

it and the larger Tenneco Corp. of Houston were "studying the possibility of importing Russian liquefied natural gas."

There has been a stepped-up U.S. interest in expanding trade with the Soviet Union from the current \$200 million yearly to billions of dollars a year. The Commerce Department, particularly interested in the possibilities of joint ventures such as the proposed natural gas arrangement, has proposed steps to remove trade barriers on both sides.

But the White House, awaiting a further improvement in the political climate, for the moment has postponed any dramatic action.

Because of heavy demand for natural gas, American suppliers have been seeking to increase the amount of liquefied natural gas imported to either East or West Coast ports. This requires refrigeration plants at ports in the source country as well as special refrigerated ships.

In the Soviet case, pipelines would have to

be laid to get the gas to either Baltic Sea or Arctic Ocean ports, and special equipment would have to be built to liquify it.

The principal factor involved is cost. At present, North African liquefied gas costs about 85 cents per thousand cubic feet in the U.S. East Coast. If the Soviet Union can work out an arrangement by which total cost would not exceed \$1 per thousand cubic feet, one gas expert said today, a deal might be feasible.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 31, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*The ways of the Lord are right and the just shall walk in them.—Hosea 14: 9.*

God of grace and God of goodness, whose presence stills our spirits in the quiet of the night and whose strength supports us in the struggles of each new day, keep our minds clear and our hearts clean as we set out upon the work of this week.

Give to each one of us the inspiration of the humble in spirit, the insight of the pure in heart and the industry of willing hands that we may add to the goodness of life and make this a great time in which to lead our beloved country.

Amid differences of opinion and divisions in relationships give us ears to hear the clarion calls of justice and freedom and hearing may we give heed with a hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

In the spirit of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life 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.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
January 27, 1972.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 4:35 p.m. on Thursday, January 27, 1972, and said to contain the Sixth Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the calendar year 1970.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

### SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-239)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Sixth Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the calendar year 1970.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1972.

### NO REPARATIONS FOR NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to believe the secret negotiations for peace between the United States and North Vietnam have included commitments for reparations, under the name of reconstruction, but apparently this is the case. This is a shocking development. We are under no obligation to rebuild North Vietnam. The damage which they have sustained, they brought on themselves. They should be required to pay reparations to us for the suffering and cost they caused us as a result of the war. And they should be paying reparations to the nations of Indochina for the destruction wrought by the Communist forces in their efforts to overturn the governments of other nations. Instead of paying reparations or providing reconstruction to the North Vietnamese, I am certain it would be more satisfying to the Congress and to our Nation to provide additional benefits to American servicemen of the conflict and to their families, particularly to the families of the dead, to the wounded, and to the families of those missing in action.

I strongly urge that the nonsense about reparations, by whatever name, to North Vietnam be dropped now.

### FCC REVERSES ITSELF AND REINSTATES A.T. & T. HEARINGS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 27, the Federal Communications Commission did an about face, set aside its own order of December 23, which had dismissed the hearings on phase II of the A.T. & T. rate case, and ordered the hearing reinstated.

On December 23, the FCC abandoned its investigation of A.T. & T., which had

been pending for 7 years, on the grounds of inadequate staff and funding. That decision constituted a default of the Commission's regulatory responsibility and was the target of widespread public outcry and criticism. The Commission was, in effect, saying that it did not have the resources to carry out its most basic responsibility—the investigation of the rate base and revenue requirements of A.T. & T.

On the opening day of this session of Congress, January 18, Senator FRED HARRIS and I held a press conference with FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, who had dissented from the December 23 decision, and we introduced legislation authorizing \$2 million to be used by the FCC to carry out this study—S. 3060 and H.R. 12423. The Commission's reversal and its reinstatement of the hearings demonstrate the importance of public pressure upon an agency to prevent it from shirking its fundamental responsibilities.

The FCC in its order of January 27 says that the President's budget for fiscal year 1973 will provide the funds to carry out this study. However, the new budget provides only 12 additional man-years for domestic telephone rate regulation. It should be noted that the Commission only asked for 10 additional man-years in its original fiscal year 1973 presentation to the OMB. Thus, the Commission has hardly exhibited any vigorous effort to obtain the resources required to conduct a thorough study of A.T. & T.

Certainly it is incumbent upon the Commission now to carry out a full study of A.T. & T., including but not limited to revenue requirements, the reasonableness of prices and profits, the amounts claimed for investment and operating expenses, and the internal rate structure of the interstate and foreign message toll telephone service.

It is essential that the FCC carry out this study without in any way slighting its other regulatory requirements. If its resources are believed to be insufficient to meet its responsibilities, the FCC has an obligation to ask the OMB and Congress for whatever funds are necessary.

### STRIKES IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the west coast dock strike is probably the most costly in the history of the Nation. There is more involved here than just the

situation as it relates to the strikers. The entire Nation is affected. Every industry and every consumer is feeling the effects. The strike is sorely damaging the American economy.

President Nixon in his state of the Union message faced up to the problem. He called on the Congress to give him the authority to do something about this intolerable situation. In fact, he has made such an appeal on several occasions. And in February 1970 he sought broad legislation to deal with strikes in the transportation industry, an industry which for the good of all must be kept moving at maximum capacity.

Legislation sought by the President is now pending before appropriate committees of the Senate and House. He has urged speedy action. The masses of this Nation are urging action.

As one who supports the position of the President on this very important issue, I strongly urge the Labor Committees of the Senate and House to promptly move this legislation out of committee and onto the floor so that the Congress may express its will thereon.

The President has done his part. The next move is up to the Congress. Time is running out.

#### PRESIDENT'S PEACE PROPOSALS SHOULD BE PURSUED AND SUPPORTED

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, indications from both the Democratic and Republican sides are of hope and encouragement that the President's initiatives will lead quickly to peace in Southeast Asia.

As a strong supporter of the Mansfield amendment, I believe that the points proposed by the President show the administration coming closer to the consensus of the country that settlement of the prisoner of war issue should lead to a definite date for total withdrawal.

Support in the House is widespread, not necessarily on the specific eight points, but for the broad proposition which the President is pressing of achieving a settlement.

My hope is that the President's affirmative proposals will lead to serious discussions between ourselves and Hanoi in Paris, and a sincere effort by their country as well as ours to move toward a settlement, American withdrawal and an end of the war.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the programs under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been carried out under the authority of two temporary resolutions since June 30, 1971. The latest extension expired on October 31, 1971. Since that time, the Environmental Protection

Agency has been without authorization for important areas of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee (Mr. BLATNIK) and his committee have been working hard on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments. However, it will be some time until this vital bill is reported, considered by the House, and differences reconciled with the Senate version. Therefore, I have introduced today a continuing resolution which is cosponsored by my able and distinguished colleague from Buffalo (Mr. DULSKI) who is also deeply interested in the restoration of the Great Lakes. It is imperative that this continuing resolution be passed so that important environmental programs which are now being held up because of lack of authorization can get going again.

This resolution can also be the vehicle for a major crash program to restore Lake Erie and the other Great Lakes.

Dr. Robert A. Sweeney, the very able and dedicated director of the Great Lakes Laboratory of the State University College at Buffalo, has been working very closely with me on this project. Recently Dr. Sweeney stated:

The costs of not instituting a program to abate pollution in the Great Lakes, particularly with respect to up-grading the effectiveness of municipal sewage collection and treatment systems, would incur damages which far exceed the expenses of such a program.

My distinguished colleague (Mr. BLATNIK) also serves as chairman of the Conference of Great Lakes Congressmen which has been a bipartisan effort since 1966 to initiate a comprehensive program to restore the Great Lakes. I know he shares my concern.

This authorization is urgently needed to enable the Federal water pollution control program to continue until permanent legislation is passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been brought to my attention that salaries are being paid under section 5(n) for which no authorization exists.

I strongly urge immediate consideration and passage of this critical measure.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks I shall include extraneous matter which will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

#### SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENT ON THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I have studied the statement made by President Nixon January 25, 1972, on his efforts to make a lasting peace in Indochina. He has told the American people of his proposals to Hanoi which would resolve this war in a fair and acceptable manner to all sides.

It is clear to me that President Nixon has lived up to his promise to search for

an end with honor to the conflict in Vietnam. I hope that all Americans will put aside partisan politics and support the eight-point initiative. There are many who are motivated to attack the President for purely political expediency, but this issue should be above politics. I would remind those who have attacked President Nixon's peace initiative that the issue is the lives of American soldiers and POW's. It is to be expected that the North Vietnamese will not readily accept any American proposal—their past record clearly indicates this fact. They will attempt to gain even more, but the President has made an entirely fair proposal and world opinion should be on our side.

I hope now that the private negotiations have been made public, all sides will be willing to begin serious negotiations at the Paris talks. I join with President Nixon and the vast majority of Americans in the hope that we will soon see the end of this war and the return of our POW's.

#### ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC SIGNS

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of December the Government index of certain leading economic indicators posted the sharpest rise since January 1971 when in the aftermath of the strike against General Motors the index jumped 2.3 percent. Aside from the January 1971 increase, last month's 2.2 percent rise was the sharpest rise in the leading indicators since October 1968, when the indicators rose 2½ percent. According to Dr. Harold C. Passer, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs:

This provides important evidence that the economy will be expanding vigorously in the years ahead.

Of the eight indicators, four advanced during December. The average work-week of manufacturing employees increased, initial claims for unemployment insurance declined by 11.6 percent, and new housing permits rose by 14.3 percent. Stock prices, represented by Standard & Poor's average of 500 stocks, gained almost 7 percent. The four other indicators, which declined, did so only slightly, with the resulting strong increase for the eight indicators taken together.

Additionally, executives in the important steel industry are voicing optimism about 1972. According to a recent report in the Wall Street Journal, there is considerable agreement among steelmen that first quarter 1972 shipments will total around 22 million tons, with a jump of 10 percent or more to about 24 million tons in the second quarter of the year. Steel orders are coming in at a considerably higher rate than they were 1 or 2 months ago. The auto industry is expected to increase its order rate shortly because of the need to restock inventories. Mr. Speaker, I think that in light of the many encouraging economic signs which we have seen in the past month, there is sound basis for optimism about the future course of the economy.



**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10086, INCREASES IN APPROPRIATION CEILINGS AND BOUNDARY CHANGES IN CERTAIN UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM**

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 782 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

**H. RES. 782**

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10086) to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 782 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10086 providing for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system.

Title I of H.R. 10086 authorizes additional appropriations for the acquisition of lands at nine units of the national park system. On page 24 of the report are listed the units involved and the amount of increase for each. The total increase is \$12,544,500.

Title II of the bill authorizes increased appropriations for development at four units of the national park system. These units and the increase for each are also listed on page 24 of the report. The total increase is \$7,367,600.

Title III of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries at 11 units of the national park system. These units and the estimated cost for each are listed on pages 24 and 25 of the report. The total acquisition costs are estimated at \$1,176,500.

Title IV of the bill amends the Ozark Scenic Riverways Act to allow the United States to accept title to approximately 6,600 acres of State parkland subject to the retention by the State of a reversionary interest if the lands are not used to national scenic riverway purposes. Also in this title, the Cowpens National Battlefield Site is redesignated as Cowpens National Battlefield and authorizes \$2,363,900 for land acquisition and \$3,108,000 for development.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 782 in order that H.R. 10086 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time, may I say the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) has explained the contents of the resolution and bill very ably. House Resolution 782 does provide for 1 hour of debate under an open rule for consideration of H.R. 10086.

I think it is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that there may be a couple of points of order on this bill, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not request the Rules Committee to waive those points of order. He stated he would stand on the bill on the floor. There is, simply, possibly an appropriation in a legislative bill, and the committee in making some 22 changes that had to comply with the Ramseyer rule inadvertently missed one of them. Rather than request the waiver of points of order, the distinguished chairman had a supplemental report prepared to cover that instance. I certainly commend the gentleman and the committee for the fine attitude they have taken in that regard. I am happy to bring an open rule to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

**[Roll No. 11]**

Abbitt	Conte	Gallifanakis
Abzug	Conyers	Gallagher
Addabbo	Corman	Gialmo
Alexander	Cotter	Grasso
Anderson,	Culver	Gray
Tenn.	Curlin	Gude
Annunzio	Danielson	Hagan
Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Halpern
Badillo	Davis, S.C.	Hansen, Idaho
Baring	Dellums	Harrington
Barrett	Dent	Hébert
Bell	Derwinski	Heinz
Blester	Dickinson	Hicks, Wash.
Blackburn	Diggs	Hillis
Blatnik	Dingell	Horton
Brasco	Donohue	Jacobs
Caffery	Dulski	Jarman
Camp	Dwyer	Kazen
Carney	Edmondson	Keating
Carter	Edwards, Ala.	Kee
Celler	Edwards, La.	Kuykendall
Clancy	Eshleman	Lennon
Clark	Evans, Colo.	Long, La.
Clausen,	Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey
Don H.	Flynt	McCormack
Clawson, Del	Foley	McDonald,
Clay	Ford,	Mich.
Cleveland	William D.	McKinney
Collins, Ill.	Fountain	Macdonald,
Colmer	Frey	Mass.

Madden	Rarick	Steed
Mailliard	Rees	Steele
Mann	Robison, N.Y.	Stephens
Metcalfe	Rooney, N.Y.	Stuckey
Mikva	Rostenkowski	Thompson, Ga.
Mills, Ark.	Runnels	Tiernan
Minshall	Ruth	Udall
Moorhead	St Germain	Waggonner
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarbanes	Wampler
Myers	Satterfield	Whalley
Nix	Scheuer	Whitten
O'Konski	Schwengel	Wilson,
Passman	Sebelius	Charles H.
Pettis	Seiberling	Wolff
Powell	Skubitz	Wright
Preyer, N.C.	Slack	Wyman
Price, Ill.	Smith, Iowa	Young, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.	Staggers	Zion
Rallsback	Stanton,	
Rangel	J. William	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 290 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

**INCREASES IN APPROPRIATION CEILINGS AND BOUNDARY CHANGES IN CERTAIN UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM**

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10086) to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10086, with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before we begin the formal debate on the bill now before us, I once again wish to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), and his counterpart, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ), and the members of the subcommittee, especially for their detailed and constructive handling of this legislation. By bringing the bill before us in the manner in which it is presented, we can save a great deal of the time of the House and get the job accomplished, perhaps more expeditiously, and in just as good a manner, as if we were to have 22 separate bills before us.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10086 and its companion, H.R. 10110, were introduced by several Members of the House as a result of an Executive communication. The bill

which was recommended by the committee by a voice vote, involves legislative changes at 22 existing units of the national park system.

All of the changes are designed to accomplish the original objective which some earlier Congress authorized or to resolve some problem at a park area where congressional action is required.

#### BASIC PURPOSE

Basically, H.R. 10086, as amended, is an omnibus bill which brings together into one measure a fairly large number of routine matters which are important at the individual units involved. Individually, I believe that each item included in this bill can stand on its own merits, but, standing alone, some of these changes would probably find it difficult to successfully compete for the time and attention of the Congress.

To accomplish what H.R. 10086 seeks to accomplish, it would undoubtedly take many hours of discussion on the House floor. While congressional oversight requires that limitations be placed on the authority of administrative agencies, detailed changes should be handled as expeditiously as possible. The members of the authorizing committee feel that H.R. 10086 is a reasonable and sound method for disposing of such legislative necessities.

To qualify for inclusion in this bill, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation established some reasonable standards which it applied to all of the items in the bill now being recommended. It suggested, and the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs agreed, that each element should meet four tests—

First, the item should be relatively free of controversy;

Second, the proposed change should be able to stand on its own merits;

Third, the item should be compatible in form with the other areas in the bill; and

Fourth, the legislative process should be complete and should include an open, public hearing so that everyone knows exactly what the issues are.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that all of the provisions of H.R. 10086 meet those tests. Every aspect of the legislation has been considered in detail by the subcommittee and reviewed by the full committee.

The general thrust of the bill is to provide additional authority for the appropriation of moneys needed to acquire lands or to complete development programs. In addition, the bill authorizes several important boundary changes which could not be made in the absence of favorable congressional action. The Members will find that the report discusses the changes recommended for each unit.

#### COST

Altogether, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10086 involves increased appropriation ceilings at about a dozen areas. The total increase is \$26,560,000. Of this amount, about \$16,165,000 is for land acquisition and the remaining \$10,395,000 is for development. Probably no one in this House is more disappointed at the necessity for recommending these increases than are

the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It is important to remember that in almost every case, the appropriation limitation has been written into the original statute by the House on the recommendation of the committee. Those ceilings are not arbitrary figures drawn from a hat; they are almost always exactly the amounts which departmental spokesmen have said are needed to do the job. If they are wrong, then, with these limitations, they must come back to the Congress and justify their additional needs. While it may be impossible to reverse an action where a substantial investment has been made, we can take a look at what has been accomplished and determine what can reasonably be expected in the future.

#### COMMITTEE ADDITIONS TO THE BILL

The committee has included several important items in H.R. 10086 which were not in the bill as introduced—

Assateague Island National Seashore, Md. and Va.;

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont. and Wyo.;

Cowpens National Battlefield, S.C.

Muir Woods National Monument, Calif.;

Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo.;

Piscataway Park, Md.; and  
Wolf Trap Farm, Va.

