environmental impact statement on research, test, development, and evaluation for Project Sanquine.

Originally the Navy said it hoped to issue a final impact statement. However, after my intervention with the Council of Environmental Quality the Navy relented and decided to issue a final impact statement on only the research aspects of Project Sanguine.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am both surprised and disappointed with the Navy's latest environmental impact statement on Project Sanguine. Out of 1,000 pages of text in the two-volume report, only nine pages are devoted to discussion about alternative locations and alternative systems to Project Sanguine.

The Navy even admits that it has not completed studies on the cost of the possible location of Project Sanguine in New York and Texas. But the Navy still insists that Wisconsin is the best location despite the fact its own studies are not completed. Apparently the Navy is still not seriously considering alternative locations of systems.

Naturally I have not yet had the opportunity to thoroughly study this huge document and comment upon it. However it should be clear that unless the Navy has answered all its critics including such Government agencies as the Corps of Engineers, and the Forest Service, I will pose further funding for the project.

There are more than environmental questions connected with Project Sanguine. A clear-cut case has never been made by the Navy that Project Sanguine is vital to our national security. Instead it appears that Project Sanguine will be a backup communication system and redundant with existing systems.

While it is true that Project Sanguine may allow the operation of our nuclear submarine at lower depths than at the moment, this consideration must be balanced by the potential environmental effects and the total cost of the system.

Unless the Navy can prove the absolute necessity of building Project Sanguine and that the project will entail no adverse environmental effects upon northern Wisconsin, I will continue to oppose additional funding for the project.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsclipping in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1972]

SCHOOL INCENTIVE PLAN A FAILURE, OEO FINDS

(By Lawrence W. Feinberg)

In some classrooms, students who did good work were given cereal and candy.

In others the reward was a dollar for each reading unit completed.

After a year of providing such incentives, plus bonuses for teachers, the Office of Economic Opportunity has reported that they failed to produce significant gains in reading and mathematics achievement.

About 1,200 low-income students—including whites, blacks, and Mexican-Americans—and 78 teachers participated in OEO's incentives experiment in Mesa, Ariz., and Stockton, Calif.

The students' scores on standardized tests, the agency said, were about the same as those of other low-income youngsters in regular classes. Progress made by both groups, it said, was "disappointing."

OEO said its experiment was the largest ever done to test whether material incentives would raise the achievement of poor children, compared with those in regular classes.

The underlying theory, based largely on experiments with rats and other animals, was that learning could be improved by giving concrete rewards for desired behavoir.

Cash and prizes, the reserachers suggested, might be more effective stimuli than good grades, which often are not valued by lower-class youngsters.

Last year OEO said the project would cost as much as $100,000. But recently, Charles Stalford, the project manager, said the actual cost has not yet been determined because the agency and the school districts have not agreed on what the final payments to teachers should be.

Neither OEO nor the two cities are continuing the programs this year, although spokesmen for both districts said some teachers are still using incentives—mostly time off from classwork, not gifts.

In late January, OEO reported that another experiment it ran last year, having business firms operate public school programs, also failed to produce overall achievement gains.

Payments in these "performance contracts," like the teacher bonuses in Mesa and Stockton, were based on student achievement as measured by standardized tests.

The report made public recently on the two teacher and student incentive programs was prepared for OEO by the Batelle Institute, a non-profit research organization in Columbus, Ohio.

It compared students who received incentives with an equal number who did not receive them in comparable schools in both Mesa and Stockton. The children were in grades 1 to 3 and 7 to 9.

In 19 of the comparisons there was no significant difference betwen the incentive and the regular class groups. In three cases, all in elementary grades, the groups getting incentives did slightly better; in two cases, both in junior highs, students in regular classes gained slightly more.

In a statement summarizing the results, OEO declared that "the addition of incentives to the regular classroom routine cannot be said to have had any effect on children's achievement. . . ."

The OEO experiment is part of a fairly widespread movement, generally called "accountability," that emphasizes making schools and teachers responsible for how much their students learn.

In Washington this was reflected last year in a plan by psychologist Kenneth H. Clark adopted by the D.C. school board. It called, among other things, for promoting teachers to higher-paying ranks, partly according to their students' performance. This was bitterly opposed by the teachers union, and was not carried out.

In both Mesa and Stockton the teachers' associations cooperated with the bonus plans. They also made the decisions to share part of the money with students.

For teachers the bonuses were computed according to formulas, which differed in the two cities. In Stockton a teacher could earn an extra $5 for each student who made a gain of at least eight months on a standard test in either English or math. Each additional month's gain was worth $2.20 for the teacher, with a maximum of $24.94 per student per subject.

Thus, an elementary teacher with 30 students could earn a maximum bonus of about $1,500 OEO officials said none of them came close.

In both cities, the incentives for students included not only prizes and cash, but also trips, free meals, and more time for recess.

Although overall test score gains did not occur, a poll of teachers, also reported by OEO, indicated that most felt that students who were offered incentives caused fewer discipline problems and developed a "better attitude" toward school.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 24, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

This is My commandment, that you love one another, as I have loved you.—John 15: 12.

O God, our Father, who art the source of light, the sustainer of life, and the support of every noble endeavor, we bow in Thy presence praying that Thy spirit may be born anew in all our hearts. Grant that in the midst of difficult days and demanding duties we may be sustained by Thy goodness and strengthened by Thy grace.

Lead us in all good works that there be no want anywhere and favor us with Thy presence that good will may live in the hearts of all our people and peace come into the life of our world.

And grant, our Father, a safe return for our astronauts, from a successful mission on the moon.

In the spirit of the Master of men 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 17, 1972:

H.R. 12749. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1973.

On April 20, 1972:

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1972 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 12931. An act to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12931) entitled "An act to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. MILLER, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SECRETARIES WEEK

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every year since 1952, the last full week of April has been set aside for the observance of Secretaries Week. Wednesday of that week is highlighted as Secretaries Day.

The National Secretaries Association, International, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce, originated Secretaries Week to bring recognition to all secretaries for the vital role they play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions. It also serves to remind secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their profession.

In 1972, for the 21st consecutive year, Secretaries Week will be observed the last full week in April, April 23–29, with Secretaries Day on Wednesday, April 26.

The activities of Secretaries Week in the Nation's Capital started with attending church services at St. John's Episcopal Church, Lafayette Square, on Sunday, April 23, which was followed by a brunch at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel. The 21st annual Secretaries Day dinner will be held at the Touchdown Club of Washington on Wednesday, April 26. The climax of the activities will be on Saturday, April 29, at the Kenwood Country Club with a luncheon and presentation of "Fashions for the Secretary" by Rose Williams.

It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to our secretaries at this time.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that Madam Binh is writing an open letter to U.S. Congressmen and Senators, urging that they use their constitutional rights to set a termination date for U.S. involvement in Vietnam, is not surprising.

Over the years, the North Vietnamese have demonstrated considerable skill and resourcefulness in using the mass media of the non-Communist world to promote their objectives.

Nevertheless, this latest gambit seems quite inconsistent with the actions of North Vietnam—both at the negotiating table and in the war-torn terrain of South Vietnam.

For nearly 4 years, North Vietnam has had an opportunity to negotiate conditions which would have made possible prompt withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam.

The record seems quite clear on this point: They have used the negotiating table as a propaganda platform in support of their drive to take over South Vietnam—not to negotiate an end to the war.

The recent invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnamese forces also does not evidence any great desire to end the conflict—except through conquest of South Vietnam.

I support the ending of the war in Vietnam. I am in favor of a prompt withdrawal of all U.S. forces from that country. But these objectives will not be achieved by words alone. They must be backed by action in support of peace.

I hope that all of us will consider the actions of North Vietnam, as well as their words and written appeals, in judging whether they really seek peace.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION ON DOLLAR DEVALUATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a House joint resolution on dollar devaluation appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

EVERY MEANS MUST BE USED TO SAVE AMERICANS IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed our being in Vietnam. It has never made commonsense. North Vietnam borders China, and our supply line to South Vietnam is 11,000 miles long. Our entrance into this war was the most disastrous blunder in military history.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have approximately 80,000 American men now in Vietnam. They are mostly supply troops; 542,000 American soldiers were in Vietnam in 1968. That number has been withdrawn to the present complement of approximately 80,000 men.

Taking advantage of the withdrawal of some 460,000 American fighting men, North Vietnam has attacked, using every combat division and regiment available. They are equipped with modern Russian tanks and combat material. The onslaught has been with great impetus. The South Vietnamese are wavering; 80,000 American lives are in danger. Instead of 500 prisoners of war, the United States could suffer the capture of 80,000 American soldiers.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that every bomb should be dropped and every shell fired which will save an American life. Saturation bombing of military installations must be necessary. Haiphong and Hanoi cannot be exempted. Every means to save our sons from capture or death must be employed now. Their backs are to the sea. We are faced with a second Dunkirk, but without the ships to remove the men, or a nearby island on which to land them.

We cannot retreat, and we will never surrender. The threat to our men is immediate.

MADAM BINH ATTEMPTS TO MANIPULATE THE U.S. CONGRESS

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, to understand the flagrant attempt by Madam Binh of the Vietcong to manipulate the U.S. Congress we ought to look back at the changing tactics of the Communists.

Originally the policy of the North Vietnamese invaders was a war of liberation, using local indigenous troops. U.S. assistance to South Vietnam made that a failure, so in 1968 they committed themselves to an all-out offensive at the time of Tet. This turned out to be a miserable failure, so they had to change their tactics again.

The new tactic was a public relations offensive, which reasoned that the American public was so tired of the war that public pressure in this country would force an end to our involvement. A steady stream of presidential candidates, Senators, and House Members went to Paris to become grist for the Communist propaganda mill. What they did and said was used for propaganda by the Communists.

Finally, a few weeks ago the peace conference sessions were temporarily

terminated and the Communists had no stage upon which to present their dramatic propaganda. Since American public opinion has been more tolerant of administration policy as our troops were withdrawn, the Communists needed to do something to regain the propaganda initiative.

In desperation they have now "gone for broke," with an all-out invasion in the classic military sense. The military verdict is not in but without doubt the Communists have regained the psychological initiative.

The propaganda mill is grinding once again, and we have the disgraceful situation of Madam Binh treating the Congress like a monkey on the end of her string. Yank all you want, Madam Binh, but this Congressman will do what he thinks is right and not what you tell him to do.

MADAM BINH'S EFFORT TO TELL THE CONGRESS WHAT TO DO

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago a Vietnamese lady by the name of Madam Nhu was trying to tell the Congress what to do. Now Madam Binh is.

I resisted Madam Nhu, who was a lot better looking than Madam Binh, I can say, and if she sends me a letter it is going to go in the waste basket.

I believe that if she wants to get on the right track that they ought to get back north of the DMZ, which was the understanding when Mr. Johnson went to the peace table, that they would stay up there and we would talk to them. Now they are crying a little bit because they violated it and they got hit and they do not like it.

So far as I am concerned, I think it is outrageous that this woman should try to tell the Congress of the United States what to do.

ANNUAL REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Title I, Section 102, of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1752a(e)), enclosed is the Annual Report of the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration for the calendar year 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1972.*

EXTENDING THE AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 218) to extend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has cleared this with the ranking minority member of the committee, who I know is not here at this particular moment.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the distinguished gentleman it was cleared both with Mr. WIDNALL and with Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader.

I do not know of any objection. It is just an extension for 3 months as per the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. ARENDS. It is just a 3-month extension.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not aware of what this extends. Would the gentleman briefly explain what it proposes to do?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, if the gentleman will yield.

Senate Joint Resolution 218 was passed to extend authority conferred in the Export Administration Act of 1969. It is important that it be extended for about at least 3 months, since it expires soon, so both parties will have an opportunity to act on it. During that time we will have the devaluation being discussed in a thorough fashion and we will have the President's trip to Moscow. It is important that we keep this alive during that period of time. I think the leaders of both Houses agree that that is true. It is just to extend it for a period of 3 months.

Mr. GROSS. The Export Control Act?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. The Senate passed it unanimously. The Senate does this first.

Mr. GROSS. What the other body does, unanimously or otherwise, is sometimes important and sometimes not so important. Sometimes we may be guided by what they do unanimously, and there are other times when I would not be guided by what they do.

Mr. PATMAN. I accept that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES 218

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as amended (Public Law 92-37; 85 Stat. 89), is amended by striking out "May 1, 1972" and inserting "August 1, 1972".

The Senate joint resolution 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.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STUCKEY.)

CONVEYING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE NATIONAL FIREFIGHTING MUSEUM AND CENTER FOR FIRE PREVENTION, INC.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 2895) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Incorporated, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2895

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") shall convey (in accordance with section 2 of this Act) to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Incorated, a corporation organized under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, all right, title, and interest of the District of Columbia in and to the real property described in section 3 of this Act. For purposes of this Act, the term "corporation" means the corporation described in this section, and the term "real property" means the real property described in section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner shall not make the conveyance provided for in the first section of this Act until the Corporation has provided reasonable assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that

(1) adequate financial support will be available to the Corporation to restore and maintain the real property for the purposes set forth in clause (1) of subsection (b) of this section; and

(2) a sufficient amount of apparatus, equipment, and other artifacts relating to firefighting will be available to provide a suitable display on the real property.

(b) The conveyance provided for in the first section of this Act shall be made without the payment of monetary consideration by the Corporation. Such conveyance shall be made subject to the following:

(1) The Corporation shall use the real property (A) for the purposes of the Corporation stated in its articles of incorporation and bylaws as of February 28, 1969, and (B) for the purpose of maintaining and displaying such apparatus, equipment, or other artifacts relating to firefighting as may be loaned

or otherwise transferred to the Corporation by the District of Columbia or the United States or other sources acceptable to the Corporation for display on the real property.

(2) If the real property shall ever cease to be used for such purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to the real property shall, at the option of the Commissioner, revert to and become the property of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia shall have the immediate right of entry thereon.

SEC. 3. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is part of lot 840 in square 1200 and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning for the same at a point on the south line of M Street, said point of beginning being 127.50 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue; and running thence east along the south line of M Street 38.38 feet to the centerline of the west wall of the premises 3208 M Street Northwest:

thence in a southerly direction along the centerline of said wall and a continuation thereof 90.0 feet;

thence in a westerly direction along a line parallel to the south line of M Street 38.88 feet, more or less, to a point 127.50 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue;

thence in a northerly direction 90.0 feet to the point of beginning: all as shown on a plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 51, page 66.

SEC. 4. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the real property and any personal property owned by the corporation which is located on the real property shall be exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia.

(b) The property described in subsection (a) of this section shall be exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia so long as it is owned by the corporation for the purposes described in section 2(b)(1) of this Act. The provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia", approved December 24, 1942 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e), shall apply with respect to the corporation and the property made exempt from taxation by this section.

SEC. 5. The Act of September 1, 1959 (Public Law 86–216) is repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 4, immediately after "purposes," insert "or if the corporation is unable prior to the expiration of the five year period immediately following the date of enactment of this act to obtain adequate financial support to restore such property and equipment for display,"

Page 3, line 10, strike out "part of lot 840 in square 1200" and insert in lieu thereof "part of Record Lot 47 in Square 1200".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, before the question is put on agreeing to the committee amendments, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a brief explanation of what these amendments purport to do.

Would the gentleman from Georgia give us a brief explanation as to what these amendments do?

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, first, let me say that there is no money involved in this bill, and to give to the membership a little background on what happened——

Mr. GROSS. On that subject, if the gentleman will pardon me for interrupting, is the gentleman assuring the House that there will be no demand upon the Federal Treasury for any funds whatsoever as a result of this legislation?

Mr. STUCKEY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, this represents the position of the House District Committee, is that correct?

Mr. STUCKEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this will be one of the few times in history, and especially history of the present day, that something has been approved—if this bill is approved—in behalf of the District of Columbia that does not cost any money.

As of today, we are assured it will not cost a dollar in the future?

Mr. STUCKEY. That is correct. The only area that I see whereby this could cost the District any money——

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about the District. I am talking about the Federal taxpayers of the country.

Mr. STUCKEY. The only way they could possibly do that would be if there was a tax exemption granted.

Mr. GROSS. A tax exemption grant?

Mr. STUCKEY. That is correct, because it would be a nonprofit organization.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Does this amendment provide that this land revert? What does the amendment do?

Mr. STUCKEY. I think I can probably clarify this by giving the gentleman a little background information on the bill.

First, the building was deeded over to the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia and it was agreed upon at that time that they would also furnish certain matter that would go into the building if it was given to them. They never exercised their option and declined the use of this building.

The building is quite deteriorated now. The rodents and other undesirable elements have taken over the building. It is in a rather tragic condition now. It is one of the oldest buildings in the District. It is one of the historical buildings in the District.

The firemen want to take it over as a fire museum into which they would place their relics and historical matter. It is the opinion of the committee that that would serve a very useful purpose and it would clean up and beautify one of the oldest buildings in the District of Columbia which is now quite run down.

Mr. GROSS. And, they are proposing to raise the money to establish this museum; is that correct?

Mr. STUCKEY. That is correct.

Further, if they do not do it within 5 years, it will revert.

Mr. GROSS. The EDA—the Economic Development Administration a few weeks ago put up some $663,000 with which to build a Hockey Hall of Fame in Minnesota.

Is it anticipated that they are going to EDA to finance this project?

Mr. STUCKEY. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that we were assured by the witnesses that the firemen themselves could raise the money with which to restore the building.

Second, they have most of the historical fire equipment ready and available and they have assured us that they can raise the money. If they do not, it does revert back.

Mr. GROSS. The property will revert to whom?

Mr. STUCKEY. To the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2895, to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the nonprofit corporation—the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention. This corporation is prepared to restore the historic Bank of Columbia building in Georgetown for use as a museum for the history of firefighting, housing firefighting apparatus, equipment and artifacts, and as an educational center as well.

The museum, for which no admission will be charged, will offer a unique opportunity to the metropolitan area's thousands of schoolchildren and visitors to view in a close setting—this building was for many years a firehouse for the District—the work of the neighborhood fireman in fighting fires and preventing them. This latter aspect—prevention of fires—will be a most important feature of the museum's educational programs, through materials geared to the urban child specifically.

In short, to enable this museum to be established in the Bank of Columbia building will afford the residents and visitors to the District a unique, enjoyable, and educational look at the history of firefighting and fire prevention.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2895, as amended and reported (H. Rept. 92–1004) by your committee, is to require the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to convey title to the historic Bank of Columbia Building, located at 3214 M Street, NW in Georgetown, to a nonprofit corporation known as the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc., at no cost to the corporation, with the stipulation that this organization shall restore and maintain the property as a museum dedicated to the history of firefighting. The corporation plans to use the museum also for the presentation of fire prevention information to an audience surrounded by these visual stimuli.

The structure which is the subject of this bill was originally erected in 1796 as the Bank of Columbia, George Washington being one of the directors, and was used for that purpose until 1807, when the Bureau of Indian Trade occupied the premises. The government of the City of Georgetown purchased the building as a city hall in 1845, and held it with only minor interruption until 1871, when Georgetown was absorbed into the District of Columbia. In 1883, the District of Columbia government remodeled the property into engine 5 of the District of Columbia Fire Department, and it remained in this use until 1940. After 1940, the property was used for

various storage purposes, the last being as a garage for garbage trucks.

In 1957, the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia petitioned the Congress to give this building to them for use as their headquarters, since the association's former meeting house had been displaced by the International Monetary Fund, for which the association had been paid $50,000.

In 1959, Congress enacted Public Law 86–216, which provided for the conveyance of this property to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, for a consideration of 50 percent of its fair market value, and with a requirement that the building house the association's considerable collection of firefighting equipment which it owned as of January 1, 1956. This act also stipulated that this real property should revert to the District of Columbia whenever it might no longer be occupied by the association for its purposes.

The Association of Oldest Inhabitants has never exercised this right to purchase the property and in 1969 they disposed of a goodly portion of their collection of firefighting equipment, the possession of which had been specified as one of the stipulations for the purchase of the property.

Since 1959, therefore, this property has stood vacant and we are informed that it is in a highly deteriorated condition.

The historic old building is protected by its inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, the Georgetown Act, and the Preservation Act of 1966, and is registered under Historic American Buildings Survey number DC–119.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The principal provisions of H.R. 2895, as amended and reported, are as follows:

First. Section 1 directs the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to convey to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc., all right and title to the real property described in section 3 of this bill, subject to the provisions in section 2 thereof.

Second. Section 2, subsection (a) states that the Commissioner shall not make this conveyance until the Corporation has provided reasonable assurances satisafctory to the Commissioner that adequate financial support will be available to the Corporation to restore and maintain the property for the stated purposes, and that a sufficient amount of apparatus and other artifacts relating to firefighting will be available to provide a suitable display on the property.

Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that the conveyance of title shall be made without the payment of any monetary consideration by the Corporation, and shall be made subject to the following conditions: First. the Corporation must use the property for the purposes stated in its articles of incorporation and bylaws, namely maintaining and displaying such apparatus, equipment, and other artifacts relating to firefighting as may be acquired by the Corporation for display on the property; and second, that if the property shall ever cease to be used for such purposes, or if the Corporation is unable within a 5-year period after the date of enactment to obtain adequate financial support to restore the property and the equipment for display, then all right and title to the property shall, at the option of the District of Columbia Commissioner, revert to the District of Columbia.

Third. Section 3 provides a detailed description of the property, which is designated as part of record lot 47 in square 1200 in the District of Columbia.

Fourth. Section 4 states that this real property, and any personal property owned by the Corporation which is located on this real property, shall be exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia so long as it is owned by the Corporation for the purposes described in this Act.

Fifth. Section 5 repeals the act of September 1, 1959 (Public Law 86–216), the act which had authorized the sale of this real property to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Our committee is advised that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia no longer has any interest in purchasing this property, and in fact they have informed us that they support the enactment of H.R. 2895.

As long as Public Law 86–216 remains in effect, however, there is a complicated legal situation existing in regard to the District's ability to convey this property to anyone other than the Association of Oldest Inhabitants. Briefly, your committee has been advised that although Public Law 86–216 granted an equitable interest in the property to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, the association cannot now perfect its title to the property because it has disposed of much of the firefighting equipment mentioned in that act. Further, since the Association of Oldest Inhabitants has never occupied the building, it cannot be said that they "no longer occupy" it, and hence the property cannot be held to revert to the District of Columbia by reason of that provision in Public Law 86–216. Hence, an equitable interest remains in the association which creates a sufficient cloud on the title to the property that the District could not now convey marketable title to the property to any other purchaser.

Thus, we are advised that a legal stalemate exists which can be resolved only by the repeal of Public Law 86–216, which the enactment of H.R. 2895 will accomplish, or by the District of Columbia bringing suit to quiet title on the property. As long as this stalemate persists, the property must continue to deteriorate.

PLANNED USE OF THE PROPERTY

The National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc., which would acquire this property under the terms of this proposed legislation, is a nonprofit organization whose headquarters is presently located at 2007 R Street NW., and it was incorporated in the District of Columbia on February 28, 1969.

This corporation plans to restore this old building, rather than to demolish it as other purchasers would undoubtedly do, at a cost which they estimate at some $150,000, and to maintain it for the two-fold purpose a museum of firefighting apparatus, equipment, and artifacts, and as a center for dissemination of educational material and data regarding fire prevention.

This institution, to which there will be no charge for admission, is planned to serve the people of the Washington metropolitan area, with its 300,000 elementary school children, and the many thousands of visitors from all parts of the United States and foreign countries who will come to Washington each year.

This property is idealy suited for a national firefighting museum. Since it is presently the property of the District of Columbia government, its transfer under the terms of this bill would not result in any expenditure on the part of the District of Columbia. Its present value is estimated at about $100,000, with or without the building, but the nonprofit corporation could not afford to pay this price for the property in addition to the very considerable expense which they must bear for its restoration and maintenance. Since the District of Columbia has no apparent use for the property, however, and in view of the fact that any other owner to whom the property might be transferred would undoubtedly demolish the fine old building with its rich background in history, this committee feels strongly that its conveyance to this Corporation under the terms of this bill is in the best interests of the public and the government of the Nation's capital.

Also, because this property belongs to the District, the tax-exempt status which this bill would grant to the organization will take no revenue from the District of Columbia which it is presently receiving.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12931, TO IMPROVE THE ECONOMY AND LIVING CONDITIONS IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12931) to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POAGE, PURCELL, FOLEY, JONES of Tennessee, BELCHER, TEAGUE of California, and KYL.

RIGHTS FOR THE BLIND AND OTHERWISE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11032) to enable the blind and the otherwise physically disabled to participate fully in the social and economic life of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11032

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

EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC PLACES

SECTION 1. The blind and the otherwise physically disabled have the same right as the able bodied to the full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, and other public places in the District of Columbia.

EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2. (a) The blind and the otherwise physically disabled are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motor buses, street cars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation in the District of Columbia, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement, or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited in the District of Columbia, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law or in accordance with law applicable alike to all persons.

(b) Every bind person shall have the right to be accompanied by a guide dog, especially trained for the purpose, in any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in subsection (a), without being required to pay an extra charge for the guide dog; but any blind person so accompanied shall be liable for any damage done to the premises or facilities by such dog.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR DRIVERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

SEC. 3. The driver of a vehicle in the District of Columbia approaching a blind pedestrian who is carrying a cane predominantly white or metallic in color (with or without a red tip) or using a guide dog shall take all necessary precautions to avoid injury to such blind pedestrian, and any driver who fails to take such precautions shall be liable in damages for any injury caused such pedestrian. A blind pedestrian in the District of Columbia not carrying such a cane or using a guide dog in any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in sections 1 and 2 shall have all of the rights and privileges conferred by law on other persons, and the failure of such a blind pedestrian to carry such a cane or to use a guide dog in any such places, accommodations, or conveyances shall not be held to constitute nor be evidence of contributory negligence.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 4. The blind and the otherwise physically disabled shall be employed by the government of the District of Columbia, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, the Board of Vocational Education of the District of Columbia, the Board of Higher Education of the District of Columbia, and the Executive Officer of the District of Columbia courts, and in all other employment supported in whole or in part by appropriations for the District of Columbia, on the same terms and conditions as the able bodied, unless it is shown that the particular disability prevents the performance of the work involved.

EQUAL ACCESS TO HOUSING

SEC. 5. (a) Blind persons and other physically disabled persons shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to all housing accommodations offered for rent, lease, or compensation in the District of Columbia, subject to the conditions and limitations established by law or in accordance with law and applicable alike to all persons.

(b) Every blind person who has a guide dog, or who obtains a guide dog, shall be entitled to full and equal access to all housing accommodations referred to in this section, without being required to pay an extra charge for the guide dog; but such blind person shall be liable for any damage done to the premises by such dog.

(c) Nothing in this section shall require any person renting, leasing, or providing real property for compensation in the District of Columbia to modify his property in any way or to provide a higher degree of care for a blind person or otherwise physically disabled person than for a person who is not physically disabled.

PENALTY

SEC. 6. Any person or the agent of any person in the District of Columbia who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in sections 1 and 2 or otherwise interferes with the rights of a blind or otherwise disabled person under sections 1 and 2 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

WHITE CANE SAFETY DAY

SEC. 7. Each year, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall take suitable public notice of October 15 as White Cane Safety Day. He shall issue a proclamation commenting upon the significance of the white cane, and calling upon the citizens of the District of Columbia to observe the provisions of this Act, to be aware of the presence of disabled persons in the community, to keep safe and functional for the disabled the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, other public places, places of public accommodation, amusement, and resort, and other places to which the public is invited, and to offer assistance to disabled persons upon appropriate occasions.

DEFINITION

SEC. 8. For purposes of this Act, the term "blind person" means, and the term "blind" refers to, a person who is totally blind, has impaired vision of not more than 20/200 visual acuity in the better eye and for whom vision cannot be improved to better than 20/200, or who has loss of vision due wholly or in part to impairment of field vision or to other factors which affect the usefulness of vision to a like degree.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC PLACES

SECTION 1. The blind and the otherwise physically disabled have the same right as the able bodied to the full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, and other public places in the District of Columbia.

EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2. (a) The blind and the otherwise physically disabled are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motor buses, street cars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation in the District of Columbia, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement, or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited in the District of Columbia, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law or in accordance with law applicable alike to all persons.

(b) Every blind person shall have the right to be accompanied by a guide dog, especially trained for the purpose, in any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in subsection (a), without being required to pay an extra charge for the guide dog; but any blind person so accompanied shall be liable for any damage done to the premises or facilities by such dog.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR DRIVERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

SEC. 3. The driver of a vehicle in the District of Columbia approaching a blind pedestrian who is carrying a cane predominantly white or metallic in color (with or without a red tip) or using a guide dog shall take all necessary precautions to avoid injury to such blind pedestrian, and any driver who fails to take such precautions shall be liable in damages for any injury caused such pedestrian. A blind pedestrian in the District of Columbia not carrying such a cane or using a guide dog in any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in sections 1 and 2 shall have all of the rights and privileges conferred by law on other persons, and the failure of such a blind pedestrian to carry such a cane or to use a guide dog in any such places, accommodations, or conveyances shall not be held to constitute nor be evidence of contributory negligence.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 4. The blind and the otherwise physically disabled shall be employed by—

(1) every individual, partnership, firm, association, or corporation, or the receiver, trustee, or successor thereof (exclusive of the Government of the United States or any agency thereof), doing business, and employing any individual for the purpose of such business, in the District of Columbia, and

(2) the government of the District of Columbia, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, the Board of Vocational Education of the District of Columbia, the Board of Higher Education of the District of Columbia, and the Executive Office of the District of Columbia courts, and all other employers supported in whole or in part by appropriations for the District of Columbia,

on the same terms and conditions as the able bodied, unless it is shown that the particular disability prevents the performance of the work involved.

EQUAL ACCESS TO HOUSING

SEC. 5. (a) Blind persons and other physically disabled persons shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to all housing accommodations offered for rent, lease, or compensation in the District of Columbia, subject to the conditions and limitations established by law or in accordance with law and applicable alike to all persons.

(b) Every blind person who has a guide dog, or who obtains a guide dog, shall be entitled to full and equal access to all housing accommodations referred to in this section, without being required to pay an extra

charge for the guide dog; but such blind person shall be liable for any damage done to the premises by such dog.

(c) Nothing in this section shall require any person renting, leasing, or providing real property for compensation in the District of Columbia to modify his property in any way or to provide a higher degree of care for a blind person or otherwise physically disabled person than for a person who is not physically disabled.

PENALTY

SEC. 6. Any person or the agent of any person in the District of Columbia who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of any of the places, accommodations, or conveyances listed in sections 1 and 2 or otherwise interferes with the rights of a blind or otherwise disabled person under sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 shall be imprisoned for not longer than 90 days, or fined not more than $300, or both.

WHITE CANE SAFETY DAY

SEC. 7. Each year, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall take suitable public notice of October 15 as White Cane Safety Day. He shall issue a proclamation commenting upon the significance of the white cane, and calling upon the citizens of the District of Columbia to observe the provisions, to keep safe and functional for the disabled the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, other public places, places of public accommodation, amusement, and resort, and other places to which the public is invited, and to offer assistance to disabled persons upon appropriate occasions.

DEFINITION

SEC. 8. For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "blind person" means, and the term "blind" refers to, a person who is totally blind, has impaired vision of not more than 20/200 visual acuity in the better eye and for whom vision cannot be improved to better than 20/200, or who has loss of vision due wholly or in part to impairment of field vision or to other factors whch affect the usefulness of vision to a like degree.

(2) The term "otherwise physically disabled" refers to an individual who has a medically determinable physical impairment (other than blindness) which interferes with his ability to move about, to assist himself, or to engage in an occupation.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the support of my colleagues for the bill H.R. 11032, of which I am pleased to be the author, and which is designed as a "bill of rights" for the citizens of the District of Columbia who are blind or otherwise physically disabled.

This bill states that persons who are blind or otherwise physically handicapped shall have the same right as all other citizens to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, public buildings, and other public places in the District of Columbia, and also to full and equal accommodations and privileges of all common carriers, lodging places, and places of public accommodation, subject only to the conditions imposed by law alike to all persons. In order to facilitate the enjoyment of these rights, blind persons are provided the right to be accompanied by specially trained guide dogs in any such places, accommodations, or conveyances, without being obliged to pay any extra charge for the guide dog. However, a blind person shall be liable for any damages to premises or facilities caused by his guide dog.

The bill provides further that the driver of any motor vehicle in the District must take all necessary precautions to avoid injury to a blind pedestrian who is carrying an identifying cane or is using a guide dog, and shall be liable for any injury he may cause such a blind pedestrian in the absence of such precautions. Also, it is stated that the failure of any blind pedestrian to carry a white cane or to be accompanied by a guide dog shall not be held to constitute contributory negligance on his part.

Another very important provision of H.R. 11032 states that blind or otherwise physically disabled persons in the District shall be employed on the same terms and conditions as the able-bodied citizens, by the government of the District of Columbia, in any employment supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated for the District of Columbia, or by any individual or firm doing business in the District, excepting only the Federal Government. This assurance of employability must be extended to all disabled persons except in cases where the potential employer can show that the particular disability of an applicant prevents his performance of the duties involved in a particular position.

This bill also takes cognizance of the problems encountered by blind and otherwise handicapped persons in obtaining housing, by providing that such disabled persons shall be entitled to full access, as members of the general public, to all housing offered for sale or for lease in the District, on the same conditions as able-bodied persons. Again it provided that blind persons may utilize guide dogs in their housing accommodations, even though dogs and other pets may be forbidden in such premises, without extra charge for the use of the guide dogs, though they will be held responsible for any damage to premises caused by their dogs. This section provides also that no person renting property shall be required to modify the property or to provide a higher degree of care for a handicapped tenant than would otherwise be the case. In other words, the blind or otherwise disabled tenant is placed on the same footing as able-bodied occupants of the same premises.

These rights are made enforceable by the provision that any person who denies or interferes with the rights of the blind or otherwise disabled person spelled out in this legislation shall be imprisoned for a period not to exceed 90 days, fined not more than $300, or both.

The bill provides that the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall proclaim October 15 of each year as White Cane Safety Day. On this occasion, all citizens of the District shall be called upon to observe especially the provisions of this legislation, to be particularly aware of the presence of handicapped persons in the community, and to offer assistance to such disabled persons on every appropriate occasion. This is consistent with the observance of October 15 as White Cane Safety Day on a national basis each year by proclamation of the President of the United States, as required by Public Law 88-628, enacted in 1964.

The term "blind person," for the purposes of this legislation, is defined as a person who is totally blind, or who has impaired vision not correctable to a greater acuity than 20/200 in the better eye, or who has loss of vision due to impairment of field vision or to other factors which decreases his useful vision to the same degree.

The term "otherwise physically disabled" is defined also, as referring to an individual who has a medically determinable physical impairment, other than blindness, which interferes with his ability to move about, to assist himself, or to engage in an occupation.

This proposed legislation, which is patterned closely after the model white cane law developed by the National Federation of the Blind, is offered in an attempt to secure for the sightless and other disabled people the same rights and privileges so casually accepted and so freely exercised by the sighted and physically sound citizens—no more, and no less. We must change or eliminate the artificial barriers of ignorance, prejudice, and discrimination, and the adverse public attitudes that prevent the blind and other handicapped from pursuing and achieving normal lives, even though they are capable of doing so through the development of modern techniques and devices.

I have sponsored this legislation because I believe it is wrong for a blind person, either with a guide dog or a white cane, to be refused admission to a restaurant or any other public place—or to be denied the use of public transportation—or to be turned down for a job by means of which he might obtain the dignity of earning his living, for the sole reason that he is blind—or not to be allowed to rent a place to live. And I am convinced that these evils can be corrected only through the medium of enforceable legal rights and obtainable legal remedies, such as this bill will provide.

It may surprise many of my colleagues to learn that blind people actually suffer discrimination in any form, for we do not like to believe that anyone could be so hardhearted or callous of feeling as to practice such discrimination. But I am told, by blind persons themselves, that the discriminations against them are not practiced by hardhearted or callous individuals, but by the compassionate, well intentioned person who sincerely believes that he is acting in the best interest of the blind themselves, for their protection and for their own good. In this belief, he often interferes with or denies the blind person's right to travel on public streets, or to visit and be served in places of public accommodation. This happens, I am told, simply because most sighted people have had few contacts with the blind, or none at all. Thus, they know little or nothing of the true capabilities of the blind, and judge these things by their own inadequacies when they close their eyes, having no knowledge of the fact that necessity teaches blind people many things that are not

dreamed of by those who can see. This leads, of course, to the fallacy that those with sight are better able than the blind themselves to judge what is dangerous to the blind, and what the blind can and cannot do.

These handicapped and disabled people do not want preferred considerations and special guarantees; they want only the opportunity for equality of treatment with respect to the fundamental rights of all citizens—the freedom to travel independently on public streets and sidewalks, to enjoy equal access to public facilities and places of accommodation, and the other benefits which H.R. 11032 will assure them here in the Nation's Capitol; for upon all these rights depends the ultimate right of the blind or disabled to earn a livelihood, to support a family, and to pay taxes rather than to require welfare from the Government.

As for the ability of blind persons to make their own way in the world, given the opportunity, I am told that today there are blind persons employed successfully in many responsible jobs, including an actuary with the Social Security Administration; an information specialist with OEO; a graduate teaching fellow in library science at the University of Pittsburgh; a high school English teacher in a parochial school in Baltimore; an electrical engineer with a large radio company in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; a medical secretary at the Veterans' Administration here in Washington; a Russian language specialist at the National Security Agency; an attorney at the Federal Communications Commission; a computer programer for the Department of the Army; a personnel management expert with a large consulting firm in Chicago; and a VISTA Volunteer in Galveston, Tex. These are but a few of the examples which might be cited, of the work these people are capable of doing when they are given the opportunity. Yet countless numbers of blind people are denied access to jobs simply because of the pattern of ignorance which leads employers to believe that since the blind can see nothing; their training, intelligence, and ability are meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, equitable status for these disabled people can be attained only by enlightened, enforceable law. This bill will simply afford them the right to success or fail because of their personal abilities or the lack of them, and I earnestly solicit the support of this body for its enactment.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11032 represents a commitment on the part of the District of Columbia to allow the blind and otherwise physically disabled to participate fully in the social and economic life of Washington. Specifically, this bill sets forth the rights of such people to first, equal access to public places, and the right of the blind to be accompanied therein by seeing-eye dogs; second, equal opportunity in employment supported through District of Columbia appropriations, and third equal access to housing. These are three areas where, in the past, blind people have found their way blocked, generally through the ignorance or senseless fears and doubts of others. This bill, then, will simply insure to the blind and otherwise disabled people who live, work, and travel in the District, that they may, indeed, pursue a normal and full life here.

It is my understanding that approximately 12 States have enacted legislation of this nature, including by home State of Maryland, just about 1 year ago. It is only proper then, that we in Congress, acting as the legislative body for the District of Columbia, give favorable consideration to this "model white cane law" and, in so doing, give simple, but unqualified recognition to the rights of the blind and physically disabled in Washington. We simply should not allow these people to be the victims of discrimination born of ignorance or fear, and I believe this bill will insure that this not be the case here in the District of Columbia.

At the time the clean bill was reported out of committee, an amendment to enable examination by a physician skilled in the disease of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual might select, was brought to my attention by the American Optometric Association. I have checked with the committee staff, who felt this amendment might not be necessary. However, I am further checking with the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia. If they feel such an amendment would be of benefit, I shall urge its adoption by the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have only one question to ask. Does the District of Columbia have a record and a reputation of discrimination against the blind and the disabled?

Mr. STUCKEY. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, I think not only does the District of Columbia but I think most of the cities and most of the States do.

Mr. GROSS. Are you saying that most of the States and cities have established reputations for discrimination against the disabled?

Mr. STUCKEY. Yes, I think that is so. I think it is done quite unintentionally and without their knowledge. I think the point was well brought out by the gentleman from Virginia when he stated that in most instances such discrimination really came about from people who had compassion for these blind people.

Mr. GROSS. I am not going to admit that so far as the State of Iowa is concerned.

Mr. STUCKEY. Well, you may not admit it, but I think if you had the blind people of your State testify, they would testify to pretty much the same thing that the blind people from the District of Columbia did, as well as the national association, that there is this discrimination.

Mr. GROSS. This exists in the several States of the United States?

Mr. STUCKEY. Yes, sir, that was brought out in the testimony.

Mr. GROSS. Then why is this bill limited to the District of Columbia? Why are we not entertaining general legislation to take care of discrimination against the blind and the handicapped throughout the United States?

Mr. STUCKEY. It might be before some other committee, but I am sure the gentleman from Iowa knows that our jurisdiction is limited to the District of Columbia

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. In answer to the gentleman's question, the State of Iowa enacted a law similar to the one we are considering today back in 1967.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine. I could not help but wonder if the District had such a reputation in this great day of enlightenment and culture.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. No; as I have already said, and the gentleman from Georgia has repeated it—this is to prevent well-meaning compassionate people from discriminating against the blind. This will encourage probably less discrimination, although we cannot prove it, less discrimination against the blind by employers and particularly the District of Columbia government. We do not have evidence of specific cases.

The gentleman knows that there is a tendency on the part of people in trying to be helpful to make things a little more difficult for the blind and the physically handicapped, but——

Mr. GROSS. I did not ask for specific cases. I am simply curious to know what prompts this legislation. It must be the fact that there is discrimination against the blind. I am talking about discrimination, regardless of race, creed or color; I am talking about discrimination, period.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, the National Federation of the Blind have been the ones who have been seeking this legislation for a long time. They feel that they are being discriminated against, and they feel that with this legislation they will have opportunities like everyone else has.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STUCKEY. The testimony that was brought out to all members of the subcommittee and the full committee was that this discrimination does exist, though hardly anyone would say that there is discrimination against the blind. But you ask the blind man, ask the Federation of the Blind, and I think they will tell you and show you that there is, and they will point out many specific instances which are in the record.

Mr. GROSS. All I was attempting to secure was some information about the necessity for the legislation limited as it is to the District of Columbia. I am not opposed to any legislation that will reasonably help the blind and disabled, the aged and infirm.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 11032, as amended and reported

(H. Rept. 92–1005) by our committee, is designed to serve as a bill of rights for those residents of the District of Columbia who are blind or otherwise physically disabled, and is based on the premise that these handicapped persons have, and should be allowed to exercise, the same rights as their nondisabled fellow citizens. This concept applies specifically in this proposed legislation to such basic precepts as the right to access to all public facilities and conveyances, the right to be protected by the law when walking on the public streets and sidewalks, the right to rent housing which is offered for lease to the public, and the right to be employed on a basis of equality.

The bill conforms closely in its provisions to the model white cane law, which has been developed by the National Federation of the Blind as a guide for State and other legislative bodies.

Today, many persons who are blind or who suffer other physical impairments can achieve normal lives, because techniques and devices have been developed, and methods and systems created, to minimize the handicapping circumstances of such disabilities, and particularly of blindness. Despite this fact, however, many blind persons encounter adverse public attitudes that bar their way, that equate blindness with helplessness, and that insist that blind persons are completely incompetent and dependent.

This problem involves such situations as a blind person with a guide dog, or with a cane, being refused admission to a restaurant or a theater or other public place which invites the general public to enter; a blind person being denied the use of public transportation or being struck down by a motor vehicle while crossing a street; a blind person being refused the privilege of renting a place to live; or a blind person being turned down for a job for which he is both trained and qualified, only because he is blind. Our committee is advised that these and other problems have occurred, and do occur, to the blind and otherwise physically handicapped citizens in the District of Columbia. The National Federation of the Blind has spearheaded a nationwide effort to achieve correction of this unconscionable situation, and the bill H.R. 11032 is patterned almost entirely after the model white cane law developed by this National Federation.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The principal provisions of this bill are as follows:

1. EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC PLACES

Section 1 provides that blind and otherwise physically disabled persons shall have the same right as the able bodied to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, and public buildings and facilities in the District of Columbia.

This provision asserts the right of blind and physically disabled persons to travel on the city's streets, and to enter into and use, just as do the physically fit, all public places and facilities, without needless restraints and unjustified restrictions. For example, refusal to admit a guide dog into a crowded public place would be an unreasonable denial. This provision also serves to put the general public on notice that the blind and disabled are to be expected in public places.

2. EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND CONVEYANCES

Section 2, subsection (a) of the bill provides that the blind and otherwise physically handicapped are entitled to full and equal accommodations and privileges of all common carriers, including all public conveyances or modes of transportation in the District and of all hotels, places of public accommodation or amusement, and other places to which the general public is invited in the District, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and application alike to all persons.

This provision asserts the right of such disabled persons to unrestricted use of all forms of public transportation, all manner of lodging accommodations and all public facilities and activities to which the public is invited. This also includes a notice to the general public that blind and disabled persons are to be expected in public places.

Subsection (b) provides that every blind person shall have the right to be accompanied by a guide dog, especially trained for the purpose, in any of the places listed in subsection (a) of this section, without being required to pay any extra charge for the guide dog. However, it is further specified that any blind person shall be liable for any damage done to any premises or facilities by a guide dog by which he is accompanied.

This provision requires that a guide dog be admitted wherever the blind master would be entitled to admission as a member of the public, but this unrestricted admissibility of a guide dog is coupled with a liability upon the dog's owner for any damage caused by the dog. The provision also prohibits any obvious and direct restraint upon such admissibility by prohibiting the imposition of an extra charge because of the presence of the guide dog.

3. SAFETY STANDARDS FOR DRIVERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Section 3 states that the driver of a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, when approaching a blind pedestrian who is carrying a cane of color and design commonly associated with use by the blind, or using a guide dog, shall take all necessary precautions to avoid injury to such blind pedestrian; and any driver who fails to take such precautions shall be liable for any injury caused to the pedestrian. It is further provided that a blind pedestrian not carrying a distinctive cane or using a guide dog, in any of the places or accommodations listed in sections 1 and 2 of this bill, shall have all the rights conferred by law upon other persons, and the failure of such a blind pedestrian to carry such a cane or to use a guide dog in such places or accommodations shall not be held to constitute contributory negligence on his part.

This section establishes reasonable safety standards of conduct which must be followed by drivers of motor vehicles with reference to blind pedestrians. It is the opinion of our committee that the disabled have the same right to use the city's streets that other people do. However, when they exercise this right, they should be required to proceed with due care in the circumstances incident to their disability, and to move about in the streets as would any reasonable person. That is, it is incumbent upon the disabled to make greater use of their remaining senses; the blind must listen more carefully, the deaf look more closely, and the aged and lame allow more space and time. Having acted in a prudent manner, however, the disabled may not be held guilty of contributory negligence on the grounds of their disability, even in the case of a blind person not carrying a cane or being led by a guide dog.

4. DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Section 4 provides that the blind and otherwise physically handicapped shall be employed on the same terms and conditions as the able bodied, unless it is shown that the particular disability prevents the performance of the work involved, by first, any individual or firm, exclusive of any agency of the United States government, doing business and employing persons in the District of Columbia; and second, the government of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Board of Education, the District of Columbia Board of Vocational Education, the District of Columbia Board of Higher Education, the Executive Officer of the District of Columbia courts, and all other employers supported in whole or in part by appropriations for the District of Columbia.

This section establishes the right of any blind or otherwise physically disabled person to the same consideration for employment as would be extended to any other person. Further, the burden of proving ability to perform the duties of any position will not rest upon the physically impaired applicant; rather, this burden of proof will be placed upon the potential employer, who will have to show that an applicant's particular disability prevents his performance of the work involved in the position for which he is applying.

5. EQUAL ACCESS TO HOUSING

Section 5, subsection (a) states that blind and otherwise physically handicapped persons shall be entitled to full and equal access to all housing accommodations offered for sale or lease in the District, as are other members of the general public.

Subsection (b) provides that any blind person with a guide dog shall be entitled to full and equal access to all such housing accommodations without being required to pay an extra charge for the dog. However, he shall be liable for any damage done to the premises by such dog.

Subsection (c) states that nothing in this section shall require any person renting or leasing property to modify his property in any way or to provide a higher degree of care for a person who is blind or otherwise physically disabled than for any other person not disabled.

This "open housing" section of the bill assures that a blind person or one who is

otherwise physically disabled wishing to rent or lease living accommodations may not be discriminated against by reason of his disability. For example, a blind person who has a guide dog may not be refused tenancy because of the dog, even though dogs and other pets may not be usually allowed. Proper protection is afforded the owner of such a property, however, for any damage caused by such a guide dog.

6. PENALTY

Section 6 provides that any person who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of any of the places, accommodations, of conveyances listed in sections 1 and 2, or otherwise interferes with the rights of a blind or otherwise disabled person under sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 of this bill, shall be imprisoned for not longer than 90 days, or fined not more than $300, or both.

This section is the "teeth" in this proposed legislation. The maximum penalties provided are the same as exist in the District today for misdemeanors in general.

7. WHITE CANE SAFETY DAY

Section 7 states that the D.C. Commissioner shall take public notice of October 15 each year as White Cane Safety Day. He shall issue a proclamation commenting on the significance of the white cane, and call upon all citizens of the District to observe particularly the provisions of this act on that occasion.

