify the public good without artificial measuring devices. Your economic guidelines apparently are developed as a substitute for good judgment and public interest evaluation on the part of individuals who are supposed to be decision makers.

With all of your short-falls you look good, however, when compared to the thirteen organizations that have circulated a so-called "Citizens Alert" which says in part:

"A high discount rate will make economic evaluations more realistic and will eliminate many destructive water projects which are economically unsound."

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association doesn't want "destructive projects" built regardless of their economic attractiveness. By the same token, we don't want imprecise economic evaluations to stop the country from meeting its social, economic and environmental obligations.

We urge you to remember that the criteria used for making economic evaluations is much more important than the discount rates applied to future benefits.

Discounting future benefits from land and water projects at a 7% rate is certain to result in benefit cost-ratios below unity for most projects in the thinly populated areas of the country.

We would expect the same result with respect to most public activities if they were to be evaluated on a basis similar to the criteria for water resource projects that we are discussing here today. This, of course, is the reason these activities are conducted by public agencies and not by the private, profit-motivated sector of the economy.

Should we abandon Rural Free Delivery because the benefit-cost is better in New York City? Should we discontinue mail service to small mid-western towns because the service does not produce economic benefits comparable to the yields that might be expected if we invested our tax dollars in steel mills?

The Association maintains its office in Denver, Colorado. Does the Council propose an economic evaluation to determine the merits of maintaining Rocky Mountain National Park as compared with logging its forests and mining its minerals? Of course you don't, and neither do we.

We applaud the new emphasis on urban parks and Federal recreation areas close to big cities. We see no need whatsoever to apply economic evaluations to programs designed to make wholesome, outdoor recreation available to the urban poor.

The thirteen organizations sponsoring "Citizen Alert" demand that beneficiaries pay a greater share of the projects' costs. We

wonder how they propose to have the beneficiaries of Federal fish hatcheries, wild rivers and national parks and recreation areas reimburse the Treasury for these splendid public activities. Will they install toll gates at Federally financed urban parks and charge the float fishermen for enjoying the wild rivers system?

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association is convinced that the high discount rates under consideration will produce results completely different from the results assumed by their sponsors and supporters.

Does the National Administration really want to adopt and pursue policies that will force more and more people into the nation's congested metropolitan centers? Will doing so achieve desirable social or economic goals? Will it enhance the national environment?

Do the thirteen organizations really want to stifle economic growth in the High Plains States by terminating Federal participation in resource development? Are they willing to see the stringent standards they advocate applied to all public programs and activities? Do they really advocate giving the Executive Branch authority to overturn Acts of Congress by executive rule making? Can it really be that they oppose Federal assistance to those regions of the country that have failed to share in economic growth?

Are our public officials and citizen organizations so unsophisticated and lacking skills that they must terminate water resource development completely to stop the construction of "destructive projects"? Will we proceed on this basis against all public programs where questionable decisions have been made? Do we terminate urban redevelopment because of the program's shortfalls? We can all identify freeways that should have been left unbuilt—does their construction justify terminating the farm to market road program?

We have heard it said that a few units in the National Park System do not meet the high standards we like to expect of National Parks. Does their existence justify liquidating the System? Rubbish!

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association is willing to agree that there are potential benefits from the re-examination of resource development that has been stimulated by the Council's studies and proposals. Like all other public activities, these programs have had their great successes. We have little doubt that there are instances more sophisticated planning and decision making would have produced better results.

The Council's proposals have obviously stimulated interest in and attracted attention to an important item in our public activity that can benefit from constructive re-examination. By doing so, you have rendered a public service and deserve commendation. However, we urge the Council to recognize that the course of action you have identified on a tentative basis is not the answer to the problem you are trying to solve.

We are equally convinced that the thirteen organizations that have circulated "Citizens Alert" cannot really be satisfied with the course of action they have suggested. We cannot believe that they care to be identified with the termination of a great program because they are dissatisfied with a few decisions made by public officials responsible for administering the program. They have found themselves re-acting to another group's proposal, when they are really seeking an opportunity to participate in developing better methods of public decision making. They must have a higher degree of sophistication than the positions taken in "Citizens Alert" suggests.

Under the circumstances, the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association urges the Council to set aside its proposed standards and procedures and its high discount rate and begin a new evaluation of Federal water resource development programs. We urge you to seek out more modern and more sophisticated techniques with the help of a wide variety of citizens and citizens groups.

We hope that we are right in assuming that all individuals and organizations, including the National Administration, that have been involved in this re-examination are looking for better directed Federal resource development programs rather than their termination.

COMMENTS OF KEN HOLUM

The statement you have just heard presents the views of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association. I have participated with Mr. Simonton in its preparation and I agree completely with the point of view that it expresses. This short supplemental statement indicates why I have come to these conclusions.

In 1961 I came to the Department of Interior from a farm home in South Dakota. As Assistant Secretary of Interior for Water and Power Development, from 1961 to 1969, it was my duty to provide secretarial direction to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Power Marketing Agency. After the Congress created the Water Resources Council, I worked with the Council as the Secretary of Interior's alternate and as a member of the Council of Representatives.

As a South Dakota farmer and as a public official, I have had the opportunity and the responsibility of being involved with Federal water resource activities over a long period of time. My South Dakota background compels my continuing support for a well-managed, adequately funded Federal water resource development program. My experiences as a public official force me to conclude that contrived economic evaluations, no matter how well they are prepared, cannot and should not supplement good judgment and wise decision making by public officials.

As a citizen, I am equally concerned that over emphasizing the importance of economic evaluations and the application of high discount rates will diminish rather than increase the opportunity for citizen and citizen groups to participate in and influence the decision making process as it affects resource development.

Bad projects shouldn't be built because a computer says it will produce a favorable benefit cost ratio, and an urgently needed one shouldn't be discarded because its long-term benefits cannot survive discounting at 7%. Do we propose to measure all of our obligations to the nation's future well being in terms of current dollars?

Mid-West suggests utilizing the interest and citizen concern developed by the Council's studies to begin a concerted effort, with maximum citizen participation, to develop more sophisticated methods of decision making in the resources field. I concur enthusiastically in that suggestion.

Our suggestion assumes that the Council is not advocating discount rates that are substantially above the cost of money to the Treasury as an indirect method of terminating resource development.

If we are correct, I find it impossible to believe that the involved cabinet members and the officials of the Office of Budget and Management want to relinquish their decision making responsibilities to computers and contrived mathematical formula. By the same token, I cannot believe that citizen groups really want that result.

We are learning in dramatic fashion that maintaining a livable world and decent economic standards is a tremendously complicated and difficult matter. We will find the answers we need in sophisticated decision making with public participation, not in mathematical equations.

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL AMNESTY

(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, as you know, I have introduced legislation to provide for conditional amnesty for draft resisters. The issue of amnesty has spawned a wide variety of opinion, some of it highly emotional. A most reasonable assessment of the situation was recently set forth in an editorial of the March 18 edition of "America," a magazine published by the Jesuits of the United States and Canada, entitled, "The Case for a National Amnesty," the commentary stresses the need for a "reconciliation" in this country. With the thought that it would be of interest to our colleagues, I am appending a copy of the editorial.

[From America Magazine, Mar. 18, 1972]

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL AMNESTY

The word "amnesty," we are told with increasing frequency these past few months, derives from a Greek word meaning "to forget." It is a sad irony that one of the greatest obstacles any proposal of amnesty faces today is rooted precisely in our desire to forget, to blot from the mind the painful memories of the Vietnam war. We should like to forget about the constant bombing missions in Indochina and the weekly toll of dead bodies, including those not our own. At home, we should like to forget the punishment still to be paid by those who opposed the war by refusing to participate.

There are, we are told, more than 500 draft resisters in federal jails, about 3,900 under indictment and some 70,000 young exiles who voted with their feet against the draft and the war. To attempt to forget them is only to nurture delusion. Like the bombed-out terrain of Indochina, the disjointed existence of these draft resisters does not cease to exist because we hear relatively little about it.

The forgetting that we need—and that the word amnesty refers to—has little in common with this switching off of the mind. It must be active and deliberate, the offspring of a strong and generous heart. Along with its twin, "forgive," amnesty aims primarily at a healing of wounds after a divisive conflict.

The practice of amnesty has had a long and distinguished career, stretching back to the Greeks in 40 B.C., and including a series of precedents in our own brief history. Five American Presidents, including Washington, Madison and Andrew Johnson, issued amnesty proclamations in connection with armed rebellions against the government. And in 1947, President Truman granted amnesty to 1,523 violators of the Selective Service Act during World War II.

If President Truman could extend forgiveness to men who violated the draft laws during a war considered just by the vast majority of Americans and their political leaders, how can we find it impossible to grant amnesty after a conflict that has divided the American conscience as much as it has devastated Indochina?

On this level the problem is essentially a simple one; we must choose between a policy of reconciliation and one of rigid adherence to the law. Certainly it is far easier to be generous after a victory, especially if we feel that truth and justice have

triumphed along with our arms. But to turn national self-doubts about the Vietnam war against many of those who first questioned the wisdom of our policies would be cruel and unconscionable.

On another level, of course, the amnesty question bristles with complexities which must be sorted out. Chief among them is the task of devising, if one can, a way of determining who "resisted" the draft and who merely "dodged" it.

The objection, voiced by Selective Service Director Curtis W. Tarr among others, that amnesty would undermine the draft system by appearing to condone the actions of thousands who fled the country has a certain plausibility. But a questioning of the draft is an already accomplished fact in the eyes of many. To place all the blame for this state of affairs on the shoulders of draft resisters is unrealistic. The war itself must bear a large share of responsibility for any present disarray of the Selective Service.

Moreover, the question of conscience cannot be ignored here. The American Catholic bishops, among others, have gone on record supporting the right of selective conscientious objection, a right not recognized by existing draft regulations. Continued punishment, by exile or imprisonment, of men who followed their conscience in this matter hardly reflects glory on American justice.

The suggestion, also voiced by opponents of amnesty, that the pardoning of draft resisters would dishonor the American dead and wounded in Vietnam also misses the main point. Amnesty aims simply at reconciliation. If we wish to heal our national division, we must presume—there is nothing else we can do—that those who fought and those who refused to fight on grounds of conscience acted in good faith. The dead will not be served by the hardening of our hearts.