All of these additions were considered in a public hearing on their individual merits. Spokesmen for the administration endorsed—in fact urged—the adoption of each of them, except for the Cowpens National Battlefield proposal. In that case, the Department reversed itself. Instead of recommending it, as it had done in the 91st Congress, it suggested that action be deferred until the administration could determine what the legislative priorities should be.

There is no question about the historical significance of the area where the Cowpens National Battlefield would be located. The Secretary's Advisory Board on National Parks and Historic Sites recommended its creation long ago. Our colleague from South Carolina, Representative GETTYS, has worked hard and waited patiently for the consideration of his legislation. The matter was considered by the National Parks Subcommittee during the 91st Congress and it was the subject of further hearings last year. The project is ready for the expansion which H.R. 10086 would authorize and should be approved along with these other changes that are being recommended.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10086, as amended, represents many days of work. It was thoroughly considered and it should be approved as recommended. Undoubtedly, other areas will require similar consideration in the future and I expect that the authorizing committee will be bringing in a housekeeping bill of this kind from time to time.

Personally, I favor all of the items included in the bill, as recommended, but I could not support the inclusion of any additional items which had not been considered and justified in a public hearing.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10086, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10086, a bill providing for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in 22 different units of the national park system. Generally, each change provided for each park unit in this bill is in furtherance of a congressionally declared objective and is non-controversial. Each change has been thoroughly reviewed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and hearings have been held. Each measure can stand on its own merits. In all instances, save one which I shall discuss later, the changes here authorized do not substantially alter the existing authorizations insofar as size or general character of the existing units are concerned. The committee's purpose in combining these authorizations into one bill is to achieve economy of time.

Title I of the bill involves nine units of the national park system and provides for increases in the statutorily authorized appropriations ceiling for land acquisition at each. In each of the nine instances, the administering agency has been unable to complete its land acquisition program, as contemplated by the enabling legislation, for a variety of reasons—the most common of which are rising land values and higher court awards in condemnation cases than anticipated. Each request for an increase in authorization ceiling has administration approval. Each increase is merited in the collective opinion of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The total amount involved is \$12,544,500.

Title II of the bill involves increases in statutorily authorized development ceilings at four units of the national parks system and involves a total dollar increase of \$7,367,600 based on March 1971 prices. Accordingly, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has added language allowing adjustment of these increases by such amounts, if any, as are justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction cost indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved for each area. In each instance, the increases here authorized were either requested by or approved by the administration.

Title III involves boundary changes at 11 units of the national parks system. Some of the changes sought are to authorize inclusion of donated lands and in two cases are to exclude unnecessary lands. The estimated value of privately owned lands to be acquired at seven of these areas is \$1,176,500. Again, each request has administration approval except for one, which the administration did not disapprove and which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered worthy of and necessary to enlarge at this time—the Cowpens National Battleground Site, S.C. In that instance, this committee determined that redesignation of the site as a national battlefield is justified as is the author-



ization of \$2,363,900 for land acquisition and \$3,108,000 for development contained in title IV of the bill for those purposes.

The costs involved at the several units varies considerably. The total amounts authorized to be appropriated by this bill are \$26,560,000. Of that amount, however, about \$16,165,000 is to be used for land acquisition and will come from funds already "earmarked" for that purpose—land and water conservation fund moneys—leaving \$10,395,000 to be appropriated generally.

It is my belief that the measures contained in H.R. 10086 before you today will go a long way toward furthering our responsibility to respond to the needs of the American people for conservation of our natural, cultural and recreation resources and opportunities even though any one measure, taken alone, is not a spectacular contribution of itself. Each change authorized by this bill is, in the opinion of the committee, both necessary to implement and consistent with the basic legislation authorizing the particular park service area. The omnibus bill vehicle permits us to review each proposal in the least possible amount of time, thereby facilitating the execution of our oversight responsibility regarding authorized programs. I am satisfied that each measure contained in this bill is worthy of enactment and is important to the mission assigned by the Congress to the National Park Service at the particular area involved. I urge your support of H.R. 10086.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House (H.R. 10086) was originally cosponsored by my friend, the ranking minority member of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. SKUBITZ, and myself. It is truly a nonpartisan bill which is designed to systematically and efficiently dispose of several of the relatively routine national park matters which require congressional attention from time to time.

#### THE OMNIBUS APPROACH

This legislation is in the form of an omnibus bill because it involves problems at 22 different areas of the national park system. It does not authorize any new area. Instead it deals with specific problems at existing national park units. Normally we take these matters up one at a time, regardless of their magnitude or character, and spend a good deal of time considering them as they move through the legislative process. Undoubtedly, if we had used that procedure, it would have absorbed as much as 22 hours of the time of the House of Representatives to complete debate on them individually.

Each of the 22 proposals contained in this bill had to pass the following tests:

First. It had to be the subject of a public hearing. I hope that no Member today will endeavor to add to this bill a proposal which has not been the subject of hearing in our committee;

Second. It had to be relatively noncontroversial;

Third. It had to be able to stand on its own merits.

To summarize the bill very briefly, it does essentially three things:

First, it authorizes additional appropriations for the acquisition of lands at nine units of the national park system;

Second, it provides for increased appropriations for development at four additional national park units; and

Third, it makes various boundary revisions at 11 other areas.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings many bills to the House floor—perhaps more than any other committee of the House. Some are large, new proposals; some deal with small problems. Combining many similar noncontroversial projects in an omnibus bill should save the Government money because it conserves the time of Congress.

We encouraged the administration to develop a bill which would combine several of these relatively simple house-keeping problems into one measure. Accordingly, on July 12, 1971, an Executive communication was forwarded to the Speaker which recommended the favorable consideration of an omnibus bill. As a result of this recommendation, H.R. 10086 was introduced.

The following month, the National Parks Subcommittee held hearings on the bill and on various individual measures which it embraced. Each item was explained and justified by spokesmen for the administration, but because the items in the bill involved areas already authorized, there was very little public participation in the hearings.

Following the consideration of the basic proposal, the subcommittee took from its calendar various other proposals which seemed to fit into the same general legislative framework of the bill to determine if it would be desirable to provide for their inclusion. Hearings were conducted on measures involving seven additional areas having problems similar in character to those involved in H.R. 10086. Subsequently, amendments were recommended to include them in the bill.

With this background, the members of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were able to judge the merits of the various proposed changes before recommending the legislation, as amended, to the House by a voice vote.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, upon examination of the bill and report, I believe that the Members of the House will be able to readily understand the provisions of the legislation. Without going into too much detail, however, I would like to very briefly summarize the bill:

Title I provides for increased authorization ceilings for land acquisition at the following areas:

Assateague Island National Seashore, Md. (including deficiency awards and interest thereon) ..	\$4,800,000
Big Hole National Battlefield, Mont ..	22,500
Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont. and Wyo.....	425,000
Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa.....	12,000
Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tenn.....	228,000

Lincoln Boyhood Home National Memorial, Ind.....	320,000
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo ..	3,804,000
Piscataway Park, Md.....	2,840,000
Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn ..	93,000

Total increase..... 12,544,500

Altogether, this title of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$12,544,500. All of this money, of course, is to be appropriated, in accordance with the usual congressional procedure, from the land and water conservation fund.

Title II provides for increased development ceilings. Under the terms of this title, an additional \$7,367,600 would be authorized at four existing units. They are:

Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa.....	\$1,850,000
Booker T. Washington National Memorial, Va.....	400,000
Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa.....	244,600
Wolf Trap Farm Park, Va.....	4,873,000

Total increase..... 7,367,600

Title III involves various boundary changes and it authorizes the appropriation of the sums needed in order to acquire any lands that are added. The areas affected are:

First, Adams National Historic Site, Mass.—to add 3.68 acres—\$122,000.

Second, Cowpens National Battleground Site, S.C.—to add 84 acres—see section 402.

Third, Fort Caroline National Memorial, Fla.—to add 12.5 acres—donation.

Fourth, George Washington Birth Place National Memorial—to add 62.3 acres—\$57,000.

Fifth, Glacier National Park, Mont.—to add 267.90 acres and to exclude 68.47 acres—\$6,000.

Sixth, Isle Royale National Park, Mich.—to add 0.52 acre—\$31,500.

Seventh, Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa.—to add 53.6 acres—\$10,000.

Eighth, Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.—to exclude 482 acres.

Ninth, Muir Woods National Monument, Calif.—to add 49.7 acres—\$950,000.

Tenth, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo.—to add 1,670 acres—included in title I, 6.

Eleventh, Petersburg National Battlefield, Va.—to exclude 257.53 acres.

Total: \$1,176,500.

Title IV covers two situations which require special language. One section deals with the acceptance of the donation of some 6,600 acres of parkland from the State of Missouri for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways subject to the retention by the State of a reversionary interest if the lands cease to be used for national scenic riverways purposes. The other redesignates the Cowpens National Battleground Site as a national battlefield and authorizes the appropriation of \$2,363,000 for land acquisition and \$3,108,000 for development at that area.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impose any further upon the time of the Mem-

bers of the House. I am sure that everyone understands the details of this measure. But I do want to assure my colleagues that the members of the authorizing committee have reviewed the legislation very carefully. We feel that the approach utilized in this instance is a sound one, that the legislation accomplishes worthy objectives, and that it represents a constructive effort to solve a large number of minor problems in the most efficient manner possible.

#### RECOMMENDATION

I urge the Members of the House to give H.R. 10086, as amended, their favorable consideration.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I shall just take a moment to endorse this concept the way it has been executed and I recommend passage of this legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to lend my wholehearted support to H.R. 10086, an omnibus bill from the Interior Committee which authorizes increased appropriations for a number of much-needed projects throughout the heartland of rural America. Many well-intentioned words have been spoken by political leaders on the need for rural redevelopment, both in order to forestall the senseless overcrowding of our cities and to refurbish and revitalize our less populous areas. Surely this is not a local issue, but in every sense a national one to which we must respond, if the past strength of this great land is to be recaptured.

Today, a bill which takes small steps toward realizing such a needed response is before the House. H.R. 10086 asks for positive allocations of funds for improving such diverse rural areas as are to be found in Montana, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Iowa. I am naturally interested in that part of the bill under our consideration which relates to my own State of Wyoming. This section incorporates bills which were sponsored last May in this House by myself, H.R. 8512, and in the Senate by Senators HANSEN, McGEE, MANSFIELD, and METCALF, S. 1878. It asks that Public Law 89-664, which established the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, be amended so the ceiling allocation of funds for the purchase of land and right-of-way is raised from \$355,000 to \$780,000.

Such increased funds are to be expended toward the completion of a road—whose construction has unfortunately been held up altogether too long—from Lovell, Wyo., to Fort Smith, Mont. This road is to be part of a great loop, extending from northern Wyoming into southern Montana and down again into Yellowstone Park. Many benefits are

expected to reach fruition through this project. The terrible traffic jams of tourists who have but one main artery into the park will be allayed. Surrounding areas, both in Montana and in Wyoming's Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, will benefit by becoming accessible tourist attractions in their own right.

If this is but one positive example of the good which many people can expect from H.R. 10086 in other areas of the country, and I think it is, I cannot more strongly recommend its passage today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GETTYS).

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman ASPINALL and Subcommittee Chairman TAYLOR and all the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for their consideration and approval of the merits of the Cowpens Battleground site proposal and for their courtesies to me personally during the several years the proposal has been before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, included in H.R. 10086 is an authorization for the enlargement and development of the Cowpens National Battleground in Cherokee, my district.

The Cowpens National Battleground has been recognized as one of the most important Revolutionary War battle sites. Here the southern strategy of Lord Cornwallis that was to end the Revolution met a crushing defeat and resulted in the winning of American independence. It was in January of 1781 that Lord Cornwallis began his grand march northward.

From his headquarters in Fairfield County, S.C., the British commander dispatched the finest of his soldiers under the dashing cavalry leader Bannistre Tarleton to destroy a band of militiamen and guerrillas under the command of Brig. Gen. Daniel Morgan.

On the morning of January 17, 1781, at Cowpens, the British force of 1,100 engaged the 600-man troop under General Morgan. In the 50-minute battle that followed, Morgan's small force executed the first and only successful double envelopment ever carried out on American soil and decimated the British forces. Only 200 of the British forces escaped.

From Cowpens, the British moved to Guilford where they won a costly victory and began the march to Yorktown where Cornwallis' surrender marked the end of the war.

Mr. Chairman, the Patriot victory at Cowpens has been recognized by historians as a crucial turning point in our War of Independence. It is fitting, therefore, that we should authorize plans for a comprehensive interpretive presentation of this historic engagement as we approach the bicentennial celebration of our national beginnings. It is also a practical necessity that we start now if we are ever to preserve this significant battlefield.

Residential development is crowding closer and closer to the battle site and, unless the needed land is acquired

promptly, the costs may become prohibitive.

The National Park Service reports that today, with only an acre and a quarter site and a simple marker to commemorate this decisive battle, some 32,000 visitors come to the Cowpens battleground annually. With proper development, its location within short driving distance of two major Interstate Highways—I-85 and I-77—will insure its use by increasingly large numbers of Americans in the years ahead.

The Cowpens battlefield project has been on the drawing boards for several years and the master plan for its development was approved by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments in 1968.

That plan calls for the enlargement of the area to about 850 acres, which would include all of the original battlefield and enough surrounding land so that it can be restored to its condition at the time of the battle. The surrounding land would provide parking and picnicking areas, foot trails and bridle paths, and an environmental education area.

Park Service plans for riding stables as part of the development is particularly appropriate since the Battle of Cowpens was the only Revolutionary War engagement in which the cavalry played a decisive role.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will approve this bill.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 10086 as amended, a bill which includes provisions comparable to my bill, H.R. 1439, dealing with Muir Woods National Monument in the State of California.

I would first like to express my appreciation of the consideration given to this legislation by the Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation and by the full Interior Committee. Everyone knows of the fine work done by the chairman of the committee, Mr. ASPINALL, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TAYLOR, and by their ranking counterparts on the other side of the aisle, Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. SKUBITZ.

H.R. 10086 as amended would provide for increases in certain appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units in the national park system. As I mentioned before, Muir Woods is one of the units included in this bill.

Located just 17 miles north of San Francisco, Muir Woods has served as a national monument since 1908. Virtually surrounded by Mount Tamalpais State Park, only a small portion of the lands remain to be acquired to complete the monument. Acquisition of these lands, which approximate 50 acres, will permit the National Park Service to relocate visitor use, service and residential facilities; improve access to the monument; and control the scenic approaches to Muir Woods.

It may be of interest to note that in the last 2 years nearly 1.5 million people have visited this beautiful grove of redwoods, which gives emphasis to the desirability of moving out of the grove itself all services and facilities, so that visitors will be less crowded and better able to enjoy the beauty of the trees.



Public control of the area is a necessity if the scenic and environmental integrity of Muir Woods—and also of adjoining Mount Tamalpais State Park—is to be preserved.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I endorse H.R. 10086 as amended and urge its approval by Members of the House.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 10086. It contains the provisions of H.R. 6442 which I introduced last year. That bill and the legislation before us today increase the authorization ceiling for land acquisition and development at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site from \$1,650,000 to \$3,500,000.

As most Members know, the Herbert Hoover Site is located at West Branch, Iowa. It is the site of the late President's birthplace and is the burial place of President and Mrs. Hoover.

Also located on the site is the Hoover Presidential Library, a replica of the blacksmith shop operated by President Hoover's father and the Quaker meeting house he attended while a boy in West Branch.

When Congress created the Herbert Hoover Historic Site in 1965, the monetary authorization was set at \$1,650,000. Rising costs have made necessary an increase in this authorization. Presently, only \$2,300 remains of the original authorization and a good deal of development work remains to be done. For that reason, I introduced H.R. 6442 which would increase the authorization by \$1,850,000 to \$3,500,000. Of course, I am pleased that is the figure included in the bill by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

For the most part, the funds will be used to the completion of the restoration and development plans at West Branch, which includes the reconstruction of Second Street in the city of West Branch.

The restoration consists primarily of the retention and rehabilitation of 19 historic structures or period buildings. Other structures will be removed. The completed restoration will bring into being a village scene at West Branch of the town which Herbert Hoover knew as a boy.

There is one large parcel of land on the west side of the development which remains to be acquired. Originally, it was thought that a scenic easement on the property would be sufficient to protect the integrity of the historic site. Negotiations have not been successful and, as a result, the purchase of almost 45 acres is now necessary.

Mr. Chairman, as someone who has been interested in the Herbert Hoover Historic Site and Presidential Library for many years, beginning with my work with the Herbert Hoover Foundation while I served in the Iowa Legislature, I have been concerned that development work at West Branch be completed as soon as possible. The adoption of this legislation should remove one of the last obstacles remaining in the path of the completion of the historic site. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10086, a bill providing

for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system.

The purposes of this bill are fourfold:

First, to authorize increased or additional appropriations for the acquisition of lands at nine existing units of the national park system;

Second, to authorize increased appropriations for development at four units of the national park system;

Third, to revise boundaries at 11 units of the national park system; and

Fourth, to make other changes related to such areas.

The changes authorized by this bill for each unit of our national parks system are as follows:

At the Assateague Island National Seashore, Md., and Va., an increase of \$4,800,000 is authorized in order to complete acquisition of about 3,644 acres within the seashore, estimated to cost \$5.2 million, plus interest, and an estimated escalation in land values of 8 percent per year. The figure was computed using the formula used in a recent condemnation award in the area. This sum, added to the \$819,802 remaining unexpended of the original authorization, is estimated to be sufficient to complete the administering agency's acquisition program.