On October 6, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law House Joint Resolution 753—Public Law 88-628—which requires that each year the President of the United States shall proclaim October 15 "White Cane Safety Day." This is a part of a campaign by the National Federation of the Blind to educate the general public in regard to the competencies and capabilities of trained and properly oriented blind people and the real nature of blindness. This section in this proposed legislation will achieve at the local level what the Federal law has established on the national level. In addition to its educational value, the annual issuance of this proclamation will constitute another form of public notice of the rights of the blind and disabled.

8. DEFINITION

Section 8 defines the terms "blind person" and "otherwise physically disabled" for the purposes of this act.

CONCLUSIONS

Blind persons, and persons with other physical impairments, have suffered from discriminatory practices in a wide range of experiences, varying from situations as petty as being denied the rental of a safety deposit box in a bank to matters as serious as the denial of protection of the law when becoming injured in a traffic accident.

Every such handicapped person who forsakes the haven of his abode to make his own way in the world meets people who prejudge his ability to live a normal, independent life; and the greatest need of the blind and otherwise physically disabled is the right to succeed or fail in an attempt to achieve such independence, by reason of their personal abilities or the lack thereof. Certainly a blind person should not be held back because other people believe that since he can see nothing he therefore can think and do nothing.

Each section of this proposed legislation is deliberately included to open for these people the doors of opportunity that have been closed for so many years, and to afford them a measure of justice and dignity to which the members of this committee believe they are entitled as are all human beings.

HEARING

A public hearing on this measure was held on March 15, at which time testimony in support of the legislation was offered by spokesmen for the National Federation of the Blind of the District of Columbia, the Center for Concerned Engineering, and the District of Columbia government. No opposition to the legislation was expressed.

COST

No cost to the government of the District of Columbia will accrue as a result of the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that legislation is needed to protect the rights of the blind and disabled in this country. But as I have stated before discrimination and exclusion are daily obstacles in the lives of these citizens.

The airlines, trains, and buslines of this country have maintained unpublicized regulations that have created chaos in the lives of handicapped travelers. I have illustrated case after case where airlines have taken individuals in wheelchairs off a plane because they somehow did not fulfill a technicality of the regulations.

The handicapped have had great difficulty in traveling but the most tragic and objectionable discrimination has been the neglectful exclusion of 4½ million children from an education. These children are denied their rights and left to lead a life of needless deprivation. Where can these children turn?

In the past year the courts of our land have handed down monumental decisions and a consent order that have given hope to these unprotected citizens. H.R. 11032 which we are debating today, for the first time establishes criminal penalties for anyone who interferes with the rights of a blind or disabled person.

This is a dramatic step in the fight to see equal treatment for the handicapped.

I support this legislation for the District of Columbia and hope that State legislatures and the Congress will follow the lead nationally.

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. Are there any further bills to be called up by the committee?

Mr. STUCKEY. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the District Calendar.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the District of Columbia bills considered today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PUBLIC INCOME TRANSFER PROGRAMS

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a report recently issued by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman. This paper, entitled "Public Income Transfer Programs: The Incidence of Multiple Benefits and the Issues Raised by their Receipt," is a staff study released as part of the subcommittee's 2-year review of public welfare programs which impact on personal incomes. Our scope includes benefits in the form of social insurance, veterans' cash benefits, public assistance, food, health, and housing programs.

My colleagues will remember that one major purpose of this 2-year study is to focus on the problems of coordinating and integrating this large and complex set of programs. As the staff study shows, these programs involve massive expenditures. Almost $100 billion will be paid out in fiscal year 1972 under 26 major Federal programs and the largest non-Federal programs. Although 119 million people are helped by these programs, the number of unique beneficiaries is probably about 60 million.

Included in the above-mentioned programs are 10 Federal programs and the local general assistance programs which directly relate benefits and eligibility to need; that is, to the current cash incomes of recipients. When allowance is made for persons receiving benefits under more than one program, the actual number of individuals receiving these income-tested benefits is no more than 25 to 30 million persons. This latter figure is a better measure of the true size of the welfare rolls than simply the 14 million persons receiving public assistance. With a beneficiary caseload of this size, our concern must be the structure of existing and proposed programs under which they may benefit, and the ways in which these programs work together.

The staff study points out that a multiplicity of separate programs dealing largely with the same population is bound to result in inefficient duplications of administrative efforts and to result in an excess of red tape confronting the recipients. The programs covered by this report are administered by 11 Federal agencies and by countless State and local agencies in all of the States and territories. Each component in this complex array of administrative machinery is faced with an enormous task, and if an error is made or a fraudulent claim is ac-

cepted, the high degree of overlap among these programs raises the possibility that such mistakes may be transmitted into the records of several programs, thereby raising the cost of the original error.

The subcommittee recently conducted a hearing in New York City. State and local administrators there are trying to make sense out of the multitude of Federal and State laws and regulations governing welfare-type programs. The acting commissioner of the New York State Department of Social Services stated that these laws and regulations pertaining to welfare have outgrown a 48-inch bookshelf. I came away convinced that public assistance in medium and large cities today is virtually unadministrable, and the regulations are largely unenforceable. Further, the inequities and the incentive problems are severe. Our witnesses included four intake-eligibility workers who said that some of the AFDC recipients can have a higher total income—from earnings and AFDC—than the workers themselves earn. And the welfare recipients are covered by an elaborate medicaid program which spends $1,070 per year for the average AFDC family.

My conclusions are:

First, the complexity of program procedures makes them difficult to understand by recipient, caseworkers, and taxpayer alike;

Second, the Federal agencies have difficulties in monitoring the implementation of national policies at the local level;

Third, the variety of local opitions in the implementation of some programs result in the fact that national perspectives on cumulative impacts of benefits are not always borne out by local area analyses;

Fourth, because of the extreme variation in local program structures, it is not now possible to accurately and comprehensively assess the impact on individuals of a change in any one of these income transfer programs; and

Fifth, the Congress and the executive agencies must take off the blinders imposed by jurisdictional responsibilities and examine specific program changes in terms of the consequences for the existing complex of programs.

THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO BOUNDARY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the United States and Mexico exchanged final ratifications of a treaty to resolve pending boundary differences and maintain the Rio Grande and Colorado River as the boundary between our two nations.

With this treaty our two great countries have resolved our last boundary dispute and established a mechanism for dealing with any future problems which may arise from the erratic wanderings of the rivers which form portions of the boundary between the United States and Mexico.

Major provisions of the treaty include:

First. Assignment of 1,606.19 acres of land to Mexico in exchange for 555.81 acres in connection with a longtime dispute over the Presidio-Ojinaga tracts.

Second. Transfer of the Horcon and Beaver Island tracts to Mexico in return for compensation to the United States of an equal amount of 481.68 acres of nearby land.

Third. Reestablishment of the boundary in the middle of the river. If there is more than one channel, the boundary will run in the middle of the widest channel. This will result in Mexico gaining more acreage and a larger number of islands than the United States. To offset this loss Mexico has agreed to transfer 252 acres of land in the Presidio Valley to the United States.

Fourth. Provisions of a procedure for future transfer of lands necessitated by shifting of river channels.

Fifth. Establishment of a permanent maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean to be drawn 12 miles from the coast.

The full text of the treaty is as follows:

TREATY TO RESOLVE PENDING BOUNDARY DIFFERENCES AND MAINTAIN THE RIO GRANDE AND COLORADO RIVER AS THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The United States of America and the United Mexican States,

Animated by a spirit of close friendship and mutual respect and desiring to:

Resolve all pending boundary differences between two countries,

Restore to the Rio Grande its character of international boundary in the reaches where that character has been lost, and preserve for the Rio Grande and Colorado River the character of international boundaries ascribed to them by the boundary treaties in force.

Minimize changes in the channels of these rivers, and should these changes occur, attempt to resolve the problems arising therefrom and promptly and equitably,

Resolve problems relating to sovereignty over existing or future islands in the Rio Grande,

And finally, considering that it is in the interest of both countries to delimit clearly their maritime boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific Ocean,

Have resolved to conclude this Treaty concerning their fluvial and maritime boundaries and for such purpose have named their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Robert H. McBride, Ambassador of the United States of America to Mexico, and

The President of the United Mexican States, Antonio Carrillo Flores, Secretary of Foreign Relations,

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE

In order to resolve the pending boundary cases of the Presidio-Ojinaga Tracts, the Horcon Tract, Beaver Island, and islands, in which the territory of one of the Contracting States has been placed on the opposite bank of the Rio Grande, and to restore this river as the international boundary, the United States and Mexico have decided to modify the position of the Rio Grande in certain reaches, in accordance with the following terms:

A. To change the location of a section of the channel of the Rio Grande in the area of the Presidio-Ojinaga Tracts, so as to transfer from the north to the south side of the Rio Grande an area of 1606.19 acres (650 hectares). This relocation shall be effected so that the middle of the new channel follows the alignment shown on the map of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), entitled Relocation of the Rio Grande in the Presidio-Ojinaga Tracts, attached to and forming a part of this Treaty.

B. To change the location of the channel of the Rio Grande upstream from and near Hidalgo-Reynosa, so as to transfer from the south to the north of the Rio Grande an area of 481.68 acres (194.93 hectares). This relocation shall be effected so that the middle of the rectified channel follows the alignment shown on the Commission's map entitled Relocation of the Rio Grande Upstream from Hidalgo-Reynosa, attached to and forming a part of this Treaty.

C. To change the location of the channel of the Rio Grande downstream from and near Presidio-Ojinaga, so as to transfer from the south to the north of the Rio Grande an area of 252 acres (101.98 hectares). This relocation shall be effected so that the middle of the rectified channel follows the alignment shown on the Commission's map entitled Relocation of the Rio Grande Downstream from Presidio-Ojinaga, attached to and forming a part of this Treaty.

D. Once this Treaty has come into force and the necessary legislation has been enacted for carrying it out, the two Governments shall determine, on the basis of a recommendation by the Commission, the period of time appropriate for each of them to carry out the following operations:

(1) The acquisition, in conformity with its laws, of the lands to be transferred to the other and of the rights of way for the new river channels;

(2) The orderly evacuation of the occupants of the lands referred to in paragraph D(1) of this Article.

E. The changes in location of the Rio Grande referred to in paragraphs A, B and C of this Article, shall be executed by the Commission as soon as practical in accordance with the engineering plans recommended by it and approved by the two Governments. The cost of these changes in location shall be equally divided between the two Governments, through an appropriate division of work recommended by the Commission in the same engineering plans.

F. On the date on which the two Governments approve the Commission's Minute confirming the completion of the relocations of the channel of the Rio Grande provided for in paragraphs A, B and C of this Article, the change of location of the international boundary shall be effected in each case and the middle of the new channels of the Rio Grande and of the present channels north of the Horcon Tract and north of Beaver Island shall become the international boundary; and consequently the following territorial adjustments shall take place:

(1) By reason of the rectification referred to in paragraph A of this Article, there shall pass from the north to the south of the Rio Grande within the territory of Mexico, 1606.19 acres (650 hectares) in the Presidio-Ojinaga Tracts.

(2) By reason of the rectification referred to in paragraph B of this Article, there shall pass from the south to the north of the Rio Grande 481.68 acres (194.93 hectares) to form a part of the territory of the United States. This transfer is in recognition of the fact that the Horcon Tract and Beaver Island, located south of the Rio Grande, comprising a total area of 481.68 acres (194.93 hectares)

now under the sovereignty of the United States shall pass to and become part of the territory of Mexico.

(3) By reason of the rectification referred to in paragraph C of this Article, there shall pass from the south to the north of the Rio Grande 252 acres (101.98 hectares) to form a part of the territory of the United States. This transfer is in recognition of the fact that, upon the adoption of the new boundary in accordance with Article II of this Treaty Mexico will receive a greater number and acreage of islands than the United States.

ARTICLE II

In order to resolve uncertainties relating to the sovereignty over islands and to restore to the Rio Grande its character as the international boundary in those locations where this character has been lost between the Gulf of Mexico and its intersection with the land boundary, the Contracting States agree that:

A. Except as provided in Articles I(F), III (B) and III(C) of this Treaty, from the date on which this Treasury enters into force, the international boundary between the United States and Mexico in the limitrophe sections of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River shall run along the middle of the channel occupied by normal flow and, where either of the rivers has two or more channels, along the middle of the channel which in normal flows has the greater or greatest average width over its length, and from that time forward, this international boundary shall determine the sovereignty over the lands on one side or the other of it, regardless of the previous sovereignty over these lands.

B. For the purposes of this Treaty, the Commission shall in each case determine the normal flows, which shall exclude flood flows, and the average widths, referred to in the preceding paragraph of this Article.

C. The Commission, on the basis of the surveys which it shall carry out as soon as practical, shall with appropriate precision delienate the international boundary on maps or aerial photographic mosaics of the Rio Grande and of the Colorado River. In the future, the Commission shall make surveys as frequently as it may consider justifiable, but in any event at intervals not greater than ten years, and shall record the position of the international boundary on appropriate maps. Each of the Governments shall bear half of the costs and other expenses determined by the Commission and approved by the two Governments for the surveys and maps relating to the boundaries.

ARTICLE III

In order to minimize problems brought about by future changes in the limitrophe channels of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River, the Contracting States agree that:

A. When the Rio Grande or the Colorado River moves laterally eroding one of its banks and depositing alluvium on the opposite bank, the international boundary shall continue to follow the middle of the channel occupied by normal flow or, where there are two or more channels, it shall follow the middle of the channel which in normal flow has the greatest average width over its length.

B. (1) When the Rio Grande or the Colorado River, through movements other than those described in paragraph A of this Article, separates from one Contracting State a tract of land, which might be composed of or include islands, of no more than 617.76 acres (250 hectares) and with an established population of no more than 100 inhabitants, the Contracting State from which the tract of land has been separated shall have the right to restore the river to its prior position and shall notify the other Contracting State, through the Commission, at the earliest possible date whether or not it proposes to restore the river to its prior position. Such restoration must be made at its own expense within a period of three years counted from the date on which the Commission acknowledges the separation; however, if such restoration should have been initiated but not completed within the period of three years, the Commission, with approval of both Governments, may extend it for one year. The boundary shall remain in its prior location during the periods herein provided for restoration of the river, notwithstanding the provisions of Article II(A) of this Treaty.

(2) If at the conclusion of the periods herein provided the river has not been restored to its prior position, the international boundary shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of Article II(A) of this Treaty, and sovereignty over the separated tract of land shall, as of that date, pass to the Contracting State on whose side of the river the separated tract is then located. Should the Contracting State from whose territory the tract was separated notify the other Contracting State of its intention not to restore the river to its prior position, the international boundary shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of Article II(A) of this Treaty, and sovereignty over the separated tract shall change as of the date on which notification is given through the Commission.

(3) When a tract of land passes from the sovereignty of one Contracting State to the other in accordance with paragraph B(2) of this Article, its area shall be ascertained and recorded by the Commission as a credit in favor of the Contracting State from which it was separated, for later compensation by an equal area in a natural separation of a tract of the other Contracting State which is not restored or in a future rectification recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments in the same river. The costs of such rectifications shall be divided equally between the Contracting States and, upon completion, the middle of the new channels shall become the international boundary and the Commission shall cancel the corresponding credit.

C. When the Rio Grande or the Colorado River, by movements other than those provided in paragraph A of this Article, separates from one Contracting State a tract of land, which might be composed of or include islands, having an area of more than 617.76 acres (250 hectares) or an established population of more than 100 inhabitants, the international boundary shall remain in its prior position and sovereignty over the separated tract of land shall not change, notwithstanding the provisions of Article II(A) of this Treaty. In such cases the Commission shall restore the river to its prior channel as soon as practical, equally dividing the costs between the Contracting States. As an alternative procedure the Commission, with the approval of the two Governments, may rectify the channel of the river in the same section in which the separation occurred, so as to transfer an equal area to the Contracting State from which the tract of land was separated. The costs of these rectifications shall be divided equally between the two Governments and, upon their completion, the middle of the new channels shall be the international boundary, as defined in Article II(A) of this Treaty.

D. The Commissioners shall exchange all information coming to their attention about possible or actual separation of lands as referred to in paragraphs B and C of this Article. The Commission shall promptly make the necessary surveys and investigations in all cases of separation and determine, in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs B and C of this Article, which type of separation has taken place.

E. Pending any changes in sovereignty brought about by the application of paragraphs B or C of this Article, each Contracting State shall extend to the nationals of the other such facilities for transit through its territory as may be necessary to permit the use and enjoyment of separated tracts as before the separation, including such exemption from customs duties and immigration procedures as may be necessary.

F. When in the limitrophe reaches of the Rio Grande and Colorado River, a part of the channel temporarily loses its character as the boundary by reason of the charges contemplated in paragraphs B and C of this Article, the international character of the use and consumption of those waters, in the order established under Article 3 of the Treaty of February 3, 1944, shall not be modified.

ARTICLE IV

In order to reduce to a minimum the shifting of the channels of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River in their limitrophe sections, and the problems that would be caused by the separation of tracts of land, the Contracting States agree that:

A. Each Contracting State, in the limitrophe sections of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River, may protect its bank against erosion and, where either of the rivers has more than one channel, may construct works in the channel or channels that are completely within its territory in order to preserve the character of the limitrophe channel provided, however, that in the judgment of the Commission the works that are to be executed under this paragraph do not adversely affect the other Contracting State through the deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows.

B. (1) Both in the main channel of the river and on adjacent lands to a distance on either side of the international boundary recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Contracting State shall prohibit the construction of works in its territory which, in the judgment of the Commission, may cause deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows.

(2) If the Commission should determine that any of the works constructed by one of the two Contracting States in the channel of the river or within its territory causes such adverse effects on the territory of the other Contracting State, the Government of the Contracting State that constructed the works shall remove them or modify them and, by agreement of the Commission, shall repair or compensate for the damages sustained by the other Contracting State.

C. (1) The Commission shall recommend to the two Governments the execution of works it may consider advisable and practical for improvement and stabilization of the channels of the Rio Grande and of the Colorado River in its limitrophe sections, including among others the following measures: clearing, channel excavations, bank protection and rectifications. The Commission shall include in its recommendations an estimate of the costs of construction, operation and maintenance of the works, and a proposal for the division of the work and costs between the Contracting States.

(2) As soon as may be practical, after the two Governments approve the Commission's recommendations, each of the Contracting States shall execute, at its expense, its share of the construction, operation and maintenance referred to in paragraph C(1) of this Article.

ARTICLE V

The Contracting States agree to establish and recognize their maritime boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific Ocean in accordance with the following provisions:

A. The international maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico shall begin at the center of the mouth of the Rio Grande, wherever it may be located; from there it shall run in a straight line to a fixed point at 25° 57′ 22.18″ North latitude, and 97°8′ 19.76″ West longitude, situated approximately 2,000 feet seaward from the coast; from this fixed point

the maritime boundary shall continue seaward in a straight line the delineation of which represents a practical simplification of the line drawn in accordance with the principle of equidistance established in Articles 12 and 24 of the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone. This line shall extend into the Gulf of Mexico to a distance of 12 nautical miles from the baseline used for its delineation. The international maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico shall be recognized in accordance with the map entitled International Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Mexico, which the Commission shall prepare in conformity with the foregoing description and which, once approved by the Governments, shall be annexed to and form a part of this Treaty.

B. The international maritime boundary in the Pacific Ocean shall begin at the westernmost point of the mainland boundary; from there it shall run seaward on a line the delineation of which represents a practical simplification, through a series of straight lines, of the line drawn in accordance with the principle of equidistance established in Articles 12 and 24 of the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone. This line shall extend seaward to a distance of 12 nautical miles from the baselines used for its delineation along the coast of the mainland and the islands of the Contracting States. The international maritime boundary in the Pacific Ocean shall be recognized in accordance with the map entitled International Maritime Boundary in the Pacific Ocean, which the Commission shall prepare in conformity with the foregoing description and which, once approved by the Governments, shall be annexed to and form a part of this Treaty.

C. These maritime boundaries, as they are shown in maps of the Commission entitled International Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Mexico and International Maritime Boundary in the Pacific Ocean, shall be recognized as of the date on which this Treaty enters into force. They shall permanently represent the maritime boundaries between the two Contracting States; on the south side of these boundaries the United States shall not, and on the north side of them Mexico shall not, for any purpose claim or exercise sovereignty, sovereign rights or jurisdiction over the waters, air space, or seabed and subsoil. Once recognized, these new boundaries shall supersede the provisional maritime boundaries referred to in the Commission's Minute No. 229.

D. The establishment of these new maritime boundaries shall not affect or prejudice in any manner the positions of either of the Contracting States with respect to the extent of internal waters, of the territorial sea, or of sovereign rights or jurisdiction for any other purpose.

E. The Commission shall recommend the means of physically marking the maritime boundaries and of the division of work for construction and maintenance of the markers. When such recommendations have been approved by the two Governments the Commission shall construct and maintain the markers, the cost of which shall be equally divided between the Contracting States.

ARTICLE VI

A. The lands and improvements which, upon relocation of the international boundary under the provisions of Articles I, III and IV of this Treaty, are transferred from one Contracting State to the other, shall pass to the respective Contracting State in absolute ownership, free of any private titles or encumbrances of any kind; compensation to the owners of the lands to be transferred shall be the responsibility of the delivering Contracting State. No payments shall be made between the two Governments for value of the lands and improvements transferred from one Contracting State to the other as a result of the change of location of the international boundary.

B. The relocation of the international boundary and the transfer of portions of territory or any other provision of this Treaty shall not affect in any way:

(1) The legal status with respect to citizenship laws, of those persons who are present or former residents of the portions of territory transferred;

(2) The jurisdiction over legal proceedings, of either a civil or crimnal character, which are pending on the date on which the relocation is effected or which were decided prior to that date;

(3) The jurisdiction over acts or omissions occurring within or with respect to the said portions of territory prior to their transfer;

(4) The law or laws applicable to the acts or omissions referred to in paragraph B(3) of this Article.

C. (1) All materials, implements, equipment and repair parts intended for the construction, operation and maintenance of the works required to carry out the provisions of this Treaty shall be exempt from taxes relating to imports and exports. For this purpose, each Section of the Commission shall furnish verification certificates covering all materials, implements, equipment and repair parts intended for such works.

(2) The personnel employed either directly or indirectly on the construction, operation or maintenance of the works required to carry out the provisions of this Treaty shall be permitted to pass freely from one country to the other for the purpose of going to and from the place or location of the works, without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements. For this purpose, each Section of the Commission shall furnish adequate means of identification to the personnel employed by it on the aforesaid works.

ARTICLE VII

The boundary on international bridges which cross the Rio Grande or the Colorado River shall be shown by an appropriate monument exactly over the international boundary determined by this Treaty at the time of demarcation. When in the judgment of the Commission the variations of the international boundary should warrant that the monument on any bridge should be relocated, it shall so recommend to the two Governments and with their approval may proceed to the reinstallation. This monument shall denote the boundary for all the purposes of such bridge. Any rights other than those relating to the bridge itself shall be determined, in case later changes occur, in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty.

ARTICLE VIII

The following agreements shall be terminated as of the entry into force of this Treaty, without prejudice to any right, title or interest which has accrued thereunder except as otherwise provided in this Treaty with respect to such right, title or interest:

A. the Convention Touching the International Boundary Line, signed on November 12, 1884;

B. The Convention for the Elimination of Bancos in the Rio Grande, signed on March 20, 1905; and

C. to the extent that they are inconsistent with this Treaty:

(1) Article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed on February 2, 1848;

(2) Article I of the Gadsden (Mesilla) Treaty, signed on December 30, 1853;

(3) Article IV of the Convention establishing the International Boundary Commission, signed March 1, 1889; and

(4) Article VI of the Convention on Rectification of the Rio Grande, signed February 1, 1933; and

D. any other agreement, or any part thereof, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States which is inconsistent with this Treaty, to the extent of that inconsistency.

ARTICLE IX

The present Treaty shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutional processes of each Contracting State and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Washington, D.C. as soon as possible. It shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications.

Done at the City of Mexico, the twenty-third day of November, nineteen seventy, in the English and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9, the Department of State, by Executive Communication 1727, sent to the House draft legislation which is necessary to the implementation of our new treaty with Mexico. Today, I am pleased to introduce that legislation and to announce that the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold a hearing on this bill on Monday, May 1.

The text of the bill and an analysis follows:

H.R. 14573

A bill to facilitate compliance with the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, and for other purposes

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 "American-Mexican Boundary Treaty Act of 1972."

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION FOR CARRYING OUT TREATY PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. In connection with the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States to resolve pending boundary differences and maintain the Rio Grande and the Colorado River as the international boundary between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized:

(a) to conduct technical and other investigations relating to: the demarcation, mapping, monumentation, channel relocation, rectification, improvement and stabilization, and other matters relating to the preservation of the river boundaries between the United States and Mexico; the establishment and delimitation of the maritime boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific Ocean; water resources; the sanitation and the prevention of pollution.