Another question remains: How sweeping should the amnesty be? If an amnesty proposal is to be equitable it should certainly look to all those who have refused in conscience to serve in the war. What about deserters? True, before the law, their situation differs significantly from that of draft evaders. Excluding them all from amnesty on principle, however, may fail to take cognizance of the peculiar complexities of this war. Certainly amnesty for deserters will not sit well with a great part of the nation. They will remain troubled that conscience in some cases prompted the questionable response of desertion. Still, the issue is not strict justice but pardon; some provision for deserters seems necessary.

Framing an equitable and coherent amnesty plan will clearly tax the ingenuity of our most gifted Solomons. More important at the moment is a commitment on the part of a large number of Americans to the goal of reconciliation through a generous use of the President's amnesty powers.

ANOTHER LOYALTY OATH RESCINDED

(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, 2 months ago a constituent brought to my attention the practice by Metromedia, Inc., of asking references for prospective employees whether they consider the applicant to be loyal to the United States. The question of the loyalty of an individual to our country as judged by another individual is so subjective that it has no value and is a question that should not be asked.

On March 27, I wrote to Metromedia expressing my concern and asking for their comments on the matter. Today I received a response from Metromedia's director of personnel administration, Robert E. Pantell, stating that the question will be eliminated in the next printing of their form. I believe that Metromedia should be commended for its flexibility and responsibility in taking this action, and at this time I should like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter of March 27 and Mr. Pantell's response.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this era of extensive dossier collections by public and private agencies, great care must be given to the soundness of the information that is put into these files—to be available for instantaneous retrieval years later. A misfounded comment on a person's loyalty—given by one who had only superficial knowledge of a person's politics or having some extreme political bias of his own—might ruin a person's employment opportunities for the rest of his life. A great responsibility lies with the collectors of information to guard against the inclusion in personal files of information that is not well founded or which may be misinterpreted years later when taken out of context. Unfortunately, I do not believe that this responsibility is being met in most instances by either public or private agencies.

Again, I would like to commend Metromedia for its response to this question. My correspondence with the company follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1972.

DIRECTOR PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT,
METROMEDIA, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have had an inquiry from a constituent concerning the question included in your reference form for prospective employees that asks, "Do you consider the applicant loyal to the United States?"

I should appreciate your sharing with me the basis for this question, the answer to which is so subjective in nature.

I must say candidly that I question the fairness or even the usefulness of asking such a question when the person making the judgment might have only superficial knowledge of a person's politics, or the basis for his politics; furthermore, you must often know little or nothing about he or she who is making this sort of judgment.

In this day and age of exchange of dossiers on individuals, I think it becomes important that great care be given in the collection of personal information, particularly when that information is in the form of subjective judgments by others.

I look forward to your comments on this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

METROMEDIA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 14, 1972.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in response to your letter to me of March 27, 1972, inquiring into a question which appears on our reference form for respective employees, to wit: "Do you consider the applicant loyal to the United States?"

I am well aware of the possibility that the person offering an opinion in answering that question may have superficial or no knowledge of the applicant's politics and that we often know little or nothing about the person who is responding. I may add that we are presented with a similar problem when evaluating responses to questions calling for an opinion of the applicant's performance, initiative, personality, dependability, and attitude towards prior employer. All of these require value judgments by the respondent. They may often be based on anything but hard facts and any intelligent employer will necessarily weigh them in that light.

We certainly agree wholeheartedly with you that great care must be given in the collection of any personal information, particularly when it is in the form of subjective judgments by others. You can be sure that we exercise such care in its evaluation and certainly with respect to further dissemination.

In this connection, in the last revision of our employment application, we took pains to examine the application currently being used by the United States Government and several of our questions are predicated thereon, although we do not ask whether the applicant is now or has for the last ten years been a member of the Communist Party or any organization which to the applicant's knowledge seeks the overthrow of the constitutional form of government of the United States by force or violence. Nor have we, as distinguished from the Government, investigated into those questions beyond the above quoted inquiry made to persons whose names happen to be given as reference. Viewed in that light, our inquiry is probably meaningless, that is, of very little practical value in eliciting the truth which, if seriously pursued, could best be obtained by other means.

Therefore, while I do not agree with your contention that the question is unfair, upon reflection I can and do agree that its usefulness is doubtful. We will eliminate it on the next printing of our form.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. PANTELL,
Director of Personnel Administration.

TREATMENT OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, every one of us has a heritage that is dear. Emotional ties exist between ourselves and the homelands of our ancestors. No one can deny that there is a unique spirit common to those of a particular family of man.

Most of us do not have to rely on this spirtual tie alone. We have a nation; a homeland. For 19 centuries the Jewish people did not have a physical home. They were in exile, and they settled in many nations.

Today they have won their nation, but those Jews who settled in the Soviet Union are denied access to their Israel. The borders of the Soviet Union have become prison walls to Soviet Jews, and although their faith can transcend these walls, they cannot leave the soil of the Soviet Union.

The hypocrisy of the Soviet Union is known to us all—indeed the Soviet Constitution grants the right to emigrate—and it is a right acknowledged by all civilized nations on earth. It is a right

guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

I joined in cosponsoring this resolution because I feel strongly that we have a moral obligation to raise our voices when justice is denied to our countrymen's countrymen. I have spoke on behalf of the other captive peoples of the Soviet Union, and I have raised my voice in protest of the situation in Northern Ireland. I will continue to do so. Not to urge intervention, but to spur action in the offending nation that will correct the injustice.

Certainly we have our own problems, our own hypocrisy, and we must never relent in the fight against them. But we are a nation containing many nations, and we cannot ignore that fact. We must not commit the crime of silence in the name of isolation.

It is my sincere hope that the President will impress upon the Soviet leadership the points of this resolution, and our solidarity with the cause of Soviet Jewry. If this resolution is passed, the timing of it related to the President's trip to Moscow will indeed be fortunate.

But we do not have to rely on the executive branch to make our voices heard. The simple passage of this resolution alone will make our sentiments known. I urge its passage in the name of humanitarianism.

CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM DEVELOPED AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, an effective and innovative crime prevention program has been developed at Syracuse University, and I would like to share it in the hope that it might serve as a model for other institutions of higher learning.

In the current political rhetoric, "law and order" does not usually conjure up a picture of students patrolling their own campuses in order to prevent crime. But this is what "law and order" is coming to mean at the Syracuse campus, thanks to student Phillip Gross and administrators Ronald Brady and Robert Flaherty.

I think this is a laudable example of student initiative in a field that badly needs more dedicated and able young people. This campus patrol program cuts through the tired "law and order" rhetoric for a realistic response to a problem that concerns every segment of our society.

I would like to enter in the RECORD an article from the Syracuse Alumni News written by Maria A. Pafundi which describes the student crime prevention patrol. I commend it to your reading, and I commend the young people who brought this program into being:

A NEW LOOK AT CAMPUS SECURITY: STUDENT FORCE CUTS CRIME

(By Maria A. Pafundi)

The official reports put the time at 9:40 p.m. The fall night was clear as Jason Israel and Paul Sikes, armed with their clipboards, flashlights and 2-way radios, made their routine rounds of Sadler and Lawrinson living centers.

They inspected the Lawrinson garage, looking for broken lights, trespassers, or thieves in search of valuable car accessories. Satisfied that all was normal, they retraced their steps. Suddenly they heard a burglar alarm sound, and they raced to Sadler in time to see three young men loading their car with University furniture.

As Israel radioed the University's security department, Sikes got a complete description of the men, and copied down their license plate number. The thieves were startled to see the two patrolmen, and sped off. Less than a minute later, a security car arrived, but through Israel and Sikes' "observe and report" tactics, the furniture thieves were tracked down the next day.

What makes this routine security operation different is that Jason Israel and Paul Sikes are not employees of the regular Security and Safety Department at Syracuse University. They are members of a 65-man student security force who work closely with campus police in preventing crime and vandalism, and in ensuring the safety of students on the campus.

Statistics all across the nation reflect major increases in the number, type and ferocity of crimes. Even the once-cloistered groves of academe have not escaped this frightening development.

The rising incidence of campus crime in recent years ranges from bicycle theft (15–20 per week at the University of Arizona) to rape (5 at the University of California in Santa Barbara during the last academic year).

The most frequent problem on the nation's campuses is theft. In 1971 at UCLA, 107 cars were stolen, and 163 broken into with property losses; at the University of Florida in Gainesville, 131 cases of breaking and entering were reported in a nine-month period.

For protection, most colleges rely mainly on small campus police forces who are usually unarmed. Security officers complain of low salaries, manpower shortages, and the lack of across-the-board jurisdiction. Faced with all this—a sharp rise in crime, shortage of funds, and limited security departments—university administrators across the country welcome innovations that will help them keep campus crime in check.

Syracuse University has all the crime problems of most large universities, but a heavy reliance on crime prevention appears to be making head-way. One important addition to this program of prevention is Student Safety Services.

The initiator of the student security force at Syracuse is Philip J. Gross, a sophomore from Maplewood, New Jersey. Gross got the idea from a similar program set up by a friend at Seton Hall University. Gross formulated a plan, and introduced it to Ronald W. Brady, vice chancellor for administrative operations. Specifics were worked out with Robert Flaherty, director of security and safety, and the force took to the campus walkways late last February.

According to the student supervisor, increasing safety to students and their property is the main objective of the operation. "I would personally rather prevent 10 percent of all crime than catch 10 percent of all criminals," Gross says.

Members of the student security force travel in pairs, wearing identifying armbands, and carry flashlights, clipboards and 2-way FM radios. To qualify for this well-paid position, a student must be at least a second semester freshman, and be in good academic and disciplinary standing. Gross has a long waiting list of applicants.

The patrol, in operation eight hours a day in two shifts, has expanded its initial coverage of three major districts to coverage of all the major living centers: Sadler and Lawrinson; the Brewster-Boland-Brockway complex; the north campus apartments; the east campus residence halls (Haven, Booth, Dellplain, and Kimmel-Marion); Mt. Olympus, Shaw, Day and the Women's Building.

At the orientation and training session at the beginning of each semester, the student teams are told that their main role is to "observe and report" any unusual circumstances or persons. Gross insists that the students are not to try to capture any prowlers or thieves; they are to use their radios to contact the main security office.