For Big Hole National Battlefield, Mont., \$22,500 are authorized. The area was created in 1910 by Executive order and enlarged and given statutory recognition in 1963. About 120 acres of an L-shaped private inholding need to be acquired to prevent usage adverse to the battlefield. No funds remain of the original authorization.

At Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Wyo. and Mont., created in 1966 and enlarged in 1967, an increase of \$425,000 is authorized to acquire about 7,685 acres of tribal and allotted Indian lands to provide adequate access to the areas added to the national recreation area by the voluntary inclusion of Crow Indian Reservation lands. The remaining 5,840 acres needed for that purpose are already in Federal and State ownership.

Effigy Mounds National Monument, Utah, was established in 1949 by Executive order; increased in size in 1952 by State donations and statutorily recognized in 1961 at which time 270 acres were added and \$2,000 were authorized to be appropriated to acquire 94 privately owned acres containing Indian burial mounds. Land values have increased. For acquisition \$12,000 additional are needed and are authorized to be appropriated by this bill.

Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tenn., established in 1928, increased in size in 1933 and increased again and legislatively sanctioned during the 86th Congress is to be increased by the acquisition of 22 acres of privately owned inholdings, needed to improve traffic safety and historic settings; \$228,000 are needed. Land values have increased since the 1960 expansion.

At Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Ind., 72 acres need to be acquired to complete the restoration of farmlands originally patented by Thomas Lincoln

in 1827. Estimated acquisition costs of \$320,000 are authorized.

At Ozark National Service Riverways, Mo., 1,670 acres of lands need to be added to the riverway in addition to the Secretary's authority to make boundary changes and within existing statutory acreage authorizations; \$3,804,000 are authorized to complete the acquisition program, including the added 1,670 acres, and to cover anticipated deficiency awards. Authorization is needed for the Secretary of the Interior to accept donation of three State-owned parks which are subject to reverter if used other than for the riverway.

In 1961 Congress authorized acquisition and administration of Piscataway Park in Prince Georges and Charles County, Md., to protect the view from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington; \$937,000 were authorized. That amount was increased in 1961 to \$4,132,000 when it became apparent that the acquisition program could not be completed. Acquisition is still not complete and land values in the Washington metropolitan area have increased tremendously. Information supplied the committee indicates that with the increase of \$2,840,000, authorized by this bill, the acquisition program can be completed as originally intended.

The Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., was congressionally recognized in 1897. In 1926, amounts authorized for land acquisition were increased by \$7,000; 191.5 acres now in private ownership are historically associated with the battlefield and are needed for the Park Service to develop a one-way loop road through the park; \$93,000 are authorized for that purpose.

At Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa, all but \$2,300 of the existing authorization ceiling of \$1,650,000 has been expended. The development plan at the site is not completed and is estimated to cost \$1,772,000. One tract of farmland of 44.59 acres needs to be acquired. Total costs authorized are \$1,850,000.

The 218-acre Booker T. Washington Farm is in Federal ownership. However, plans to develop a "living farm" at the site have not been implemented because of the limits on development imposed by the enabling legislation. In order to implement the development plan, a development ceiling increase of \$400,000 is needed and is authorized by H.R. 10086.

At Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa., 53 acres, of which only 12 acres need be acquired, would be added to the present 56-acre national memorial in order to better interpret the 1889 flood disaster. A foot bridge would be constructed to provide visitor access across the river. Interpretative trails and visitor facilities would be constructed. Development costs are estimated at \$244,600 are authorized.

At Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia, an increase in the development ceiling of \$1,473,000 is needed to expand visitor facilities at or near the Filene Center, principally because of the phenomenal success of the park. H.R. 10086 increases the present development ceiling by that amount.

Authority to acquire 3.68 acres including the historic Beale home and carriage house which are adjacent to the present Adams National Historic Site, Mass., at cost to the National Park Foundation—\$112,000—are authorized.

The Cowpens National Battleground Site, S.C., would be redesignated as a national battlefield commemorating that Revolutionary War battle; the battlefield site would be expanded from 1¼ acres to 850, and funds would be authorized for land acquisition—\$2,363,900—and development—\$3,108,000. The Secretary's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments indorsed the proposal in 1968.

At Fort Caroline National Memorial, Fla., 12.5 acres are proposed for addition to the present 128.29-acre site, and are to be donated.

At George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Va., 62.3 acres would be added to the existing 393.68-acre monument. These lands are presently being used as part of the "living farm" operation at the memorial with the consent of the owner. Purchase is expected to cost \$57,000 and is authorized by the bill.

Boundary changes at Glacier National Park, Mont., consist of reestablishing a railroad right of way, the route of which was altered by a flood, as the park boundary line. 267.9 acres would be added and 68.47 acres deleted. Net increase would be 200 acres. Costs are about \$6,100. Portions are presently in Federal ownership and would be acquired by exchange. This legislation is necessary because the enabling act does not contain authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make minor boundary adjustments.

At Isle Royal National Park, Mich., additional facilities are needed for administration and visitor use. This legislation would permit acquisition of a one-half acre lot and vacant building which bisect the present mainland headquarters for the park for the option price of \$31,500 thereby permitting development of the needed facilities.

Adjustment of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., boundaries by transferring 481.23 unneeded acres to the Forest Service for administration as part of the existing Lassen National Forest would be facilitated by this legislation.

H.R. 10086 authorizes the Secretary to acquire 49.7 acres of private lands in between the Muir Woods National, Calif., Monument and a State park, otherwise adjacent to the monument. The Secretary is authorized to acquire the lands in fee but grant a revocable use permit to the present owners or acquire the lands subject to a life or 25-year estate in the present owners. Acquisition is desirable to prevent possible future adverse use. Cost for the authorized acquisition are \$950,000.

At Petersburg National Battlefield, Va., 258 acres which are no longer needed would be eliminated and transferred to the city of Petersburg pursuant to an agreement that the city maintain them in their present park-like character. The lands to be excluded are principally two public roads of about 7 miles in length.

All of the items covered by this lengthy

bill are relatively free of controversy, and all, except Cowpens National Battleground Site in South Carolina, were recommended for enactment. In the case of the Cowpens Battlefield Site, the Department recommended deferral until the administration could establish priorities for the national parks program. Nevertheless, after hearings, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs deemed the Cowpens Site worth of inclusion in this bill.

The bill is a good bill. It was carefully assembled. It represents, I think, an efficient method of handling a group of relatively small but necessary legislative proposals which time might not otherwise permit to be separately considered. I urge your support for its passage.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us today would affect appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of our national park system for California to my own State of Maryland.

As I have often pointed out in the past, our growing Nation needs the natural retreats and open spaces provided in our nationwide park system. Particularly great is this need in the northeastern urban corridor stretching from Metropolitan Boston, Mass., to Metropolitan Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D.C.

During the 91st Congress I suggested that any excess lands at the Agriculture Research Center in Beltsville, Md., in my congressional district, be made available as a parkland and animal refuge to provide enjoyment for urban and suburban youngsters.

Although this proposal is not included in the bill before us since the Department of Agriculture is still evaluating what acreage may be termed "excess," H.R. 10086 does include a provision to secure the purchase or acquisition of scenic easements on all the lands within the Piscataway Park boundaries in Prince Georges and Charles Counties in my congressional district. The purpose of this additional acquisition is to insure and protect the riverfront view from Mt. Vernon on the Virginia side of the Potomac River.

Originally some of the lands within the Piscataway Park boundaries were donated by public-spirited individuals and organizations. It has become apparent, however, that the remaining lands will have to be acquired through fee simple arrangements or purchase of scenic easements.

Certainly the landowners of this remaining property are concerned about the acquisition of their land, particularly since the plans have been redrawn and revised numerous times in the past few years. At the present time over 80 such landowners have joined together as the ROUR—Retain Our Rights—Committee. The committee is particularly concerned that they have not been advised or consulted about any changes with regard to their property in the Piscataway Park area since 1961. While they are vitally concerned about the environmental and ecological development of the area, they are also fearful that the Department of the Interior has plans to change the natural character of the area

with paved roads, parking lots, visitors' centers, boat landings, and broadened highways.

The Department of the Interior has further indicated that Public Law 87-362 gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to condemn their properties in order to acquire the needed additional lands.

Mr. Chairman, with so few families involved in this particular parkland acquisition, it would appear that the Department of Interior officials might take a more considerate and concerned approach in their negotiations with these landowners. Certainly, some equitable and fair treatment might be achieved by rational discussion between the landowners or their representatives and the officials of the Department of Interior. At the very least, these residents deserve the right to be heard with respect to their own property and its use.

I earnestly hope that this request be heeded on the part of the Interior officials as well as by our colleagues during the deliberations of the Senate-House conference committee.

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

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

H.R. 10086

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

#### TITLE I—ACQUISITION CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 101. The limitation on appropriations for the acquisition of lands and interests therein within units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana: section 5 of the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 18), is amended by changing "\$20,000" to "\$42,500";

(2) Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa: section 5 of the Act of May 27, 1964 (75 Stat. 88), is amended by changing "\$2,000" to "\$14,000";

(3) Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tennessee: section 3 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 875), is amended by changing "\$226,000" to "\$454,000";

(4) Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana: section 4 of the Act of February 19, 1962 (76 Stat. 9), is amended by changing "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,320,000" and "\$75,000" to "\$395,000";

(5) Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee: section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 826), is amended by changing "\$57,100" to "\$150,100".

#### TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 201. The limitations on appropriations for acquisition and development of units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(b) Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa: section 4 of the Act of August 12, 1965 (79 Stat. 510), is amended by changing "\$1,650,000" to "\$3,500,000";

(2) Booker T. Washington National Monument, Virginia: section 4 of the Act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 86), is amended by changing "\$200,000" to "\$600,000";

(3) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: section 5 of the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 752), is amended by changing "\$2,000,000" to "\$2,244,600".

Sec. 202. The additional sums authorized to be appropriated for development in the



Acts as amended in section 201 are based on March 1971 prices and may be increased or decreased in appropriation Acts by such amounts, if any as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved for each area.

#### TITLE III—BOUNDARY CHANGES

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of the following units of the national park system:

- (1) Adams National Historic Site Massachusetts: to add approximately 3.68 acres;
- (2) Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida: to add approximately 12.5 acres;
- (3) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Virginia: to add approximately 62.3 acres;
- (4) Glacier National Park, Montana: to add approximately 233.15 acres and to exclude approximately 68.47 acres;
- (5) Isle Royale National Park, Michigan: to add approximately 0.52 acre;
- (6) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: to add approximately 53.6 acres;

- (7) Lassen Volcanic National Park, California: to exclude approximately 482 acres;
- (8) Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia: to exclude approximately 257.53 acres.

Sec. 302. The boundary revisions authorized in section 301 shall become effective upon publication in the Federal Register of a map or other description of the lands added or excluded by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 303. Within the boundaries of the areas as revised in accordance with section 301, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. Lands and interests therein so acquired shall become part of the area to which they are added, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto. Lands and interests therein excluded from the areas pursuant to section 301 may be exchanged for non-Federal lands within the boundaries as revised, or they may be transferred to the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency or to a State or political subdivision thereof, without monetary consideration, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem appropriate. In exercising the authority in this section with respect to lands and interests therein excluded from the areas, the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States, retrocede to the appropriate State exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, over such lands, to be effective upon acceptance thereof by the State. Any such lands not so exchanged or transferred may be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$228,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests therein added to the areas referred to in section 301.

Sec. 305. The authorities in this title are supplementary to any other authorities available to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the acquisition, development, and administration of the areas referred to in section 301.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

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

(1) Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland: section 11 of the Act of September 21, 1965 (79 Stat. 824, 827) is amended by changing "\$16,250,000" to "\$21,050,000" (including such sums, together with interest, as may be necessary to satisfy final judgments rendered against the United States);

(2) Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana: section 5 of the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 18), is amended by changing "\$20,000" to "\$42,500";

(3) Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Wyoming and Montana: section 5 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 913) is amended by changing "\$355,000" to "\$780,000";

(4) Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa: section 5 of the Act of May 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 88), is amended by changing "\$2,000" to "\$14,000";

(5) Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tennessee: section 3 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 875), is amended by changing "\$226,000" to "\$454,000";

(6) Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana: section 4 of the Act of February 19, 1962 (76 Stat. 9), is amended by changing "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,320,000" and "\$75,000" to "\$395,000";

(7) Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri: section 8 of the Act of August 27, 1964 (78 Stat. 608), is amended by changing "\$7,000,000" to "\$10,804,000";

(8) Piscataway Park, Maryland: section 4 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 780, 782), as amended by section 2 of the Act of July 19, 1966 (80 Stat. 319), is amended by changing "\$4,132,000" to "\$6,972,000"; and

(9) Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee: section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1962 (44 Stat. 826), is amended by changing "\$57,100" to "\$150,000".

#### TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 201. The limitations on appropriations for acquisition and development of units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa: section 4 of the Act of August 12, 1965 (79 Stat. 510), is amended by changing "\$1,650,000" to "\$3,500,000";

(2) Booker T. Washington National Monument, Virginia: section 4 of the Act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 86), is amended by changing "\$200,000" to "\$600,000";

(3) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: section 5 of the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 752), is amended by changing "\$2,000,000" to "\$2,244,600"; and

(4) Wolf Trap Farm Park, Virginia: section 3 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 950) is amended by changing "\$600,000" to "\$5,473,000".

Sec. 202. The additional sums authorized to be appropriated for development in the Acts as amended in section 201 are based on March 1971 prices and may be increased or decreased in appropriation Acts by such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved for each area.

#### TITLE III—BOUNDARY CHANGES

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of the following units of the national park system:

- (1) Adams National Historic Site, Massachusetts: to add approximately 3.68 acres;
- (2) Cowpens National Battleground Site,

South Carolina: to add approximately 845 acres;

(3) Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida: to add approximately 12.5 acres;

(4) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Virginia: to add approximately 62.3 acres;

(5) Glacier National Park, Montana: to add approximately 267.90 acres and to exclude approximately 68.47 acres;

(6) Isle Royale National Park, Michigan: to add approximately 0.52 acre;

(7) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: to add approximately 53.6 acres;

(8) Lassen Volcanic National Park, California: to exclude approximately 482 acres;

(9) Muir Woods National Monument, California: to add approximately 49.7 acres;

(10) Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri: to add approximately 1,670 acres; and

(11) Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia: to exclude approximately 257.53 acres.

Sec. 302. The boundary revisions authorized in section 301 shall become effective upon publication in the Federal Register of a map or other description of the lands added or excluded by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 303. Within the boundaries of the areas as revised in accordance with section 301, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. Lands and interests therein so acquired shall become part of the area to which they are added, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto. When acquiring any land pursuant to this Act, the Secretary (i) may tender, to the owner or owners of record on the date of enactment of this Act, a revocable permit for the continued use and occupancy of such land or any portion thereof subject to such terms and conditions as he deems necessary or (ii) may acquire any land pursuant to this Act subject to the retention of a right of use and occupancy for a term not to exceed 25 years or for the life of the owner or owners. Lands and interests therein excluded from the areas pursuant to section 301 may be exchanged for non-Federal lands within the boundaries as revised, or they may be transferred to the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency or to a State or political subdivision thereof, without monetary consideration, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem appropriate. In exercising the authority in this section with respect to lands and interests therein excluded from the areas, the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States, retrocede to the appropriate State exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, over such lands, to be effective upon acceptance thereof by the State. Any such lands not so exchanged or transferred may be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 304. For the acquisition of lands and interests in lands which are added to the areas referred to in section 301, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not more than the following amounts:

- (1) Adams National Historic Site, \$122,000;
- (2) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, \$57,000;
- (3) Glacier National Park, \$6,000;
- (4) Isle Royale National Park, \$31,500;
- (5) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, \$10,000; and
- (6) Muir Woods National Monument, \$950,000.

Sec. 305. The authorities in this title are supplementary to any other authorities available to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the acquisition, development, and

administration of the areas referred to in section 301.

#### TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES

SEC. 401. The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of August 27, 1964 (78 Stat. 608) is amended to read as follows: "Lands and waters owned by the State of Missouri within such area may be acquired with the consent of the State and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to provision for reversion to such State conditioned upon continued use of the property for National Scenic Riverway."

SEC. 402. For the purposes of the Cowpens National Battleground Site, which is hereby redesignated as the Cowpens National Battlefield, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$2,363,900 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$3,108,000 for development.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a question to someone in charge of this bill with respect to raising the ceiling by some \$4,873,000 on appropriations for the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia. I would like to ask why this has been increased in that amount and why there should be this expenditure of Federal money on two theaters for the performing arts within a comparatively few miles of each other? The taxpayers of this country already have some \$50 million invested in the cultural center in Washington, allegedly the Center for the Performing Arts. I cannot help but wonder why this substantial amount is to be invested in the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) for yielding to me.

May I say that as I consider the various theaters, areas and facilities in this field that we have around Washington, D.C., for this particular purpose that I do not like to bring them into any particular relative significance with each other. It so happens that I am one of the supporters and sponsors of the legislation having to do with the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia. The lady from Kansas, Mrs. Joutte Shouse has given so much of her money in order to see that this facility has been made available to the people in this area, and there is really no comparison between any other facilities that we have and this particular facility.

Most of the money we have spent so far on this facility has been donated by the lady to whom I have made reference. The basic facilities have been constructed. Additional public facilities are required to complement the Filene Center.