(b) to acquire by donation, purchase, or condemnation, all lands or interests in lands required—

(1) for transfer to Mexico as provided in said treaty;

(2) for construction of that portion of new river channels and the adjoining levees in the territory of the United States;

(3) to preserve the Rio Grande and the Colorado River as the boundary by preventing the construction of works which may cause deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the rivers or of their flood flows.

(4) for relocation of any structure or facility, public or private, the relocation of which, in the judgment of the said Commissioner is necessitated by the project.

(c) to remove, modify, or repair the damages caused to Mexico by works constructed in the United States which the International Boundary and Water Commission has determined have an adverse effect on Mexico, or to compensate Mexico for such damages.

SEC. 102. The United States Commissioner

is authorized to enter into contracts with the owners of properties to be relocated whereby such owners undertake to perform, at the expense of the United States, any or all operations involved in said relocations; to construct, operate and maintain all works provided for in said treaty and/or Title I of this Act; and to turn over the operation and maintenance of any such works to any Federal agency, or any State, County, municipality, district, or other political subdivision within which such project or works may be in whole or in part situated, upon such terms, conditions, and requirements as the Commissioner may deem appropriate.

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Commissioner in authorized to dispose of by warranty deed, or otherwise, any land acquired by the United States Commissioner on behalf of the United States, or obtained by the United States pursuant to treaty between the United States and Mexico, and not required for project purposes, under procedures to be formulated by the United States Commissioner, to adjoining land owners at such price as he considers fair and equitable, and, if not so disposed of, to turn said land over to the General Services Administration for disposal under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 104. When a determination must be made under the treaty whether to permit a new channel to become the boundary, or whether or not to restore a river to its former channel, or whether, instead of restoration, the Governments should undertake a rectification of the river channel, the United States Commissioner's decision, approved by the Secretary of State, shall be final so far as the United States is concerned, and the United States Commissioner is authorized to construct or arrange for construction of such works as may be required to give effect to that decision.

SEC. 105. Land acquired or to be acquired by the United States of America in accordance with the provisions of said treaty, including the tract provided for in section 106, shall become a geographical part of the State to which it attaches and shall be under the civil and criminal jurisdiction of said State, without affecting the ownership of said land. The addition of land and the ceding of jurisdiction to a State shall take effect upon acceptance by said State.

SEC. 106. Upon transfer of sovereignty from Mexico to the United States of the 481.68 acres of land acquired by the United States from Mexico near Hidalgo-Reynosa, administration over the portion of that land which is determined by the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, not to be required for the construction and maintenance of the relocated river channel shall be assumed by the Department of the Interior; and the Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is authorized to plan, establish, develop and administer said portion of the acquired lands as a part of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

SEC. 107. The Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 590) as amended, shall be further amended as follows:

(1) The heading of section 322 shall be amended to read: "International Traffic and Rescue Work; United States-Mexico Boundary Treaty of 1970";

(2) Paragraph (b) of section 322 shall be amended by striking the word "and" at the end of subparagraph (2); by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (3) and inserting "; and" in lieu thereof; and by adding a new subparagraph to read:

"(4) Personal property reasonably related to the use and enjoyment of a separated tract of land as described in article III of the Treaty To Resolve Pending Boundary Differences and Maintain the Rio Grande and Colorado River as the International Boundary between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed on November 23, 1970."

SEC. 108. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for the use of the United States section of said Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of said treaty and title I of this Act.

TITLE II—PRESIDIO FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

SEC. 201. The Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to conclude with the appropriate official or officials of the Government of Mexico an agreement for a coordinated plan by the United States and Mexico for international flood control works for protection of lands along the international section of the Rio Grande in the United States and in Mexico in the Presidio-Ojinaga Valley.

SEC. 202. If an agreement is concluded pursuant to Section 201, Title II of this Act, the United States Commissioner is authorized to construct, operate and maintain flood control works located in the United States having substantially the characteristics described in "Report on the Flood Control Project Rio Grande, Presidio Valley, Texas," prepared by the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for the use of the United States section of said Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of Title II of this Act. No part of any appropriation under this section shall be expended for flood control works on any land, site, or easement unless such land, site, or easement has been acquired under said treaty for other purposes or by donation and, in the case of a donation, the title thereto has been approved in accordance with existing rules and regulations of the Attorney General of the United States.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

The Boundary Treaty of 1970 imposes on the United States and Mexico numerous responsibilities and obligations. These relate principally to the settlement of all existing boundary disputes and uncertainties and the prevention of new ones. The maintenance of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River as the international boundary is an important element in the achievement of both objectives. The treaty also defines and provides for demarcation of maritime boundaries in the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. It entrusts execution of the responsibilities and obligations to the International Boundary and Water Commission, which has been exercising similar duties with respect to the boundary with Mexico since 1889. The Commission consists of a United States Section and a Mexican Section each headed by a Commissioner. The United States Commissioner would act for the United States in these matters under the policy direction of the Secretary of State.

Title I of the bill would provide the United States Commissioner with all the authority he is expected to need now and in the future to discharge the responsibilities and obligations assigned to the United States by the treaty. For this purpose he will have to conduct investigations, acquire lands and easements in lands, and construct, operate, maintain works. Sections 101 and 102 of the bill, which are based on Sections 1 and 2 of the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184), would authorize these and related functions; they are largely self-explanatory. Since, if the Commission should determine under Article IV(B)(2) of the Treaty that works constructed in the United States cause deflection or obstruction of a river flow, this Government must remove or modify them, and possibly repair or compensate for the damage, Section 101(c) of the bill would authorize the United States Commissioner to perform such work and make compensation to Mexico.

Section 103 reflects an exceptional circumstance resulting from the treaty, and is designed to mitigate the adverse effects of the operation of the treaty on certain individuals. Lands being transferred to Mexico under the terms of the treaty cannot be selected on the basis of convenience or exclusively domestic considerations. The new channel of the Rio Grande, relocated under Article I (C) of the treaty to place north of the river Mexican territory being ceded to the United States, will follow an alignment determined as much by Mexican as United States interest. The Department wishes, to the extent practical, to protect the individual United States landowners adversely affected by an arrangement which was in part to accommodate Mexico. The United States Commissioner can best do this by being able to make transfers, sales and exchanges of certain lands sympathetically and expeditiously "on the spot" to suit the needs of the owners involved and provide equitably for all without delay. For example, eleven pump sites are being eliminated from the river by its relocation. Where a United States farmer finds himself separated from the new river channel and his former pump sites by lands ceded by Mexico, he becomes understandbly concerned. The United States Commissioner would want to preserve an owner's riparian rights on the water course, and prevent another from acquiring the land and totally cutting him off from his source of irrigation water. Under Section 103 the United States Commissioner would be able to offer the intervening land to an adjacent owner at a price determined to be fair and equitable. Similar circumstances may well arise in the event of future acquisition of land from Mexico under the treaty, and the same provision would enable the Commissioner to protect other United States landowners. If adjoining land owners do not acquire the lands, the Commissioner would turn them over to the General Services Administration for disposal.

Section 104 relates to a complex procedure introduced by Article III of the treaty for the treatment of tracts of land shifted from one side of a boundary river to the other. Decisions must be made under the treaty, in accordance with varying circumstances, whether to restore the river to its prior channel or whether to allow a new channel to become the boundary, whether to undertake rectification of the river and, in the rectification process, what lands to exchange with Mexico. Section 104 would authorize the United States Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to make these decisions for the United States and to construct whatever works are required.

Section 105 is designed to eliminate any confusion concerning the exercise of jurisdiction over lands which pass from Mexico to the United States under the provisions of the Treaty.

Section 106 would assign to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior responsiblity for administering for the Federal Government that part of 481.68 acres being ceded to the United States by Mexico in the Lower Rio Grande Valley near Hidalgo, Texas, and not required in the relocation of the river at that point or for the maintenance of the project. The Department has learned that this tract would be especially useful as a wildlife refuge, and believes that this is the most beneficial use to which the tract could be put. The choice of tract was

determined by flood control considerations, and it otherwise would probably have little value.

Section 107 is incorporated at the request of the Bureau of Customs. Since under Article III of the treaty tracts of land belonging to the nationals of one country might be on the opposite side of a boundary river for as long as four years, the treaty provides that those nationals would be extended such facilities for transit as may be necessary to permit them the use and enjoyment of separated tracts as before the separation, including exemption from customs duties and immigration procedures. Thus, for a period of as much as four years, Mexican nationals may be crossing to and from the United States and transiting United States territory to reach and return from tracts belonging to them on the north side of the Rio Grande or the east side of the Colorado River. The Bureau of Customs is of the opinion that legislation would be necessary to permit it to admit personal property belonging to them without entry or the payment of any duty or tax. The Bureau has therefore recommended the incorporation of Section 107 so that it can comply with the Treaty.

SEC. 108 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to implement the Treaty.

Title II would authorize an agreement with the Mexican Government for the construction of a joint flood control project for the protection of the lands in the United States and Mexico in the Presidio-Ojinaga Valley. Lands in the valley have experienced flood damage on the average of one year in three. A flood control project has been impractical, however, because of the territorial dispute in that valley. Now that the dispute over the location of the international boundary has been settled by the treaty, the river is being relocated in the valley to place north of the river channel all United States territory and to place south of the river all Mexican territory. Authorities of both countries agree that the least costly means of providing flood protection would be the addition of levees to the relocated channel at the time of its relocation, with the channel and areas between levees maintained clear of brush. The Department has therefore included Title II in the enabling legislation. SEC. 202 also authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to construct, operate and maintain this flood control project.

OVERBURDENED AMERICAN TAXPAYER IS GOING TO GET SOCKED AGAIN

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend all of us received a copy of a canned press release which I understand was prepared by the National League of Cities so that we can inform our local news media of how much free Government money each State and local government within our area may receive under the general revenue-sharing bill.

Of course, everybody likes to give money away and everybody likes to receive it, and the press release was designed to enhance the Santa Claus image of Members of Congress, and to ingratiate us to our local government officials.

There was only one major omission in the canned press release from this taxpayer-supported lobbying group, and that is, it never mentioned how the money was to be raised. Of course, all of us know there is only one source and that is the already overburdened American taxpayer. He is going to get socked again.

I am sure all Members of Congress will remember when we voted for this 5-year appropriation under a closed rule, totaling approximately $30 billion, that we do not have the money and that we must raise this new money by either taxes or borrowing, and in the case of borrowing, we will pay the price not only in an untold amount of interest but in the additional fires of inflation.

This revenue-sharing proposal is unwise and should be defeated. I voted against it in committee as one of a bipartisan group of seven who opposed it.

The following is a copy of the canned press release which I understand was furnished all Members of Congress so they could announce this new-found money for States and local governments:

SAMPLE PRESS RELEASE

Congressman ——— today announced that legislation approved last week by the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means would provide (name of state) and its communities with $——— this year.

According to provisions of the State and Local Government Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, (name of state)'s state government will receive $———, while $——— will go directly to local government units within (name of state).

The Act was approved April 17 by the House Committee on Ways and Means. It is expected that the entire House will vote on the bill in early May.

The committee's version of the bill authorizes a five-year program which appropriates a total of $5.3 billion to state and local governments during its first full year. During the first year, the committee's proposal allocates $1.8 billion to state governments on the basis of tax effort. A total of $3.5 billion is distributed to local government units according to need as determined by population, urbanized population and relative per capita income. The Act provides virtually every city, county, village, town and township in the country with fiscal assistance. The proposed legislation places no restrictions on state government spending, but requires that local units channel funds into law enforcement, transportation and environmental protection programs.

Congressman ——— announced the following allocations to communities within the ——— District.

OBLIGATION OF PUBLIC AGENCIES TO CONDUCT ACTIVITIES PUBLICLY

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a subject which has demanded increasing attention in recent times—the obligations of a Government agency to conduct its activities publicly, so that those who are affected by its actions will know upon what considerations such actions were based. I am very troubled that the Securities and Exchange Commission is currently engaged in closed-door discussions with representatives of the industry the Commission was created to regulate, with the view to formulating rules and regulations affecting the millions of Americans who invest, directly or indirectly, in the stock market. For the past few months the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, which I have the privilege to chair, has been attempting to insure that these discussions be made public. So far we have been unsuccessful in this effort. A brief account of our actions may be in order.

On February 2 of this year the Securities and Exchange Commission announced its plans for a major restructuring of our Nation's securities markets. The Commission's goals were expressed in very broad terms, and it announced that it planned to create three industry advisory committees to assist it in the formulation of definitive rules and regulations.

Since that announcement, the Subcommitttee on Commerce and Finance has been attempting to discover how these industry advisory committees will function and whether their deliberations, conclusions, and recommendations will be made public.

Initially the Commission informed us that the work of the committees would be made public as required by prevailing rules concerning industry advisory committees, or beyond that, as deemed appropriate by the Commission.

When asked what the prevailing rules were, the Commission cited Executive Order No. 11007, which prescribes regulations for the formation and use of advisory committees. The Commission recognized that this order was directly applicable only to executive agencies and not to independent regulatory agencies, but stated its intention to adhere to the procedures set forth in that order.

Upon further questioning, however, the Commission has admitted that it does not intend to make public the deliberations, conclusions or recommendations of the industry advisory committees.

We asked whether the advisory committee meetings would be open to the public. We were informed that they would not.

We asked whether, since the meetings were to be nonpublic, verbatim transcripts of the meetings would be kept, as provided in Executive order 11007. We were informed that they would not.

The Executive Order would seem to provide that if the advisory committee meetings are to be nonpublic, and if verbatim transcripts are not to be kept, then as an absolute minimum detailed minutes of the meetings are to be maintained. We asked whether the Commission intended to comply with that provision. We were informed that while minutes would be taken and be made available to the Commission and its staff, they would not be made available to the public. Indeed, the Commission has recently convened the first meetings of these committees, and I am informed that there is no public information available as to what took place.

Mr. Speaker, we are truly living through an era of disillusionment for many people in this country. And, rightly or wrongly, Washington is the symbol of much of that disillusionment. There seems to be a feeling of frustration with Government, a feeling of com-

plete futility in attempting to deal with the faceless organizations which make the decisions that influence the lives of so many Americans.

It seems to me that the actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission that I have described lend support to this feeling of futility. We must not allow these types of actions, since they eat at the very heart of our system of Government. Moreover, from the SEC's own point of view, I would think that it would not want to expose the members of the industry committees to the suggestion of improper influence of the type which has so recently been prevalent in the national news media.

For these reasons I am again requesting the Commission to make these discussions available to the public. I hope that they will agree. If they do not, then the Congress must act. The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance has the duty of overseeing the activities of the SEC. If the agency persists in its determination not to make these discussions open to public scrutiny, it may be necessary, after each advisory committee meeting, to invite the industry representatives to appear, either voluntarily or involuntarily, before the subcommittee at open hearings and to testify under oath as to what has transpired at these meetings.

I would prefer that the SEC act on this matter itself. But if it will not, then the Congress must.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE CLOSING OF HAIPHONG HARBOR

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on Friday an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times referring to the fact that a U.S. naval ammunition ship has been loaded with aerial mines at the big American naval base at Subic Bay, in the Philippines, and is expected to join U.S. vessels off the coast of Vietnam.

Aerial mines are high explosive devices planted in the sea from planes, and could be used to seal off a harbor.

I commend the administration for its decision as to employing aerial mines.

It has been amazing to many of us that this has not been done before.

This seems to be a new sign that we are coming to our senses in Southeast Asia.

Speaking as a Marine Corps trained jet attack and helicopter pilot, now a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, as well as being a Congressman, I urge the President to take not only the logical but the humane next step which would be to utilize the aerial mines which he is properly currently deploying, to mine Haiphong Harbor, thereby sealing it off.

This is a logical step since we have several types of planes which can plant air-deliverable mines, thereby bringing to an end the North Vietnamese capability to send heavy artillery, T-54 tanks and antiaircraft weaponry against our remaining troops in the south, the South Vietnamese troops defending their country, and our aircraft operating in the north. It is also humane since it would effectively cut off resupply efforts for the troops supporting the invasion of South Vietnam, thereby saving not only countless South Vietnamese and American lives but also the lives of the young North Vietnamese men who are impressed into the army to come south, to suffer malnutrition, to be chained into tanks, never to go back home, and finally to die.

As an alternative to sealing off the harbor with mines I might suggest that the most humane act of all could be to use one 500-pound bomb on the dredge which is necessary to keep the Haiphong Harbor open and operating without the dredge in operation, the harbor would silt up in a very short period of time. I understand that during World War II the Japanese operated at Haiphong and we stopped them from using it by sinking one ship in the channel.

It seems to be an easy harbor to close, and we have two alternatives for doing so.

I have already spoken out in favor of the President's resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, and want to take this opportunity of joining with Governor Ronald Reagan of California and many other responsible citizens and national leaders who have deplored those who criticized the President's very necessary action.

NATIONAL STANDARDS NEEDED FOR DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have been working for the past 2 years for national drinking water standards were heartened by the recent testimony of Robert W. Fri, Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, before the Senate Subcommittee on Environment. In the course of his statement, Mr. Fri gave EPA's endorsement for legislation which would have the Administrator of EPA set national drinking water standards for all health-related aspects of drinking water.

This endorsement of the principle of national standards may well remove the last impediment to House consideration of this legislation, which now rests in the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), who is chairman of that subcommittee, took the leadership on the question of safe drinking water last May when his subcommittee held extensive hearings on H.R. 1093, sponsored by Chairman ROGERS and several members of his subcommittee, and H.R. 437, the Pure Drinking Water Act, which I introduced in this Congress.

During those hearings, Administrator Ruckleshaus, of the Environmental Protection Agency, stated that EPA could not support the legislation pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Mr. Ruckleshaus indicated that EPA would continue its study of problems relating to drinking water supplies and would consider the need for both administrative and legislative actions. We are now exceptionally pleased to see that EPA has indeed concluded that national standards are necessary to insure the safety of drinking water, and the way is clear for expeditious House consideration of legislation which would insure that the best available technology is used to protect against chemical, bacteriological, and viral pollution of drinking water.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to insert in the RECORD at this time the remarks of the Honorable Robert W. Fri, Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency:

STATEMENT BY HON. ROBERT W. FRI

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity of appearing before this Committee to testify on EPA's program for the protection of drinking water and to discuss Amendment 410 to S. 1478, the proposal relating to that program.

The Federal government's responsibility for protecting drinking water is centered in the Environmental Protection Agency, which inherited this authority from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1970. Historically, this program has been based on the Federal responsibility for preventing the spread of communicable diseases in interstate commerce, pursuant to the Public Health Service Act. Under this Act, EPA enforces regulations which preclude interstate carriers from utilizing water from sources which have not complied with certain required drinking water standards.

Regulations adopted under that authority are used to enforce standards for those systems which serve interstate carriers; presently, ths enforcement authority applies to 665 out of an estimated 30,000 public water supply systems serving both large cities and small towns and applies only as such water is used by interstate carriers.

Under that authority drinking water standards have been established. These U.S. Public Health Service Standards, last year revised in 1962, contain certain mandatory limits and recommended limits concerning physical characteristics and chemical and biological constituents affecting the quality of the water. Our regulations concerning drinking water also deal with requirements for effective control programs to limit the future risk potential of structural or operational defects of water supply systems.

Violations of the mandatory aspects of the Standards lead to prohibition of the use by interstate carriers of water drawn from that system pending the application of additional treatment or the development of an additional drinking water source. The Standards impose these mandatory limits on levels of coliform bacteria, arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, cyanide, lead, fluoride, selenium, and silver intake which can clearly affect the health of the user.

In addition, the Standards recommend limits on certain physical characteristics and chemical constituents of drinking water which are primarily of aesthetic concern in that they impart undesirable taste and odors to the water, cause discoloration of plumbing fixtures and the like.

Since the jurisdiction of our existing program is limited to those water supply systems serving interstate carriers, our enforcement covers only half of the 160 million people served by community water supply systems. We would point out, however, that most large cities and the States use the Standards in regulating the quality of their

drinking water supplies. An extrapolation of the Community Water Supply Study, a field inspection and evaluation of 969 community water supply systems conducted by HEW in 1970, indicated that approximately 5.4 percent of the national population or 8 million people are served water that is potentially dangerous in that it fails to meet the mandatory standards set by the Federal government. These 8 million people receive unsafe water from an estimated 5,000 of the nation's community water supply systems surveyed in the Community Water Supply Study. In the majority of cases these deficient systems are smaller systems serving smaller communities. In relation to this, national health figures indicate that during the ten-year period from 1961 to 1970, there were at least 128 known outbreaks of diseases or poisoning attributed to drinking water.

While the Community Water Supply Study shows that most Americans are receiving drinking water that meets health standards, it also indicates that many of our Nation's water supply systems are subject to potential problems because individual water supply systems contain structural or operational defects; because they are manned by improperly trained personnel; and because many State and local control programs are inadequate. As a result of the inadequacies in State surveillance programs revealed by the 1970 Community Water Supply Study.

We are evaluating nine additional State control programs, we have also been reviewing the manpower and training needs required to administer public water supply programs at the State and local levels of government. We believe, as a result the Community Water Supply Study, that a lack of trained personnel is one of the greatest problems in insuring an adequate and safe water supply for the public. We have determined that the States employ about 300 engineers in water supply activities, which is about one-third the number which we believe is needed to support an effective program at the State level.

EPA is also conducting a research program to provide a better scientific base to assure safe and asthetically acceptable drinking water for public consumption. The research includes inquiry into such areas as identification and evaluation of disease producing and toxic agents that may appear in drinking water supplies, development and evaluation of water treatment processing, and development of simple and rapid methods of detection and quantification of bacteria, virus, chemicals, and toxic agents in water.

The Community Water Supply Study showed that poor operating and surveillance procedures and inadequate physical facilities, while more prevalent in smaller communities, exist in all types and sizes of water supply systems, in both large cities and small towns.

Our concern is to assure the application of adequate and up-to-date standards of quality for safe, healthful drinking water and that water supply systems are in fact reliable in delivering safe water supplies. This objective necessarily entails the use of trained and competent staffs for operating and maintaining the systems so as to deal with difficulties of the individual water system in an effective manner. We believe that this effort should and must be implemented at the State and local level.

Although our study and analysis is not yet completed, several deficiencies have clearly emerged in the over-all national approach to providing safe public drinking water supplies. First, the application of Federally enforceable standards is not broad enough to cover all community water supply systems. Second, State and local control programs, because of deficiencies in their planning, training, and enforcement activities are not providing adequate regulation of local water supply systems. Finally, from a reliability standpoint, many of the systems themselves are not capable of delivering drinking water of acceptable quality on a continuing basis because of their lack of adequate facilities, and sufficient numbers of trained personnel.

In view of these shortcomings, we have concluded that Federal legislation is needed to address certain aspects of the overall situation. As a result we are recommending to the Committee what we believe to be the essential ingredients for legislation to correct the problems of providing safe, reliable supplies of drinking water.

Such legislation should in our view contain the following element.

1. The Administrator should be authorized to set National drinking water standards, which would be addressed to all health related aspects of drinking water. These standards would limit the chemical, biological, radiological, or other health related contaminants that might appear in drinking water. The standards would also include requirements for the operation and maintenance of water supply systems insofar as necessary to assure achievement of the health related limits described above. We believe that the setting of such standards should be a Federal responsibility because standards needed to protect health do not vary with locality and the Federal Government can bring greater resources to assess the complex health and technical aspects involved.

2. The application of such standards should be clearly limited to drinking water supplied, and not to raw water sources. Extending the purview of standards beyond the goal of upgrading the quality of drinking water and supply systems would be a duplication of the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, under which standards have already been established and would continue to be established relating to such raw water sources.

3. In addition to the National standards which relate to health aspects, we believe that EPA should develop and publish recommended limits relating to other constituents and characteristics which affect drinking water, such as taste, odor, and color. I would emphasize that these would be recommended limits as distinguished from the standards which specify mandatory limits. Such recommended limits are helpful as guidelines for States and localities to set out desirable characteristics for which they should strive for their public drinking water supplies even though a health risk is not involved.

4. The primary enforcement responsibility for drinking water standards, in our opinion, should lie with the States and localities. Federal authority to enforce the drinking water standards should come into play only if the States and local governments fail to act. Primary responsibility for assuring safe drinking water now rests with State and local government, and that is where we are convinced it should remain. The difficulties that we have identified with the National programs of drinking water do not stem from the present roles of respective levels of government but rather from inadequate coverage or enforceable Federal standards and from inadequate State and local programs. The solution of those problems would not, in our opinion, be effected by changing the roles of Federal or State governments in this area, but by assuring the enforcement of National standards and by strengthening State and local programs. In order for enforcement to be effective, a dual requirement should be included which would provide in cases where substantial adverse health risks are involved for immediate notification first, to State authorities and, through the States, to the Administrator and second, to the users of the water supply system. Such notice should include the extent and nature and possible health effects of such noncompliance with National standards and the remedial measures which will be taken to correct the problem. Additionally, in cases where the State or locality fails to take prompt remedial action, the Administrator should have authority to institute administrative orders as appropriate to regulate uses of the water supplies in question, prohibit new connections, regulate the sources of contamination or prohibit delivery of contaminated water.