The mere physical aspects of the university are open invitations for criminal activity. Narrow, twisting, secluded pathways through wooded sections—the Mt. Olympus area, for example—are aesthetically pleasing in the daylight, but dangerous at night. Thus, they present ideal conditions for potential muggings and rapes. Gross says that the force's real concern is for "females travelling across the campus to the library or to the Mount." He names one important advantage of the program: "girls who were hesitant to go to the library at night can feel more secure."

Carol Williamson, director of Shaw, a women's residence, affirms this opinion, saying that the student patrol has helped the living situation of the girls in her building: "their presence alone has added a measure of relief."

Another factor in the university crime situation is unfortunately simplistic: students as a whole are too trusting.

Students who live in dormitories don't worry about locking the main doors. When it comes to their own doors, they don't think it necessary to lock them; they feel they know everyone on their floor, and they are not suspicious of them.

"A guy steps out of his room to make a phone call, leaves his door unlocked, and when he comes back, his wallet is gone." This, says Gross, comes as a shock to most students who learn the hard way. He estimates that better than 75 percent of crimes committed at SU are due to unlocked doors.

Leo Graszler, assistant director of security and safety, becomes upset because "students are too free in handling outsiders. They allow them to prowl around their residence halls, and they never question the presence of strangers."

The student security force is trying to make up for this naive, trusting attitude of students. An important duty is to check for unlocked dormitory and apartment doors as they walk through their districts. Carol Williamson is grateful for this; many students use Shaw as a shortcut to the Westcott Street area, and they invariably leave open doors behind them.

Gross makes it a policy to have the same men cover the same district each night. He contends that a familiarity with an area improves the team's performance, and this is proving to be correct. Jim Lee, a first year student at the Law College, has been patrolling the university-owned apartments in the University Avenue area since September. He claims that he knows about 70 percent of the people in the area; he is familiar with their cars, the girls' boyfriends, and the neighborhood's residents. It is usually easy for him to recognize an outsider.

All concerned with crime on the campus agree that most of the problems are caused by outsiders. Speaking about the expensive stereos, tv sets, musical instruments, and many other student possessions that can be sold easily on the streets, Graszler says that "undesirables consider this place a smorgasbord." Victor J. Colway, vice president for business management, puts the percentage of outsiders at 90 percent of the total crime situation.

Residence hall directors are aware of roaming bands of youths who have no place to go, and who are attracted by college activities. Lawrinson, sees a decrease in the number way complex are closest to the outside community and have in the past experienced the worst problems. But Peter Stace, director of Lawrinson, sees a decreaes in the number of incidents over the last year and credits the student patrol with alleviating much of the problem.

Gross reports that male students most frequently complain about the outbreak of thefts from university-owned garages. One dorm director had his car stolen twice last year. Graszler is pleased to note this year the number of instances where the student patrol has surprised criminals at work in the garages.

The most common problem among SU women, according to Gross, is the possibility of rape and assault. In 1965, says Graszler, there were three vicious rapes—one on campus, one in a dorm, and one on Ostrmo Avenue—and one attempt. In 1971 there were two—one in Day Hall, and one in front of Brewster. So far this year, there have been none. Colway asserts that three things stand out in his mind as having a marked impact on this decreasing record: the K–9 dog patrol, the mini shuttle bus which provides free transportation around the main campus at night, and most recently, the Student Safety Services.

Again, the emphasis is on prevention rather than law enforcement. "It makes no difference to a girl after she is raped whether the guy is caught or not," says the student supervisor. "What we want is to discourage the rape itself."

Like many of his colleagues across the country, Leo Graszler believes that "no police organization or semi-police force ever has enough people." Vice-President Colway, whose jurisdiction includes the security department, thinks that SU's 35-men staff is "minimal." And figures support Colway's evaluation. The city of Syracuse has one policeman for every 403 citizens. The University averages one security officer for every 655 members of the Hill community. Much of the department's time is taken up with parking violations and driving some 50 students per day to the health service center.

For these reasons, Graszler, Flaherty, and Colway are extremely pleased with the work of the student safety service. Graszler looks upon them as "extra eyes and ears for the detection of crime on campus, and for the location of hazardous conditions."

A big plus that the student force brings to the security operations is the fact that they travel on foot and check inside living centers, whereas the security officers patrol only in cars. They are able to detect many physical aspects that are potential crime or safety problems; in a one month period last semester, the student patrol made a total of 559 reports that included discharged fire extinguishers, broken lights, open and unlocked doors, acts of vandalism, and fire hazards, such as trash accumulation. Gross compiles the reports daily, and the safety and security office turns them over to maintenance crews, the physical plant department, or the Office of Residential Life for corrective action.

Campus security officers frequently suffer from the typical low regard of students for police. In the year since the Student Safety Services was organized, it is generally agreed that student patrol teams relate better to other students than the uniformed officers. Students often complain of "being hassled" if a regular security officer comes into a living center on official business; they will, however, accept other students. For example, during a bomb scare at Haven last fall, several girls refused to move outside at the order of the security officers. Students passing through on their foot patrol were able to talk them into cooperating.

Carol Williamson theorizes that this good relationship between students and the Student Safety Services is a result of the force's high visibility. "While the regular officers are in cars, these fellows are on foot—they stop in at the desk, or they take a break with other students in the lounge." Shaw's director contends that students look upon the two forces differently: the security office is where they go *after* an incident has occurred, to report a theft or an assault; the students are looked upon as *preventive* agents.

The University's approval of this program is shown in its strong support. Initially, the student patrol was "nothing more than an experiment" between the security department and the Office of Administrative Operations. But early in its development, it was the recommendation of both Flaherty and Graszler that the student patrol be continued. Gross says that $45,000 will be paid out this academic year in student salaries, and another $15,000 will go for operations. Graszler considers the appropriation "justifiable—although it's not shown in the university books, it will show in student pockets."

One way such preventive programs as the Student Safety Services does show up on university books is in insurance rates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that the increase in campus crime has led to rate hikes for many universities, sometimes as high as four times the old rates. At Syracuse University, the situation is exactly the opposite; rates paid for casualty, fire and property in 1967–68 were $222,259; in 1968–69, $182,636. In 1969–70, SU paid $127,279. Colway asserts that the Student Safety Services have a "definite impact" on lowering liability rates.

What's ahead for this innovative program? Its operation is smooth, it has proven its usefulness, and university administrators are pleased with it. Several improvements have been planned, and others have been suggested.

Gross is now in the process of having the daily crime reports computerized in order to indicate the number, locations and times of campus crime. Such a project will aim at pinpointing campus trouble spots.

The student supervisor is also considering the possibility of expanding the present force with a team to make spot rounds of the whole academic campus for such activities as Film Forum, People's Place, and the men's gym. At this time, no funds are available for such expansion.

One expansion that has been authorized is a public education program. A major objective of Student Safety Services is to make other students more security-conscious. This semester the force will attach stickers to all public phones listing numbers to call in case of fire or emergency; posters have been designed to warn students of crime problems.

The Student Safety Services is by no means the total solution to all of SU's crime problems. But, added to the regular officers, off-duty plain-clothesmen, the mini shuttle bus, and the K–9 dog patrol, the new student-manned program unites more people in the same function of crime prevention. Vice President Colway answers for SU's successful record very simply: "We have improved our housekeeping."

PROSPECT FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been continuing discussion with regard to the prospects for the recovery of the economy. The Department of Labor has issued figures showing that the average for weekly hours of overtime has increased to 3.3 hours per week. This is the highest level for the past 2 years and shows the continuing demand for goods from the manufacturing sector of our economy.

Increasingly, we have also seen signs that the President's wage and price controls have been effective. The average hourly earnings of production workers rose only 2 cents in March to $3.47. This compares to a year ago March when the wage rate rose 21 cents, or 6.3 percent in just a single month. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the average weekly earnings have risen 6.5 percent since March 1971, while consumer prices have risen only 3.7 percent. It is obvious that the President's wage and price control program has been effective in placing a lid on inflationary pressures. Even though unemployment increased slightly last month, we find that the total employment picture is the best that it has been in a number of years. In goods-producing industries, employment increased by 155,000 workers for the January to March quarter. This is the highest level of increase since the end of March 1970.

Furthermore, factory jobs rose by over 110,000 over the quarter. In the service-producing sector of the economy, there was an increase of 570,000 jobs over the first quarter. This is the largest quarter to quarter increase since the end of World War II.

Beyond the shadow of a doubt, the policies of this administration are providing jobs for the American worker and ending the inflationary spiral which has been wracking our economy.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR INTEREST PAYMENTS ON LOW-INCOME HOMES

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the Congress passed section 235 of the National Housing Act. This section authorized the Federal Government to subsidize the interest payments on homes purchased by low-income families. The Government, under the program, can subsidize interest down to 1 percent depending upon the income of the recipient. This subsidy payment is made by HUD directly to the lender.

Recently, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that even though the interest payments on 235 homes are being paid by the Federal Government, the taxpayer—235 homeowners—has the right to take the interest payments, including the portion paid by the Government, as a deduction on his Federal income tax. The net effect of this ruling

has been to give this homeowner a double subsidy.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I can state that when the committee reported this bill to the House floor it never was envisioned that this type of deduction would never be allowed. In order to correct this misinterpretation of congressional intent by the Internal Revenue Service, I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit the taxpayer who lives in a 235 home to take the portion of his interest payments made by the Government as a deduction on his Federal income tax.

VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT OF 1972

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years crime has been one of the foremost political issues facing the Nation. The courts have taken steps to guarantee and protect the rights of persons accused of criminal activity. This Congress and the many State legislatures have passed stringent laws in order to attempt to curb the spiraling crime rate. However, throughout this whole process no mention has ever been made of the innocent victims of crime. Many times criminal activity has led to innocent persons being maimed, permanently disabled, killed, or psychologically affected, all of which has to have a direct impact upon their lives. No consideration has been given to the pain, suffering, loss of time, and wages which these victims suffer. I believe it is time that the Congress of the United States recognized these victims' situation and provided them with due compensation. In reality, these victims are the price the society pays for not being able to control crime.

The Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence both were intended to protect the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of all our citizens. However, the skyrocketing crime rate has shown that all three branches of our Government have been negligent in meeting this mandate.

In modern law there is a sharp contrast between criminal and civil proceedings. The criminal is always thought to owe a debt to society which must be paid, and in the context of criminal prosecution the sole purpose of this prosecution is to protect the public safety from continual harassment by the offender. In these proceedings the victim is supposed to be a disinterested witness whose relief is to be found only in private tort action. This solution has been found to be highly inadequate. The first nation to perceive this problem and act affirmatively was New Zealand. In 1963 the parliament of that country established a crime compensation tribunal with power to award compensation to victims or their dependents where the victim had been injured or killed through the commission of certain crimes.