I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I think if it can be said

to be a difficulty, one of the difficulties here is that this has been such an outstanding success for the purpose for which it has been constructed.

Mr. GROSS. If it has been such an outstanding success, why raise the appropriation ceiling by \$4,800,000?

Mr. ASPINALL. I was just coming to that. A substantial portion of their funds are for facilities to complement the Filene Center. A visitor center, picnic area, an outside picnic area, an outside orchestra shell, walkways, and concession facilities are planned.

The plans also include a pedestrian tunnel under the Wolf Trap Farm Road which is essential for the safety of the visiting public.

Perhaps we should have thought of these facilities in the original authorization, but we did not. We did not understand the hazards that were going to be present because of the attendance at this place of both motorists and pedestrians. That is the reason we are at the present time back here asking for additional money.

May I also say that this is only right that the Federal Government contribute its share, as private donations in large amounts are coming in from many of those who are interested in this particular facility.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. This Wolf Trap Farm has been a great satisfaction to me, and for this basic reason. We used to have a colleague here who spoke of the "suede shoe boys" and the "one gallus boys." I know the gentleman from Iowa agrees with us, when we are trying to dispense culture to the people of the United States, we should make it available to the one gallus folks who just do not have the funds to participate at some other place where the meals cost a lot of money and where you almost feel ashamed if you do not drive up in a chauffeured limousine.

This is a center for the people and it has proven to be so. It started with about \$4¼ million donation from Mrs. Shouse and others. The investment of the Government has been an excellent one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the 5 additional minutes because this seems to be getting interesting.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The facilities which are there now are inadequate for the numbers of people who attend the performances.

One of the things proposed is an outdoor orchestra shell where a much larger audience can be accommodated and again in using of the clothing that one would wear during the season of the year when outdoor performances are held. This would be in the nature of that famous bandshell in Sioux City, Iowa which has been so attractive for so long.

It is the kind of cultural center that I believe the gentleman from Iowa would really appreciate because it does attempt to present cultural experiences to the people of the country.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: When is Maryland going to ask for funds for a cultural center in the vicinity of the District of Columbia? Have you any advance warning that they will be here with a request?

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield, I think the only thing in the wind at this moment is the private development in the nature of a Disneyland type of operation, close to Washington in the State of Maryland, but so far as I know Mr. Marriott is figuring that will be a totally private operation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think the taxpayers of this country are going to have to underwrite that too; does he?

Mr. KYL. No, I certainly do not.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if nearby Maryland is going to get into this act. It seems to me they are entitled to because they must travel all of 10 or 15 miles to get to that cultural edifice on the Potomac River in Washington and past which flows some of the worst pollution in the country.

Are we not becoming surfeited with culture around here? What is culture doing for the District of Columbia? I read in the newspapers that the rate of crime is increasing. Down perhaps a little now, but it is one of the worst crime-ridden cities in the Nation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I would have to disagree, in the first place, that Wolf Trap Farm in Virginia, is a contribution by the Government to the State of Virginia. As a matter of fact, I have personal knowledge that a number of Iowans have attended performances at that center. This is a national unit. It is for all States.

I suppose there is a basic disagreement, which is quite apart from the merit of Wolf Trap Farm, as to how much money we should spend on those things we loosely call "culture" in the United States. I personally do not think we are spending enough. I would hope that the economic situation of the country might improve to the extent that we could expand the amount of money we are spending on cultural affairs. But the kind of culture that is being presented at Wolf Trap Farm is directed to the people of the country, not to a few individuals, and not to the State of Virginia. It is a part of a national system, and so far the operation has been strictly in accordance with that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Iowa I hope the money holds out and that we can take care of all the cultural centers whenever and wherever they spring up around the country, but I am afraid we are going to be fresh out of money soon for any but essential purposes. I am not opposed to culture, whatever that is, but life would go on in this country without expending millions upon millions of dollars as the taxpayers of the entire country are called up to do at



the Cultural Center on the Potomac in Washington and now this. However, life cannot go on without the necessities of life. I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will join with some of the rest of us in holding down these expenditures for nonessential purposes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to give their support to H.R. 10086 as amended and as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I want to pay special tribute on this occasion to the members of the committee and its Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation who labored so diligently to put together this most worthwhile bill. I know I am speaking not only for the citizens of Quincy, Mass., whom I represent here in Washington, but also of the surrounding communities, the State of Massachusetts and indeed the whole Nation in expressing my gratitude to the committee for including in this bill under title 3 dealing with boundary changes provision to add approximately 3.68 acres of the Adams Historic Site. I was happy to testify before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation to urge inclusion of this boundary change and acquisition of the adjacent property back in August just before the summer recess. Naturally, any Congressman is elated when his recommendation and a cause which he supports is agreed with by his colleagues, especially his experienced and distinguished colleagues who are members of the committee with jurisdiction in this area. So today I urge passage of the bill as reported from this committee with this provision. In doing so, I am hardly being local or provincial. The Adams' family contribution to our Nation's history is a matter of local and universal recognition. Every schoolchild knows the role the family played, not only in the Nation's early days, but right through to the present. In some senses, the family continues to be its own best memorial, a living continuous embodiment of public service and high ideals for the Nation. It is, however, altogether fitting and proper that we the heirs and beneficiaries of their efforts take steps to preserve for future generations what we have to enjoy in the way of an unspoiled piece of early American history in its natural setting; namely, the Adams Historic Site. I just want to conclude by way of summary and repeat here the gist of my testimony before the subcommittee as a matter of record:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES A. BURKE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before you today on the subject of legislation, which was submitted by the department on July 21.

Of particular concern to me is title III, section 301, article (1) providing for a boundary change to the Adams National Historic Site, Quincy, Massachusetts. The addition of approximately 3.68 acres would provide the necessary protection for the Adams property and insure that the historic site would

be preserved much as it was in the time of the Adams.

The necessity of this land purchase was dramatized recently when the city of Quincy re-zoned property directly across from the site, allowing for the construction of a parking lot. The parcel in question today, known as the Beale estate, is presently zoned for residential purposes, but this is no guarantee that it will remain that way. Furthermore, the extension of the MBTA (subway), this month, which runs parallel to the site, would create pressures for new developments in the surrounding area.

As a gift of the Adams family, the mansion was meant to serve as a national monument to the American people. Local units of government have been unable to finance preservation and therefore it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to preserve its particular character. Cost of adding these acres and development is \$122,000, an amount I'm sure you'll agree will be an investment well spent.

I have long been interested in protecting the site and filed legislation on numerous occasions to acquire the Beale property. I am confident that purchase can be made at this time without further delay.

Of particular historical significance to me is the fact that two residents of the mansion, John Quincy Adams and Charles Francis Adams were my predecessors in the U.S. House of Representatives.

History has indeed taught us that good intentions are not sufficient to protect our noble heritage. What we need and demand is a definite policy for our government to insure the preservation of this national monument.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR: Page 5, after line 16, insert:

"TITLE I—ACQUISITION CEILING INCREASES

"SEC. 101. The limitation on appropriations for the acquisition of lands and interests therein within units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would correct an error that was inadvertently made in printing the language of the committee amendment in the bill. The first sentence, which appears on page 1 of the report, is not reflected in the bill. The amendment would insert that language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR:

Page 9, line 1, after "Scenic" strike out "Railways," and insert "Riverways".

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would correct a printing

error made by the Government Printing Office. The bill reflects the committee language on page 9, line 1, as referring to "Ozark National Scenic Railways." It should be "Ozark National Scenic Riverways."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBERTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that, that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10086), to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 782, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 2, not voting 126, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—303

Abernethy	Bolling	Cederberg
Abourezk	Bow	Chappell
Adams	Brademas	Collier
Anderson,	Bray	Collins, Tex.
Calif.	Brinkley	Colmer
Anderson, Ill.	Brooks	Conable
Andrews	Broomfield	Coughlin
Archer	Brotzman	Crane
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Daniel, Va.
Ashley	Brown, Ohio	Daniels, N.J.
Aspin	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Wis.
Aspinall	Broyhill, Va.	de la Garza
Baker	Buchanan	Delaney
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Dellenback
Begich	Burke, Mass.	Denholm
Belcher	Burleson, Tex.	Dennis
Bennett	Burlison, Mo.	Dent
Bergland	Burton	Diggs
Betts	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Bevill	Byrnes, Wis.	Dorn
Blaggy	Byron	Dow
Bingham	Cabell	Dowdy
Blanton	Carey, N.Y.	Downing
Boggs	Casey, Tex.	Drinan

Dulski  
Duncan  
du Pont  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Calif.  
Ellberg  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford,  
William D.  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Frenzel  
Frey  
Fulton  
Fuqua  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Gibbons  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Gross  
Grover  
Haley  
Hall  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Harsha  
Harvey  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hicks, Mass.  
Hogan  
Hollifield  
Hosmer  
Howard  
Hull  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jarman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Keith  
Kemp  
King  
Kluczynski  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Kyl

Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Landrum  
Latta  
Lent  
Link  
Lloyd  
Long, Md.  
Lujan  
McClary  
McClure  
McCollister  
McCulloch  
McDade  
McFall  
McKay  
McKevitt  
McKinney  
McMillan  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Mahon  
Mallory  
Martin  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathis, Ga.  
Matsunaga  
Mayne  
Mazzoli  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Michel  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mills, Md.  
Minish  
Mink  
Mitchell  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Morgan  
Morse  
Mosher  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Podell  
Poff  
Price, Tex.  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Quillen  
Randall  
Rangel  
Rees  
Reid  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Riegle  
Roberts

Robinson, Va.  
Robison, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers  
Roncallo  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Roush  
Rousselot  
Roy  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Scherie  
Schmitz  
Schneebeli  
Scott  
Shipley  
Shoup  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Terry  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thompson, Wis.  
Thone  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Waldie  
Ware  
Whalen  
White  
Whitehurst  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Winn  
Wyatt  
Wylder  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Fla.  
Zablocki  
Zwach

## NAYS—2

Devine

Hastings

## NOT VOTING—126

Abbitt  
Abzug  
Addabbo  
Alexander  
Anderson,  
Tenn.  
Annunzio  
Ashbrook  
Badillo  
Barrett  
Bell  
Biester  
Blackburn  
Blatnik  
Boland  
Brasco  
Caffery  
Camp  
Carney  
Carter  
Celler

Chamberlain  
Chisholm  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Collins, Ill.  
Conte  
Conyers  
Corman  
Cotter  
Culver  
Curlin  
Danielson  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, S.C.  
Dellums  
Derwinski

Dickinson  
Donohue  
Dwyer  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, La.  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Evans, Tenn.  
Fascell  
Findley  
Fish  
Flynt  
Foley  
Galifianakis  
Gaiamo  
Grasso  
Gray  
Gubser  
Gude  
Hagan

Halpern  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington  
Hébert  
Heinz  
Hicks, Wash.  
Hillis  
Horton  
Kazen  
Keating  
Kee  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Long, La.  
McCloskey  
McCormack  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McEwen  
Madden  
Mailliard  
Mann

Metcalfe  
Mikva  
Mills, Ark.  
Minshall  
Moorhead  
Moss  
Myers  
Nix  
O'Konski  
Passman  
Pettis  
Powell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Railsback  
Rarick  
Rostenkowski  
Runnels  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Sarbanes  
Scheuer

Schwengel  
Sebelius  
Seiberling  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Steele  
Stephens  
Stuckey  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Waggonner  
Wampler  
Whalley  
Whitten  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyman  
Young, Tex.  
Zion

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Biester.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Cleveland.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Wolf with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Chamberlain.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Smith of California.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Scheuer.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Dickinson.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. Collins of Illinois.  
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Udall with Mr. Badillo.  
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Hillis.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Gude.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. Keating.  
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.  
Mr. Foley with Mr. Metcalfe.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. McCloskey.  
Mr. Carney with Mrs. Abzug.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Minshall.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Heinz.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Ruth.  
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Pettis.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Zion.  
Mr. Gaiamo with Mr. Myers.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Sebelius.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wyman.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Railsback.  
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Steele.  
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Hicks of Washington with Mr. Schwen-  
gel.  
Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Wampler.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. Boland with Mr. Davis of South Carolina.  
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Dellums.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Seiberling.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Hagan.  
Mr. Clay with Mr. Sarbanes.  
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Mann.  
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Curlin.  
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Runnels.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Smith of Iowa.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Leggett.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2601), to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the bill just passed, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2601

An act to provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system, and for other purposes

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

#### TITLE I—ACQUISITION CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 101. The limitation on appropriations for the acquisition of lands and interests therein within units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Assateague Island National Seashore—Maryland and Virginia: section 11 of the Act of September 21, 1965 (79 Stat. 824, 827), is amended by changing "\$16,250,000" to "\$20,650,000", and by adding the following sentence after the period: "Funds authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of lands and interests in land may, notwithstanding the foregoing limitation, be increased in appropriation Acts by such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest and deficiency awards owed by the United States as determined in condemnation actions for the acquisition of such lands and interests."

(2) Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana: section 5 of the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 18), is amended by changing "\$20,000" to "\$42,500";

(3) Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Wyoming and Montana: section 5 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 913), is amended by changing "\$355,000" to "\$780,000";

(4) Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa: section 5 of the Act of May 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 88), is amended by changing "\$2,000" to "\$14,000";

(5) Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tennessee: section 3 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 875), is amended by changing "\$226,000" to "\$454,000";

(6) Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana: section 4 of the Act of February 19, 1962 (76 Stat. 9), is amended by changing "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,320,000" and "\$75,000" to "\$395,000";

(7) Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri: section 8 of the Act of August 27, 1964 (78 Stat. 608), is amended by changing "\$7,000,000" to "\$11,111,000"; and section 2 of such Act is amended by revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Land and waters owned by the State of Missouri within such area may be acquired only with the consent of the State and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to provision for reversion of such State conditioned upon continued use of the property for park purposes";



(8) Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee: section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 826), is amended by changing "\$57,100" to "\$150,100".

#### TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 201. The limitations on appropriations for acquisition and development of units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa: section 4 of the Act of August 12, 1965 (79 Stat. 510), is amended by changing "\$1,650,000" to "\$3,500,000";

(2) Booker T. Washington National Monument, Virginia: section 4 of the Act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 86), is amended by changing "\$200,000" to "\$600,000";

(3) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: section 5 of the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 752), is amended by changing "\$2,000,000" to "\$2,244,600".

Sec. 202. The additional sums authorized to be appropriated for development in the Acts as amended in section 201 are based on March 1971 prices and may be increased or decreased in appropriation Acts by such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs are indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved for each area.

#### TITLE III—BOUNDARY CHANGES

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of the following units of the national park system:

(1) Adams National Historic Site, Massachusetts: to add approximately 3.63 acres;

(2) Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida: to add approximately 12.5 acres;

(3) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Virginia: to add approximately 62.3 acres;

(4) Glacier National Park, Montana: to add approximately 267.90 acres and to exclude approximately 68.47 acres;

(5) Isle Royale National Park, Michigan: to add approximately 0.52 acre;

(6) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: to add approximately 53.6 acres;

(7) Lassen Volcanic National Park, California: to exclude approximately 482 acres;

(8) Muir Woods National Monument, California: to add approximately 49.7 acres;

(9) Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia: to exclude approximately 257.53 acres.

Sec. 302. The boundary revisions authorized in section 301 shall become effective upon publication in the Federal Register of a map or other description of the lands added or excluded by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 303. Within the boundaries of the areas as revised in accordance with section 301, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. Lands and interests therein so acquired shall become part of the area to which they are added, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto. Lands and interests therein excluded from the areas pursuant to section 301 may be exchanged for non-Federal lands within the boundaries as revised, or they may be transferred to the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency or to a State or political subdivision thereof, without monetary consideration, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem appropriate. In exercising the authority in this section with respect to lands and interests therein excluded from the areas, the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States, retrocede to the appropriate State exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, over such lands, to be effective upon acceptance thereof

by the State. Any such lands not so exchanged or transferred may be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,328,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests therein added to the areas referred to in section 301.

Sec. 305. The authorities in this title are supplementary to any other authorities available to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the acquisition, development, and administration of the areas referred to in section 301.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR

Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2601 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 10086, as passed, as follows:

#### TITLE I—ACQUISITION CEILING INCREASES

"Sec. 101. The limitation on appropriations for the acquisition of lands and interests therein within units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland: section 11 of the Act of September 21, 1965 (79 Stat. 824, 827) is amended by changing "\$16,250,000" to "\$21,050,000 (including such sums, together with interest, as may be necessary to satisfy final judgments rendered against the United States)";

(2) Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana: section 5 of the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 18), is amended by changing "\$20,000" to "\$42,500";

(3) Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Wyoming and Montana: section 5 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 913) is amended by changing "\$355,000" to "\$780,000";

(4) Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa: section 5 of the Act of May 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 88), is amended by changing "\$2,000" to "\$14,000";

(5) Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tennessee: section 3 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 875), is amended by changing "\$226,000" to "\$454,000";

(6) Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana: section 4 of the Act of February 19, 1962 (76 Stat. 9), is amended by changing "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,320,000" and "\$75,000" to "\$395,000";

(7) Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri: section 8 of the Act of August 27, 1964 (78 Stat. 608), is amended by changing "\$7,000,000" to "\$10,804,000";

(8) Piscataway Park, Maryland: section 4 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 780, 782), as amended by section 2 of the Act of July 19, 1966 (80 Stat. 319), is amended by changing "\$4,132,000" to "\$6,972,000"; and

(9) Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee: section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 826), is amended by changing "\$57,100" to "\$150,100".

#### TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT CEILING INCREASES

Sec. 201. The limitations on appropriations for acquisition and development of units of the national park system contained in the following Acts are amended as follows:

(1) Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa: section 4 of the Act of August 12, 1965 (79 Stat. 510), is amended by changing "\$1,650,000" to "\$3,500,000";

(2) Booker T. Washington National Monument, Virginia: section 4 of the Act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 86), is amended by changing "\$200,000" to "\$600,000";

(3) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: section 5 of the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 752) is amended by changing "\$2,000,000" to "\$2,244,600"; and

(4) Wolf Trap Farm Park, Virginia: section 3 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 950), is amended by changing "\$600,000" to "\$5,473,000".

Sec. 202. The additional sums authorized to be appropriated for development in the Acts as amended in section 201 are based on March 1971 prices and may be increased or decreased in appropriation Acts by such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved for each area.

#### TITLE III—BOUNDARY CHANGES

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of the following units of the national park system:

(1) Adams National Historic Site, Massachusetts: to add approximately 3.68 acres;

(2) Cowpens National Battlefield, South Carolina: to add approximately 845 acres;

(3) Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida: to add approximately 12.5 acres;

(4) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Virginia: to add approximately 62.3 acres;

(5) Glacier National Park, Montana: to add approximately 267.90 acres and to exclude approximately 68.47 acres;

(6) Isle Royale National Park, Michigan: to add approximately 0.52 acre;

(7) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pennsylvania: to add approximately 53.6 acres;

(8) Lassen Volcanic National Park, California: to exclude approximately 482 acres;

(9) Muir Woods National Monument, California: to add approximately 49.7 acres;

(10) Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri: to add approximately 1,670 acres; and

(11) Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia: to exclude approximately 257.53 acres.

Sec. 302. The boundary revisions authorized in section 301 shall become effective upon publication in the Federal Register of a map or other description of the lands added or excluded by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 303. Within the boundaries of the areas as revised in accordance with section 301, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any other Federal agency. Lands and interests therein so acquired shall become part of the area to which they are added, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto. When acquiring any land pursuant to this Act, the Secretary (i) may tender, to the owner or owners of record on the date of enactment of this Act, a revocable permit for the continued use and occupancy of such land or any portion thereof subject to such terms and conditions as he deems necessary or (ii) may acquire any land pursuant to this Act subject to the retention of a right of use and occupancy for a term not to exceed 25 years or for the life of the owner or owners. Lands and interests therein excluded from the areas pursuant to section 301 may be exchanged for non-Federal lands within the boundaries as revised, or they may be transferred to the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency or to a State or political subdivision thereof, without monetary consideration, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem appropriate. In exercising the authority in this section with respect to lands and interests therein excluded from the areas, the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States, retrocede to the appropriate State exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, over such lands, to be effective upon acceptance thereof by the State. Any such lands not so exchanged or transferred may be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and

Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 304. For the acquisition of lands and interests in lands which are added to the areas referred to in section 301, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not more than the following amounts:

- (1) Adams National Historic Site, \$122,000;
- (2) George Washington Birthplace National Monument, \$57,000;
- (3) Glacier National Park, \$6,000;
- (4) Isle Royale National Park, \$31,500;
- (5) Johnstown Flood National Memorial, \$10,000; and
- (6) Muir Woods National Monument, \$950,000.

Sec. 305. The authorities in this title are supplementary to any other authorities available to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the acquisition, development, and administration of the areas referred to in section 301.

#### TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES

Sec. 401. The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of August 27, 1964 (78 Stat. 608) is amended to read as follows: "Lands and waters owned by the State of Missouri within such area may be acquired with the consent of the State and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to provision for reversion to such State conditioned upon continued use of the property for National Scenic Riverway."

Sec. 402. For the purposes of the Cowpens National Battleground Site, which is hereby redesignated as the Cowpens National Battlefield, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$2,363,900 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$3,108,000 for development.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10086) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE CONTINUED DESIGNATION OF DENVER AS THE HOST CITY FOR THE 12TH WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES IN 1976

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 787) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 787

Whereas the 11th Winter Olympic Games commence on February 3, 1972 in Sapporo, Japan, and

Whereas the 12th Winter Olympic Games have been awarded to Denver, Colorado coinciding with our Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives extends its good wishes to the citizens of Japan and the participants of the 11th Winter Olympic Games, and be it further

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives affirms its support for the continued designation of Denver as the host city for the 12th Winter Games to be held in 1976.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time to ask my colleague from Colorado whether or not he would explain the resolution.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if my friend from Pennsylvania will yield, I shall be glad to explain.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that when I finish my explanation, I shall also ask the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT) for a further explanation.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is presently in Sapporo, at Japan, the International Olympics Commission. They are having a meeting relative to a final designation of a place for holding the 12th Winter Olympic games, which heretofore were awarded to Denver to coincide with our 200th birthday. On February 3 this year there will be held in Sapporo the 11th Winter Olympic games.

Our athletes taking part are already assembled in that winter center in Japan.

This resolution does two things. It sends to the people of Japan our best wishes for a fine meeting of the games beginning with the 3d of February, and it also continues the support of the United States, and, if this resolution is passed by the House of Representatives, it agrees with the designation of Denver for the 12th Olympic games.

May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and my colleagues in the House, that the other body has already passed a similar resolution. I think our resolution is in order. I am sure everyone would like to see this great international event brought to the United States, and Denver, so I am advised, is in a position to host such an event.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT).

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this week the 11th Winter Olympic games get underway in Sapporo, Japan, as I am sure the House is aware.

Because Denver, Colo., has been designated the host city for the 12th Winter Olympic games in 1976, I believe it appropriate that the House of Representatives join with the other body in extending best wishes to the participants in the 11th Winter Olympic games and to the people of Japan on the eve of the 11th Winter Olympic games, and affirm our

support of Denver as the host city of the 1976 Winter Olympic games.

The 1976 Winter Olympic games, which Denver will host, coincides with our country's 200th anniversary and has been designated a part of the celebration.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN).

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I concur with both of my colleagues, the gentlemen from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and (Mr. McKEVITT). I would point out to the Members of the House that we are, in fact, affirming actions we have taken heretofore. In January 1970, this body did support the bid of both Los Angeles for the summer games and Colorado for the winter games. So, as the resolution correctly states, this is a reaffirmation of that particular support.

I certainly urge the support of the Members of the House for this resolution which is consistent with our previous support.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for offering this resolution. I think certainly it is fitting and appropriate to commend our athletes who are now in Sapporo, Japan, and I certainly look forward to that day in February 1976, when the winter Olympics will be held in the Mile-High City of Denver, Colo. I have read some of the planning literature regarding the 1976 event and am thoroughly convinced that the State of Colorado, the city of Denver, and the Olympic committee will make the 12th Winter Olympic Winter games the standard by which all future events will be measured. Surely, in the majestic Rocky Mountains, there could not be a better setting for this international sports and cultural event.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MONAGAN, of Connecticut and Mr. STEELE, of Connecticut.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c. The Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members



on the part of the House: Mr. WOLFF, of New York and Mr. WYDLER, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355 (a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HULL, of Missouri; Mr. MURPHY, of New York; Mr. DAVIS, of Wisconsin; and Mr. PIRNIE, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968 (a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STRATTON, of New York; Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio; and Mr. MILLS, of Maryland.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, Chairman; Mr. ROBINO, of New Jersey; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. BURTON, of California; Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio; Mr. MATHIAS, of California; and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary group the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania, Chairman; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. GONZALEZ, of Texas; Mr. DE LA GARZA, of Texas; Mr. KAZEN, of Texas; Mr. UDALL, of Arizona; Mr. WALDIE, of California; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; Mr. THOMSON, of Wisconsin; Mr. STEIGER, of Arizona; Mr. WIGGINS, of California; and Mr. LUJAN, of New Mexico.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the

following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GALLAGHER, of New York, Chairman; Mr. JOHNSON, of California; Mr. RANDALL, of Missouri; Mr. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KYROS, of Maine; Mr. STRATTON, of New York; Mr. MEEDS, of Washington; Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan; Mr. McEWEN, of New York; Mr. VANDER JAGT, of Michigan; Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts; and Mr. SMITH, of New York.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona; and Mr. McKEVITT, of Colorado.

#### DR. WILLIAM D. McELROY

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to express my appreciation, and also the appreciation of many other Members of the Congress, to Dr. William D. McElroy for the outstanding leadership and service he has given to our country as Director of the National Science Foundation for the past two and a half years.

During that time he served as the third Director of the Foundation since its creation in 1950. Today he is leaving this post to become the chancellor of the University of California at San Diego.

Dr. McElroy for many years has been making notable contributions to our country's well-being, both as a citizen involved in public affairs and as a distinguished scientist.

Immediately before coming to the National Science Foundation he was chairman of the biology department at Johns Hopkins University.

At the Foundation, two of his first acts as Director were to reorganize the agency, in order to regroup programs around broad policy objectives, and to improve management, in order to assure that his policy directives would be translated into reality.

In his many appearances before the committees of the Congress, Dr. McElroy was always well prepared to discuss not only the programs of his agency, but the broader implications of science and technology for all mankind.

The President's budget message this year notes that the Foundation has increased its support for science by 48-percent since 1969. Federal funds for non-defense research and development activities have increased by 65 percent under the leadership of Dr. McElroy. As much as any other individual, he must be awarded credit for this substantial current increase in Federal support for science.

I would note that Dr. McElroy takes with him from the Foundation staff, an-

other capable individual who has worked closely with him in the Foundation as the Assistant Director for Administration, Mr. Bernard Sisco. He will assume new responsibilities as the vice chancellor for administration at the university. He leaves behind a long and outstanding career with the Federal Government as a civil servant in many and varied capacities with several departments and agencies.

In closing, I congratulate the University of California at San Diego in acquiring a man of Dr. McElroy's demonstrated ability. This is certainly an unusually attractive opportunity offering a stimulating challenge to one who has spent a lifetime in higher education. With his interest in associating with young people in an academic setting, he is eminently qualified to fill the challenging post he is taking.

Those of us who know him feel confident that he will meet nobly and effectively the challenges of his new position, and we wish him well in this and all of his future endeavors.

#### A PROMISING START FOR SPACE SHUTTLE

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased by the President's announcement earlier this month of plans to go forward with space shuttle, a highly imaginative program for exploiting our near-earth environment in space.

It will be at least 6 years before any of these reusable spacecraft are airborne. But the implications of what they will be able to do are already clear and exciting.

Take the weather. Everyone talks about it—but manmade satellites are doing something about it.

In 1960, the first meteorological satellite was orbited by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Since 1966, a network of spacecraft equipped with cloud-cover cameras have enabled man to observe the atmosphere on a continuous basis, a capability that has enabled us to predict and trace the origins, paths, and ultimate dissipation of hurricanes and other severe storms.

What's next? With the help of space shuttle, the sky is quite literally the limit. I for one can easily foresee a time when satellites will actually help us control the weather, through such techniques as fog and cloud clearance, suppression of lightning, and even tinkering with precipitation.

Regardless of what awaits us in the heavens, it will be a far cry from Hatfield the Rainmaker, the legendary brother act credited—or blamed, depending on the viewpoint—for the record floods which inundated parts of my home community of San Diego back in 1916. The Hatfields' equipment may have been primitive, but they sure got results and were chased out of the country by angry farmers.

Besides weather modification, satellites maintained by space shuttle should, by the late 1970's, also be equipped to extend

the advance for accurate weather forecasts from 48 hours to 2 weeks or more. They will also prove valuable in monitoring air pollution, and charting action to alleviate these conditions.

Space shuttle, of course, will have many other exciting applications, in such areas as communications, navigation, astronomy, oceanography, and agricultural management.

All are good reasons for supporting the program, but the most basic reason is that space shuttle represents the logical next step in the overall space program. No one can describe the ultimate limits of space exploration. But we can all be certain of at least one thing: We are proceeding from the high drama and the great rewards we have experienced with the Apollo program to a follow-on effort that may be less dramatic, but promises even greater rewards.

First steps are always groping ones. First steps are always taken with hesitancy. We have taken these first steps and with magnificent success. The advances in technology that have been required for us to reach the moon's surface are already having their influence on the much more prosaic ways of our daily life. These rewards, these benefits to all of us, are only the beginning; we have only begun to realize the ways in which our lives here on earth can and will be benefited by both the technological surge that has been required for the space program, and the actual practical results that will come to all of us because of the program.

Let us get on with this magnificent adventure in space, to enhance the quality of life everywhere here on earth.

#### SPACE SHUTTLE

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, even though the judge has not been selected nor the jury assembled, we are already seeing in the press the beginning of the trial of the space shuttle program. If I could believe that the prosecuting attorney really knew what he was talking about, I might find myself listening with a great deal more credence than I have been able to muster so far.

We read of analogies being drawn between the space shuttle program and SST; we hear that Congress has not gotten sufficient input from the scientists of the country, that NASA's activities are being presented to the Congress as scientific endeavors when all they are, are engineering feats.

All that I can say about these arguments is that they seem to be designed to confuse rather than inform the public. To me the only resemblance between the space shuttle program and the SST is that people would be carried in both vehicles. One is a scientific—and engineering—endeavor and the other was a very fast means of commercial travel. At this point the resemblance stops. As to the lack of input of the views of scientists, we will all recall that 2 years ago

the President set up a task force to review the whole space program. On that task force were eminent scientists and engineers, and the task force during the entire period of study had available to it, and used, the most objective and far-reaching scientific advice that is available in the country.

Another one of the facile—and to my mind cynical—allegations made about the space shuttle program is that it is designed to bail out the aerospace industry.

The aerospace industry, like all industry in the United States, is you and me and all the people of the United States. Millions of Americans are affected in one way or another by the aerospace industry. The aerospace industry is the source of most of the great advances that have been made during the lives of all of us present here today. If that industry—if those workers—will also benefit, along with the country generally, then all I can say is, "Let's get on with it." I feel that a much more sensible—and a much more fair—approach to the aerospace industry is to offer to it every encouragement rather than subject it to criticism. It is an industry like any other industry, and the healthier it is the healthier the economy of the country is; the more jobs there are, the more the money is spread among the working people of our country.

Perhaps there is a visualization of the aerospace industry as made up exclusively of executives at the top and scientists and engineers the level below—and nothing else. In actual fact, of course, the aerospace industry, although requiring a large number of scientific and engineering trained people, has assembly lines, has workers just exactly the same as the workers in virtually every other industry in the United States. And outside of the industry itself are all of the other people—the other segments of our economy—that benefit from a healthy aerospace industry. All of these people—whether in the industry itself or outside but affected by it—must build or buy houses; must buy food and clothing; must purchase transportation; and thereby spread throughout the whole of our economy the wages earned in the industry. And they must send their children to school. And they must pay taxes.

It is estimated that the space shuttle program will add some 50,000 jobs to industry. I would like to have someone explain to me why it would be better—as it is implied—if these jobs were added to some other area of our industrial or manufacturing, or any other part of our business activity. There is a lack of logic, a lack of good sense, it seems to me, to engage in this kind of unthinking criticism. Working people are people who are working and making wages, and spending money. Is this not what we are seeking? Is it not jobs—and more than that, is it not jobs in activities that cannot fail but improve our lives? This is no boondoggle that we are about to engage in, it is serious scientific and engineering endeavor. Are not the benefits that we have already seen from the space program so far a good criterion by which to judge the future?

It has been said often, and it will be

said many times again: The space shuttle is the next logical step to take in order to continue to learn and use what is waiting for us in the laboratory that the space around our earth represents.

Indeed, I say, "Let's get on with it."

#### BLACK PROGRESS UNDER NIXON BELIES CHARGES BY KENNEDY

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I think all too often the KENNEDY speechwriters got carried away with themselves and forget the facts. No better example of this tendency can be found than the recent utterances of the Senator erroneously criticizing the administration for its progress with the blacks when the blacks have in fact made more progress under this administration than previous administrations. A good summary of this progress was contained in an article written by Nick Thimmesch which appeared in the Toledo Blade on January 30, 1972.

BLACK PROGRESS UNDER NIXON BELIES CHARGES BY KENNEDY

(By Nick Thimmesch)

Blacks make progress, and though some people resent this, the momentum of blacks into a better life is hard to stop. The anguished cries of the 1960s are behind us. Now is a time for work, not burned-out, demagogic rhetoric uttered by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) about the "race issue," as he calls it. He recently not only gave short shrift to President Johnson on his role in the 1964 civil rights bill, but also cut loose with falsehoods about the Nixon administration's record on blacks. Senator Kennedy declared that under Mr. Nixon "the chain has broken, progress has stopped, there are no achievements to cite." Every indicator shows life improving for blacks, and surveys report that black Americans are more optimistic about their future than whites. Yet Senator Kennedy talks of 25 million blacks "starving for the bread of hope and notice," and claims "you have to go back to the era of Reconstruction to find a comparable abdication by the Federal Government of its responsibility for civil rights." Black America, intones Senator Kennedy, "lies becalmed today, halfway between hope and desperation."

This is rubbish. The Nixon administration has not only maintained the momentum for blacks, but has added on plenty and put its deeds and money where Teddy's mouth is. Blacks are on the move.