5. Each water supply system authority should have to report regularly (at least annually) to the State agency regarding the quality of water delivered. The states should also have to report to the EPA annually regarding the quality of water delivered by each system in the State. Such a reporting system is important because it would provide continuing and pertinent information as to contaminant level and operation and maintenance procedures of the individual water supply.

6. States and localities should develop strong programs of surveillance, enforcement, technical assistance, training, and long-range planning. We see a Federal role in this regard directed toward the provision of research and technical assistance in those areas that are beyond the capabilities of the States.

7. Any drinking water legislation should clarify that the Administrator continue to be authorized to promote and conduct research into all aspects of water hygiene. We believe such research is necessary to provide the scientific data and methodology that will enable the Federal, State, and local entities involved in the supplying of drinking water to effectively perform their respective responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that many of these elements, which we consider necessary in any Federal drinking water legislation, are provided in Amendment 410 to S. 1478. However, we have difficulty with the following aspects of this Amendment. First, we do not believe that program grants as suggested in Section 302(m) are necessary or desirable. They would serve to help erode State responsibility and make State agencies dependent on Federal standards, coupled with adequate monitoring requirements, will serve to stimulate improved local programs.

Second, we feel that the standards published pursuant to Section 302(a) of that Amendment should not apply to the "raw water source" or drinking water supply. In the same regard, the "National Water Hygiene Standards" of Section 302(b), which relate to various undesirable substances in "lakes, rivers, streams, bays, inlets, or other inland and coastal waters" are, in our view, an inappropriate requirement. These two provisions are duplicative of, and in possible conflict with, the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its Amendments now pending before the Congress. Under that Act, water quality standards have been established for various surface waters. Those standards specifically address water to be used as drinking water supply. Multiple inconsistent standards directed to the same end are not only unnecessary, they would in all likelihood thwart both the solution to the drinking water as well as the pollution problem.

We also have difficulty with Section 302(j) of Amendment 410 which would establish a "National Water Hygiene Advisory Council". We would prefer not to have such a body created by statute and feel that it would limit the administrative flexibility so necessary to properly perform our responsibilities.

I will now be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE LONG REVIEWS THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

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, our colleague, CLARENCE D. LONG, a nationally respected economist in his own right, has taken a close look at the operation of the economic stabilization program, and found it severely wanting in fairness and effectveness. Mr. Long presented some of his findings in testimony last Thursday before the Joint Economic Committee. I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE D. LONG

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before the Joint Economic Committee to present my views and those of my constituents in Maryland's Second Congressional District on the results of the Economic Stabilization Program.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that wages and prices are continuing to increase—and that service prices are increasing more rapidly than other prices. But my constituents to see that inflation continues and that the Economic Stabilization Program has not beat the high cost of living.

I recently polled my district on the effect of the stabilization program. A sample drawn from more than 5,000 responses shows that 96% have not experienced a halt to high costs; more than 84% said their income had not kept pace with rising costs; over 40% reported that local stores were not complying with the freeze; 41% said they had consulted price lists in stores; and 10% said they had complained of freeze violations, but only one in eleven of those who had complained said he had received a satisfactory response to his complaint. Overall, 44% said the impact of the President's program was bad, 40% reported no impact, 12% reported a good impact, and 4% did not answer the question.

In addition, more of my constituents complained about increases in food prices than about any other price increase. The next category about which complaints were received was medical costs, followed by property taxes, utilities, clothing expenses, car expenses, and rent.

Returned questionnaires have been accompanied by bitter complaints of higher food costs, price variations from store to store, difficulty in interpreting the ambiguous, long-winded Economic Stabilization Regulations; increasing Blue Cross-Blue Shield costs; and fruitless attempts to obtain assistance from the Baltimore District Office of the Internal Revenue Service. Here is what they told me:

1. Mr. L. "Using the price lists is a waste of time. If you complain to the store manager he has a glib cut-and-dried excuse, such as the wholesaler charges him more or his labor has gone up. The customer cannot win . . . I complained about a legitimate case of a violation . . . to the Internal Revenue Service . . . after being relayed to four different people and repeating my complaint to each of them, I was given another number to call. After dialing this number for half an hour I was told that he knew nothing of such matters. I got nowhere and finally gave up in disgust."

2. A Baltimore area resident reported a 9.2% rent increase. "When I complained to him that this was far in excess of the 2.5 to 3.5% maximum permissible under current rent regulations he said: "Pay or get out." When I reported the matter to the local Economic Stabilization Program Office, instead of taking punitive action against the landlord for openly violating the law, they suggested that I have a *talk* with him. If we are ever to control inflation we need regulations with *teeth* in them and administrators who will use every legal means to force compliance from people who have no respect for and completely disregard all principles of law and order."

3. Another constituent wrote: "The IRS suggested the solution (to our threatened rent increase) was to file a formal complaint. Recalling some action taken under the old OPA and the unpleasantness to all concerned that developed, up to this time I have resisted this action. An attorney from one of the large, reputable Baltimore law firms has been engaged. Evidently as qualified as he is, considerable difficulty is being experienced in interpreting the regulations. Generally speaking, it appears many of the regulations are subject to individual interpretation depending upon the side taken.

"Admittedly and perhaps morally the landlord is entitled to increased rental. Incidentally, after placing his interpretation upon Phase II regulations, a second proposal, later withdrawn, raised the rental almost 40%. There also have been threats of eviction if we did not comply with his interpretation . . . considerably different than our lawyer's interpretation."

After receiving these complaints, I decided to send a member of my staff to survey the Baltimore IRS office. He found the following shortcomings in enforcement of the program.

OPERATION OF THE DISTRICT STABILIZATION MANAGER, BALTIMORE DISTRICT OFFICE, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Based on interview with Mr. Gordon Stone, District Chief in charge of Stabilization, and Mr. Plitt, Acting Director, Baltimore District Office, IRS, with Representative of Congress Clarence D. Long.

Mr. Stone has 30 full time employees—of whom 8 are clerical. Although their office is exempt from the President's 5% cut in federal employees, the office staff has not been increased during Phase II, and they have not put in over-time, although they are authorized to work overtime. When needed, there are revenue agents, tax experts, and other specialized personnel whose services are available to conduct their surveys and investigations. It is difficult, however, to determine how frequently these people are used.

During Phase II, the Stabilization Office reports the following activity:

INQUIRIES, COMPLAINTS, APPEALS, AND SPOT CHECKS CONDUCTED NOV. 15, 1971–APR. 14, 1972

Activity	Wages	Prices	Rents	Total
Verbal inquiries	7,166	9,349	30,773	47,288
Written inquiries (interpretations, factual information requested)	709	454	881	2,044
Written complants of violations	64	960	1,594	2,618
Number of appeals	18	3	6	27
Spot checks (to note posting of base prices, etc.)	1,543	7,040	853	9,436

SHORTCOMINGS

1. The Baltimore IRS officials have no record of the number of notices of violation of the stabilization program they have sent out, nor do they know how many have been sent to rental management companies, to retail establishments, nor to any other activity subject to Economic Stabilization Program regulations!

2. An individual or organization has 48 hours in which to appeal a notice of violation. If the appeal is unsuccessful, the alleged violator can seek relief in the U.S. District Court. But the IRS Office does not know how many have sought this relief!

3. The Baltimore IRS Office has filed 14 suits in District Court, Baltimore against stabilization program violators. They consider this a good record because only 120 suits have been filed nationwide, they told my staff.

4. As a result of action by the Baltimore IRS office, only 1 refund has been granted—A total of 20c was refunded to a man who paid too much for Uncle George's Wild Bird Seed at a local drug Store!

5. The Baltimore IRS office was asked—(1) Is its staff capable of checking larger stores such as major food chains, etc. for violations? Answer: No, staff is not capable. (2) Were any spot checks made? Answer: No. (3) Are they auditing the major stores? Admission: since November 15, they had not completed a single unit of a single major store.

6. The only indication that the IRS could have of the level of compliance is from the number of violations that are turned up in the spot check procedure. However, under questioning they admitted that they could not tell how many violations appeared during their spot checks—therefore, they have no indication of the level of compliance.

7. Last week, on "Face the Nation," Mr. Jackson Grayson said that the Stabilization Program depends on voluntary compliance. We all know that any program that depends on voluntary compliance has to have a powerful deterrent to breaking the law. From all indications, this program has little if any deterrent effect. We found that if a store has been overcharging a customer since November 15 and is caught, they are merely told by IRS to roll back prices and to conform. If they conform, that's the end of it. The rub is that the consumer has suffered these higher prices since November 15 and nothing has happened to punish the violator. What kind of deterrent is this?

My staff assistant's report points out one of the gravest failures of this program—the failure to enforce it. Let me give you an example. Late last year Blue Cross-Blue Shield announced a 45% increase in premiums for federal government employees. Blue Cross did not receive approval of the Price Commission before announcing this increase. And the Price Commission did not look into the size of the increase until an investigation was suggested to Chairman Grayson at a House Committee hearing. Subsequently, Federal Insurance Administrator Bernstein told Price Commission Chairman Grayson on December 14th that "we (Federal Insurance Administration) must conclude that the proposed High Option Rate increase of 34.1% is unjustified . . . we estimate that no more than a 10 to 15% increase is justified." Yet the Price Commission finally settled on a 22% increase. And subsequently, without any prior approval by the Price Commission, Blue Cross cut some of the benefits federal employees received.

Another serious problem with the stabilization program is the large number of exemptions—raw agricultural products, certain insurance premiums, property taxes—and for all intents and purposes corporate salaries. When I learned that Henry Ford had been paid $689,000 in 1971—an increase of $189,000 over his 1970 income from the Ford Motor Company—and that some of the other company officials had received even more substantial increases—I examined the Pay Board's regulations for executive salaries. These regulations mean everything and nothing—they could be used to justify anything—upon careful reading no one could tell what restrictions accompany payment of executive compensation. Although I understand the Pay Board began an investigation of Mr. Ford's income on April 10th, who can be confident about the results?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that if the administration is not prepared to make this stabilization program

effective, embracing all prices, salaries, wages and rents, applying to the rich as well as the poor, and enforcing it with real teeth, it should be abandoned all together. As it operates now, the nice guys obey, the chiselers have a field day, and the consumer is becoming increasingly disillusioned.

Thank you.

MORE ON USO SCANDAL

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, I am releasing additional statements today by two former USO employees detailing kickbacks, inflated prices in USO concessions and one accusation that one USO employee made more than $2 million in Vietnam.

If these allegations are true, then the evidence is rapidly mounting that a gang of USO thieves cheated American GI's in Vietnam.

The statements I have releated today directly contradict claims by the USO that our GIs were not cheated.

USO president, Maj Gen. Francis L. Sampson USA—retired—said last Tuesday that:

> No serviceman was in any way damaged, defrauded or denied services he could expect from USO by the alleged activities.

According to the statements I am releasing today, GI's were overcharged and allegedly taken in by a fraudulent mail-order scheme.

One former USO employee Floyd Seller, who served as USO club director in Dian, allegedly received kickbacks from concession owners in his USO club. It is interesting to note, according to the testimony, that Mr. Seller also constantly bragged about making a fortune in Vietnam.

One USO assistant club director charges that "the GI's were being cheated blindly." Some items were overpriced by as much as 300 to 400 percent.

One of my informants has told me that Richard Alexander, a former director of Tan Son Nhut USO, probably made over $2 million in Vietnam.

An assistant club director was not permitted to examine invoices and inventories of an alleged illegal private concession run by Richard Alexander. In addition, a USO staffer who hoped to collect furniture for GI drug treatment halfway houses was barred access to USO's warehouse on three separate occasions by Brian Sweeney, a top USO official. Naturally, all USO professional staffers ordinarily are able to visit the warehouse.

At the moment, I am continuing my investigation in order to ascertain whether USO's top leadership has been aware of this apparent scandal. One of the principal unanswered questions is whether top USO officials are guilty of covering up some of this alleged criminal activity.

Naturally, I am turning over all the information I am disclosing today to the Department of Defense which is also conducting an investigation.

USO should serve our GI in a fair and equitable manner overseas and at home. The American people who contribute to the USO through the United Fund must be assured that their contributions are being wisely used.

USO has done a great deal of good for our servicemen overseas. But, as these statements indicate and as Secretary of Defense Laird has admitted, there has been alleged wrongdoing within the USO organization.

The testimony follows:

INTERVIEW

This interview was conducted with a professional U.S.O. staff member who served in Vietnam during 1970–1971. This individual came forward with this testimony involving a major scandal in U.S.O. The witness in question served in two of the major scandal areas and has intimate knowledge of the questionable activities within U.S.O.

B. What do we know about Brian Sweeney. You said that when you talked with the U.S.O. lawyers in New York . . .

K. Yes. I always . . . Brian and I always fought. We never got along at all. And, I don't know, it must be in my personnel file in New York. I never saw it in my personnel . . . I've looked at my personnel file in Saigon, there was nothing in it, but they must have the heavy stuff . . . they keep all the heavy stuff about everybody in New York. And evidently, there was some letter that had been written saying that I was saying nasty things about Brian Sweeney that weren't true . . . and I've always believed that he's a crook.

P. Why do you believe Brian Sweeney is a crook?

K. Oh, it's, well, it's just how he handles everything and how he handled different things with me . . . personal things. I was told from the first day in the country that he was a crook and that everybody knew it and a good one to speak about this would be ——— because she knew the situation and knew it very well and I got a lot of my information from her. But, then there was other things. For instance, when I would try to get into the U.S.O. warehouse to get just a broken down old sofa or anything for the halfway houses because that's where I was working for the drug program there and these guys didn't . . . you know, they had set up these halfway houses without any furniture or anything so I was trying to get some old, junky U.S.O. discarded furniture that they leave around in the warehouse . . . and I even got in writing from Mr. Shireman that I was given permission. Brian wouldn't let me in without seeing it in writing first. Anyone else could just come in and say, you know, hey, Brian I need something. But in my case, he made Mr. Shireman type out a memo saying I had authorization to get some of these things from the warehouse if U.S.O. didn't need them . . . and he never would let me in . . . and I asked for an inventory of the stuff we had. There was no inventory . . . he'd never kept an inventory.

B. No inventory of the equipment . . .

K. To my knowledge, there's never been any inventory at all. All the inventories are in Brian Sweeney's head and Mr. Shireman, of course, didn't know what was going on and he let Brian handle the whole thing.

P. You know this because you requested to see them? You asked to see the inventory and he told you they didn't exist.

K. Yes, I demanded. I said that I wanted to see the inventory list because I wanted to know what we have and what we don't have so that I can send stuff out to these drug centers around the country that need this stuff. You know, if we're not going to use it, why the hell not let them have it.

P. Now, as closely as you can remember, what was his precise reply? What exactly did he say? You know, when you asked him that . . . Did he say, no, we don't have any inventories?

K. Yes. He said, you know, well that he wasn't going to let me see them and then I checked with Mr. Shireman and I checked around with and Mr. Shireman and with everyone and nobody seems to know if there are any inventories or where they are.

P. But your request was that yes he had them, but you couldn't see them.

K. No. I got the distinct impression from him that there wasn't any inventories that there was some kind of a secret . . . that he was the only one who had access to them or something . . . meaning that there aren't any. I was so mad one day that I was going to go down there and demand to see invoices of different things . . . different property and inventories and everyone just shut me up and told me to mind my own business, including Mr. Shireman. And I was told by . . . later that there were not inventories . . . that he knew it for a fact . . . and I just knew it by osmosis and vibrations . . . and this sort of thing.

P. And normally a person in your position would have the right to see the invoices

K. Yes, any person in the organizations . . . it's not the invoices . . . but at least they should let me see the inventory because this was something I was doing for the U.S.O. in a joint venture with the military and there's no reason . . . and Mr. Shireman did put it in writing that I could go into the warehouse and check it out and see what was there so that I could, you know, use anything that was available because U.S.O. didn't need it . . . and Brian, every time there was three different appointments that I made with him and I had to drive downtown . . . it takes an hour to drive downtown in the heavy traffic and I was supposed to meet him for him to give me the key or for him to take me there himself and something . . . he'd always disappear into the sunset and Brian never left the keys and I never did get in.

P. I see and this was an inventory directly related to your work and activities in U.S.O.

K. Sure. I even got it in writing from Mr. Shireman and Brian wouldn't even dream about it unless Shireman wrote a memo to the effect that I could.

P. So you never did get into the warehouse.

K. No . . . just from the outside, but they wouldn't let me in. I got furious and I went over there. I was going to have the guards let me in and they wouldn't. Brian didn't give the keys to anyone.

P. What was his explanation for not showing up three times?

K. He never gave me an explanation. He never talked to me.

P. Do you know anybody who went into the warehouse and told you what he or she saw?

K. No. Brian . . . this was his own personal little domain and nobody interferred with it.

P. And, of course, the U.S.O. I'm sure had requirements that inventories and invoices be kept.

K. I assume they did but I would sure like to know where they are.

B. In the clubs that you worked in, were you ever required to make up an inventory?

K. No . . . and that's another thing that I always questioned but, if they sent us . . . and I remember one time they sent us an air conditioner from Saigon. Brian Sweeney sent it and there was no papers to go along with it . . . no invoices, no anything. He just like, he's like a little personal dictator that just ships all these expensive items like, you know, $500 air-conditioners that cost $500 apiece . . . maybe 11 of them. One day he'll put up a Stars and Stripes flight which was a World charter and we had the program with World so we used them to ship a lot of our stuff. He'd be shipping stuff up . . . vehicles he'd ship up because they couldn't

drive because the highways weren't secure and I never saw any invoices or anything. And when he wanted something or another club needed something, he'd just call up and say, have it ready and he'd send up one of his boys and they'd pick it up and there was never any paperwork involved to my knowledge.

B. And everyone knew about this . . .

K. Sure, in fact we all joked about it and everybody from Golden Gate in Danang just laughed about it and everybody said, this is just Brian's little personal domain and there's nothing we can do about it. We couldn't prove it, you know. But we also knew that Mr. Shireman didn't have any idea of anything that was going on and he was afraid. I mean, he needed Brian because he simply couldn't handle what Brian was doing. That job, even if he was doing it legally, Mr. Shireman wouldn't know how to handle it.

* * * * *

B. We've talked about the mail order a little bit, but let's talk about it in more detail.

K. I don't know the details. All I know is that Alexander had some kind of a mail order business running there at Tan Son Nhut USO where, as the GIs came in and said. . . . I remember one item in particular because I had to answer the letter when Joe Doe would get back in the States. He would have gone home and we'd get a letter from him and he'd say, I ordered and paid $80 for . . . what do they call them? . . . some kind of arrows . . . foreign arrows things.

B. You mean the blowguns?

K. Blowgun. Well, not really blowguns, but a really fancy wild kind of that some tribesman in Australia some crazy thing. . . . I don't know how it ever was. . . . But it cost $80. The kind of arrows what ever it is on a blowgun. I don't know what you call it.

P. You mean it is one of these automatic long arrow things that the cross bow use?

K. Something like a cross bow. But I've seen them. I saw a couple of them but they are so . . . $80, if you can believe that.

P. The GIs bought them.

K. Yes. Those guys are crazy. They get into Saigon maybe if they come in on a 3 day R & R . . . they go crazy buying stuff and sending it home. And there was a lot of other stuff so what he had was this mail order thing and the GIs would order it by mail and they would pay . . . give the check to Dick Alexander. . . .

B. Personally to Dick Alexander?

K. I don't know . . . and then it was supposed to be sent directly to the GIs home address in the States. . . . Only nothing was ever sent because that's what I was told by my boss and that was one of the big scandals, I know.

B. Was there any mention that they got letters back?

K. Oh, yes. We were still getting letters back from GIs saying, where the hell is my blowgun or whatever it was.

B. Did you ever see any of these letters?

K. Yes. I had to answer a couple of them.

B. How many of them would you guess that you got during the time that you answered them?

K. I didn't see all. I ended up not answering them. Mrs. Qui took care of it after a while . . . but there were 3 or 4 of them and I didn't know what it was all about. I was supposed to answer these letters and then whoever was there said, "well, I'll take care of it."

P. But did you ask Alexander about it? Did you ask him how come they haven't been sent?

K. No. Alexander was gone. My boss was there and he said that it was a big fraudulent thing that Alexander had going on and we were going to have to write back all of these GIs and USO would have to cover it. USO would have to fork over this money.

B. Do you know if USO did refund this money?

K. I have no idea.

P. Why did they . . . why didn't somebody contact Alexander and ask him about it.

K. Why didn't somebody contact Alexander a long time ago about all of these things. He was in Hong Kong and the only answer that Mr. Shireman would give any of us when we brought these things up was that, "well, he's fired and it's too bad, but it's been taken care of. I've cleaned house."

B. Who would sign the concessionaire contracts normally for USO?

K. The only person who was authorized to do this was the USO executive in Vietnam, who was Mr. Shireman and before him, was Same Anderson.

B. Did you ever see a contract that was signed by someone else besides him?

K. Yes. While I was at Golden Gate USO in Danang, I saw a contract signed by Brian Sweeney and I believe it was for the Kim Chi, I think, I'm not sure but it was for some Vietnamese or Korean front type of . . . it was for a gift shop . . . and I wanted to throw them out and I thought that we could do it legally, that this contract was invalid because it was signed by Sweeney and not by Mr. Shireman.

B. Why did you want to throw them out?

K. Because I had suspicions they were pulling over a lot of stuff on us and, of course, I couldn't catch them at it, but, you know, if somebody else was there who was wise in the ways of black marketing, you know, like if my boss was there, he would have caught it right away. I was just suspicious about them and I wanted them out. I didn't like the way they were handling things.

B. You don't have any specific incident or any specific item . . . did you feel they were overcharging?

K. Everything they were overcharging on . . . everything. The GIs were being cheated blindly and I knew this. Things made by the Montanyard tribesmen in Vietnam which are, ordinarily you buy these things for next to nothing from these people, and they were selling them for . . . things that I wouldn't pay . . . like a little shirt, these Dashikis that were very big among the GIs made by the tribesmen and they were selling them for . . . I don't remember how much . . . but maybe $5 or $6 and they were not worth 50 cents.

B. Could you go out and buy them in the markets in Vietnam for 50 cents?

K. Sure . . . maybe you'd have to pay $1 because when you're an American, you pay more . . . but let's remember that it was Vietnamese who were doing the buying for the concession.

B. Why was USO allowing shirts to be sold for approximately $5 when you could buy them out in the streets for $1?

K. USO always did this. I remember once when a sergeant came in to show how he had been cheated on an I.D. bracelet he bought from us. He paid over $100 for it—it was supposed to be solid gold. When he was downtown he showed it to a Chinese merchant. The merchant laughed at him and said he had been cheated, that it wasn't solid gold and wasn't worth that much money. The sergeant let them cut it open and sure enough, it was brass or copper, some cheap metal, on the inside. He came in and showed us and asked for his money back. I raised hell when I first went down to Tan Son Nhut USO with one of Dick Alexander's . . . it wasn't even a concession . . . it was one of his business enterprises run by a man named Mr. Klein. Because I spent so much time in India, I know what the prices are in these things in India and in Thailand also . . . how much the Thai woodcarvings are and how much the brass ware and things from India . . . I know because I've gotten these things in India myself and I know that they had a markup of 300% to 400% on them that they were selling to the GIs . . . and I questioned this and it was the day before Alexander left when there was the big blowup and it was the first day that my boss was at Tan Son Phut USO and we were sitting around out on the patio and it was my boss and this Mr. Klein who was paid directly by Dick Alexander or from Tan Son Phut USO . . . they didn't sign concession agreements, they didn't have concessions.

B. Well, how did it work then?

K. That's what I'm getting at . . . Dick Alexander had all these things brought it by his illegal, devious means . . . Well, he had a little . . . it wasn't a concession . . . but like we had a little shopping arcade and there were five little shops outside in this little arcade . . . and they did heavy business there with the GIs. And, like one of them would be, was a gift shop where they had brass work from India and Vietnamese handicraft and another one would be a poster shop and another one was the barber shop and, you know . . .

B. These were not USO concessions?

K. No. There was no . . . how Aleander worked it was that first this Mr. Klein was the one that ran the gift shop for him and these guy were making $1,000 a month . . . Alexander was paying them a salary but they were making it on commission on how much business they did.

B. $1,000 a month?

K. Yes. I should have been so lucky. I should have been doing what they were doing. They were making a lot more money than I was.