In 1964 the Tory Government of England enacted a similar program. The first American jurisdiction to adopt the compensation principle was California. Its program was enacted in 1965 and put into operation 2 years later. Since that time programs have been established in New York, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Maryland, Nevada, and New Jersey. Several State legislatures now have proposals before them which would create compensation boards. It is obvious that the Congress will be called upon to act in this area in the very near future. Adequate precedent for this action has been set since two English-speaking parliamentary governments plus the legislatures of several of our States have enacted compensation laws. Definitely, the time has come for compensation for the innocent victims of violent crimes to be adopted. Society has a moral obligation in this area and I believe that the legislation I am introducing today will meet that obligation.

My bill establishes within the Department of Justice the Federal Compensation Board which will make direct awards to or in behalf of innocent victims of violent crimes in financial need.

The jurisdiction of the Board would be limited to primary Federal jurisdiction such as maritime and territorial areas, and the District of Columbia.

The Board would be of a quasi-judicial nature, composed of three appointed members who would serve 8-year terms. They would have the authority to compel the attendance of witnesses, but the strict rules of evidence would not be followed and hearings would not be of an adversary character.

In determining the amount of the award, the Board would be authorized to investigate all aspects of the case, including private and public sources of funds to meet the victims' financial needs. A very important factor in the awarding process would be the victims' cooperation with police. Also, recovery would be limited to $50,000 and the payments could be made in a lump sum or by periodic disbursals. Criminal conviction would not be a prerequisite for recovery. However, when an award were made by the Board, it would not subrogate the rights of the victim against the offender. Furthermore, when the offender were prosecuted, the court would be authorized to direct that any part of any fine paid by him be placed in an indemnity fund which would be administered by the Board.

The second part of my bill would amend the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968 to provide a new grant program to be administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to encourage States to set up compensation boards. Any State which would meet the minimum requirements of this act would receive matching grants up to 75 percent of the cost of establishing a State compensation board.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposal which I am presenting today is realistic and will help solve one of the more glaring needs in our society. I believe that this legislation warrants the support of all Members of this body.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS UNFAIRLY BLAMED FOR RETAIL MEAT PRICES

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, four of my constituents from northwest Iowa made a significant contribution clarifying recent confusion about meat prices in their testimony before the Price Commission last week. They are Frank R. Buryanek, Glenn Gregg and Ed Ladd, farmers from Sioux and Lyon Counties, and Mayor Harlan Hummel of Hawarden, Iowa. They told the commission and the American people that present day livestock prices are inadequate to give farmers anything like a fair return for their labor and investment, and their testimony very eloquently established that livestock producers are being unfairly blamed for recent increases in retail meat prices at a time when retail food chains have been increasing their profit margins and refusing to pass the benefit of reductions in wholesale meat prices on to the consumer.

Buryanek and Ladd also testified on the same subject the previous day before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains and I have heretofore asked unanimous consent that my introduction of these witnesses and their highly persuasive testimony be set forth at this point in the RECORD, together with the testimony of Mayor Hummel before the Price Commission the following day. The portions of the subcommittee's and Commission's proceedings to which I have referred are as follows:

BEEF PRICES

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy to introduce a typical Northwest Iowa farmer to give us firsthand information on some of the problems confronting pork producers on the farm today. Frank Buryanek rents 320 acres in Sioux County, Iowa, which is the nation's largest producer of corn fed cattle with over 250,000 head delivered yearly. It is also a top producer of hogs.

Frank is one of a group of Northwest Iowa farmers and businessmen, principally from Sioux County, who came to Washington at their own expense on March 27 and 28 to protest adverse and unfair publicity about livestock prices. They were specifically and justifiably indignant about the very misleading newspaper advertisements placed in Washington newspapers by the Giant Food Store chain blaming lack of controls on livestock prices for high retail food prices and telling consumers to buy less meat. I had the pleasure of taking these hard working Americans to the Department of Agriculture to confer with Secretary Butz and Assistant Secretary Palmby on March 28. They proved to be such eloquent spokesmen for agriculture at this meeting that the Secretary and I urged them to return to Washington for the Price Commission hearings on food prices which begin tomorrow. Frank Buryanek and three other Northwest Iowans will accordingly testify before the Commission tomorrow and Frank is here to give us the benefit of his practical experience today.

STATEMENT OF FRANK R. BURYANEK

Mr. BURYANEK. Thank you, Congressman Mayne. Mr. Chairman, I am 38 years old, married and have three children. I farm 320 acres of land in Sioux County, Iowa. I am what is usually termed a diversified farmer. That is,

I raise corn and also feed hogs and cattle for market. In a good year I will try to feed 500 hogs and 250 head of cattle. Sometimes I don't produce quite those numbers due to a short corn crop or other factors.

I belong to a group of 190 Northwest Iowa farmers who use the services of the Northwest Iowa farm records association. This firm does a complete breakdown of our records and through the use of computers is able to show us just where the money is being made or lost. By using this service I can tell what my costs are on the various phases of my operation. Without bragging, I can honestly say that the 190 who belong to this group are considered either average or above average farmers.

Gentlemen, last year my net farm income was $3445. That isn't much for a family of five to live on. This figure does not allow me anything for labor. This was my total wages for working 13 months last year. This 13 month figure is based on the average American who buys the products I produce, work week of 40 hours. Using USDA hourly averages on how much time it takes to raise a hog, an acre of corn, etc. I work 56 hours per week. By this you can see that I'm not sitting on my can raking in the money. With wages like these it's no wonder that young men want no part of agriculture. My son is 12 years old. While I'm here talking to you he is responsible for the care of over 200 hogs. He can handle the job and he likes to do it. But when the day comes that he asks me, "Dad, should I stay in farming?", I could no more answer yes than I could tell him to go fly a kite.

The thing that concerns me is that the average age of an Iowa farmer is 56. Where are we going to get the young men to replace these men about to retire. With the profits we have been getting the last few years, no one can blame young men for leaving the farm for jobs in the city. Take these men off the family farm and it leads down only one path. Corporate farming. The family farm has been a way of life in America since before the revolution. Don't take it away now.

Last year I raised and marketed 297 hogs. This was way below my 500 goal and thank goodness for that. I received an average of $16.83 per cwt. My cost of producing 100 pounds of pork was $17.80. This was before figuring labor. Adding my labor at the minimum wage of $1.65 per hour, this pork cost me $19.18 per 100 pounds. This is a loss of $2.35 per cwt, or $5.16 for every hog marketed.

This is why I get mad when the newspaper quote the so called authorities who blame the farmer for high food prices.

You're not listening to a bad farmer either. The average production costs in Illinois is $19.50 per cwt. The average in Iowa is $20.00. Using family labor I managed to hold my costs below the average and I still lost money. You can see I'm definitely in the ball park when it comes to raising hogs.

Gentlemen, I didn't come to the city to cry and beg for sympathy. I know how my hogs did last year. The producer is used to these ups and downs. We just bite our lips and hope that next year will be better. It has every indication of this when I sold hogs in February for $28.50. Then all this fuss started about the farmer getting rich and stores advertising to tell people not to buy meat. Since that time the price of hogs has really dropped. As of last Thursday, the Sioux City Central Public Market had a hog top at $22.75. This is roughly a $6.00 drop per hundred or $12 per hog. Pork is not that much cheaper today in the store, so whose getting it. It sure isn't me.

Of these 190 farmers I spoke of, in 1969 their average total investment was $263,638 and the average net income was $8,331.00. In 1971 their total investment average had risen to $308,427 and their average net income had dropped to $7,717.00. Investment up $44,789.00 and the income down $614. Something's out of line here. You probably wonder why I farm?

Gentlemen, I think that the family farm is the best place in the world to raise children and I love to farm. But I don't know how much longer I can afford these luxuries. We in rural America do not ask for the moon. All the majority of us want is the opportunity to earn a decent living and the chance to supply our children with a few of the good things in life such as education.

All we ask is a fighting chance. We are a minority—feeding the majority. Drive us off with bad prices and rising costs and you will be taking the backbone out of America. Too many people don't know our life style or realize our problems and many more could care less.

I thank you for the opportunity to tell my story. If only a few of you understand us better, my task is accomplished. Tell your voters you heard it from a farmer. No man is farther from a phone booth but closer to God.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, another outstanding Northwest Iowa farmer who will testify here today and before the Price Commission tomorrow is Ed Ladd of Rock Rapids in Lyon County.

Ed was one of four Iowa farmers chosen as a Master Farmer by Wallace's Farmer in 1971. He has served in many positions of farm leadership, such as County ASCS Committeeman and Soil District Commissioner and is presently Vice President of the Lyon-Sioux member and an officer of his county Livestock Feeders Association. I am also very proud of the fact that he has been a member of my district farm advisory committee since 1966. This is a group of actual farm operators with whom I consult frequently on farm policy and programs.

It is a real pleasure to introduce Ed Ladd to my colleagues on this Subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF ED LADD

Mr. LADD. Honorable Chairman Mr. Purcell and members of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee on Agriculture, I am here today as an active farmer involved in a diversified farming operation located in the northwestern most county of Iowa. My age is 50 and for the past 25 years my family and I have worked toward the goal of putting together an efficient farm unit. By sacrificing most other wants and some imagined needs, we have been able to gain control of a unit that economists tell us has most of the efficiencies that can be obtained in a farming enterprise.

For this to happen we were fortunate enough to have adjoining land become available for sale, and to be able to obtain financing to accomplish th expansion. We now farm 640 acres—renting 160 acres and having title to 480 acres.

For the past seven years my wife has worked as an Extension Home Economist in a two county area. Her feeling was that she could contribute more to the enterprize this way than oy working on the farm and her wisdom has been sound. The added income has enabled us to make farm payments and keep two children in college while I have concentrated on developing a good farming programs. We feel that with good health and the Lord willing, we will now be able to survive the revolution that agriculture has been going through for the past 20 or so years.

I am sad to report, however, that a lot of my friends and neighbors have not been so fortunate. Some of them because of conditions they were not able to control are no longer farming. Many others because of limited volume and increasing costs are finding it more difficult all the time.