The 1973 budget, for example, calls for \$2.6 billion to be spent on federal civil rights activities, compared with \$835 million in 1969 when Mr. Nixon took office. Outlays for civil rights enforcement have jumped from \$75 million in 1969 to \$295 million for 1972 and \$602 million in the new budget. The Justice Department has doubled its staff of attorneys enforcing Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Minority business enterprises got \$200 million when Mr. Nixon came in, and 1973 called for \$715 million. Federal purchases from minority firms increased tenfold under Mr. Nixon, from \$13 million to \$142 million currently.

More, the Administration asks for \$1.5 billion to help desegregate schools in the next two years, in addition to \$1.5 billion for assistance to schools in low-income neighborhoods. In asking for \$200 million federal aid to black colleges, the Nixon administration would be doubling the outlay of three years ago. The 1973 budget also calls for a 33 per



cent increase in the cost of administering fair housing programs.

Under the present administration the percentage of blacks in government employment reached a record 20 per cent. Moreover, the Nixon administration appointed a record number of blacks into the uppermost echelons of the bureaucracy. A White House staff assistant on domestic affairs is a Negro woman. The director of the Labor Department's women's bureau is black. A black woman now heads VISTA.

Mr. Nixon appointed the first black to the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. The navy got its first black admiral and assistant secretary in this administration, and the army added five black generals. A black man, Col. Vernon Coffey, army aide to the President, is close to Mr. Nixon, will accompany him to China.

It drives Nixon haters daffy, but in 1969 only 6 per cent of the nation's black children were in legally desegregated schools, and now the figure is 92 per cent. In 1969, there was no food stamp program in 500 counties; now it's down to 10. In 1969, food stamps went to 2.9 million. Mr. Nixon upped it to 11 million. And Senator Kennedy knows that the first family assistance program, including welfare reform, was proposed by the President.

He got only 9 per cent of the black vote in 1968 and won't get much more in 1972, so I have to conclude that his administration's good record on this matter results from his conviction that it's right and it's also part of the relentless movement of history.

If President Nixon is to be flawed, it should be for allowing G. Harrold Carswell to be nominated for the U.S. Supreme Court, and for not bragging up his administration's good civil rights activity record. But Mr. Nixon, like Senator Kennedy, can make mistakes.

## THE DOCK STRIKE ON THE WEST COAST

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, hearings have started in the appropriate House and Senate committees on the administration's antilabor proposal for imposing a forced settlement on the parties to the dock strike on the west coast. Events of the last week—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 20, page 510—demonstrated that the Pacific Maritime Association is determined to use every means available to force a settlement of the dispute on its own terms.

I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Labor Council and the San Francisco Building Trades Council on January 24, 1972. The resolution states in the clearest terms the broad and united opposition of the groups of labor represented by the two councils, as well as the opposition of Mr. George Meany, president, AFL-CIO, to the imposition of compulsory arbitration.

In addition, the resolution requests that local and national elected officeholders state their positions on forced or "legislative settlements" of labor-management disputes. This is clearly a reasonable and justified request. My own position is unequivocal—I oppose the pending bill. The text of the resolution follows:

### RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Nixon Administration economic policies have been actively opposed by the labor movement; and

Whereas, President Nixon imposed a wage freeze and wage controls which have sabotaged hard-won union conditions gained through collective bargaining; and

Whereas, The Taft-Hartley Act has been used to break strikes; and

Whereas, The Nixon economic policies deliberately created unemployment; and

Whereas, The latest action of the Nixon Administration is to demand compulsory and forced arbitration against the striking Longshoremen which could affect every section of the American Labor Movement; and

Whereas, George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, has condemned the President's request with a statement that, "our unions will never submit to compulsory arbitration;" now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Labor Council, protest and oppose all attempts at compulsory arbitration, a "legislative settlement" for the striking Longshoremen or any other section of labor, and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Mayor and Board of Supervisors of the City of San Francisco to adopt similar stands through resolutions and statements of policy; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask all candidates for elective national office, their positions on compulsory arbitration or "legislative settlements;" and be it further

Resolved, That we call for an immediate emergency conference of all labor organizations, regardless of affiliation, to plan concerted action to defeat this latest threat to all of organized labor.

### POW'S AND MIA'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the negative response of the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong to President Nixon's new proposal for peace should be illuminating to all U.S. citizens. It requires me to speak out concerning the actual situation of our POW's and MIA's.

Too many of us in the United States and other civilized countries of the world seem to misunderstand the POW/MIA situation.

Too many politicians are trying to make too much political capital out of a delicate, agonizing, and frustrating situation.

Our POW's in Southeast Asia are in fact and reality not prisoners of war—are not now and never have been.

Our military personnel captured by the Vietcong or North Vietnamese and now incarcerated in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia have never been considered to be prisoners of war by the enemy. They have never been called or referred to as prisoners of war by the enemy. They have never been treated as prisoners of war by any definition or common understanding of the term. They have never been accorded treatment or the status of prisoner of war as defined by the Geneva Convention, the International Red Cross, the Hague Convention, the United Nations, or by any agreements pertaining to prisoners of war signed by

the official representatives of the Government of North Vietnam.

The men we refer to as prisoners of war are simply and clearly hostages; and they have been hostages from the beginning of their incarceration.

We need to recognize the difference between a prisoner of war and a hostage as well as to try to understand the mind and attitudes of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists toward all human beings and particularly toward captured military personnel.

There are many distinctions between prisoners of war and hostages. POW's are entitled, by various international laws, agreements, protocols, and conventions, to certain prescribed treatment. There is no legal or contractual law which covers or defines the treatment to be accorded hostages. The Vietcong and North Vietnamese have complied with no law—not even common decency or humanitarian treatment of the hostages. Holders of hostages are outlaws in every society. Every nation considers the holding of hostages to be criminal. No nation considers the incarceration of prisoners of war, in compliance with international agreements, to be criminal.

Prisoners of war are customarily liberated by the victor or released by the terms of the settlement at the end of the war. Hostages are released upon acceding to the demands of ransom—or, possibly, when it becomes clear the ransom will not be paid and the care becomes a burden—or they must be rescued.

Because early on in this war we decided not to try to win a military victory—we now have no practical way to rescue or liberate our POW's. Our determination to not invade, or permit invasion of, North Vietnam precludes our opportunity to overtake or liberate their prison camps and release our personnel.

As soon as the Vietcong and North Vietnamese discovered that we had no intention of gaining a military victory over North Vietnam but that our only objective was to prevent a successful North Vietnamese invasion and takeover of South Vietnam, they knew that personal hostages could bring them as much or more than they could accomplish by guerrilla or conventional war.

They, of course, will use any and all means to accomplish their objectives of domination over Southeast Asia—guerrilla war, conventional war, subversion, terrorism, negotiation, waiting, delay, hostages, blackmail, welching, anything, everything.

What they cannot achieve by other means, they hope to achieve by holding out to us the conditional release of our hostages. Because our hostages are precious to us and we have power and influence in Southeast Asia, the value of our captured military personnel is extraordinarily high and now a principal stake in the Southeast Asia conflict.

Prisoners are returned at the conclusions of wars—hostages are not. Hostages are redeemed by the payment of the ransom.

Hanoi refuses to exchange other military personnel for our prisoners even though many have offered to change

places with our prisoners. Even highly rated pilots have offered to change places with our prisoners—to no avail. If Hanoi was simply interested in "preventing warriors from returning to do battle against them"—the real and legitimate reason for retaining prisoners to the end of a war—they would exchange our prisoners for equally or more highly rated pilots.

Hanoi refuses to exchange prisoners with South Vietnam, 10 for 1 or even 100 for 1, because, even though they would gain a large personnel advantage, they would thereby dilute their hostage value.

Obviously many of our MIA are dead—either from illness, injuries, or the crash of the aircraft. The reason Hanoi does not give accurate information concerning deaths that are known to them is solely to maintain or enhance the hostage value. A pilot known to be dead has little hostage value so they keep us believing he might still be alive—no matter how cruelly agonizing the anxiety may be to his family.

Also hostage value is increased by such contrived techniques as publishing an obviously unclear photograph of a downed pilot—so that many will conclude—even if only out of an incredible hope—that the picture depicts a husband or son who has surely survived. Twenty some wives once identified the subject of one photograph as their husband. A poignant phenomenon which should help us understand both the incredible hope and the psychological torture the families endure.

Hostage value is also increased by severely restricting mail—because this enormously increases our curiosity to know more and our desire to relieve this awful state of agony and anticipation.

The escape of a POW is not too serious. Loss of a hostage, on the other hand, is costly. So our POW's—hostages—have been guarded and secured extraordinarily—even moved from prison to prison from time to time; and kept isolated or confined in small groups. Those few who have been released have been of the least hostage value—often believed dead. But their release after being believed deceased simply raises the hopes of other families that their servicemen who is MIA may still be alive and in custody—thereby increasing the hostage value even though he may in fact be dead.

Ordinarily POW's who are injured, sick or who have become mentally incompetent are repatriated—because they are no longer of any military value and are a great bother to their captors. But the sick and crippled still have value as hostages. This explains why very few of our sick or injured POW's—hostages—have been repatriated.

So we must conclude that our captured servicemen are hostages rather than prisoners of war. We must understand this distinction. We must deal with the situation realistically.

Cruelty is no deterrent to a hostage holder; to be initially successful, they must be uncaring and abjectly inhuman. Hostage holders always threaten—expressly or subtly. Worry by his loved ones concerning the welfare of the host-

age increases the hostage value. So Hanoi exploits every possible means and utilizes every technique to enhance the hostage value. This kind of exploitation is never carried out toward prisoners of war who have little or no hostage value.

Our POW's are hostages for many objectives; among others;

First. Total U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia,

Second. Overthrow of any non-Communist government in Southeast Asia, and

Third. Reparations—the payment of any initial amount will sharply escalate like blackmail.

We cannot capture enough Vietcong or North Vietnamese to accomplish any tradeoff of personnel. Their values of persons and life are too different from ours. In fact, loss of life alleviates many problems of support in North Vietnam.

Our only opportunity for an exchange of persons would have to involve very high ranking Communist officials or leaders.

Our only other bargaining chip would be the threat of certain destruction of large and valuable parts of North Vietnam. Bluffing would not succeed.

We cannot accede to blackmail to obtain the return of our hostages. The first concession would inevitably escalate every succeeding demand.

What to do? When to do it?

What if the Vietcong or North Vietnamese set a date certain, as the South American Tupamoros did—"You comply with our demands, our seven points, before July 1, 1972, or we will execute so many of the hostages." This could happen. Do not be deluded.

We are not dealing with civilized diplomats. We are dealing with unfeeling, uncaring, different people who are isolated from the free world by their almost total reliance upon the media for information, and who are under enormous pressure and on the verge of catastrophe.

There are at least two points which should be made and understood by all who are truly concerned about the plight of our POW's, MIA's, their families, and our Government's position pertaining to prisoners of war.

One, the international rules regarding prisoners of war, their status and treatment, desperately need to be revised, updated, and reformed. They are presently inadequate, misunderstood, and not applicable to present conditions. All nations should join and collaborate in drawing new, modern, and clear rules. With clear, appropriate, and comprehensive rules, all nations might be more willing to comply with them.

Two, Members of the Congress, candidates for public office, and proponents of various proposals for ending the war in Southeast Asia, should try to understand the true present conditions and circumstances of our prisoners of war. We must wage a negotiated settlement of the war. We can, with united support, achieve a settlement without surrender or sellout. The President's proposal is one more step toward a permanent peace with freedom for all peoples of this planet.

## TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's pioneers of progress and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation.

American Willis H. Carrier first devised air conditioning in 1911.

## PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will introduce the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972. Because hearings on public broadcasting legislation will begin in the Subcommittee on Communications and Power at 10 a.m. Tuesday, February 1, 1972, I want to take time today to discuss this proposal and ask that it be printed in the RECORD so my colleagues will have an opportunity to review the legislation.

Many of us who were involved in the legislative process that led to adoption of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 had significant misgivings about the act. There were too many unanswered questions regarding the appropriate role of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB—the activities that should be authorized to the Corporation, and the nature and level of financing for CPB and for the public broadcasting system as a whole. Most of the witnesses who appeared before us were quite eager for the financial benefits they saw flowing from the legislation, but in that frame of mind, they did not wish to come to grips with the fundamental problems of who would manipulate the basic control and the direction that financial and organization control might take.

At that time I joined in a statement of minority views which urged a strengthening and clarification of the language limiting the powers of the Corporation, particularly as it referred to networking. We raised "the possibility that the Corporation could emerge as the high mogul of a new nationwide network."

Now that CPB has been in existence for some 5 years, we still have not resolved all the questions which were left unanswered in 1967 concerning CPB's objectives, its functions, and its financing. We do have the advantage, however, of seeing how CPB has organized itself and has carved out its own direction and emphasis within the field of non-commercial educational broadcasting.

Prior to the establishment of CPB by adoption of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, we saw a vigorous growth in the number of local noncommercial television stations, and this has continued since 1967, although at a diminished rate because so many markets had been saturated prior to that date. But before 1967 or after, most such stations were oriented to education with regard to both pro-



gram content and basic sources of public support. And most of that educational orientation, in turn, involved financial support from or program support to institutions whose primary function was and is classroom instruction.

What we have seen from CPB, however, has been what must be considered the development of a centralized national network system, only limited support for the operating needs of local ETV stations, and a preoccupation with "general interest" programming. This might lead one to conclude that CPB is more interested in being an example to commercial broadcasting than in breaking new ground in instructional or community education television, the areas of primary emphasis of most of the stations it was supposedly organized to serve. It is not unfair to conclude that the Corporation has emerged as the "high mogul" of a new nationwide network and that the thrust of that network is more accurately described as "public broadcasting" than "educational" or "instructional."

At the same time that this direction of CPB's influence has developed, it has been my conclusion that the real purpose of noncommercial broadcasting as envisioned by the Carnegie Commission and the Congress—that is, its role in strengthening and developing new thrusts into the educational broadcast field—both in classroom-utilized instruction and in general educational programming for those outside the formal education sphere.

The Carnegie Commission for educational television noted that educational television should undertake all facets of the educational process. While differentiating community education from the instructional programming of formal teaching, the commission carefully stated "that we look upon these two parts as constituting a single whole." Unfortunately, under CPB, instructional television has been relegated to the position of the second child receiving hand-me-downs from its more glamorous, favored brother.

As the congressional debate on the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967—which established CPB—indicated, however, the prospects of classroom and general instructional programs offered the strongest appeal to many Members of the Congress. It was my feeling at the time, and even more so now with the growing crisis in our schools, that both the local stations and CPB should give priority to developing programs for classroom instruction above either general community or cultural education. But in any event, education efforts should take priority over any ambition to be merely an artistic or philosophic competitor with existing commercial television. In an effort to fill the highest priority of need in the local communities they serve, this is the role being filled by most noncommercial television and radio stations. They have not dropped "education" from either their name or their purpose, in spite of the emphasis CPB has tried to bring for "public" broadcasting and in spite of the fact that CPB was established as the vehicle to finance the programming "software" of educational broadcasting.

By reversing the downward power flow on programming decisions from a federally well-heeled CPB to a hard-pressed locally financed station, and by limiting the influence of large outside sources of income, we can reestablish the balance of instructional and cultural programming as local communities want it. Local station control of the CPB board and local station financial independence of CPB will assure that CPB serves the local station rather than the local stations serving CPB. Above all, this would answer the concern about who makes the decisions in programming—local broadcasters and educators or centralized arbiters of national viewpoint.

In my view the time has come to deal with these unresolved issues of 1967 and modify the structure of our public broadcasting system based upon our experience with it over the past 5 years. The bill I have submitted accomplishes the purpose of redirecting the control and thrust of CPB's activities in order to achieve the economies in program production, localized service and freedom from central control of public educational broadcasting that was envisioned by the Carnegie report, the Congress and the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 would accomplish these general purposes by the following particular amendments to the existing statute:

Title I of the bill, in Section 101(a), amends the "Facilities" portion of the existing statute by substantially increasing, for a 5-year period, the amount of appropriated funds to be used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—to support the construction and expansion of local public educational broadcasting facilities. This program has proven its worth in bringing the benefits of public broadcasting to many of our citizens who have previously been unserved or underserved by public broadcasting stations.

These amendments also add a new assistance program to HEW's responsibilities. They authorize the expenditure of substantial Federal funds—an average of \$40 million annually—to support the general operating expenses of individual public radio and television broadcast stations. This modification is in line with the original recommendation of the Carnegie Commission for Educational Television, whose report established the framework for public broadcasting as it is reflected in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The Carnegie Commission stressed the critical need for Federal aid to local station operation, but opposed placing the responsibility for this support in CPB. The commission believed strongly that, without this separation of funding functions, the Corporation would become too big and too central and would dominate the local public broadcasting stations, since each station would have to look to CPB for its daily requirement of operating funds and of programming. But in 1967 the Congress rejected the Carnegie Commission approach and lodged with CPB responsibility for general operating support of local stations. Unfortunately, experience has shown that the fears of the Carnegie Commission were justified. CPB spends only about 12 percent of its

budget on local station support, an amount that averages only 5 percent of the budget of the local stations. The time has now come to return to the original concept of the separate roles of the local stations and CPB, in order to restore some balance to the system by making the local stations financially viable and autonomous.