B. These were Vietnamese or Americans?

K. These were American civilians. Men that just were friends of Dick that . . . I have no idea how they got to Vietnam originally or what they were doing there . . . and there were a lot of those types around. . . . American civilian men that were just hanging around making money but they were on. . . . Alexander would give these men a paycheck, you know, around $1,000 a month. To my knowledge, there were no written contracts. It was just an agreement between Dick Alexander, and say, let's use the example of Mr. Klein and he's the one that I'm most familiar with . . . and, so, you know, like this wasn't a regular concession that, you know, concessions have to be approved by MAC V . . . so, obviously, this didn't have to be approved by MAC V. Now, the question is how did all these goods come in to Vietnam . . . these Indian goods and Thai goods and other things. . . . Well, Dick Alexander made all his deals with Johnny Kahn or the marine pilots or however he did it. . . . I don't know . . . or with people at the docks or the Vietnam Regional Exchange . . . they were obviously making deals with somebody because there was no invoices, there was no, you know, paperwork, . . . when it clears Vietnamese customs . . . obviously, all of these things had come into Vietnam illegally . . . and they brought them in dirt cheap. The last day there, I blew the whole thing wide open. We were . . . and my boss knew . . . he understood exactly what they had been up to but he also knew that Alexander was leaving the next day and it was my boss's first day and, you know, like I was just figuring it out verbally in front of everyone because I was raising hell. I was showing my new boss around Tan Son Nhut USO. He had never been there before so we went into the gift shop. Then we went out with Mr. Klein who had been running it for Mr. Alexander and I started raising hell. I said, you know this is cheating the GI. I know what you pay for this junk in India and I know that, you know, even if you did pay customs on it you're still having a markup of 300% and USO is not

here to cheat the GI's and that's what you're doing . . . and I said, I want to see the invoices on everything in there and I want to see a complete inventory and I had that right as an assistant director to demand that of him . . . and there was no invoices and there was no inventory.

B. Did he say, "I don't have an inventory"?

K. Yes. He said he didn't have it and he made all kinds of excuses and he'd say, well I don't have anything, you know, Dick takes care of it and then I'd ask Dick Alexander and he'd say, well I don't have anything. All I know is that about the second day he was still coming around for about a week after Dick Alexander left. I caught him one day he came in with another American civilian in a jeep and they wanted these two big conex where they use for storage, you know, these big metal conex and he went in there . . . he still had the key and I didn't think that he should have even had the key, but he did and went in there and he took out all kinds of papers and I ran upstairs and I can't remember if it was . . . who it was . . . maybe my boss wasn't one . . . I can't remember because if it was my boss, he would have stopped it. Maybe it was Dick Alexander and maybe nobody was there, but I tried to stop them from removing the papers from the premises.

B. Whose papers were they?

K. They were all boxed and they looked to me to be like . . . not really invoices . . . but hand receipts, receipts from business that they had done. They removed . . . to my knowledge . . . a whole lot of them. They removed what looked to me to be receipts of . . . a GI would come in and buy a $50 ring . . . and it would say, one ring, $50. Stacks and stacks of these receipts and I couldn't stop him. He removed them with my strong protest.

B. Now, these . . . all these shops around there . . . they were USO sanctioned or were they USO? What was the relationship between these shops and USO? Wasn't it kind of a constant issue on the part of USO?

K. Yes. You see, this is what I don't understand. My boss will have to explain it to you. He understands it. In my own eyes it would seem to me that either Sam or Dick they . . . all the USO clubs that they would have immediately wanted to know about their concession agreements that they had with these people. Now, when I . . . there is another interesting thing. Mr. Shireman, for a while, would not let the gift shop, after Klein left, it was turned over to the wife, second wife, a Vietnamese woman and her name . . . and she is the second wife of Pat Lam . . . the one who has . . . and an interesting thing is that my boss knew and he wanted to get rid of her and Mr. Shireman evidently talked to somebody in New York and they let her stay.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT

K. I saw one bank statement of Alexander's that had tens of thousands of dollars in it. We (USO staff) often discussed his many bank accounts in banks all over the world, and I was told by my boss that he was sure Alexander made over $2 million; we were *all* sure of it.

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1972

M. This is my personal opinion but I think the whole operation in Vietnam with the exception of a very few good people was complete apathy. It seemed to me that everybody was out to make a buck.

B. Including Anderson?

M. I don't know because when I came to Saigon he left shortly for the U.S. and I know absolutely nothing about that but it was just an apathetic situation that seemed to be taking place over there you know. For instance, some of these concessionaires had absolutely absurd items to sell. Really cheap junk and they were way over priced and . . .

B. So were they cheating the GI?

M. Yes, you know like they could go to . . .

B. What would be an example of cheating the GI?

M. Well for instance like in Saigon they had a jewelry concessionaire and she had . . .

B. What was her name?

M. They called her Lulu. I don't know what her name was . . . She was a Chinese girl and her whole family lived with Sam Anderson.

B. She and her family lived with Sam Anderson? In the same house? Was she married?

M. Yes, she had a husband who had a band that played at the USO club every . . .

B. What was his name?

M. His name was Pat Lam.

B. Was he Vietnamese?

M. No, he was Chinese.

B. Pat Lam was Chinese?

M. Yes. He and his wife were Chinese but I thought and I said several times that his jewelry was way overpriced and can get it better and cheaper in the PX. But the concession was there when I left, it still hadn't been closed down.

B. Is it legal for the U.S.O. to sell stuff that PX was selling too?

M. I don't know, I really don't know.

B. But it was definitely overpriced?

M. Well I thought it was, it was just . . .

B. What stuff was it and how much did it cost?

M. For instance, like I don't remember how much it cost but I remember the princess ring you get in Bangkok you could get those in the PX there are reasonable.

B. How much?

M. Anywhere from $15 on and I remember pricing one in the Saigon PX was something like $35. They don't even cost that much in Bangkok. It was just . . .

B. And who benefits from this?

M. Well supposedly the club made money on these concessions. I don't know how much because when I got over there and I saw how things were run I refused to have any dealings whatsoever concerning money or purchasing or anything like that and I never bothered to learn what cut went back into the club.

B. Was it pretty much assumed by everyone in Vietnam that many of the U.S.O. personnel were crooked?

M. Oh, yea. Sure.

B. The majority?

M. No, I wouldn't say the majority. There were some very good people over there.

B. Who were the best known people who rumor had it were the most crooked?

M. Well, this Richard Alexander was the notorious crook and Brian Sweeney and Bob Rawson and then Bob Rawson and this guy named Paul . . .

B. Paul Hebling?

M. Yea, I think so. See, they were fired because they got caught stealing. It had something to do with invoices. You know, buying I don't know what it was because this took place after I left, but they were, you know, I don't know who caught them or sent them home or anything, but I know they were fired.

B. How about . . .

M. . . . and Floyd Sellers

B. Yes. I've never heard too much about Floyd Sellers.

M. Well, he was the guy out at Dian . . . that's all he talked about was making a fortune in Vietnam.

B. What did he make a fortune on?

M. He was supposedly in with the concessioneers.

B. How would that work, the concessioneer thing?

M. Paying him off.

B. Concessioneers would pay him off?

M. Yes.

B. Who told you that?

M. One of the concessioneers who worked down there.

B. What was his name?

M. His name was Dong Pae.

B. How do you spell that?

M. D-O-N-G P-A-E.

B. And what was his concession?

M. Well, he sold this Korean woodcarving.

B. And how much did he pay Sellers?

M. He never told me this . . . how much he had personally paid him off, but I just got from the jist of the conversation . . . you see, this guy was a Korean and he had no intentions of doing anything to jeopardize his position and this is the guy who got stuck with that $45,000.

B. But he told you that he was paying off Sellers?

M. He didn't tell me that he was personally. He said the concessioneers were.

B. Did you ever see anyone pay Sellers off?

M. No.

B. You don't have any idea how much . . . do you think all of them paid him off?

M. Well, I was talking to Floyd one time . . . and all he talked about was getting rich in Vietnam, getting rich in Vietnam.

B. He told you he was getting rich in Vietnam?

M. Yes.

B. How did he tell you he was getting rich in Vietnam?

M. He didn't say.

B. What did he mean by getting rich?

M. Well, I presume by various ways of making money over there. I don't know anything about business. I don't understand how a lot of this works.

B. Is Floyd Sellers still with U.S.O.?

M. I don't think so . . . and see he had a Chinese secretary working for him but the rumor was that she did a lot of operations down in Chinatown

B. Doing what?

M. Like selling U.S.O. food, you know, stuff like that.

B. This was food that U.S.O. intended to feed the GIs with?

M. Yes. Well, for instance like you could mark up for spoilage like you order 10 cases of hamburger meat and you call up the next day and say our refrigerator went out last night and its all spoiled. So you take that hamburger meat down to the market and sell it on the black market and they will give you 10 more cases.

B. I see. Now, did you ever hear him call up and say he had spoiled meat?

M. No.

B. Who told you that it worked this way? . . . or did you just figure this out?

M. Oh, just hearing people say different ways . . . now this girl up in Danang, Mary.

B. Where is she now?

M. She's in California some place, but she supposedly knew every way everyone could cheat over there and I would hear her just tell stories, that's all it was, how people made money over there.

B. Would she tell stories about how she made money?

M. No. I think she was a very honest person.

REV. JOHN D. BANKS GIVES HOUSE INVOCATION THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I speak for all of Quincy when I say that it was indeed an honor bestowed upon the citizens of that distinguished community when the House last week invited one of its most prominent religious leaders, Rev. John D. Banks, minister of Bethany Congregational Church, to give the invoca-

tion on Thursday, April 20. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of the occasion was not lost upon us, as we are all aware of the limited opportunities available for guest chaplains in the course of the legislative year. What could have more meaning than to be reminded of the solemnity of one's duties by a religious leader of one's constituency who puts into words the concerns and hopes of the people back home.

I include at this time in the RECORD his prayer for his country and his Government. I am also happy to include an article written by a very highly respected news reporter for the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Mr. David Lynch, regarding Reverend Bank's remarks:

HOUSE LED IN PRAYER BY QUINCY MINISTER

WASHINGTON.—The Rev. John D. Banks, minister of Bethany Congregational Church, Quincy, Thursday led the House of Representatives in opening prayer.

House chaplain, The Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch usually delivers the opening prayer, but Rep. James A. Burke, (D-Milton), arranged for the Rev. Mr. Banks to appear as guest chaplain.

The prayer follows:

"Lord of creation, whose wisdom overrules the faltering judgment of your children: a new day summons us to labor within the framework you have given us. To the men and women who here engage in great decisions, grant your holy spirit in guidance and power. For their acceptance, in faith and trust, or the burgeoning concerns of their neighbors, we thank you. For their firm commitment to the right as you give them to see it, we thank you. Lift them above the dark sense of futility, for your economy there is neither majority nor minority, neither loser nor winners, but only degrees of integrity. Form and inform the minds of these representatives, and those they represent. Then my Grace, mercy and peace be the hallmarks of our national life, and your will be done. Amen.

FORMER OAS AMBASSADOR SOL M. LINOWITZ CRITICIZES NIXON LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 one of the United States most distinguished foreign policy practitioners, former Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Sol. M. Linowitz, delivered a forceful and eloquent speech to the National Women's Democratic Club on the shortcomings of current U.S. policy toward our hemisphere neighbors.

All those who believe, as I do, in the value of our inter-American system and the necessity of maintaining close and friendly relations with our neighbors should weigh Mr. Linowitz' well chosen words most carefully. They underline the need for the United States to abandon its current policy of minimal concern for our neighbors while there is still time for us to reestablish a strong and dynamic relationship.

I am therefore commending his remarks to the consideration of my colleagues:

THE ROAD TO REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA

From the outset of his administration, President Nixon has stressed the importance of maintaining a "low profile" in Latin America. But what this kind of approach overlooks is that in Latin America our profile is there, whether we want it to be seen or not. The only question is whether our face is turned toward Latin America or away from it.

For the real fact is that in Latin America we are like a giant in a crowded room. We can't move without stepping on someone's toes; and if we don't move we may find ourselves standing on someone's toes. And to the Latin Americans it appears as though the so-called "mature partnership" the administration has in mind in its rhetoric about Latin America is one which avoids any responsibilities, undertakes no commitments, rejects any involvements.

The case of Chile in many respects presents a microcosm of the problems of our relationships in this hemisphere.

Let me first state the obvious: Our present problems with Chile are unfortunately the joint result of actions taken by both the Government of Chile and the Government of the United States. But as Americans we ought to be especially aware of our own contributions to the present difficulties and have some sense of how our actions and inactions have looked to the people of Chile and indeed throughout Latin America.

I do not propose to comment upon the allegations with respect to ITT and its efforts prior to the election of President Allende as the democratically elected Marxist President of Chile. But I would point out that when President Allende was inaugurated, the United States was conspicuous in its failure to send even the normal congratulatory telegram. Thereafter, the Administration in a number of ways made clear its displeasure at the appearance of a socialist regime in Chile. This attitude persisted despite the fact that Allende's government was clearly seeking to avoid a confrontation with the United States and was behaving with restraint in the international arena. As a matter of fact, Allende and his Ministers emphasized their desire to work within the Inter-American community and to participate actively in the OAS and in Latin America efforts to achieve a common market. President Allende stated that his country was prepared to have "the best—the very best" relations with the United States; and President Nixon stated in his 1971 foreign policy message to Congress that: "We are prepared to have the kind of relationship with the Chilean Government that it is prepared to have with us".

Yet as time went on, the Chileans came to feel that the United States looked upon their new Government as a challenge rather than an opportunity. In Inter-American councils, Chile and other Latin American countries expressed their dismay that the United States failed to extend the same respect and cordiality to the Government of Chile, duly selected by the people of that country through the democratic process, as it did toward governments in other Latin American countries which came into power by overthrow of existing governments.

Then came the nationalization of the Anaconda Kennecott and Cerro copper mines; the sudden cancellation of the visit by the carrier *Enterprise* to Santiago after it had been announced by Allende; the refusal of the Export-Import Bank, at the instigation of the Treasury Department, to guarantee Chilean loans to acquire three Boeing jets; Secretary John Connally's widely publicized observation about Latin America that: "The U.S. can afford to be tough with Latin America because we have no friends left there any more"; then President Allende's startling announcement of an excess profits figure of $774 million to be deducted from the as yet undetermined value of the nationalized copper mines. And while these things were happening, Latin America was hit by the impact of the President's August 15th 1971 Economic Game Plan.

To understand what this meant to Latin America, let me remind you that a central goal of the Alliance of Progress from the outset was the industrial development of the continent and the stimulation of exports. Consistently since its inception the United States had sought to encourage the growth of Latin American industry and the development of regional and common markets. A primary incentive was the promise that one day the United States might grant a trade preference to manufactured products from Latin America.

Early in 1969, in his only major speech on Latin America, President Nixon placed great emphasis on a proposal to work for such tariff preferences from the United States and other developing areas. Thereafter the OECD and Japan have adopted such preferences, while the United States remained at the starting line.

Last August 15, when he announced his new Economic Game Plan, the President had an extraordinary opportunity. Accepting the fact that a surtax on foreign imports from Japan, Europe and other developed areas might have been considered necessary, this would have been the moment for the President to state our clear recognition that our foreign economic problems do not arise from Latin America and the other developing areas and to reassert his firm intention to make effective a tariff preference for manufactured products from Latin America and other developing areas. Such a move would have demonstrated that the nation which had done so much to help bring the Alliance into being was still deeply aware of its responsibilities and commitments to Latin America and other less developed areas of the world.

But instead of a redemption of the promise Latin Americans found themselves confronted with an export surtax affecting 22 percent of their exports to the United States. And its effect reverberated throughout the continent.

Similarly, the inclusion in the President's program of a 10 percent cut in our already severely reduced foreign aid program had very profound implications for Latin Americans. Ironically, the day after the President's announcement—on the Tenth Anniversary of the Alliance for Progress—the President issued a statement reaffirming the United States commitment to "the noble principles" of the Alliance for Progress.

Not surprisingly the effect of the foreign aid cut in Latin America was to reinforce the widespread skepticism about the seriousness of our professed interest in their problems. And the sudden United States decision a few weeks later to announce at the Panama meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council that the foreign aid cut would, after all, not be applied to Latin America hardly overcame the strong Latin American resentment which had already been built up.

Then, this past January 19, President Nixon took another step which aroused Latin America. He announced that the United States would not approve economic aid to nations that expropriate American property without reasonable compensation, and that the United States would also oppose granting of loans of those countries by such international agencies as the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank.

It was, of course, obvious that these statements were aimed particularly at Latin American countries such as Chile and predictably the reaction in Latin American reflected this recognition.

On its face, the new announcement sounded reasonable in that the United States has traditionally demanded that any property belonging to its citizens be reasonably compensated when that property is nationalized by foreign governments. However, there were three things fundamentally wrong with approaching the prob-

lem in this manner. First, it indicated that the United States would decide unilaterally what international law applies to the subject of expropriation, an area where the law is not entirely clear. Second, it left to the United States alone the standard of judgment as to what constitutes fair or reasonable compensation. Third, and perhaps most serious of all, the policy undermines the principle or multilateralism in interfering with decisions of the multilateral lending institutions such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. As voting in those institutions is proportional to the amount of capital each nation has in the banks, this makes it relatively easy for the United States to exert great leverage against any new loans to governments it does not like.

Granted that the nationalization problem is a real one, are there other more acceptable ways to deal with it? I think so. One might be a special OAS tribunal or similar international tribunal to pass upon and determine expropriation claims. Another could could be, as has been proposed, a multilateral investment insurance agency to be set up under the World Bank auspices to cover such contingencies. Or the United States could set up a permanent joint mechanism with Latin America to adopt and enforce investment guidelines.

If instead of trying to deal with the situation cooperatively, we proceed unilaterally as we have, why should we be surprised at the increasing manifestations of virulent nationalism and anti-Americanism running up and down the continent? Why should we be surprised that at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of Latin America not too long ago the United States was condemned for acting in a manner inconsistent with our professed principles?

Last year a brilliant young Columbian economist and friend of the United States wrote: "It is doubtful that any new inter-American initiative can be undertaken until after the Vietnam tragedy has come to an end." But I'm afraid we don't have time. Latin America's problems won't wait and its people won't wait. In one way or another—with or without the United States—Latin Americans will have to come to grips with their problem. This is going to require change and some of it—perhaps most of it—we will not like but we will simply have to learn to accept.

LAW, ORDER, AND JUSTICE

(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, on April 15 in New York City an outrageous, barbaric event occurred which requires those who believe in justice to speak out in condemnation. I refer now to the brutal, physical assault made upon members of an organization known as Gay Activist Alliance, who while seeking to publicly voice their opposition to sections of a revue which satirized homosexuals in a demeaning way, were, according to eyewitnesses, unmercifully beaten to the ground. Because the charges leveled against those who allegedly participated in the beatings are the subject of a criminal complaint and ultimately should be tried in a court, I will not comment upon any individual by name. It is also important to note that the individuals who were assaulted have complained that a police officer who witnessed the attack upon them failed to intervene and protect them from being beaten because allegedly one of the attackers is a well-known city official. It is also alleged by the young men who were the subjects of the beatings that they have not received either the cooperation of the police or the district attorney having jurisdiction over the matter, in pursuing their complaint against the alleged attackers.

It has also been reported that since the original assault there was a subsequent attack made on one other young man who took pictures of the original incident and who may, in fact, be able to provide the evidence which would confirm the identity of the attackers. I am advised that at the time he was attacked, he was told by his attackers that they were seeking the film which, fortunately, he did not have in his possession.

This situation immediately calls to mind the scenario of the movie "Z." You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the movie based on an actual incident which took place in Greece just prior to the takeover of the government by the present military junta, there were beatings of dissidents, indeed, the death of the leader of the dissidents, which the government, because of the complicity of government officials, sought to cover up. It must be unacceptable for any government here in the United States on whatever level, city, State, or Federal, to permit such a a situation to take place in this country. The law is the law and no one, no matter in what position, is above the law. The mayor of the city of New York has called for a full investigation into the facts surrounding this case and I have joined in that request. I have also advised District Attorney Frank Hogan of my views on this incident of April 15, 1971. A copy of my letter to him is appended.

The rights of every minority to exist and enjoy the freedoms of this country, which the majority proudly proclaim as the right of every American, must be protected. By so doing, we, in fact, are protecting the rights of that very majority. There is not one of us, who at some time on some issue, does not find him or herself in a minority position. We must never, therefore, forget that when we defend the rights of others we are, in fact, defending our own. President John Kennedy summed it up when he said:

> The rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened.

The climate for such assaults is fomented by the failure of law enforcement authorities to take appropriate action when incidents such as these occur. I would like to place in the RECORD correspondence which I had with the Appellate Division, Second Department of the State of New York, on a similiar occurrence which took place in July 1969. When the incident to which I have reference was brought to the attention of the court, it chose to do nothing although it had the power to intervene. In a sense there is a casual relationship between the incident of July 1969 and the more brutal happening of April 15. Those who violate the law and go unpunished will escalate their violence and that is what has happened in New York City. The correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE J. BELDOCK,
Presiding Justice, Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, Second Department, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JUSTICE BELDOCK: I was very distressed to read that a vigilante committee with the alleged assistance of the police department had been formed in the Borough of Queens and had undertaken to take the law into their own hands and harass homosexuals.

What particularly disturbs me is that it appears from the New York Times articles, copies of which I am enclosing, that an attorney was a leader and spokesman of this vigilante group. If that is the case, would those actions not be subject to attention by a disciplinary committee and would these reports require that an investigation be made by your office?

I would appreciate your advising me as to whether any such investigation is contemplated or has been initiated.

With all good wishes to you and with the thought that the newsletter which I send to my constituents may be of interest to you, I am enclosing a copy of the same.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION, SECOND DEPARTMENT,
Brooklyn, N.Y., July 15, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 8 and the enclosure with reference to the incident in Queens and the copy of the New York Times article. I also note your comments about the attorney.

This is a matter which I will submit to the Court when it convenes in the Fall.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE J. BELDOCK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE J. BELDOCK,
Presiding Justice, Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, Brooklyn. N.Y.

DEAR MR. JUSTICE BELDOCK: I very much appreciate and wish to acknowledge your letter of July 15.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

SUPREME COURT APPELLATE DIVISION, SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT,
Brooklyn, N.Y., September 11, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Your letter of July 8, 1969, with respect to the vigilante committee formed in Queens County to harass homosexuals, was presented to the Court yesterday at Consultation. The court was of the opinion that it is not a matter in which we should intervene.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BELDOCK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1972.

Hon. FRANK HOGAN,
District Attorney,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: I am writing to you because there is great concern in my congressional district that the violence committed against Jim Owles, a member of the Gay Activist Alliance, and others at the Hilton Hotel on April 15, is not being given the attention by law enforcement authorities that it should receive. The concern voiced to me by constituents is that because the name of a high

city official has been mentioned as being involved in the incident, the thoroughness of the investigation now being conducted by the Police Department and your office may be perfunctory and less than dedicated. I have told those who have raised this possibility with me that I have the highest regard for your dedication to justice and that you will not permit a slipshod investigation to occur and most importantly, you will not permit anyone, no matter how high his position may be, to receive special treatment.

What concerns me is to make certain that we do not see a re-enactment in New York City of the incident which took place in Greece and was dramatized in the movie, "Z", where high officials who engaged in illegal and violent acts were protected by law enforcement authorities. The thought that that could occur in New York City must be abhorrent to every citizen supportive of law, order and justice. But because people are concerned, I wanted to share their concern and mine with you.

I was told over the week-end that one of the witnesses to the incident was beaten and a demand made upon him by his attackers that he surrender the films allegedly made during the incident which might identify those who attacked Owles and others on April 15th.

I would very much appreciate your keeping me informed, subject to your rules and procedures in matters of this kind, on what measures your office is taking to investigate this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

INCREASED FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS AIDING THE MENTALLY RETARDED

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills to increase the fiscal year 1973 appropriations recommended by the President for the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act—DDSA—and the hospital improvement program—HIP—two programs providing assistance to the mentally retarded and others with developmental disabilities.

H.R. 14577 increases funding for formula grants to the States under title I of DDSA in fiscal year 1973 from $21.7 million requested in the President's budget to $65 million. Funds under this act have been successfully used for community-based programs for the mentally retarded, enabling many people who would otherwise be institutionalized to live at home and often work in the community. The need for these community service programs is great, and yet the funds appropriated by Congress in the past 2 years under DDSA have fallen far short of the act's authorization. A total of $165 million was authorized for fiscal years 1971 and 1972, but only $32.9 million was appropriated. Another $130 million is authorized for fiscal year 1973, but the President has recommended that only $21.7 million be appropriated—the funding level for fiscal year 1972.