With this type of situation continuing there is very little incentive for young men to be attracted to farming as a career and with the average age of the Iowa farmer at 48½ years, we will be faced with a problem that in my mind could be disastrous. Unless the long term profit potential in agriculture improves, young people will continue to choose careers outside of agriculture and the family farm as we know it will be a thing of the past.

I claim no great knowledge of farm problems on a national scale and can only report to you what is occurring in my community and what my own records show. My banker expressed a similar concern for their business. He said that of the active farm loan customers they serve that only 10% were below the age of 30. Of the 6 farm sales they clerked the past year, 3 were farmers retiring, 2 were foreclosures and one was forced out because the land was sold. He reported that they had no new starts.

We have been concerned for some time that the farmers share of the consumers dollar remains relatively stable while our costs keep skyrocketing. In the past 5 years my machinery repair cost has gone up 44%. Shop time for implement and machinery repair has gone from $4.50 per hour in 1967 to $7.00 per hour in 1971—up 64%. Taxes on two quarters have gone from $904.02 in 1966 to $1271.62 in 1971—an increase of 29%. You name it and if it is anything not produced on a farm, you can be sure it will be higher.

Where have we gone so wrong as to think that it should be the consumer's inalienable right to buy meat for the same price as it was twenty years ago when their own disposable income has more than doubled in the same period? Somehow it is alright for automobiles to go up $150 to $200 every year and it's alright for medical costs to go up 400% in the past 20 years, but it is not alright for farm products to go higher. Whenever prices start to go up in the livestock industry, we get hit with higher import quotas or some other device designed to hold down meat prices.

I recently attended the National Livestock Feeders Convention in Omaha where Mr. Raymond Ioanes, Administrator of USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service told us we must "get cracking" if we are to keep up with the booming demand for beef. He said that every industrialized country is itching to consume more beef, and the economic growth we are seeing around the world is making it possible for more and more people to satisfy their demand for more beef. He closed by saying that the most impressive feature of the current situation by far is the price strength we are seeing. Record beef production is being marketed at attractive prices almost everywhere.

This means only one thing to me—trying to keep a lid on domestic prices by importing more beef may be setting the stage for a real beef shortage in the future. It takes a producer two years from the time he decides to supply more beef until there is meat for the consumer's table. If we are not allowed a reasonable profit potential that will pay the capital investment, risk and give a management return, there will be no real herd expansion.

I belong to the Northwest Iowa Farm Business Association and my records tell me that in 1971 my weaned calf cost me $39.18 per hundred weight. By applying my 1971 feeding enterprise costs and selling price I should realize $11.15 per head return for risk and management—a total of $791.65 for the total cow-calf enterprise. That's hardly enough to attract many people into a cow-calf operation.

The midwest is the only real hope for further herd expansion. We have abundant supplies of low cost feed in the form of corn stalks and crop residues that now go to waste. Unless there is a profit incentive to diversify into livestock production the midwest farmer will continue to raise only corn and soybeans that create problems in the market and great expense to the government.

Wouldn't it be better to let meat prices

seek their own true level in an atmosphere unclouded by artificial restraints?

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MAYOR HARLAN HUMMEL, HAWARDEN, IOWA

I'm Harlan Hummel, Mayor of Hawarden, Iowa, a rural community of 2800 in Northwest Iowa. I represent a coalition of cattle feeders, pork producers and businessmen in 10 Northwest Iowa counties with a population of 300,000 people. It is a fact, that I can prove with figures and graphs, that a substantial segment of the nation's population is threatened with an unwanted and unneeded change in life style. Through undeserved publicity and political rhetoric, the farmer is being blamed for today's inflationary food prices.

Eighty per cent (80%) of the population in the ten county area that I represent is engaged in farming, agribusiness, or is directly dependent on the farmers income to maintain over 100,000 small town jobs.

My home county, Sioux County, Iowa is the nations largest producer of corn fed cattle in the world with over 250,00 head delivered yearly.

Just to the south is Plymouth County, Iowa's largest producer of pork products. We have a stake in any deliberations about food price controls because you are threatening our way of life. If you depress the price that the Iowa farmer receives for his products, the only alternative you leave is commercialized farming.

Give Mr. Meany a shot at 100,000 workers on just a few large farms and see what the price of labor can do to farm prices. Drive 10,000 Iowa farmers and their children off the farm and see how more complex your city problems can become.

We're not here to defend the prices that beef and hog producers are getting, but to show that in relationship to inflationary prices that are being paid for other consumer products, plus the increased cost of production that the food producer has been forced to absorb, that the food producer should and does feel deserving to be receiving a decent price for his products, because if he had continued much longer at dealing in a market that has been stagnant for at least twenty years, America would be looking elsewhere for its food supplies.

Let's talk inflation, and decide who has been the victim.

Out of the last 15 years, only the last two have given the beef producers a chance to realize a price for their products in relation to the rise in other consumer products. In 1951 one hour's labor purchased 1 and ½ pounds of beef for the family table. Today, one hour's labor will place 3½ pounds of a better quality more nutritional beef on the same family's table. If the beef producer is responsible for rising prices, I don't know the meaning of inflation. We feel that you as a price board responsible for controlling inflation, will direct your attention to those segments most responsible for the unwarranted spread between the feed lot and the table.

Let's talk price increases and degrees of spread. I have figures here taken from USDA miscellaneous publication 74. In 1952, the retail market showed the average price of a pound of beef at 85.7¢ per pound. Of this 85.7¢ the farmer-producer received 74% or about 63.4¢. Nineteen (19) years later the retail average for the same pound of beef was $1.04. The farmer producers percentage dropped to 65% of the price paid or a return of 67.8% of the price Mrs. Housewife paid. The retail price of a pound of beef increased 22% while the farmers share decreased almost 12%. This 12% decrease was occurring while the farmers cost of production rose 125%. Wherein lies inflation?

We are here to tell our story because we are appalled to think that people believe that government controls are the answer to lower food prices. In all the history of American food production there has been no better control on food prices than supply. The American farmer has always supplied the country's table at a reasonable price. Granted this price has fluctuated, but consider the fact that only a few years ago, food purchases took about 22% of the average American's disposable dollar. Today food purchases take only 15% of that same dollar. Food has become a target only because by his makeup, his desire to be independent, the farmer tried to go it alone, standing on his own two feet, without any type of unionization. His lack of desire for organization made him a convenient scapegoat.

Give the farmer enough reason to organize and you will see the start of a union that will make the AFL–CIO look like a Sunday School Picnic.

The beef producer has no complaints with a 33–35¢ cattle market. He only wants to impress you that his margin of the last several years is not excessive—and he feverishly resents any of the suggested synthetic means of price depression. He needs this present margin to keep his family farm and for all of us to keep rural America as it is today.

One of these friends, a Sioux County hog raiser, revealed to me that in 1971 he marketed almost three hundred head of hogs at an average selling price of $116.83 per hundred weight. He is a good recordkeeper and his books showed that his average cost of production before labor, was $17.80 per hundred. This was a net loss of 97¢ per hundred before he was paid for his labor. Now using the minimum wage advocated by the Dept. of Labor, $1.65 per hour, his average production cost was $19.18 per hundred. Now a $1.65 per hour wage is barely above the poverty level, and a lot lower than the average wage paid to the husband of Mrs. Housewife who thinks pork prices are too high. But at a labor figure of $1.65 per hour, this hog producer lost $2.35 per hundred. His production costs were not out of line. The average cost of production per hundred weight in Illinois was $19.50. The average in Iowa was $20.00 per hundred weight. Through the use of family labor, this producer held his production costs under the average in either state, yet he lost money.

In closing I would like to touch once more on the fact that your decisions will affect not only the farmer, but the people who prefer small town, rural America to life in the city. It's a fact, that for every 8 family farms that cease to exist, one small town businessman closes his doors.

Not only farmers, but packers will attest to the fact that in the very near future the country will face a shortage of meat because of a lack of capital and interested producers. The capital will be in short supply because no banker can risk his depositers money in a market where returns are so questionable.

Producers will soon be in short supply. Young men are reluctant to remain on the farm because of the low return for their labor. Based on a 40 hour work week, the Northwest Iowa farmer worked 14 months in 12 months time last year. The average age of the Iowa farmer is over 56. In 1969, we had only 53 men under age 25 on the farm in Sioux County. During the same period we had 429 farmers between the ages of 55 to 64.

Instead of replacing those men about to retire from the farm we are losing ground. We are losing producers in the face of the fact that the midwest offers the only real potential for economical expansion of pounds of beef production. Remember that the more pounds produced, the greater the supply, the lower the price. Take these factors into consideration. Lack of producers, shortage of capital, and it leads you down only one path. Nobody is going to produce food for the consumers table. A Detroit auto worker doesn't produce a car without a fair wage. We're rapidly approaching a time when the farmer is going to feel the same way about food production.

I've touched upon the alternative to the family farm, expressed what I think are my fellow rural Americans sentiments on what these hearings can do to a way of life that we are fighting to maintain. There must be a favorable long term profit outlook before the family farm can continue to be a reality. These farmers cannot continue to make the investment, assume the risk, and supply the labor and still deny their families those things that many other Americans consider part of their way of life. Food prices have risen sharply. If this is due to excessive profit, the blame lies elsewhere. Prices paid for raw food products are finally reflecting what America's farmer deserves for his work and investment.

REPORTS ON NURSING HOMES

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly amazed at the amount of fiction which passes for fact among the Federal agencies and is delivered to an unsuspecting public as being "the word" from on high.

The most recent example is a letter from the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Robert O. Beatty, in a letter dated March 28, 1972, advised among other things that section 1106 of the Social Security Act "states that all information obtained in the administration of the social security program shall be kept confidential." Now Mr. Beatty must know that that statement is not accurate.

On March 27, at page 10296 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted a legislative history of section 1106 prepared by an objective source, the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. That study conclusively shows that nursing care cases were not included in the original act or covered by subsequent amendments. Yet Mr. Beatty goes forward spreading his fiction thereby effectively keeping the public uninformed about the real conditions which exist in too many nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, as of this date, I have not received any acknowledgment or reply from Secretary Richardson to my letters of February 3 or March 2 to which I referred in my remarks before the House on March 27. I am sure that the bureaucrats in HEW are busy—but so busy they cannot answer a congressional inquiry?