These operating support grants would come directly from HEW, much as facilities funds are now distributed. Within certain minimums and maximums designed to assure some equality of distribution, the funds would be provided on a matching basis to encourage a maximum of local initiative on the part of the stations. The funds would be made available to the stations without any discretion being exercised by HEW. Moreover, the goal of insulation of the Federal funds from programming activities would be furthered, since the operating funds could not be used for program production or procurement. Program development will be the primary function of CPB, as outlined in title II; but, of course, nothing would prevent program development by a local station from funds provided by local governments or from gifts or grants from individuals, corporations, foundations, or CPB.

Title II modifies the present Public Broadcasting Act by precluding CPB from activities, functions and means that it has used to assume an autocratic role in the public broadcasting system. It also legislatively proscribes CPB from underwriting the kind of programming for which use of Federal funds is inappropriate—even as the board of CPB has belatedly concluded as a result of public reaction to some of its recent activities.

In section 201(a), the bill would give local station managers a two-thirds majority on the Corporation board. Balance in the membership representation is called for with reference to the region of the country, the size of the city and the type of station. Local station operators would thereby exercise a dominant influence on program content sponsored by CPB. This would give appropriate emphasis to their own educational programming priorities without stifling innovative concepts of artistry and method which would also be contributed through the board.

Section 201(b) of the bill modifies the present act by adding to the general prohibition on political activity, specific preclusion of the Corporation from funding programs on matters of current, partisan political controversy. This change is necessary not only because it is inappropriate to use Federal moneys for such presentations, but also to protect the Corporation from the inevitable buffeting it would get in reaction to such involvement in the political arena. The Corporation can be a much more effective "insulator" of programming from excessive partisan zeal when it is not itself a subject of such controversy.

Section 201(b) further modifies the present act by extending to CPB the antilobbying restrictions applicable to tax-exempt, private foundations. Since CPB has foundation-like responsibilities with respect to program funding, there

is no reason why it should not be subject to the same reasonable constraints. The taxpayers' money should not be used by a private organization to influence legislation, whether it is taxes collected or taxes expended.

Section 201(b) of the bill amends the 1967 act by removing the interconnection and advertising functions from CPB's authorized purposes and activities.

The original intent of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was to preclude use of interconnection facilities to support a fixed schedule, real-time network. The resources have, however, been used for this purpose. When this use is combined with the corporation's programing responsibilities, it casts the corporation's network arm—the Public Broadcasting Service—into the mold of the three commercial television networks and allows the corporation to dominate the schedules of the local broadcast stations.

The local stations should have complete autonomy with respect to their schedules and should have unrestricted authority to present CPB-financed programing at times of their own choosing. The bill therefore removes the interconnection support functions from CPB and precludes it from controlling a network, even indirectly, as it exercises financial control over the Public Broadcasting Service. It is anticipated that the local public broadcast stations will use a portion of the operating funds they receive from HEW to organize themselves into a truly representative membership organization to provide for the kind of distributive interconnection system that was originally intended for the public broadcast system by the Congress.

The removal of CPB's advertising and promotional activities reflect a strong feeling that this is an inappropriate use of public moneys.

Many in the Congress were uneasy about authorizing CPB to engage in this activity, and CPB's plunge into extensive promotional campaigns confirms the original reluctance to give CPB this responsibility.

Section 201(c) continues the authorization for free or reduced rate interconnection services for public broadcasting, but makes clear that the stations, rather than CPB, are entitled to the advantages of organizing such a service.

In addition, subsection (g)(2)(a) under 201(C) prohibits CPB from accepting from any individual or entity an amount more than 10 percent of the federally appropriated funds for the given fiscal year. This is designed to assure that no single contributor influences CPB through the vehicle of providing finances. Item (g)(2)(f) under section 201(C) authorizing the encouragement of new noncommercial broadcast stations, methods and technologies, such as CATV, cassettes and the like, to enhance the service of educational broadcasting.

Section 201(d) provides a 5-year authorization of appropriations for CPB. The level of funding has been reduced to reflect the fact that CPB would no longer have to expend substantial portions of its budget for networking and advertising purposes, and that substantial support of operating costs of individual sta-

tions is provided from HEW under title I.

Section 201(e) makes mandatory an annual GAO audit, so that Congress may keep informed as to CPB's activities and operations and be certain that the letter and spirit of CPB's authority from the Congress is being adhered to completely.

In short, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 would eliminate the present perversion of the original purposes of the 1967 act by restoring overall balance to the public broadcasting system. This would be accomplished by strengthening and giving increased importance to the role of the local broadcast stations, and by taking from CPB's hands the tools that have led, inevitably, to its dominant role in the system. However, the essential role of CPB would be preserved, and in fact, strengthened. CPB would be able to devote its full resources and its full energies to the program creation role it was originally intended to serve, but the station-oriented board would assure the program software needs of local stations were served.

The public broadcasting system would be built on a bedrock of localism, and it can be. Issues that were left unresolved in 1967 have been dealt with by CPB in a manner that made the so-called bedrock a very shaky foundation for the system indeed. Final resolution of these issues in a manner consistent with the Congress original intent will serve to strengthen that foundation before the structure that has developed on it crumbles on its own weight.

The bill follows:

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1972

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by authorizing general support grants to defray the ordinary operating costs of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast stations and by establishing the long-range financing of public broadcast programing through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in a manner consistent with the original intent of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967

*Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Act of 1972."*

#### TITLE I—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES AND GENERAL SUPPORT

SEC. 101 (a) Sections 390 and 391 of Subpart A of Part IV of Title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. §§ 390-391) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 390. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subpart is to assist (through matching grants) in the construction and operation of noncommercial educational television and radio broadcasting facilities and stations."

"SEC. 391. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS AND GENERAL SUPPORT GRANTS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCAST STATIONS—

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$120,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the facilities purposes of Section 390. There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the said purposes of such section, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. There are

also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for the succeeding fiscal year, \$30,000,000 per fiscal year. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under Section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1977.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to help defray the ordinary operating costs of existing and new noncommercial educational television and radio broadcast stations (except FM radio stations operating with no more than 10 watts transmitter power output) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$250,000,000, in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the general support purposes of section 390. There is also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of said section, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of station support grants for which applications approved under subsection 391 (b)(1) have been submitted under such subsection prior to July 1, 1977. Such sums shall be disbursed in the manner and for the purposes set forth below:

"(1) Each licensee or permittee of a noncommercial educational broadcast station seeking assistance under this subpart to defray the ordinary operating costs of its station(s) shall submit to the Secretary no later than September 30 each year an application for a general support grant and shall certify the amount of financial support received by the applicant from State or local governmental entities and the amount of funds contributed by private persons, corporate entities, and foundations during the preceding fiscal year. The applicant shall also provide such other information as the Secretary may by regulation require, including but not limited to assurances that the station(s) is qualified to receive construction and general support grants under this section, that the grant will not be used to produce or purchase the rights to present programing or to advertise or otherwise promote particular programs or program series.

"(2) Upon approving such applications, the Secretary shall distribute to each qualified applicant an amount equal to the amount of financial support and contributions (excluding corporate entities and foundations) certified by the applicant as having been received during the preceding fiscal year to support operation of its station(s), provided that no single noncommercial educational television broadcast station authorized to such applicant shall be entitled to a matching grant less than \$30,000 or in excess of \$150,000, and that no single qualified noncommercial educational radio broadcast station authorized to such applicant shall be entitled to a matching grant less than \$1,000 or in excess of \$25,000."

SEC. 101. (b) Sections 393 and 395 of subpart A of Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 393-394) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 393. RECORDS.—Each recipient of assistance under this subpart shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his functions under this subpart, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project, undertaking or operations in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project, undertaking or op-



erations supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this subpart."

#### RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 394. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this subpart, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for general support grants under section 391(b) or for projects under section 392 or to determine the amounts of general support or construction grants for such projects."

SEC. 101. (c) Subpart A of part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by striking of the heading of such subpart A and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

#### "SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AND STATION OPERATIONS"

#### TITLE II—SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC BROADCAST PROGRAMMING THROUGH THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

SEC. 201. (a) Subsections (c) (1) and (c) (2) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(c) (1)–(2)) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), consisting of fifteen members, ten of whom shall be station members and five of whom shall be public members. Board members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than eight members of the Board may be members of the same political party.

"(2) The station members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are, at the time of their appointment, managers of noncommercial educational television and radio broadcast stations; (B) shall be selected so as to provide a broad representation of various regions of the country, various size cities, various educational systems, and various types and sizes of stations. The public members of the Board (C) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts; (D) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation. (E) The above composition of the Board shall be accomplished within three years of the passage of this Act."

SEC. 201(b). Subsection (f) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(f)) is hereby amended by adding the following paragraphs:

"(4) The Corporation shall not fund, through grants or contracts, directly or indirectly, the production of, or otherwise procure, programs or program series dealing in whole or in part with the coverage, presentation, discussion, or analysis of current news events or current issues that are the subject of partisan political controversy.

"(5) The Corporation shall not engage in any activity which, under section 508(e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 508(e) (1)) must be prohibited by the governing instrument of any foundation which seeks to be exempt from taxation under section

501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a))."

SEC. 201(C). Subsection (g) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(g)) is amended to read as follows:

#### "PURPOSES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE CORPORATION

"(g) (1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to:

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature;

"(B) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum autonomy and independence of the local noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named:

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions except that no grants or contracts from a single private individual or entity shall amount in total during any fiscal year to more than ten percent of the amount of Federal funds appropriated to the Corporation under section 396(k) of this Act for such fiscal year.

"(B) to contract with or make grants to independent program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure from diverse production sources, educational television or radio programs for distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programming costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations except for advertising and other promotional costs;

"(D) to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and to publish a journal;

"(E) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(F) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis, and to encourage the development of new communications technologies for educational and instructional uses which will be to the economic advantage of the public.

"(G) to contract with or make grants to non-profit entities for research, demonstrations, or training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own, operate or exercise financial or other control, either directly or indirectly, over any television or radio broadcast station, interconnection system or network, cable television system, or interconnection or program production facility."

SEC. 201 (d). Subsection (h) of Section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(h)) is amended by deleting the phrase "for non-commercial educational television or radio services" and inserting in lieu thereof "to non-commercial educational television or radio broadcast stations."

SEC. 201 (e). Subsection (k) of Section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(k)) is amended as follows:

(1) By deleting paragraph (1) thereof and substituting the following:

"(1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$20,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the sum of \$25,000,000; and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of \$30,000,000."

(2) In paragraph (2) thereof, by deleting the phrase "July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972, to June 30, 1977."

SEC. 201 (f). Subsection 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 396(1)) is amended by—

(1) Deleting paragraph (1) thereof in its entirety.

(2) Deleting the phrase "may be audited by the General Accounting Office" in subparagraph (2) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office."

(3) Remembering paragraphs (2) and (3) thereof paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

#### THE GROWING INCIDENCE OF HEROIN BABIES

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the recent alarming increase of heroin-addicted babies. One of the blatant tragedies of our permissive society, where the drug scene is so prevalent, is that babies born of heroin-addicted mothers are themselves addicted to heroin. They begin withdrawal within the first 15 hours after birth. The number of such heroin babies born in New York City alone has risen from 200 in 1966 to 550 in 1971.

The baby experiences a coarse tremor during withdrawal. Its arms twitch and its knees jerk convulsively toward its chest. Sometimes the hands claw at the face and arms until they are raw. All the while, the baby cries out with a tense, high-pitched shriek. Detoxification, as with adults, takes 10 to 20 days. In more than a few instances, the babies must remain in the hospital for as long as 40 days due to complications, even after withdrawal, and usually at public expense.

An epidemic of heroin addiction is prevalent in this Nation, and unless more meaningful steps are taken to curb the situation, we will be faced with a white plaque that threatens to sweep across the country, preying upon those innocents who have not yet even been born.

No one knows at this point just how much damage is being caused by women who continue to take heroin while pregnant—will these children crave narcotics in later years? Will they become abnormally susceptible to the effects of drugs? The question of chromosome or brain damage has not even been determined yet.

What is involved here, Mr. Speaker, is the possibility of a dead child, or of a deformed and addicted child. It seems to me that a doctor has an obligation to the unborn child and to society to inform the appropriate agency of the mother's addiction when an examination during pregnancy reveals that she is using narcotics.

Where there is danger to society, such as an addicted or deformed child, then the doctor should be released from his privileged information obligation so that the mother can be placed on immediate withdrawal. This matter should be a priority subject for the AMA, Mr. Speaker, and for the legislative process. I intend to seek action on both these fronts.

Another development in this grim tragedy is the unabated flow of heroin-addicted GI's, back from Vietnam, into our city streets. It has been predicted that the 50,000 to 70,000 ex-GI's who have already returned to American society with their heroin habit intact can "turn on" as many as 3 million others by 1975. Many of these contacts will naturally be women. This cannot help but set the scene for a steady increase of babies hooked on heroin from birth.

How much further proof do we need before we realize that American society today is being threatened at its very roots by the ravaging menace of narcotics abuse? How much longer will we delay action on important drug bills presently before Congress?

And for how long will our citizens tolerate an Army policy which results in the return of addicted GI's to America with little or no attempt at rehabilitation? Mr. Speaker, now that our unborn children are falling victim to heroin addiction, perhaps we will realize that it is time to act.

#### EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

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, during the first session of this Congress, I introduced two bills to enhance and reorganize the present Federal effort to improve emergency medical transportation. The sequence of these bills parallels the drift of my thinking on this subject, and I would like to briefly explain the considerations which brought me here today to jointly introduce the Emergency Medical Services Act with my colleague from West Virginia.

As I have previously mentioned to this body, certain activities in my own congressional district directed my attention to the subject of ambulance services. Due to the success of the Chemung County "Shockmobile," a mobile emergency treatment facility, I was prompted to introduce legislation which would make this kind of comprehensive emergency treatment vehicle available to every area of the country. At that time I joined my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) in making this proposal, and I believe our enthusiasm for this kind of emergency treatment vehicle has

proven out, as Chemung County, N.Y., prepares to put a second such vehicle into operation.

Even such a slight brush with the large and complex subject of emergency medical transportation was enough to impress me with the large gains which could be made in the saving of human life, if sufficient public attention were given to the improvement of these services. After reviewing the programs now undertaken by the Federal Government, as well as talking and corresponding with many of those involved in the planning, administration, and evaluation of these programs, I concluded that effective Federal participation in the improvement of emergency medical transportation would require some reorganization and some redirection of the present Federal effort. On the basis of that thinking, I introduced H.R. 11193, which would designate the division of Emergency Health Services, Health Services, and Mental Health Administration, HEW, as the single office responsible for the professional guidance and grant support of emergency medical transportation.

As I was preparing this latter bill, I was pleased to learn that my colleague from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) had also devoted a great deal of study to the subject of emergency medical transportation. The bills which he introduced in Congress last July are clear indication that the Congressman from West Virginia has been conscientious in his study and determined in his desire to improve the Nation's ambulance services. For some months, I have had the considerable satisfaction of working with Mr. MOLLOHAN on the draft of a new bill which would translate our shared convictions into workable legislation. We have that bill ready, today, and we ask that our colleagues give the Emergency Medical Services Act their serious consideration.

This new proposal attempts to meet the most serious deficiencies in this country's emergency medical transportation capability in a direct and coordinated manner. We first propose that the division of Emergency Health Services within HEW be upgraded and redesignated the Emergency Medical Services Administration. In following action, all Federal Government functions and responsibilities relating to the improvement of emergency medical transportation would be centralized in this Administration. Among its most important duties, the new Emergency Medical Services Administration would be charged with setting up national standards for the operation of ambulance and related services. These standards would apply both to the fitness of ambulance equipment and to the training of ambulance personnel. Further, the new Administration would provide financial assistance, through the States, for the operation of local ambulance services which meet national standards. Funding would also be provided for the initial purchase of ambulance equipment, so that localities could bring their ambulance services up to the standards required by the Emergency Medical Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some trouble during previous remarks to my colleagues to describe the extent to which accidents and consequent inadequate emergency medical services have inflicted physical and economic suffering on our citizens. It has not been my intention to berate my colleagues through statistics of suffering and death, and I have tried to avoid doing so, today. However, I was encouraged that the President used the forum of his state of the Union address to impress upon the Nation the need for improved emergency medical transportation services. In his January 20 message to Congress, President Nixon noted:

Last year, more than 115,000 Americans lost their lives in accidents. Four hundred thousand more were permanently disabled and 10 million more temporarily disabled. The loss to our economy from accidents last year is estimated at over \$28 billion. These are sad and staggering figures—especially since this toll could be greatly reduced by upgrading our emergency medical services. Such improvement does not even require new scientific breakthroughs; it only requires that we apply our present knowledge more effectively.

To help in this effort, I am directing the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to develop new ways of organizing emergency medical services and of providing care to accident victims. By improving communication, transportation, and the training of emergency personnel, we can save many thousands of lives which would otherwise be lost to accidents and sudden illnesses.

Certainly we welcome the contributions which the HEW study can make to the improvement of these services. Yet, with all due respect, Congressman MOLLOHAN and I have studied this question—with the aid of many medical professionals—and we believe we already have a proposal which will save thousands of lives.