My second bill (H.R. 14576) increases the funding of the hospital improvement program by $8.5 million to bring the funding level to $13 million. In this case the President's recommendation of $4.5 million falls short of the $6.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1972. HIP has been very successful in providing States with money to develop innovative programs in their institutions for the mentally retarded and residential alternatives to institutional care. With this money training has been given in institutions to some of the most severely retarded making them self-sufficient to the point of maintaining their own personal care. At this time when costs of institutional care are increasing rapidly, many States are barely able to keep up with the minimal needs of the retarded.

It is estimated that the States are now spending $1 to $1½ billion for the care of the retarded in institutions and an additional $500 million for community services to the retarded. It is appropriate and necessary that the Federal Government provide the extra money needed for training programs—programs that in the long run will reduce the expense of servicing and caring for the retarded. The cost of care for an incontinent patient is extraordinary. Far better that our money be spent for the initial training of a retardate enabling him to take care of his creature needs, than to abandon him to a lifetime of misery in the back wards of an institution.

The mentally retarded are innocent victims of fate. It is criminal that our society should compound this tragedy by failing to appropriate funds necessary to meet their needs and develop the potential they do have.

During the past several months a lot of attention has been given by the news media to the deplorable conditions in many of our State institutions for the mentally retarded. The conditions are a product of decades of neglect, as well as the immediate shortage of personnel to care for the day-to-day needs of the patients. Part of the desperation of an institution like Willowbrook in New York is the condition of the patients—a condition that cannot be changed over night but one that can be improved if we are willing to commit the money and patience required to train them.

By increasing the appropriations for DDSA and HIP, the Congress can help to change the character of the States' institutions for the mentally retarded. The conditions for those who must remain in the institutions can be improved and opportunities can be expanded for those who can return to the community.

For decades the needs and even the existence of the retarded have been pushed to the back of the consciousness of the American public; it is time that the mentally retarded be recognized as members of society deserving their full share of services and opportunities. Today many suits are being pressed in the courts for the retardates' rights to rightful care and equal education opportunities. The courts are providing an unparalleled leadership in recognizing these rights and demanding that the appropriate services be provided by States and communities. It is imperative that the Federal Government do its share in helping the States meet these new costs.

Mr. Speaker, the increased funding levels in my bills—$65 million for the formula grants under title I of DDSA and $13 million for HIP—are supported by the National Association of Retarded Children, Council for Exceptional Children, Epilepsy Foundation of America, National Association of Coordinators of State Programs for the Mentally Retarded, National Association of State Mental Health Coordinators, and United Cerebral Palsy Association.

Finally I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues a survey made by the National Association of Coordinators of State Programs for the Mentally Retarded that demonstrates the critical needs of the States for DDSA funds. Almost all the States indicated they could use 3 to 10 times the amount presently available to them. The estimates follow:

ATTACHMENT B—PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES ON NEED FOR STATE FORMULA GRANT FUNDS UNDER TITLE I OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ACT (PUBLIC LAW 91-517)

State	Fiscal year 1972 allotment	Estimated need, fiscal year 1973 [1]
Alabama	$439,030	[2]
Arizona	[3]	[3]
Arkansas	245,977	$1,500,000
California	1,387,494	[4] 4,100,000
Colorado	183,314	1,450,000
Connecticut	226,680	[2]
Delaware	100,000	1,000,000
District of Columbia	100,000	5,000,000
Florida	617,761	[5] 40,450,000
Idaho	100,000	500,000
Iowa	276,547	3,700,000
Georgia	482,220	[6] 5,500,000
Kansas	205,408	2,000,000-3,000,000
Kentucky	406,641	[2]
Louisiana	400,911	12,000,000-15,000,000
Maine	114,744	300,000
Massachusetts	466,622	2,300,000
Michigan	768,122	[7] 1,500,000
Minnesota	359,108	510,000
Missouri	447,609	1,000,000
Montana	100,000	[2]
Nevada	100,000	[2]
New Jersey	547,134	[8] 1,876,000
New Mexico	103,415	2,500,000
New York	1,413,340	17,000,000
North Carolina	594,422	1,000,000
Ohio	937,362	[2]
Oklahoma	272,220	772,220
Oregon	187,154	1,300,000
Pennsylvania	1,115,313	30,000,000
Rhode Island	100,000	1,000,000
South Dakota	100,000	400,000
Tennessee	458,558	5,000,000
Texas	1,067,287	[9]
Vermont	100,000	375,000
Virginia	461,271	1,500,000
Washington	263,160	1,000,000
West Virginia	247,591	[2]
Wisconsin	425,408	1,500,000-3,000,000
Wyoming	100,000	500,000

[1] All estimates are based on the preliminary results of a survey of State DDSA officials conducted by the National Association of Coordinators of State programs for the Mentally Retarded, Inc.

[2] No specific estimate provided. In most instances, however, other descriptive information supplied in the questionnaire would tend to suggest a level of need comparable to States of similar size.

[3] Not participating in the developmental disabilities program.

[4] This estimate includes only the amount necessary to meet the immediate need for expansion of one aspect of State services—the network of 13 regional centers. The State estimates that approximately 100,000 retarded children and adults need services but are not presently receiving them. In order to provide such services the State's present budget would have to be supplemented by an estimated $180,000,000.

[5] Represents the latest estimates on the amount needed from all Federal sources to provide a full array of services to the mentally retarded alone.

[6] The State estimates that the total cost of providing needed community services to all mentally retarded citizens would be an additional $31,325,500 annually. It's worth noting that this figure does not include the cost involved in improving care in State institutions nor does it encompass the costs of providing services to other developmentally disabled (the cerebral palsied, the epileptic, etc.).

[7] Estimate based on service needs only; does not include amounts required for construction of facilities.

[8] This figure reflects only the total amount requested for service and construction projects in fiscal year 1971 (when the State's allotment totaled $304,000). A 1969 survey indicated that two-thirds of the over 70,000 retarded citizens in New Jersey were not receiving the diagnostic, treatment, educational, day training or vocational services they needed.

[9] No specific estimate provided; however, during both fiscal year 1971 and 1972 requests for funds have exceeded the amount of Federal dollars available by 2 to 3 times.

A MASSIVE BLOODBATH AND COMMUNIST CONQUEST OF SOUTHEAST ASIA RIDE ON OUTCOME OF HANOI-MOSCOW INVASION OF SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, our withdrawal from Vietnam is now nearing completion. Only 75,000, including less than 8,000 combat troops, remain—and the President has indicated further reductions will follow.

Therefore, any talk about our disengagement is moot. Any argument about getting out of Vietnam is academic. Leaning on such an issue and belaboring it now is like trying to beat daylight into a cellar with a club. For all intents and purposes we are already out, except for Air Force and naval units which are needed to protect American lives and prevent major enemy assaults, such as the recent invasion across the DMZ. Moreover, until the prisoner-of-war issue is resolved the continued presence of this capability to punish the enemy is considered to be essential.

Nor is this any time to talk about whether we should or should not be in Vietnam. Only the remnants of our forces remain there. Our original involvement was sanctioned by a solid vote of the Congress. Tragedy has stalked the course of our involvement, and mistakes in strategy have occurred. That is now a part of history.

But let us not dissipate our responsibilities as Americans by dwelling upon that subject now. We have passed that stage, and we are now using our air and sea power to meet a desperate and dangerous challenge unleashed by our mortal enemy—the same enemy which killed some 50,000 of our bravest and best; an enemy which today holds or has refused to account for 1,600 Americans and steadfastly refuses to allow neutrals to see them or inspect prisons where they are held.

TIME FOR APPRAISAL

It is now time to appraise the entire picture and assess the future. There are those who insist that what happens in South Vietnam now and in the future is none of our business. They prefer to ignore the fate of the remaining Americans whose lives could become seriously jeopardized. Are they aware that contingents of enemy forces are striking within 20 miles of Saigon? Or do they care? And they choose to ignore other inescapable contingencies implicit in the outcome of the Communist invasion.

This attitude of willy-nilly opposing the use of U.S. bombers and Naval power against the invaders' supply lines is an attitude shared by the Communist world. And it appears to be shared by several presidential candidates, and by some Members of Congress.

What do they seek? Would total surrender make them happy? Surely not.

VIETNAMIZATION SUCCEEDING BUT MORE TIME IS NEEDED

The simple fact is that in terms of history and in terms of humanity it is imperative, at a time when our troop withdrawal is drawing to a close, that we intensify our efforts to make certain the Vietnamization program works successfully. Let us shake off emotionalism and politics for a moment, engage in some statesmanship, and review the issues involved in the outcome of that war.

Let us talk about Vietnamization for a moment. Recognizing the consequences of Communist conquest in Southeast Asia, President Nixon in announcing our orderly withdrawal from South Vietnam wisely coupled it with a stepped-up Vietnamization program. That is, a plan to train and equip indigenous forces to defend their country against the aggressors. Strangely enough, the extremist element among our war protesters condemned our helping the ARVN's train and equip themselves. Why? Which side are they on, anyhow?

Significant progress in that goal has been achieved and demonstrated. More than a million men have been armed and trained. But more time is needed, particularly to better train and equip an effective South Vietnamese air force. That takes more time.

The enemy was aware of that fact and timed their invasion accordingly. In the meantime, U.S. bombers and naval support is necessary.

AS SOUTH VIETNAM GOES SO GOES ALL OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. Speaker, those who oppose our resistance to enemy supply lines should reexamine their thinking and consider the consequences of a Communist victory, which God forbid.

The Communists have made it crystal clear that once victory in the south is achieved, their next goal would be Thailand. Indeed they have already crossed that border several times, seeking a foothold. The world knows that both Moscow and Peking have made large investments in Hanoi's war. Right now the Soviets are pouring 200,000 tons of war supplies into Haiphong each month, representing 80 percent of requirements. Stakes are high for the Communist world and those stakes extend beyond the boundaries of South Vietnam.

If our bombers are grounded, as war protesters and political opportunists demand, that would presumably mean the dismantling of our Air Force presence in Thailand, which country—unassisted—could probably not survive. Along with that, Laos and Cambodia would fall—as eventually would Burma.

Then, if those countries are overrun, what about South Korea? We must assume, in such an eventuality, Communist pressures would draw a bead on Korea. We can anticipate American antiwar activists would then go into action, and I suppose some politicians would jump on their bandwagon. If they succeed—which they must not—the Indian Ocean would become a Soviet pond and the entire Pacific area would become seriously jeopardized. Many authorities believe this would bring world war III closer to reality in the years ahead.

EXPECTED BLOODBATH OF CATHOLICS AND OTHERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In the meantime, what would have happened to the people of conquered South Vietnam—should the invading Communists have their way? And who cares? I am speaking of what could happen if Vietnamization is not perfected and, if protesters have their way, bombers are grounded and our naval guns are silenced.

Clark Clifford, when he was Secretary of Defense, said such an eventuality would result in the biggest bloodbath in history. I heard him say it. This likelihood is buttressed by the fact that under the tyrant Ho Chi Minh some 50,000 dissidents in North Vietnam, mostly Catholics, were slaughtered, while vast numbers hurriedly escaped to the south before the border was closed.

How many would be killed? And who cares? The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee made and published an in-depth study of this subject, based largely upon the history of other Communist take-overs in Russia, China, North Vietnam, and elsewhere.

That committee cited Prof. P. J. Honey of London, who it said was "one of the foremost authorities on North Vietnam in the free world." He was quoted as predicting that:

> On the basis of past Communist deeds, and given the size of South Vietnam's population, the minimum number of those to be butchered will exceed one million and could rise to several times that figure.

Also quoted by that study was Col. Tran Van Doc, a North Vietnamese officer who defected after 24 years in the Communist movement, who estimated the slaughter of up to 3 million.

Another authority cited was North Vietnamese Col. Le Xuan Chuyen, who defected after 21 years of membership in the Communist Party, and who should know whereof he speaks. He disclosed that 5 million people in South Vietnam are on the Communists' "blood debt" lists He believes that 10 to 15 percent of these would be killed; that another 50 percent would be imprisoned; and that the rest would have to undergo "thought reform."

Still another highly recognized authority was cited—if more is needed. That was Douglas Pike, author of "The Viet Cong," who recalled what happened at Hue after it was held briefly by the North Vietnamese. Bodies of 5,700 innocent victims—helpless men, women, and children—were dug up from shallow mass graves, all slaughtered, who, according to captured Communist documents, were considered "wicked tyrants," or "counter-revolutionaries," who owed "blood debts" to the people.

Here is Mr. Pike's estimate of the situation, assuming a decisive Communist victory:

> First, all foreigners would be cleared out of the South, especially the hundreds of foreign newsmen who are in and out of Saigon. A curtain of ignorance would descend. Then would begin a night of long knives. There would be a new order to build. The war was long and so are memories of old scores to be settled. All political opposition, actual or potential, would be systematically eliminated . . . Hanoi versus Southern Catholics, the pattern would be the same: Eliminate not the individual, for who cares about the individual, but the latent danger to the dream, the representative of the blocs, the symbol of the force, that might someday, even inside the regime, dilute the system. Beyond

this would come Communist justice meted out to the 'tyrants and lackeys' . . .

But little of this would be known abroad. The Communists in Vietnam would create a silence. The world would call it peace.

ARE GOOD-INTENTIONED PEOPLE BEING SUCKED IN AND USED?

Mr. Speaker, no doubt some good-intentioned people are being unwittingly used by those who really want the Communists to win the war. Others appear to be victims of emotionalism or sheer ignorance of what it is all about. Only a few days ago, for example, 300 mobsters demonstrated at nearby Maryland University, where they burned an American flag, condemned the ROTC on the campus, uttered anti-American epithets, and had to be quelled by the National Guard.

About the same time, 20 degenerates visited the Soviet embassy here, brazenly called on the Russians to "Avenge Hanoi and Haiphong" and "Send More Missiles To Shoot Down More U.S. Planes."

In San Francisco on yesterday a crowd gathered in Kezar Stadium in San Francisco to hear Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, chief Hanoi delegate to the Paris peace talks, over a telephone hookup.

The press reported she "demanded that the Nixon Administration set an immediate date for withdrawal from Vietnam, stop all bombing, and stop supporting the Saigon Government."

To remove any doubt about the loyalty of the 30,000 who were present, a Vietcong flag and a peace banner were implanted atop the stadium's flagpole.

Across the country, at student protest gatherings on yesterday, the press reported—

Vietcong flags, red banners representing anarchy, black balloons symbolizing bombs dropped in Vietnam and multicolored banners representing dozens of activist groups waved above the crowds in the larger demonstrations.

I have cited these incidents to illustrate the quality and the motivations of the participants. These people are not on our side. They are on the enemy's side.

Now these despicable characters were not protesting the draft. Nor were they seeking to escape service in Vietnam. They were protesting the U.S. interference with the current Communist invasion of South Vietnam. It is just that simple.

Some may scoff at the bloodbath dangers to which I have alluded. Unpleasant as it may be, facts are what they are. Under these dire circumstances, how important is it to us, to history, and to humanity, for our bombers and naval craft to interfere with the brutal and illegal invasion?

PEOPLE ARE NOT BEING FOOLED

Mr. Speaker, we can expect outbursts from the ignorant and the subversives. Under our Constitution, I suppose we must put up with their mouthings however distasteful that may be. But at the same time it is understandable that many Americans have been shocked that, in the moment of grave crisis, some people in high places have condemned the bombing of Haiphong—or any other bombing designed to interfere with the forward thrust of Communist invading forces. I am convinced these people have sadly misconstrued the will, the temper, and the mood of the vast majority of the American people. People are aware of the fact that there could have been no massive invasion of South Vietnam in the first place but for the presence of the erstwhile sanctuary port of Haiphong.

Indeed, it is also understandable that the mainstream of American public opinion cannot comprehend why so many of these critics rarely if ever utter a word of criticism for anything the enemy does. It is significant that it was only when interference with the enemy's invading march was registered—days after—that these critics first screamed "escalation!" Such sophistry. Such hyprocrisy. Considering the portents of the issue, these curious critics should hang their heads in shame.

COMMUNISTS UNDERSTAND BUT ONE LANGUAGE—FORCE

Surely it has come to pass by this time that these shallow-minded critics recognize that the only language the enemy understands or will heed is force. Surely they must admit that under present conditions further negotiations are useless and would be fruitless. Any person with a lick of sense would know that.

If these critics, who like Mme. Binh demand negotiations now, will listen to the voice of reason surely they will know that any meaningful negotiations in the future will be the result of the enemy being hurt and the likelihood they will be blasted again and again. Therein lies our only real hope for prompt release of American prisoners.

Let those Communist warmongers know they are in for more punishment, more than has already been unleashed, and the day of freedom for the POW's will have been advanced. As the situation now stands, the devastation that can be wrought by B–52's and other bombers and by sea-power constitute the only meaningful advantage and bargaining power we have left in the process to bring the war to an end and obtain a peaceful solution of the issues. Nothing short of that will suffice. Panty-waist treatment, favored by the critics, is exactly what the Communists want.

HANOI IS RISKING EVERYTHING

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to believe the outcome of the war hinges on the outcome of the current invasion. The Communists have put all their eggs in one basket, risked everything on commitment of practically all their troops south of the DMZ. If they are thrown back, military experts doubt they will ever be able to regroup, recoup their losses, and again be a serious threat to the independence of South Vietnam.

Thus, much is involved in the outcome of the present invasion. The enemy is undoubtedly counting upon the disunity of Americans to help them slaughter civilians and achieve victory.

It is time for thoughtful Americans to assess this situation realistically. And it is high time for presidential candidates, whose pronouncements are heard loud and clear in Hanoi, to wake up to their responsibilities as Americans and as candidates for this high office. There is a time and a place for the practice of politics. This is not it.

It follows that in this time of grave peril, when we are playing for keeps, that all Americans close ranks, lay aside their own views about the war—whatever they may be, and give solid support to President Nixon. He is the only Commander in Chief we have. He operates under the majesty of the American flag—your flag and my flag. And, as I have said, the stakes are indeed high in the outcome of this struggle.

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM: THE REALITIES OF EXPROPRIATION

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in a world which is changing rapidly, in which old policies and traditions become obsolete daily, we need men of vision and courage who will not blanch at the prospect of adjusting to new realities.

We need such people in the public domain, and in the private sector.

In my work as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have had the good fortune to meet some of the people who possess such talents.

High among them has been Charles W. Robinson, president of Marcona Corp., who has an impressive record of accomplishment in initiating, developing, and managing successful and imaginative business enterprises in Latin America and in other parts of the world.

In a recent speech to the 35th Mid-American World Trade Conference in Chicago, Mr. Robinson outlined some of his thoughts about the need for a whole new set of relationships, on the governmental as well as on the private planes, between the United States and the developing countries of the world.

I have not always agreed with all of Mr. Robinson's views—but at all times, I have found them stimulating and deserving of most careful consideration.

Mr. Robinson's speech in Chicago has dealt thoughtfully and perceptively with many problems which occupy our attention in the Congress, and which sometimes weigh heavily on the structure of U.S. relations with other countries.

I would, therefore, like to commend his remarks to the consideration of my colleagues:

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM: THE REALITIES OF EXPROPRIATION (PARTNERS IN PROGRESS)

(By C. W. Robinson)

When I was first approached and asked to be your speaker today it was on the basis that I would discuss the art of survival in the developing world. I indicated that if there was a magic formula guaranteeing protection against political attack I am not privy to it. A wave is cresting over us all threatening the very existence of private enterprise and no one company can stand alone protected from this force. However, I do feel that there is much we can do to raise the odds for success acting through the U.S. Government, with the multinational corporate community and as individual investors. It is on this basis that I appear before you today.

MARCONA CORPORATION

I suppose it would be appropriate for me to first introduce myself—and confess my biases. As President of Marcona Corporation I am responsible for a global program involving the extraction and processing of mineral resources and the operation of a worldwide shipping operation. However, at one time I was the only employee and was personally responsible for establishing our first venture—an iron ore mining project in Peru. This has grown from an initial investment of $7 million to a total of almost $200 million today. That operation continues to grow as we are just completing a $30 million expansion and are now negotiating terms of a new agreement with the Peruvian government which will allow us to proceed with another $60 million addition.

Soon after we initiated operations in Peru we commenced development of our own bulk transport operation which in turn has led us into salt mining in Chile, a titanomagnetite operation in New Zealand, and involvement in a major iron ore operation in Western Australia.

We also have underway efforts to bring into production other mining ventures in India, Alaska, Greenland and Brazil.

We have had a full measure of crises in our various activities throughout the developing world; however, to date we have continued successful operations in all areas.

My corporate responsibilities today involve forward planning and overall direction of the enterprise; however, I still maintain direct contact with government leaders in countries in which we operate. This has given me a feeling for their ambitions and their goals, both legitimate and otherwise. From this experience I have gained a firm conviction that there are basic deficiencies in our relationships with the developing world—a conviction which I want to share with you today.

PROBLEM DEFINED

I am confident that where there is a will—combined with vision—there will be a way to navigate through the rocks and shoals which certainly lie ahead in the developing countries. However, this requires a clear understanding of our basic problems.

Latin America

My comments will be largely directed toward problems in our relations with Latin America because of the magnitude of our involvement. U.S. direct investment in this area totals almost $14.0 billion, or about 70% of U.S. investment in all of the developing world. However, even though I speak of Latin America it should be understood that the same basic problems exist—or will develop inevitably in Africa, Southeast Asia and other sectors of the developing world.

Gaposis

Some of you may recall an advertising campaign many years ago with each ad containing a photograph of a person with some item of clothing improperly secured by the use of buttons. There was always the question—"Are you suffering from gaposis?" This was accompanied by the suggestion that the affliction could be easily cured with a zipper.

Today we are suffering from a serious case of "gaposis" but unfortunately it will take more than a zipper to effect a cure. First, there has been a rapidly growing gap between our perception of the developing world and the reality of that world. This is reflected in our attitudes and in our government polices which have become increasingly anachronistic and therefore counterproductive.

The second gap which we must deal with today is that which continues to widen between the economic level of the developed and the developing nations.

Since World War II accelerating technological growth has greatly extended our capacity to communicate and transport over great distances. The freer exchange of ideas—people and goods across national boundaries has stimulated an irreversible movement towards the interdependence of all peoples. Thus, it is not only the gap which has developed between our levels of development—but also a growing awareness of that gap. This is creating what appears to be almost insurmountable problems in our relationships with the developing world.

We are rapidly becoming one world family with all of the stresses which arise within any family group, especially where unequal opportunities exist.

U.S. relations with Latin America

Since the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine 150 years ago we have viewed Latin America as our special preserve for both strategical and economic reasons. During this period our tactical plan has swung between actual intervention and a paternalistic benevolence. We have viewed with suspicion—if not alarm—European or Asian efforts to move in on the raw material sources and markets of this continent.

I suggest that there is no creditable strategy argument supporting a continuation of this policy today—and certainly Japan, Germany, China or any other country has as much right to investment in this area as does the U.S. If we are to avoid more Cubas or Chiles where U.S. investors dominated the economy, we must encourage the flow of investment into Latin America from other nations of the world. This calls for a new perception of our relationship with Latin America and a change in our basic policies.

ECONOMIC GAP

The widening gap between the social and economic standards in the U.S. and the developing world is a real and critical problem. It sounds simplistic to say that the gap can be eliminated by accelerating the development process in Latin America, by reducing our rate of growth, or by a combination of both. However, this forces us to face up to two basic realities.

First, it is simply unrealistic to think that we can raise the standard of living in the developing world to the U.S. level of consumption. The rate at which this would chew up earth resources and contaminate our environment goes beyond imagination.

If we are even to begin to resolve the psychological and political differences between the developed and developing worlds we must recognize the necessity for a drastic reduction in the rate at which we in the U.S. increase consumption of earth resources to satisfy our escalating demands.

Dr. Osborne, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, predicts that by the year 2000 we will be consuming mineral resources at four times the current level. Without development of basic technology which could render domestic reserves economically exploitable we would have to increase the current level of mineral imports by seven times. This just isn't going to be—especially if we continue to count heavily on other Western Hemisphere sources. We must reverse our traditional concept of Latin America as our private storehouse of mineral and energy resources—as well as our market for finished products.

Continued accelerated consumption of earth resources is simply inconsistent with the limitations of a finite planet. Our world is on a collision course with disaster unless there are basic changes in social values and government policies, especially in the U.S. and other developed nations.

In summary—we must not continue to deceive ourselves, or others, by pretending that we are going to elminate the gap between developed and developing worlds. However, it is essential that we make every effort to narrow this gap through a reassessment and scaling down of our own development goals combined with positive support for accelerated development abroad. There is no alternative solution.

U.S. Emotionalism

We must recognize another problem in Latin American relations which stems from the emotionalism influencing our views of each other. We are quick to point out the volatility of the Latin temperament but do we appreciate the extent to which we respond emotionally to issues between us?