I hope the Department will be forced to respond to the suit which has been filed against it on the matters I have raised. A copy of the complaint and supporting documents are appended to my remarks at this point:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Malvin Schechter, 6529 Elgin Lane, Bethesda, Maryland (301) 229–0636, Plaintiff, v. Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201, Defendant—Civil Action No. 710–72.

1. This is an action under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C.

552, to order defendant to produce certain documents entitled Extended Care Facility Survey Reports (Form SSA–1569) (hereinafter "Survey Reports") which have been unlawfully withheld.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 (a)(2) and (a)(3) (hereinafter "the Act").

3. Plaintiff is Senior Editor of *Hospital Practice*, a national magazine with its Washington office located at 1230 National Press Building, which is concerned primarily with the practice of medicine in hospitals, nursing homes, extended care facilities, related other institutions and in the community.

4. Defendant Elliot L. Richardson is Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and under 42 U.S.C. 1395kk he has the chief responsibility for the administration of the Medicare Program. Extended care facilities may receive payments under the Medicare Program if they meet the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 1395X.

5. By letter dated March 1, 1972, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, Plaintiff requested that the Defendant make available copies of or grant access for inspection to the most recent Survey Report on Harmar House, a Medicare approved extended care facility in Marietta, Ohio, as well as Survey Reports for fourteen additional Medicare approved extended care facilities as listed in the attachment to Exhibit A.

6. By letter dated March 28, 1972, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, the Social Security Administration, an agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by its Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Robert O. Beatty denied Plaintiff's request.

7. Defendant has repeatedly denied access to the Survey Reports based upon an interpretation that 42 U.S.C. 1306 prohibits disclosure of any file, record, report or other paper obtained by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the performance of his duty, and hence disclosure is exempt under 552 U.S.C. (b)(3).

8. Defendant's interpretation by 42 U.S.C. 1306 is erroneous, and the documents requested by Plaintiff are required by 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(3) to be made available for copying and/or inspection.

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays (1) for an order directing Defendant to produce the documents requested by Plaintiff for inspection and copying by Plaintiff (2) that this Court award Plaintiff his costs and disbursements in this action, and (3) that this Court grant such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

ALAN B. MORRISON,
Attorney for Plaintiff.

HOSPITAL PRACTICE,
March 1, 1972.

Commissioner ROBERT H. BALL,
Social Security Administration,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR COMMISSIONER BALL: On Jan. 9, 1970, a fire at a Medicare-approved nursing home in Marietta, Ohio, took 32 lives. In preparing a story at the time, I became aware of SSA policy, based on Section 1106 of the Social Security Act, to hold confidential the Extended Care Facility Survey Report. I was denied access to the report on the Marietta facility, Harmar House.

I am now preparing a follow-up report bearing on Medicare inspections of extended-care facilities.

Hoping that your confidentiality policy may have changed, I ask to be permitted to inspect and copy the latest Extended Care Facility Survey Report on Harmar House.

In addition, I ask to inspect and copy the survey reports on ECF's named in the attachment.

I would appreciate a reply within 30 days. If you must reject my request, I would like a clear statement of the statutory basis for the rejection. Lacking a reply in the 30 days, I shall assume and report to my readers that such reports continue to be withheld under the old policy based on Section 1106.

My thanks for your consideration.

MAL SCHECHTER.

LETTER FROM MAL SCHECHTER, HOSPITAL PRACTICE, TO SSA COMMISSIONER ROBERT M. BALL

Extended Care Facility Survey Reports covering the latest inspections are requested for the following facilities:

1. Grosvenor Lane Nursing and Convalescent Center, 5721 Grosvenor Lane, Bethesda, Md. 20014.

2. Resmor Sanitarium, 5721 Grosvenor Lane, Bethesda, Md. 20014.

3. Westwood Nursing Home, 5101 Ridgefield Rd., Bethesda, Md. 20014.

4. Kensington Gardens Nursing Home, 2000 McComas Ave., Kensington, Md., 20795.

5. Potomac Valley Nursing Home, 1235 Potomac Valley Rd., Rockville, Md. 20850.

6. Sylvan Manor Health Care Center, 2700 Barker St., Silver Spring, Md. 20907.

7. Silver Spring-Wheaton Nursing Home, 11901 Georgia Ave., Wheaton, Md. 20902.

8. Hebrew Home of Greater Washington, 6121 Montrose Road, Rockville, Md.

9. Ada B. Payton Home, 1307 Emerson St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20011

10. Baptist Home, 3700 Nebraska Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20016.

11. Mar-Salle Convalescent Home, 2131 O St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

12. Ruth E. Cavanaugh Home, 507 44 St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20019.

13. Stoddard Baptist Home, 1818 Newton St., N.W., 20010.

14. Presbyterian Home Infirmary of D.C., 3050 Military Road, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015.

MARCH 28, 1922.

Mr. MAL SCHECHTER,
Hospital Practice,
Washington Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHECHTER: This is in response to your letter of January 5. I must apologize once again for the delay in responding to your inquiries but hope that you will understand that it was occasioned by Stewart Hunter's retirement and the need to shift the responsibilities so ably carried by him to another member of my staff. Russ Roberts, whom I understand you've already met, has assumed Stew's duties, and now that the dust has begun to settle from that transition, I hope that we can be more prompt in responding to you in the future.

Concerning your questions about our Social Security Administration, Section 1106, as I believe you are aware, states that all information obtained in the administration of the social security program shall be kept confidential—except as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulation prescribe. (Section 1106, incidentally, is one of the existing stautory provisions exempted under the Freedom of Information Act.)

Regulation No. 1, which you described in your October 28 letter as a "confidentiality authority" is really quite the opposite. This regulation specified the exceptions that will be made to the blanket prohibition against disclosure contained in Section 1106.

At this time, Regulation No. 1 does not provide for the release of the internal records of State agency inspections of providers of services under the Medicare program. But the question of whether a modification should be made to permit the disclosure of certain information important to consumers regarding established provider deficiencies is now under consideration.

Regarding our Food and Drug Administration and Abbott Laboratories, the decision as to whether criminal action is to be taken has not as yet been made. At the present time the matter is being given serious consideration under procedures found in Sec. 305 of the U.S. Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. This is public knowledge inasmuch as Abbott Laboratories recently issued a statement to the press stating the firm has been cited. This process is a forerunner to a final decision as to whether court action will be recommended to the Justice Department.

As far as HEW's policy regarding "fullest disclosure" is concerned, it is stated in our Public Information Regulation (45 CFR, part 5) which is enclosed, and is fully endorsed by Secretary Richardson in the attached memorandum of November 12, 1971. In application, we are concerned with ensuring that both the letter and the spirit of the Freedom of Information Act prevail. That is why the Secretary's memorandum requires that "No denial for records under the Freedom of Information Act be made except in accordance with the Public Information Regulation, and then only after consultation with the Office of the General Counsel." Often these consultations result in disclosure of information which might have been denied under one or more exemptions but for which agreement is reached that there is no practical need to withhold.

I know that you are as interested as we are in ensuring that information about the Department, its programs, policies, and activities is made available to all those who have a right to know or a need to know.

We are most appreciative of your interest and your continuing efforts to foster the free flow of such information.

Sincerely,

ROBERT O. BEATTY,
Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

HUD AND CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, each year some 400,000 young children between the ages of 1 and 6 are subjected to a devastating, yet totally preventable, disease· childhood lead poisoning.

The prime cause of this vicious crippler and killer of children is the ingestion of lead-tainted paint and plaster fallen from the walls and ceilings of dilapidated dwellings. As these lead-poisoned chips flake and peel off tenement walls youngsters have a tendency to pick them up and eat them. The result can be blindness, cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and even death.

In an effort to mount a meaningful Federal assault on this dread disease, the Congress passed the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (Public Law 91–695) of which I am the original sponsor. This legislation provides for the establishment of a comprehensive program of grants to screen and treat the victims of this silent epidemic and to identify and eliminate lead-based paint. It also prohibits the use of lead-based paint. It also prohibits the use of lead-based paint in Federal and federally assisted dwellings.

On December 16, 1971, the Department of Housing and Urban Development set

forth its program to implement the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. That program, embodied in HUD Circular HPMC–FHA 4500.5, specifically mandated that—

In public housing, in HUD-owned properties, and in rehabilitation work, any old lead-based paint remaining on walls and ceilings shall be removed or completely concealed with a suitable covering . . .

Full implementation of this provision is integral to mounting an attack on this devastating disease. Yet in an appalling—previously undisclosed—action on February 18, the Department amended this provision to exclude HUD-owned properties. HUD Circular HM4310.7.

This deliberately initiated policy will needlessly expose thousands of young children to the disease of childhood lead poisoning. It is estimated that HUD owns or is in the process of acquiring some 160,000 units, subjecting 500,000 youngsters to the possibility of this menace.

This unconscionable disregard for the health of the children of this Nation cannot be countenanced.

Therefore, I have today called upon Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney to order immediately the eradication of all lead-based paint on the walls and ceilings in public housing, in HUD-owned properties, and in any other dwellings in which Federal assistance is involved in any form. There is no excuse for excluding HUD-owned properties from the necessity of eliminating lead-based paint.

That this disease continues to plague the children of America is a stain on our national conscience. It is not some rare malady awaiting the discovery of a new cure. We know how to identify it. We know how to treat it. We know how to eradicate its causes. It exists only because we have let it exist.

We have an obligation to the children of this Nation to protect them from this totally manmade and totally preventable disease. The reversal of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's policy excluding HUD-owned properties from the necessity of eliminating lead-based paint is a major step in that effort.

I include at this point HUD Circular HPMC–FHA 4500.5 of December 16, 1971, setting forth the Department's original policy and HUD Circular HM4310.7 of February 18, 1972—eliminating HUD-owned properties from the necessity of eradicating lead-based paint:

PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF LEAD-BASED PAINTS

1. *Purpose.* This circular sets forth the Department's position with regard to the elimination of the use of lead-based paints.

2. *Policy:*

(a) *Prohibited Use of Lead-Based Paints.* Effective January 1, 1972, the use of paint containing more than 1 per centum lead by weight (calculated as lead metal) in the total non-volatile content of liquid paints is prohibited on HUD projects in accordance with paragraph 2b.

(b) *Applicability.* All new construction and rehabilitation of HUD assisted, owned, and mortgage insured residential properties come under this restriction. The maintenance of low-rent public housing also is covered by this restriction. The prohibition applies to all exposed interior surfaces and to all portions of exterior elements and surfaces readily accessible to children—decks, stairs, porches, railings, doors, windows, etc. Concealed work such as structural steel is excluded.

In public housing, in HUD owned properties and in rehabilitation work, any old lead-based paint remaining on walls and ceilings shall be removed or completely concealed with a suitable covering such as drywall, hardboard, plywood, etc. before these surfaces are redecorated.

3. *Implementation:*

(a) Local Housing Authorities, Local Public Agencies and Local Public Bodies shall be responsible for the implementation of the prohibition with respect to any structures which they are developing, own or lease with HUD assistance.

(b) Regional, Area and Insuring Offices shall make this prohibition known to individuals and entities responsible for the construction or rehabilitation of HUD assisted or mortgage insured properties or for the maintenance of low rent public housing.

(c) *Cooperation with Other Agencies.* The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have executed a Memorandum of Understanding for implementation of Public Law 91–695, the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. It provides that HEW and HUD will cooperate, where necessary, in developing policy, program procedures, standards and guidelines for carrying out their respective responsibilities under the Act.

4. *Compliance.* Current industry practice is to label paint consisting of more than 1% lead with the warning "CONTAINS LEAD, HARMFUL IF SWALLOWED" or similar words. Such paint shall not be used on the surfaces described in paragraph 2b.

The inspector shall examine paint containers and make appropriate inquiries to assure that there is compliance with this policy. Any observed noncompliance shall be reported on the appropriate inspection report.

5. *Incorporation into handbooks and standards.* Appropriate material on this matter will be incorporated into handbooks and standards as soon as possible. In the interim, this Circular should be kept accessible for ready reference.

LEAD-BASED PAINTS—HUD-OWNED PROPERTIES

1. *Purpose.* To eliminate the reference to HUD-owned properties in the second subparagraph of Paragraph 2b of Circular HPMC–FHA 4500.5 dated 12–16–71.

2. *Background.* The second subparagraph of paragraph 2b of Circular HPMC–FHA 4500.5 provides that:

"In public housing, in HUD-owned properties and in rehabilitation work, any old lead-based paint remaining on walls and ceilings shall be removed or completely concealed with a suitable covering such as drywall, hardboard, plywood, etc. before these surfaces are redecorated.

3. *Nonapplicability to HUD-owned properties.* The provisions cited in paragraph 2 above are not applicable to HUD-owned properties at this time. There is currently underway a federal demonstration and research program to determine the methods by which lead-based paints can most effectively be detected and removed. When the results of this study are known, instructions will be issued regarding implementation of appropriate procedures dealing with HUD-owned properties.

THE VIOLENCE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am stunned by the resumption of bombing of the cities of North Vietnam. It restores the war to its pre-1968 level of intensity and cruelty.

Each escalation results in a corresponding retaliation. It is a shift toward more war with grave consequences.

We are entering a dangerous new phase—"Vietnamization by bomb." It is likely to result in the massive deadly slaughter of countless innocent civilians. It is certain to result in a "heating up" of the conflict.

Again, I call for the passage of H.R. 14056, which requires a complete withdrawal from Vietnam by all American Armed Forces 30 days after the enactment of the legislation, contingent upon the release of our prisoners of war.

H.R. 12202, RELATING TO HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this week my bill, H.R. 12202, relating to health insurance coverage for Federal employees and retirees will be debated on the floor of the House.

When the bill reaches the floor, I plan to introduce an amendment to the bill to clarify an area of vital importance.

During hearings on this bill before the Subcommittee on Federal Employee Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, which I chair, the members of the subcommittee were largely of the opinion that postal workers, supervisors, and other personnel of the Postal Service were to be included under the provisions of the bill.

These hearings were held on September 28, 1971. On January 26, 1972, shortly before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee acted on the bill, Chairman DULSKI received a letter from Mrs. Louis A. Cox, General Counsel of the Postal Service, claiming that H.R. 12202 would not be applicable to the Postal Service or its employees.

By a vote of 13 to 12, the full committee chose to refer the issue of Postal Service application back to the subcommittee, and to report H.R. 12202 out of the committee without clarifying the postal matter.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee held a hearing on this matter and heard representatives of the postal employees and the Postal Service management.

From those hearings, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the representatives of the workers were of the distinct impression that although health benefits were to be under the collective bargaining provisions of the Postal Reorganization Act, the level from which the rate was to be discussed would be the current level being applied to Federal employees.

Thus, if H.R. 12202 were to pass, the increased Government contribution to the health insurance premium of all Federal employees would constitute the

basis of negotiations, if any, between the Postal Service and the bargaining agents for the Postal employees.

In signed affidavits presented to the subcommittee, by Mr. Bernard Cushman, chief negotiator for the postal unions during the collective bargaining negotiations, Mr. Chester W. Parrish, chairman of the Council of American Postal Employees, Mr. James H. Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and Mr. Francis S. Filbey, president of the American Postal Workers Union it is apparent that all parties agreed that "current" levels of contribution by the Federal Government would be the base figure for all future bargaining on the issue of health benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a base for negotiations is an important part of any collective bargaining agreement. It would appear that there is a serious area of misunderstanding and confusion that can only be resolved by firmly establishing the legislative intent in this matter.

Thus, I am proposing an amendment to H.R. 12202 which will clarify this matter once and for all. This amendment will include postal employees under the provisions of H.R. 12202 and will enable postal workers to thus bargain from a set and defined base.

The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 5. The rates of Government contribution for health benefits determined under section 8906 of Title 5, United States Code, as amended by the first section of this act, and the inclusion, for health benefit purposes, of certain unmarried children as family members under section 3 of this Act, shall apply to the United States Postal Service and its officers and employees and to the Postal Rate Commission and its officers and employees.

PRESIDENT NIXON ESCALATES THE WAR

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's sudden decision to bomb Haiphong came as a rude shock to the American people. For months they had heard the message being broadcast from the White House that our ground forces were being withdrawn from that embattled country, and they had assumed we would soon be out of the war. Now they have received another message: that we are still very much in the war and will remain there until it is ended on Mr. Nixon's terms.

It would be well, Mr. Speaker, to remind ourselves what those terms are. There are two conditions that President Nixon has imposed for our total withdrawal. The White House now speaks only of the first, that this action was necessary to protect American lives. Nobody opposes that purpose. We all insist that the lives of American boys in Vietnam must be protected.

But one must question whether that reason is valid. Certainly history moves us to a contrary view, for even at the height of the American intervention in Vietnam when more than 500,000 American ground troops were embattled there in various locations, President Johnson refused to bomb Haiphong. He considered it too extreme, too dangerous, a possibility for inviting much greater Soviet intervention against us. Certainly, if protection of our troops were required by bombing Haiphong, he would have done so.

Now President Nixon has plunged ahead to take the risk President Johnson would not take. The war has been escalated again.

There is a second requirement for ending the war established by President Nixon which is hardly mentioned by the White House: that is the assurance that the South Vietnamese Government will be able to sustain itself against enemy attack. There is no time limit imposed. Apparently, President Nixon intends to stay in Vietnam with large naval and air units as long as it is necessary to protect the present Government.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the message that comes through loud and clear from the bombing of Haiphong is that we will not be out of the war even when all of our land forces are withdrawn. The bombing was not a step toward peace. It reiterated Mr. Nixon's firm intention that the war will be continued until North Vietnam and its forces give up the fight.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the fighting and killing will go on for a very long time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, Monday, April 17, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

To Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, April 17, on account of illness.

To Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

To. Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. PURCELL), for April 17 and 18, 1972, on account of official business.

To Mr. MCKEVITT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and April 20, 1972, on account of official business.

To Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for today, Monday, April 17 and Tuesday, April 18, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KOCH, today, for 1 hour, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BADILLO, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DUNCAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPENCE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BADILLO), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURPHY of New York, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. EILBERG, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MIKVA, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEGICH, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, on April 18, for 30 minutes.

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL prior to passage of H.R. 736.

Mr. ROONEY of New York and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BENNETT, to extend his remarks immediately preceding passage of H.R. 4634.

Mr. BENNETT, to extend his remarks immediately preceding passage of H.R. 8209 today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA immediately prior to the passage of H.R. 9135.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter during the consideration of H.R. 13752.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois during consideration of H.R. 13752 and to include a letter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD during consideration of H.R. 13752 and to include pertinent material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. PEYSER in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. FORSYTHE in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.
Mr. SEBELIUS.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BADILLO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
Mr. DOW.
Mr. BEGICH in three instances.
Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.
Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.
Mr. COLMER.
Mr. ROE in three instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in seven instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. STEED.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California.
Mr. BOGGS in two instances.
Mr. UDALL in eight instances.
Mr. BADILLO.
Mr. HAWKINS in four instances.
Mr. WOLFF in four instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. LENNON.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. WALDIE in six instances.
Mr. DELLUMS in six instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
Mr. KARTH in two instances.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. GRIFFIN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1346. An act relating to benefits for employees of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1998. An act relating to educational personnel in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2956. An act to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9395. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with teachers and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the purchase of annuity contracts;

H.R. 9900. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and of civilian employees who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; and

H.R. 10344. An act to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Compact on Mental Health.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1861. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to enhance the ability of the Rural Telephone Bank to obtain funds for the supplementary financing program on favorable terms and conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1862. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a semiannual report on funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research programs during the first half of fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 409 of Public Law 91–121; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1863. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1971 to January 1972, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1864. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting an interim report on the process of funds allocation under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, pursuant to section 102 of Public Law 91–230; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1865. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report on the state of the domestic mining, minerals, and fuels industries, pursuant to the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1866. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for calendar year 1971, pursuant to 62 Stat. 85; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1867. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission; transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 322. *The Ponca Tribe of Oklahoma, and William Overland, Metha Collins, and John Williams, as representatives of the Ponca Tribe, and all the members thereof, Plaintiffs* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of an amendment to the Standard for the Flammability of Childrens Sleepwear to provide for a sampling plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1869. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting part I of the 1970 national power survey, containing the report of the Commission and the Commission's Task Force on Environment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1870. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting revised prospectuses for projects planned within the Federal Triangle, Washington, D.C., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1871. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; transmitting a list of the present and former NASA employees who, subsequent to December 31, 1971, have filed reports with NASA pertaining to their NASA and aerospace-related industry employment for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 91–119, as amended by section 7 of Public Law 91–303; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1872. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1873. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on efforts to employ disadvantaged persons in the Federal Government, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1874. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on efforts of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice to prevent dangerous drugs from illicity reaching the public; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1875. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a table showing the voting age population of the States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the dollar spending limitations allowed by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 in each State for use of communications media based on the voting age population figures, and the dollar amount of the portion of that limitation (60 percent) which may be spent for use of broadcasting media; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Pursuant to an order of the House on April 13, 1972, the following report was filed on April 14, 1972*]