Let me give you an example—How many of you react with anger when you read about the Peruvians or Ecuadorians capturing another U.S. fishing boat? How many respond favorably to the suggestion frequently expressed in Congress, that we send a destroyer down to protect our boys? But I ask—have you ever studied this issue objectively? Do you know the nationality of the captains and crews of these boats? Do you understand the need to preserve the important but expendable reserve of marine life that exists in the Humboldt current which extends about 200 miles off the West Coast of South America? Are you aware of the U.S. law which provides compensation for fines but not for purchase of reasonably priced fishing licenses, the revenue from which is used to study and protect this marine resource?

I recognize that after a careful review of the facts you may not agree with my conclusion that our concern over the effect of a change in territorial limits on the surface of the seas has led us to an absurd and indefensible position on this fishing issue. However, I do suggest you defer any future emotional response until after you have carefully reviewed the facts.

As a further illustration of the element of emotionalism in our reaction to Latin America—several days ago Canada's Minister of External Affairs—Mitchell Sharp—stated that many U.S. multinational corporations were continuing to be imperialistic. He goes on to say—and I quote: "Canadians are determined that foreign corporations will serve Canadian interests, buttress Canadian priorities and respond to Canadian aspirations." This generated some concern in the U.S. but because of our association with Canada we know that we will find a way to reconcile any differences that might arise from application of this policy. But let's think for a moment—about the reaction which would have been prompted by this statement if made by a high government official of, say, Brazil. We would be in a state of panic and convinced that we faced dire—even though unclearly defined—perils.

The difference is in our ability to communicate. It was Francis Bacon who said—"it is by discourse that men associate." Somehow we have failed to establish a meaningful discourse with Latin America which has greatly limited our true association.

We are painfully aware of the iron and bamboo curtains and the limitation on discourse they impose—or perhaps I should say have imposed in the past—but somehow geographical proximity which inspired the myth of "Pan-Americanism," has concealed the existence of a cultural and language curtain which separates us from Latin America. We must make a positive effort to pierce this veil.

Growing Nationalism

Nationalism—a growing phenomenon in Latin America—again engenders emotional response in both developed and developing worlds. However, we shouldn't fear nationalism in itself. We have expended billions of dollars and thousands of American lives to create a sense of nationalism in South Vietnam. Furthermore, we will never see any real economic and social progress unless individuals do identify with national goals and

aspirations—or gain a sense of nationalism. Somehow we must learn to reconcile our corporate policies and activities to the legitimate objectives of nationalism and accept it for what it is—an essential condition for development.

However, the growth of nationalism does bring an emotional and political sensitivity to what the host country often views as imperialism on the part of the foreign investor. To counter this we must find ways to depoliticize or denationalize our foreign investments. The mere presence of investors from nations other than the U.S. will go a long way to moderate this problem. The developing nation soon learns that all foreign investment behaves in substantially the same way.

The development of consortia for major investments formed with participants from two or more countries can at least reduce the risk of political attack based on the "invasion of sovereignty" argument. Perhaps the ultimate solution is the "World Corporation" without nationality—incorporated by and responsive to a truly international institution.

"Fade Out" Formula

One of the by-products of excessive nationalism is the pressure to limit the period of foreign control over an investment. The Andean Group formed as a regional economic bloc by the five Latin American countries of Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador and Columbia, has issued an investment code—which includes what is referred to as the "fade out" formula. After 10 to 15 years the foreign investor is expected to "fade away into the sunset" with local investors acquiring a controlling interest in the enterprise. It is ironical that this scheme was conceived in U.S. academic circles reflecting the view that every foreign investment contains an incipient cancer which must be removed at an early stage before it contaminates the country's socio-economic body.

This simply ignores the need for a continuing flow of capital, technology and managerial know-how which is vital to the success of any venture. Application of the "fade out" formula would discourage all but those investors interested in a quick profit who do not identify with the long range interest of the developing nation. I believe that sound and constructive overseas investments serves as "engines" for development not merely the "ignition spark."

Furthermore, capital is increasingly without nationality—only management tends to retain its overseas national ties. Through developing truly international management sensitive to and willing to harmonize with host country long range interests, I am convinced that this "fade out" principle will itself fade away over time.

The excesses of nationalism have posed a growing threat to foreign investment during the past few years with a rising hostility leading in some cases to expropriation. In almost all areas we have witnessed an unpredictable changing of the rules—increasing taxes and other burdens on corporate enterprise—both foreign and domestic. This is a problem which must be resolved if foreign investment is to continue contributing to the development process.

I am totally committed to the principle that we can and will resolve this problem. However, we must recognize that the ambient—or atmosphere within which we can influence the future of our individual investments is determined to a great extent by the behavior of our government and that of other investors in the same area. Accordingly, we must find ways to encourage the establishment of new government policies and actions of other investors which will enhance our chances of success in this important—in fact essential—effort.

U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Let's first consider the question of U.S. government policies.

Foreign assistance

Our foreign aid efforts in Latin America have suffered from the Marshall Plan syndrome. We have simply failed to distinguish between the requirements for *reconstruction* as opposed to *development*.

The Alliance for Progress was conceived in the early 60's in an atmosphere of political euphoria. This was a completely unrealistic scheme to satisfy the development goals of Latin America over a short period of time. We poured massive amounts of financial aid through government-to-government channels. This only assured preservation of the status quo in spite of certain development criteria we attempted to impose on the recipient nations. Real development—calls for change—both social and economic—and this is a painful process, naturally resisted by the established and controlling forces. The dramatized presentation generated wild unrealizable dreams on the part of the Latin American people. This effort has failed and they are now suffering from a painful hangover from their emotional binge. But where do we go from here?

I feel that there is a breath of fresh air coming into our foreign assistance philosophy which holds great promise for the future. In 1969 Congress passed foreign assistance legislation which recognized the difference between the objectives of military aid, large government-to-government loans for infrastructure and support of social development or the change process.

To deal with the latter, a new government corporation was established by Congressional action. It was designated the Inter-American Social Development Institute—later changed to the Inter-American Foundation. This is a relatively small scale program—with initial multi-year funding of $50 million to be employed through Latin American non-government institutions dedicated to social change. It is administered by a 7-man Board appointed by President Nixon, of which 4 are from outside of government. I am pleased to be serving as a member of this Board and terribly excited by the potential in this new approach. We do not dictate programs—but respond to Latin American needs—not as we see them but as they perceive them, and evidence this by their own initiatives.

There are many ripples on the sea, most of which soon disappear back into the surface; however, every now and then one appears whose time has come and it continues to build into a giant swell to crash eventually on a distant shore. I believe that this new approach is a ripple whose time is overdue and the Inter-American Foundation will lead us into a new concept of foreign assistance—not only in Latin America but throughout the developing world.

Credit diplomacy

Let's look at our "credit diplomacy" of the 1960's as reflected in the Hickenlooper Amendment. This was designed to prevent illegal expropriation of U.S. property—by threatening withdrawal of all financial aid unless there is prompt adequate and effective compensation. This is our 20th Century version of the British gunboat diplomacy of the past century.

No one can argue very effectively against the principle that you shouldn't continue to provide financial aid to governments who kick us in the teeth in clear violation of accepted international standards. However, in my opinion, the Hickenlooper Amendment fails in that:

It not only tells the President, but also the opposition how he is to play his poker hand.

It generates an international emotional issue strengthening political support for the government leaders who have taken the expropriation step, and who for that reason can't afford to succumb to U.S. pressure.

It provides support for big business with sufficient clout in Washington to induce the government to jeopardize our international relations on their behalf. (You can be certain that your Uncle Joe's hamburger stand on a street corner in Lima doesn't operate under this same umbrella.)

And finally, it encourages an inflexibility and intransigence on the part of the threatened company, further compounding the problem.

We must find ways to bring appropriate economic pressure on governments to encourage fair treatment for all U.S. investors—large or small. Perhaps this can be better accomplished through an international institution such as the World Bank. In any event, it calls for a flexible—nonpublicized and thus noninflammatory approach, which can be adapted to the special circumstances which surround each expropriation case.

Investment insurance

Another area of our foreign policy which I believe requires review and change relates to our overseas private investment insurance.

In the first place, insurance against expropriation of property does not cover the most common risk in the developing world—which is the creeping expropriation of profit. This reduces the value of the investment but leaves the ownership intact, thereby avoiding the messy problem of compensation; secondly, I question whether we have ever really established the true objectives of this program now administered by OPIC. Are we encouraging U.S. overseas investment in developing countries because we want to support their economic growth? If so, wouldn't it be logical to extend this insurance program to investors from other countries?

Are we interested in protecting existing U.S. investments? If so, I am convinced that U.S. interests now in Latin America are better protected by new investment from Japan, Europe and elsewhere than by additional U.S. investment. On this basis perhaps we should only make the insurance available to investors from other countries.

On the other hand, our true objective may be to preserve Latin America as a reserve of raw materials and as a market for the future of U.S. industry. If that is the case, I submit that we are acting out of harmony with our stated objectives and contrary to the interests of the developing world.

It is difficult for me to see any valid argument for this insurance program which tends to encourage inflexibility on the part of the insured company, greatly increasing the likelihood of expropriation, very possibly at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer.

Our present bilateral approach also results in escalating what is a company-to-government argument into a major international issue involving both governments. This could be avoided by establishing an insurance program on an international basis to be administered by the World Bank. In any event, with current U.S. copper company insurance claims in Chile alone exceeding present OPIC reserves, and the growing reluctance of Congress to vote increased funds for this kind of program, the problem may resolve itself. Events may conspire to provide an answer.

Preferential import treatment

On another issue—we have talked for years about our desire to support the advancement of export industries in Latin America. We have offered assurance that we will establish preferential import duties as an important step in this effort. However, our actions have never matched our rhetoric. We must fulfill this promise and also en-

deavor to gain similar treatment for Latin American products from the European Economic Community and Japan.

Underemployment crisis

Another emerging issue in our relations with the developing countries results from our failure to create more employment in the developing world through our foreign investments. The "marginal man"—or underemployed individual—continues to grow in numbers at an alarming rate, promising social stress and political instability in the years ahead.

The U.S. was developed in an atmosphere of labor scarcity—which encouraged the capital intensive approach. Unfortunately, we continue this same approach in our investments in the developing nations and thus fail to generate new jobs at anywhere near the rate required to avoid a major crisis. U.S. credit policies combined with import duty concessions and accelerated depreciation offered by the developing nations, induce investors to go the capital intensive route. We should take the lead in developing new formulas for overseas financing to accelerate the creation of jobs. We must also encourage the developing nations to follow a similar course in their efforts to stimulate new investment. This rapidly emerging problem could well prove to be the single key issue of the 70's.

Territorial limits

I have already mentioned the question of fishing rights, but this is only a part of the larger issue of international codes. If we were to be completely honest we would have to admit that historically these are designed to protect the strong against the weak. The fact that might begets right was clearly the case when Britannia ruled the waves. Territorial limits were established at 3 miles from the coast which was the distance that a round iron ball could be fired from a shore gun. Technological "might" now replaces military "might" as the controlling factor, at least in all subsurface considerations. This is evidenced by the U.S. claim to the continental shelf for exploitation of the subsoil oil resources which became imperative when offshore oil drilling capability had been developed to exploit these resources. In the case of the fishing boat controversy—we seem to be saying that the Peruvians and Ecuadorians must restrict their offshore claims to 12 miles because we have the technological capability to send large self-sustaining, electronically equipped fishing vessels to exploit the subsurface resources beyond this limit.

To improve our relations with the developing world we must find a way to preserve the essential freedom of passage over international waters—but still deal with the subsurface and subsoil resources in ways that fully protect the weak as well as the strong.

Department of Commerce study

I have reviewed with you a few examples of current U.S. policies toward developing nations which I am convinced must be changed to reflect the realities of our world today. I am pleased to learn that our new Secretary of Commerce—Chicago's own Pete Peterson—is studying the broad question of U.S. international economic policies with a view to bringing them into line with our rapidly changing world. I have great confidence in his capacity to effect the policy changes which are absolutely essential if the U.S. is to play its proper role in the international economy.

MULTINATIONAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS

As individuals we can also influence our relations with the developing world through association with other companies. Multinational business leaders will become an increasingly important influence in U.S. international relations. Inevitably this will lead to the development of action oriented organizations through which international businessmen will join forces. The Pacific Basin Economic Council is an example of this trend as it brings together business leaders of the U.S., Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand to cooperate in the economic development of the entire Pacific area—including the West Coast of Latin America. There will be many other such organizations through which we can exercise a positive influence in our relations with the developing world.

INDIVIDUAL BUSINESS POLICIES

Now I come to what I consider the most important area for individual effort—the operation of one's own overseas business. You'll have to forgive me if this appears to be an overly personalized review—because I have been involved directly and would like to share this experience with you.

There are many international business executives who have convinced themselves that they are following proper management policies in the developing world. Frequently you will hear them say that it is true that 30 or 40 years ago U.S. companies took advantage of the host country with their activities subject to criticism as imperialistic; but we have come a long way since then and complaints today are really "beating a dead horse."

However, the world is changing at an accelerating rate and there is a danger in steering our course by looking at the path behind as we are very likely to miss the bend ahead. I feel that we must continually reassess our policies to insure that we stay in harmony with the world as it exists today.

Continued building

While I was initiating our operation in Peru 20 years ago—I saw a cartoon from the New Yorker—which has greatly influenced my thinking and our policies in Latin America ever since. There was a picture of two Arabs sitting on a desert rock looking at a petroleum refinery under construction on the horizon. One was asking the other—"Shall we take it over now or wait until it's finished." I decided that the answer was—let's wait until it's finished and concluded that our policy should be one of never finishing. Twenty years later I am more than ever convinced that this is an important key to survival in Latin America; however, I now recognize that this calls for a good deal more than a continuation of physical construction through reinvestment of earnings—as important as this is. It is more than just expanding the role of local employees in overall company management, or building community relations as a good corporate citizen.

Partner in progress

I refer to a building process which calls for sensitivity to the country's development needs and a positive effort as a true "Partner in Progress."

I would like to describe three specific examples of our efforts in Peru which illustrate what I mean by a partnership in progress. In doing this—let me assure you I am not seeking accolades for our charity. On the contrary, I confess to having been motivated by a high level of long range self-interest. Furthermore, there are other companies playing a similar role in their operations in Latin America. However, I am convinced that the future for all foreign enterprise would be considerably brighter if all would adopt this approach. It's in the hopes that I might gain a few converts that I discuss it with you here today.

IPFE

The first example deals with the problem of education. Over 10 years ago we concluded that the most important factor in development was the cultivation of the human resource through education and training.

However, it was clear that this wasn't just a matter of building more facilities, or providing more scholarships for study in the U.S. It called for a change in the public attitude towards education—which was then viewed as the exclusive responsibility of the state. For that reason education had become a political issue and as a result both the quantity and quality of education failed to meet even minimum requirements.

We concluded that what was needed was a new perception of responsibility for education on the part of the advantaged sectors of the Peruvian society. Accordingly, we encouraged a group of leading citizens to form a foundation known as the Instituto Peruano de Fomento Educative—the Peruvian Institute for Educational Development. We supplied the necessary funds for initiation of this effort and also arranged for continuing financial support from the U.S. government. This organization has grown every year with increasing involvement in the entire spectrum of Peruvian educational life including scholarship programs from the secondary school level through overseas graduate schools, in construction of educational facilities, in text book publishing, teacher training courses, and educational credit. The foundation functions today under a multimillion dollar budget with broad local support. It is one of the most important factors in the development of human resources outside of the government itself.

This is the father of private educational foundations in Latin America and is now being studied by interested citizens in other countries of Latin America as a model for similar development elsewhere.

This was not a public relations effort—as we carefully concealed from the public our identification with the project. It was a step taken as a "partner in progress" which we felt would produce a return down the road as Peru finds her true international identity.

Local sourcing

A second example relates to the development of local manufacturing capability. Until about 5 years ago we, like other foreign operations in Peru, resisted the pressures to buy locally produced supplies and equipment. We were geared up to use fully proven products from abroad and we were concerned with the quality and reliability problems involved with local manufacturers. However, we finally concluded that we had a responsibility for and—more than that—a real stake in the future of Peru which demanded accelerated economic development.

Having made the decision, we invited top representatives from 20 of the leading manufacturing companies in Peru to spend a weekend as guests at our mining center. We reviewed with them the list of over 50,000 items in our inventory broken down into product groups which were of interest to each company. These representatives returned to Lima to work on this challenge and soon had selected literally hundreds of products they would like to produce.

To assist them in this effort we organized a company task force made up of technicians, accountants, and quality control personnel, to spend full time with potential suppliers on this project. This program was highly successful and today we are operating with substantially higher dependence on local supplies—greatly reducing our inventory investment and overall costs. A large group of local manufacturers—which have expanded far beyond the initial 20 invitees—are producing new products and increased total volume supported not only by Marcona but by the other foreign and locally owned enterprises now taking advantage of this development.

It was not an easy battle and there were many failures along the road; however, the overall gain for local industry has been truly amazing. Needless to say, we have also generated a large new constituency sharing our interest in Marcona's survival. Again we have

acted as a partner in real self-sustaining progress.

Customs administration

One final and most recent example of our partnership philosophy—the new military government in Peru brought significant changes in the administration of custom duties and in the personnel responsible for this program. Delays in clearing customs were stretching into weeks and months, seriously jeopardizing both operations and construction programs. The government explained that they simply couldn't overcome the growing backlog of paper work.

We had several alternatives for improving this situation but we finally decided to offer the government assistance in studying the problem and in developing a solution. We assigned a team of data processing specialists who in cooperation with government officials developed a computerized system with new forms and the necessary organizational changes. This system is now going into operation with important savings for Marcona—but also for Peru and for all other companies operating in that country.

I have reviewed these three examples of cooperation—to illustrate our philosophy of "partnership in progress." It is our hope that more foreign owned companies will share increasingly in this responsibility and opportunity.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, I sense that the rising tide of nationalism and anti-foreign capital attitude could be approaching its high watermark. If we will recognize the legitimate needs of the developing world and adjust our government and corporate sails to the violent and shifting winds of the developing world we will survive.

I do not predict peace and tranquillity—this is no place for the timid nor the weak. Certainly we must continue to adjust our relationships at an accelerating rate reflecting the realities of the world today. However, if we proceed with vision, foreign investment can become an even more dynamic and positive force in the absolutely essential development process.

"Without vision" said the Prophet Isaiah, "the people perish"—and I submit that the same fate awaits the foreign investor in the developing world. We must evidence more vision as "Partners in Progress" if we are to survive. This demands a sensitivity to trends, the imagination to project their consequences, the courage to proceed in the face of mounting risks, and the patience to support our convictions.

This is both our grave responsibility—and our hope for the future.

SOUTHEASTERN STATE COLLEGE TO PRESENT "OF MICE AND MEN"

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 28, Southeastern State College of Durant, Okla., will present its production of John Steinbeck's classic drama, "Of Mice and Men," at Washington's Kennedy Center, as part of the American College Theater Festival. Southeastern comes to this prestigious festival after competing against the finest plays from Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and New Mexico. This is a high artistic honor for Southeastern State College, and I know that all Oklahomans join me in congratulating the outstanding cast, Director Dave Cook and President Leon Hibbs. On behalf of our State, I am pleased to bring my colleagues' attention to the following resolution, which was recently adopted by the Oklahoma State Legislature:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION COMMENDING SOUTHEASTERN STATE COLLEGE, DR. LEON HIBBS, PRESIDENT, THE DRAMA DEPARTMENT AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE DRAMA DEPARTMENT, DAVID B. COOK

Whereas, the Southeastern State College Drama Department entered into competition, with many other colleges, in the American College Theater Festival produced by the Smithsonian Institution and the John F. Kennedy Foundation for the Performing Arts; and

Whereas, such competition was based on the artistic merits of production, and Southeastern State's presentation of John Steinbeck's "Of Mice and Men" was selected as the most outstanding production among the five participating colleges and universities in Oklahoma; and

Whereas, after winning recognition at Regional level, as judged by critics from New York and California, the production was nominated first in Regional competition; and

Whereas, in the face of competition with thirty other nominees from thirteen regions of the United States, the production by the Southeastern State Drama Department was again selected as among the leading ten to compete in the National Festival to be held in Washington, D.C., on April 28, 1972, where two performances will be scheduled, one at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and one in the Eisenhower Theater; and

Whereas, Southeastern State College is the smallest college with the least staff of any of the participants in the competition, such other participants being: University of Minnesota, Miami University, Hawaii University, Montana State University, Portland State University, United States International University at San Diego, California, Southern Methodist University, Southern Illinois University and University of North Carolina School of the Arts; and

Whereas, on April 16, 1972, the production "Of Mice and Men" will be performed at the Kirkpatrick Fine Arts Auditorium on the Oklahoma City University Campus, at which time the Governor will hold a reception for the cast and attending audience.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 2nd session of the 33rd Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Section 1. That the Southeastern State College and Dr. Leon Hibbs, President, the Drama Department and the Director of Drama, David B. Cook, have brought fame and recognition to the State of Oklahoma, by their excellence of performance and achievements.

Section 2. That distribution of copies of this Resolution shall be made as follows: one copy to Dr. Leon Hibbs, David B. Cook, the Honorable David Hall, Governor of Oklahoma, and the Honorable Carl Albert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; three copies to Frank Cassidy, Executive Producer, American College Theater Festival, John F. Kennedy Theater for the Performing Arts, 776 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.; and one copy each to members of the cast and crew, consisting of: Charles Warthen, Frank Wade, John Waggoner, Paul King, Don Hill, Steve Tilford, Janie Freeman, Mike Dawson, Jay Ellis, Curt Boles, Bill Groom, Howard Starks, Norman Colvin, Fay Lockwood, Marty Cook, Lewis Chandler, Chuck Ladd, Janie Roberts, Eddie Cook, Andy Riddle, Karen Riggs, Vicki Moore, Frances Wade, Jane Ann Looney, Steve Schlesselman, Neal Standsfield, Terry McClelland and Ellen Monks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. RUNNELS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, April 24, through Thursday, April 27, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, April 24 and the balance of the week, on account of committee official business.

Mr. FLOWERS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, April 24 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, April 24 and the balance of the week, 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. FASCELL, for 60 minutes, on May 18 and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter on Cuban Independence Day.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOLLISTER), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:

Mr. ROBISON of New York, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 2895.

Mr. PERKINS, in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOLLISTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mrs. DWYER in four instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. MCKEVITT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. BADILLO.
Mr. EILBERG in five instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. BURTON.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HANNA in three instances.
Mr. BEVILL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 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:

1897. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of increases in tariffs on certain ceramic table and kitchen articles, pursuant to section 3151(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fourth annual report on medicare, covering fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 1875(b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 92–284); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1899. A letter from the treasurer, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the society for calendar year 1971, together with an audit report for the same period, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways and public mass transportation facilities in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, to establish an urban transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1901. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966, title 23, United States Code, section 401 et seq.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1902. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14582. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 1174. Joint resolution making an appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–1016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14573. A bill to facilitate compliance with the Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 14574. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a South Atlantic Basin environmental conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. DWYER, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 14575. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Clara Barton House National Historic Site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 14576. A bill to make appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants under section 303(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 14577. A bill to make appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants under section 130 of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 14578. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50 cent pieces and $1 pieces in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14579. A bill to provide for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14580. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 3 months duration-of-relationship requirement which is presently applicable in certain cases involving suvivor benefits (where the insured individual's death was accidental or occurred in line of duty while he was a serviceman); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 14582. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 1174. Joint resolution making an appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Con. Res. 590. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States, through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, to take steps to have placed on the agenda of the United Nations the issue of self-determination for the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SISK presented a bill (H.R. 14581) for the relief of Yvonne L. Larsen and Scott Greene Larsen, which was referred 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:

216. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Leo A. Boller, Little Neck, N.Y., relative to declaring 1 minute of prayer for prisoners of war on Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

217. Also, petition of Mrs. Edward L. Jacobi, Martinsburg, Mo., relative to crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NUCLEAR POWER CRISIS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have been working with the people of Midland, Mich., in my congressional district, to realize their goal of building a nuclear powerplant to furnish badly needed electrical energy to the central and northern Michigan area. I was pleased to join the majority of my colleagues on Monday of last week as we passed H.R. 13752, providing for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants. The passage of this legislation indicates the seriousness with which my colleagues take the recent warnings we have received regarding the power shortage which threatens our country. It also gives hope to the citizens of communities like Midland who have been waiting literally years for the approval of their plans for providing additional electrical energy for their communities and their industries.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation's industrial community cannot tolerate much longer the delays which they are encountering in obtaining adequate power and resources to meet the demands which are placed on them by the American