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10488. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Pursuant to an order of the House on April 12, 1972, the following report was filed on April 14, 1972*]

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries. H.R. 13025. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1948, with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes. (Rept. No. 92–990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Pursuant to an order of the House on April 12, 1972, the following report was filed on April 14, 1972*]

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13752. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermo-electric generating plants, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 17, 1972*]

Mr. HAGAN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12846. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug dependent members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–992). 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 Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 14369. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. KARTH, Mr. BETTS, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 14370. A bill to provide payments to localities for high-priority expenditures, to encourage the States to supplement their revenue sources, and to authorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 14371. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 14372. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 14373. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes a passenger vessel operating solely on inland rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 14374. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need, and to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 14376. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 14377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 14378. A bill requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 7 through 13, 1972, as "Municipal Clerks' Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 14379. A bill to authorize the construction of 40 liquefied natural gas carriers to meet the energy crisis; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 14380. A bill to amend section 3401 of Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 14381. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program for prescription drugs, hearing aids, eye examinations, glasses, and treatment, dental care, and the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14382. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 14383. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (to the outer limits of the Continental Shelf) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 14384. A bill to extend the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 14385. A bill to amend section 7 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 14386. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1974, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14387. A bill to amend title 5. United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 14388. A bill to prohibit the Tennessee Valley Authority from acquiring or utilizing, in carrying out its operations and functions, any coal mined by strip mining methods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14389. A bill to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds to finance a newly-established guaranteed annual income program for the Nation's elderly, blind, and disabled citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 14390. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to limit the scope of regulations respecting service of food in competition with the programs authorized under that act and the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14391. A bill to enact title 49, United States Code, "Transportation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 14392. A bill to establish a system of Wild Areas within the lands of the National Forest System; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 14393. A bill to amend the Occupation Safety and Health Act of 1970 to delete the provision imposing penalties where violations are corrected within the abatement period prescribed; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself and Mr. POFF):

H.R. 14394. A bill to remove the limitation on payments for consultant services in the Community Relations Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14395. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the pay of prevailing rate employees assigned or detailed to perform duties of positions in grades or pay schedules higher than the grades of pay schedules of their existing position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14396. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14397. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 14398. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 14399. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that married individuals who file separate returns shall be taxed at the same income tax rates as unmarried individuals and to provide a special rule in the case of earned income which is community income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 14401. A bill to amend titles 18 and 39 of the United States Code, to permit the mailing of lottery tickets and related matter, the broadcasting or televising of lottery information, and the transportation and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce, but only where the lottery is conducted by State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14402. A bill to establish an executive department to be known as the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 14403. A bill to authorize Federal cost sharing in promoting public safety through the elimination of hazardous open canals by converting them to closed conduits and by fencing; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14404. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 14405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Aging and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 14406. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to increase the amount of Federal financial aid with respect to State meat inspection programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14407. A bill to provide for the development of Federal standards for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLMER, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KING, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 14408. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to define the term "employee" more precisely; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.R. 14409. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to define the term "employee" more precisely; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 14410. A bill to authorize Federal cost sharing in promoting public safety through the elimination of hazardous open canals by converting them to closed conduits and by fencing; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 14411. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 14412. A bill to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELCHER, (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JARMAN, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 14413. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River Basin compact, Arkansas-Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 14414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participation in war may elect to have his income, estate, or gift taxpayments spent for nonmilitary purposes; to create a trust fund (the World Peace Tax Fund) to receive these taxpayments; to establish a World Peace Tax Fund Board of Trustees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. SCHWENGEL, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 14415. 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. FISH:

H.R. 14416. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize design standards for schoolbuses, to require certain standards be established for schoolbuses, to require the investigation of certain schoolbus accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 14417. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for 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 amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 14418. A bill to provide emergency loans to the District of Columbia to carry out the expansion and renovation of the Blue Plains Sewage Treatment Facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself), Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 14419. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of law under which assistance is provided for the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DOW, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 14420. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's widower's, or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 14421. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to insure greater safety for students in getting to and from school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PIKE (for himself and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H.R. 14422. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States", approved October 14, 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 14423. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to enhance the ability of the Rural Telephone Bank to obtain funds for the supplementary financing program on favorable terms and conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 14424. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Aging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 14425. A bill to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-378; 84 Stat. 794) to expand the Youth Conservation Corps pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14426. A bill to provide for the comprehensive development of correctional manpower training and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 1162. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of office of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DOW, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BURTON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. KEMP):

H.J. Res. 1163. Joint resolution designating the third week week of April of each year as "Earth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FISH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee):

H.J. Res. 1164. Joint resolution designating the third week of April of each year as "Earth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. LINK, Mr. BELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. ROE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.J. Res. 1165. Joint resolution designating the third week of April of each year as "Earth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MANN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.J. Res. 1166. Joint resolution designating the third week of April of each year as "Earth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.J. Res. 1167. Joint resolution to extend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1168. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the day of May 21 as "National Women in Education Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 1169. Joint resolution to establish a national policy relating to conversion to the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. KYROS):

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Con. Res. 580. Concurrent resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 581. Concurrent resolution urging the review of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

368. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment of health centers for the elderly within the Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

369. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

370. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 14427. A bill for the relief of Sun Hwa Koo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 14428. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Litman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14429. A bill for the relief of Maimonides Medical Center, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

213. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Johnny Holmes, Jr., Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also petition of the city council, Pacific, Wash. relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROJECT SANGUINE: A DISTINGUISHED EXPERT SAYS IT HAS NO PROVEN SCIENTIFIC MERIT

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1972

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it seems that the more the scientific community studies the Navy's proposed Project Sanguine communications system, the more serious doubt there is expressed about whether this very large and very complex system will work.

Previous studies by Dr. Albert Biggs, a distinguished electrical engineer at the University of Kansas at Lawrence, and by the Wisconsin Committee for Environmental Information, cautioned that the Sanguine system advanced by the Navy could not generate an interference-free, jam-proof signal over large distances as envisioned.

Now we have another report, this one by Dr. Charles W. Harrison, Jr., of the Sandia Laboratories at Albuquerque, N. Mex. This report is a most serious indictment of scientific data used by the Navy to demonstrate the technical feasibility of Project Sanguine.

From the record of floor debates last September 22 and 29 on Project Sanguine, the Senate is aware of statements by the Navy regarding Sanguine.

Essentially, the Navy views this project as a backup for communications with nuclear submarines and other military outposts throughout the world. However, there is serious doubt whether it is needed and whether it would be effective. The Navy says that at least 6,400 square miles of northern Wisconsin would be covered with a transmitting antenna consisting of up to 1,000 miles of criss-crossing cable buried 6 feet deep. Some 30 megawatts of electricity would run continuously through the system, according to the Navy, to generate an extremely low frequency radio signal—in code and one-way only—to the submarines.

Because of the serious questions raised by Dr. Biggs and by Drs. Michael McClintock, Alwyn Scott, and Mr. Paul Rissman, of the Wisconsin Committee for Environmental Information, I asked the Navy to undertake an independent scientific review by a select group of highly qualified scientists.

The Navy notified my office on May 14, 1971, that a panel of scientists would be established by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. In the letter of May 14, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Robert A. Frosch said, in part:

> The Navy will supply the theoretical and experimental data on Sanguine to this Committee to permit them to make a thorough technical assessment of the validity of the Navy's computations of the expected systems power requirements, and ability to transmit messages to submerged submarines within the specified time, with the stated reliability, and in the presence of jamming.

Dr. Harrison is a member of the review panel selected by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. As such, he has spent countless hours studying all data on Project Sanguine supplied to the technical review panel by the Navy and by independent scientists, including Dr. Biggs and members of the Wisconsin Committee for Environmental Information.

Dr. Harrison is a distinguished scholar and practitioner of applied physics. His service to science, both with Sandia Laboratories since 1957 and prior to that with the U.S. Navy, from which he retired with the rank of Commander, has earned him recognition in "Who's Who in the West" for the past 8 years, in the "Dictionary of International Biography" and in "The Two Thousand Men of Achievement."

The paper by Dr. Harrison was reviewed by Dr. Ronald W. P. King, a Gordon McKay professor of applied physics at Harvard University. Dr. King, whose numerous achievements and contributions in the field of science have earned him recognition in "Who's Who in America" for the past 12 years, concurs in the report authored by Dr. Harrison.

Biographical sketches of both Dr. Harrison and Dr. King appear at the conclusion of the report.

The report is highly disturbing for what it reveals about the performance by the Navy in assessing the scientific merit of Project Sanguine. It is even more disturbing when it is considered that the Navy has spent 14 years and over $50 million on research and development of Sanguine.

The report says, in essense, that the Navy still is in only the genesis of research on this project.

That being the case, the Navy, according to Dr. Harrison, simply cannot provide a scientific basis for its assertion that the Sanguine antenna will work.

The Navy says that Sanguine will require a power input of 30 megawatts. Dr. Harrison says this estimate quite probably is 100 times too low—that at least 3,000 megawatts of power may be required. This would require the construction of at least six or more power plants the size of some of the largest power plants being built today.

And this much power dispersed into the Sanguine antenna could turn northern Wisconsin into an environmental no-man's land.

The Navy says that the Sanguine antenna would cover 6,400 square miles. Dr. Harrison has serious doubts, and he privately believes the system will have to be several times larger.

The Navy says that Sanguine would cost $750 million. But on the basis of the error margins exposed by Dr. Harrison, the cost could end up being many billions of dollars.

The Navy says the Laurentian shield bedrock of northern Wisconsin is the best suited for Sanguine because of its low conductivity. However, Dr. Harrison says in his paper that little is known of the Laurentian shield from a geological standpoint and that studies have indicated that pockets of very high conductivity may be found in areas of mineral deposits or in vertical fractures of the rock formation that are filled with water.

In short, Dr. Harrison says the Navy does not really know much about its Sanguine system or about the Laurentian shield. Certainly, he says, not enough is known to prove whether the system will work.

Dr. Harrison suggests that to ascertain