We encourage the interest and advocacy of the Emergency Medical Services Act by all of our interested and concerned colleagues.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to fortify these remarks by inserting a noteworthy analysis of the present status of this country's emergency medical services prepared by Dr. Gerald L. Looney, coordinator of emergency services, University of Arizona College of Medicine. Dr. Looney presents a battery of facts which depict the present serious state of emergency medical services and emphasize the urgency of corrective action:

#### THE REAL CRISIS IN HEALTH CARE

(By Gerald L. Looney, M.D., M.P.H.)

It has now been roughly two years since President Nixon popularized the phrase "crisis in health care," and the net effect has been a rising crescendo of concern over health costs and a clamor for national health insurance proposals. However, even the best of these proposals offers to the citizen-consumer primarily convenience and comprehensive coverage of relatively routine (or non-emergency) medical services and leaves ignored and unchanged probably the most vital aspect of medical care—emergency medical services. National health insurance will cost literally billions and will add only gradually, if at all, to the average life span of Americans. A really comprehensive system of emergency medical service would add an immediate bonus in longevity to thousands of Americans at much less cost.

Like most other physicians, I am very much



interested in pursuing the fountain of youth and eliminating heart disease, cancer, and stroke; but I am mystified by the universal lack of concern over the number one cause of death under age thirty-seven—accidental injury. By almost any standards, the loss of healthy, vigorous, and productive citizens is a much greater tragedy for society and offers much greater investment returns than trying to add a few weeks or months at the inexorable end of a life span. Yet, the priorities for attention and funding have been reversed, and we find that emergency medical services are distinguished only by their undisputed position at the bottom of the medical totem pole, remaining the most primitive area of an already archaic industry. Without a doubt, trauma is America's most neglected disease!

When one considers the future, this anachronism seems even more intolerable as the number of motor vehicles and machines steadily increase and as society witnesses an increasing use of violence in social problems. The permanence of trauma and accidental injury as the primary health problem of the United States now seems firmly established, and to combat it we have virtually the same emergency medical system that we had fifty years ago!

By 1975, how much will national health insurance help the 150,000 citizens who will die of accidental injury? How will national health programs bring patients to this marvelous and comprehensive coverage from remote regions or from areas where physicians are literally dying out and not being replaced? Or how will all of these wonderful prepaid benefits help the thousands of patients with heart attacks or strokes while they wait and wait at home or on the street for a mortuary vehicle staffed by grade school drop-outs or a police station wagon or van driven by rushed and harassed patrolmen with virtually no medical training or equipment for medical emergencies, while they wait as the vehicle slowly makes its way (sometimes recklessly, but rarely rapidly) through jammed city streets to the rear entrance of a hospital which adamantly refuses to admit that one of its most vital functions today is emergency care, and then wait some more after they enter a crowded and disorganized emergency room which is understaffed both in the quantity and quality of its medical personnel?

I urge the development of a new program for the re-training and re-orientation of these skilled individuals to meet changing needs in our society. This would not only help the unemployment statistics, but would allow great savings over the cost of training new medical and paramedical personnel from scratch. Furthermore, it would provide a rapid infusion of new ideas and enthusiasm into the rather stodgy and unimaginative area of health care. Medicine has the greatest collection of antique objects in the world: its systems to handle medical data, to monitor patients on a wide scale, to disseminate new medical advances quickly and efficiently, and to evaluate what man is doing outside the hospital (particularly to his environment) are still struggling through the Nineteenth Century and have had little exposure to Twentieth Century technology. It is imperative that medical planners and the health industry not become so engrossed in leaving the Nineteenth Century and belatedly entering the Twentieth that they overlook the fact that the Twenty-first Century is less than three decades away.

"In Moscow anyone without two kopeks to make a phone call can push the 'emergency' button and dial 03 for medical help. If the patient is suffering from a heart attack, a mobile cardiac unit manned by a heart specialist will arrive in minutes to take him to a hospital specializing in cardiac cases. A stroke case would be picked up by a stroke ambulance carrying a neurologist; a child by a children's ambulance staffed by women;

a known case of shock by a shock ambulance; automobile accident victims are taken to a hospital specializing in traumatology or the Institute of Trauma. The crew can evaluate the problem on the spot and remove the patient to the proper facility, treat him and refer him to his regular health system, or treat and dismiss him."

Later, in October, *Time* reinforced this description:

"Perhaps the most impressive aspect of Soviet medicine is its system for emergency care. Each city has a central station (reached by dialing 03) that dispatches ambulances from local substations. Leningrad, which handles as many as 1,800 calls on a winter day, has 120 ambulances at 16 stations spotted about the city. Officials boast that an ambulance can be on the scene from seven to nine minutes after a call is received. Ambulances carry equipment for emergency surgery, care of cardiac patients and 'reanimation' in cases of near death. They also carry a medical doctor and a *feldsher*, or medical assistant, a combination that makes treatment more readily available than it is in most U.S. emergency rooms."

The Russians may not have put a man on the moon as quickly as we have, but they certainly can take better care of a man on earth and get him to medical care quicker than we can. I see no reason why the United States cannot do both if it really acknowledges and tackles the problem of emergency medical services and the support of life on earth as zealously as it tackled the problem of space and life-support systems on the moon. This would seem to be a much better bargain than the currently popular "moon shot" attack on cancer slated to receive \$100,000,000 in President Nixon's proposed budget.

If there is one area of common agreement in the health-care field today, it is the consensus that there is a crucial and widespread need for medical manpower in practically all areas (not just emergency medical services), a need which is poorly met at the present in the more traditional modes of care and which will probably remain unfilled for several years (if not decades) as new modes of care are developed such as air mobility and remote telemetry and telecommunication.

To fill this need for medical manpower is a surplus of highly skilled persons with a sophisticated background in technology and education, a surplus which seems to have largely been ignored by health planners and recruiters. I am referring to the engineers and scientists unemployed since the cutback in military spending, the unplanned and uncontrolled expansion of graduate schools whose Ph. D. graduates now find that they are a glut on an already tight employment scene, and a similar oversupply of public school teachers from the state teachers' colleges.

These people usually have an excellent background for medical work, and, except for a course or two in biophysics or organic chemistry, could readily meet even medical school requirements. Why not make a concerted effort to allow the surplus (as a matter of free choice) to move over to fill the deficit in another area? I can't think of a better way to balance a troublesome budget in these days of tight finances.

"In Chicago, according to a study made public a few weeks ago by the Chicago Hospital Council, an average of 804 emergency cases are transported to hospitals weekly in police 'squadrols'—actually paddy wagons that may carry drunks and prisoners with the patients. 'Oxygen cannot be given to the 35 cardiac cases per week, nor to the 51 cases of seizures/convulsions, nor to the 21 unconscious cases per week,' says the council. 'The fractures of the 179 external limb injuries per week could not be splinted nor the 200 laceration cases per week temporarily cared for.' The situation, says the report,

'presents a substantial threat to the health and even life of the patients transported.'

"A 1968 University of Iowa study of ambulance service in that state revealed that 59.9% of the services were run by undertakers. Of these, only half required any first aid training at all of prospective employees, and 80% had no regular in-service training; 48.3% gave no first aid 'in bad cases' before the patient was picked up, and 29.5% gave none at all, 'because our business is transportation.' Some 29% of the vehicles were station wagons and another 29% of all ambulances were more than ten years old. About 60% carried no splints. Only 48% of the operators bothered to clean the medical equipment after each use. 'These data for Iowa are little different from those gathered in other states,' commented the study's author, Lyle L. Shook. 'The picture of ambulance service is very discouraging.'

"A University of Michigan team headed by surgeon Charles F. Frey examined the autopsy protocols of 159 patients who died of motor vehicle accidents in Washtenaw County. Of the victims, 28—18%—might have been salvaged and returned to society in much their previous state of health had the equipment and capability to start I.V. therapy and to perform endotracheal intubation and aspiration for tension pneumothorax been available at the accident scene or en route to the hospital. Another nine victims were listed as possibly salvageable.

"Commercial ambulance service varies from excellent to atrocious. Last June, the *Chicago Tribune* ran a blistering expose of some of the private services, calling them 'misery merchants' and 'profiteers of human suffering.' The articles told of attendants demanding \$40 from a man suffering from an apparent heart attack; when they found he had only \$2 in cash, they stole that and left him. Other incidents included the stories of an epileptic with a fractured hip who lay for two hours in a police 'squadrol' waiting for the arrival of a private ambulance whose crew paid off the cops with \$10; of a woman who had just suffered a miscarriage being forced to walk downstairs from the third floor; of an attendant pretending to give a woman oxygen so that a \$10 extra fee could be charged, but actually turning off the valve."

As in preparing a direct comparison, Dr. Patrick B. Storey described the situation in Russia in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (January 12, 1970):

The real "crisis in health care" in this country is in the homes and on the streets—not in the doctors' offices or hospitals or community health centers, as most health planners would have you think. Somehow, medical spokesmen have become intoxicated with their own rhetoric as they rant and rave that our current system of episodic and crisis-type care has been polished and perfected and yet is still not enough, that we have to have a whole new comprehensive program of toupee-to-toenail care which will prevent disease and illness (but not accidental injury).

There are two major obstacles in accepting these arguments: first, the overall yield in the terms of health statistics from these "preventive maintenance programs" is going to be disappointingly small, and the inevitable escalation of demands for more money and medical personnel surprisingly large. Even the president of Blue Cross, Mr. Walter McNerney, has begun to publicly caution Dr. John Knowles and other medical spokesmen that the cost of preventive medicine on a routine and general basis will be expensive, and significant benefits will be very difficult to prove. The second obstacle is even more distressing: the medical system in this country still hasn't even mastered the art of really good crisis-care. We manage to spend billions on hospitalized patients and have developed some very sophisticated and expensive techniques and equipment to work

on and watch over these patients, but the hospital is usually only half of the story of episodic crisis-care, and for those who don't get to the hospital in time, it's none of the story. The American Heart Association estimates that about 600,000 Americans die each year because of coronary heart disease, and nearly 70% of these deaths occur outside the hospital. The real crime in the streets is not the occasional human assault; it is the repeated loss of potentially productive citizens who are suddenly and unexpectedly stricken or injured and die needlessly because life-saving personnel and equipment are not available.

Even the much-maligned military profession has more concern for the sick and injured than the civilian medical profession. No military medical planner would ever dream of devoting his budget and resources to television sets, air conditioning, and wall-to-wall carpeting for the base hospital, while leaving the emergency care and transport of patients to this fine facility totally up to happenstance and mainly untrained and unsupervised crews (with whom he rarely converses socially and never communicates medically). However, the most amazing phenomenon of this dilemma is the apparent complacency of the general public and the medical establishment in the face of steadily decreasing effectiveness of emergency medical care and transport. No one seems to be aware of the statistics which show a better chance of survival from injuries sustained in Vietnam than in Virginia or Vermont. In spite of the many marches and protests about the war, no one seems to be pointing out that a person in Saigon can reach a medical facility quicker than a person in Somerville or Seattle, that a soldier wounded in the jungles of South Vietnam can be brought to medical care quicker than a sailor injured in an auto accident in South Boston or South Dakota.

In a recent excellent review of "The Crisis in Emergency Care," *Medical World News* described the situation in other areas of the United States:

"In the 20 counties of northwestern Ohio, with a population of 1.5 million, ambulances with some exceptions have only enough room for the patient lying down, with little or no room for an attendant to function. Equipment on most ambulances consists merely of an oxygen tank and mask. There are no splints and backboards, no equipment for resuscitation, heart monitoring, keeping the patient's clogged-up windpipe open, or providing intravenous therapy." So wrote the *Toledo Blade* on May 6, 1970, adding that even had such equipment been available, attendants were not trained to use it."

#### EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 19 I introduced two bills designed to improve the quality of emergency medical care received by highway accident victims and others suffering from medical emergencies. The thrust of the legislation was to improve the Nation's ambulance services and I stated at that time that the quality of ambulance care, generally very poor across the Nation, had received very little consideration by all levels of government.

Today the situation is rapidly changing. An increasing number of leaders here in the Congress and in the administration are becoming aware of the deplorable

condition of ambulance services and the thousands of lives which are being wasted each year because of inadequate and oftentimes nonexistent ambulance care.

The Public Health Service estimates that as many as 60,000 lives could be saved each year if the Nation had a truly effective ambulance and hospital emergency room system delivering professional medical care to patients as rapidly as possible.

The unwritten presumption behind those estimates is that people are dying needlessly at the hands of ambulance attendants who are so medically unskilled that they do not know how to deal effectively with many common medical emergencies. Furthermore, these people are dying because ambulances may not be equipped with such rudimentary lifesaving devices, such as oxygen respirators, that are essential to keep the patient alive.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that less than half of the ambulance attendants in the United States have received advanced first aid training, although such a course itself amounts to only 27 hours of training in the mere basics of first aid. The NHTSA also estimates that far less than half of the ambulance vehicles in the Nation are equipped with the kind of lifesaving devices recommended as the very minimum by the National Academy of Sciences.

President Nixon gave further impetus to emergency health care efforts in his recent state of the Union address when he announced that he was directing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop new ways of organizing emergency medical services and of providing care to accident victims.

The President said:

By improving communication, transportation, and the training of emergency personnel, we can save many thousands of lives which would otherwise be lost to accidents and sudden illnesses.

There is substantial bipartisan agreement on recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of the Federal Government's role in trying to upgrade ambulance care.

For instance, one of my previous bills, H.R. 9876, which would establish a grant program within the Public Health Service to assist hospitals in operating top quality ambulance services, pointed out the need for greater participation in this area by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This bill was closely followed by one from the Honorable Howard W. ROBISON to transfer all existing Federal programs dealing with ambulance services to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; then on January 24, Chairman PAUL ROGERS of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee introduced H.R. 12563 establishing an expanded grant program under the Public Health Service Act. The trend in this series of bills represents a recognition that ambulance care is a health problem, rather than one confined solely to highway safety and transportation.

After months of research, the Honorable HOWARD ROBISON and I are joining in the introduction of legislation to establish an Emergency Medical Services Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to direct and coordinate all Federal programs on emergency health care as well as to provide financial assistance to help qualified communities in the operation of their own ambulance corps as a third public service.

This is a bold step, but the deplorable conditions in ambulance care today and the inexcusable inaction and lack of coordination on all levels of government require this action to be taken to prevent the needless loss of thousands of lives. With such an organization the Nation will be able to have space age emergency health care rushed to the sick and injured. We will be able to utilize technological advances in the medical field, as well as the talent of a new breed of paramedical professional, the emergency medical technician. We will see an end to the present situation in which the sick and injured die waiting for ambulances that never come. We will put to an end the present situation in which the sick and injured are cared for in the back of a station wagon or a hearse by ambulance men who may have little or no medical skill.

Let me explain why this action is needed.

In the past—and unfortunately to a large extent today—when someone called an ambulance, he was likely to get a hearse driven by a funeral home worker. Patients have died because that hearse was unequipped with lifesaving devices and because the worker was medically unskilled.

Today, about half of all ambulances are operated by funeral homes and this is so all across the Nation, but primarily in the Midwest and the South. But, due to financial situations making the answering of emergency calls unprofitable, funeral homes are discontinuing such rescue calls at an alarming rate, so that many communities are left without any emergency ambulance service whatsoever.

But funeral directors still use their ambulances. They use them as medicare and welfare taxis, because the Federal and State governments pay for the ride. The equipment and personnel training requirements for getting this reimbursement under medicare are really far below what other Federal offices, chiefly the National Highway Safety Administration, the Division of Emergency Health Services, and the National Academy of Sciences recommend as the very minimum. The conclusion is that the medicare program is actually subsidizing substandard emergency health care and is directly responsible for the shift on the part of the funeral home industry from answering unprofitable emergency rescue calls to concentrating solely on the more lucrative medicare trade. This shift has left many communities without emergency ambulance care.

Furthermore, in all but a handful of States, there are no regulations for ambulance services, no requirements that



attendants have any degree of medical training, no requirements that any lifesaving equipment be carried aboard an ambulance, and no requirements to insure that the vehicle which responds to an emergency is not in fact a station wagon with only a flashing red light as its sole pretense of being an ambulance.

This is where the Federal Government comes in, for under the Highway Safety Act, the Department of Transportation has the power to cut off 10 percent of highway construction funds to any State which does not have an acceptable highway safety program designed to save lives. The Department has achieved very little progress in getting States to regulate ambulance services although it has the authority to disapprove a highway safety program if it finds unsatisfactory. Ambulance programs are recognized by law as a required ingredient in a State's highway safety program, but the officials of the Department of Transportation who deal daily with ambulance programs confess quite openly that they are discouraged by the lack of State action in this vitally important field.

Although the Transportation Department has drawn up detailed recommendations for the operation of ambulance services, and although it has done much to show State officials just how an ideal ambulance service should operate, I doubt seriously that the "concrete and wheels" philosophy inherent in the Department itself has much business handling ambulance care which is essentially a health problem.

That is the trend in the progress of ambulance care. We are moving away from the transportation approach which gave us the underequipped ambulance hearse, and we are moving toward a health care approach which will give us a mobile hospital emergency room that will bring advanced lifesaving devices and qualified paramedics to the rescue of the sick and injured.

Unfortunately, the health aspect has been largely ignored by the Federal Government. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not provided the kind of leadership necessary to emphasize this. The Division of Emergency Health Services represents the Department's sole concern with ambulance care, and the Division itself is an ignored and powerless guardian of unfunded programs.

Although the Division recommends certain high standards for ambulance services, such recommendations have been ignored by the higher officials of the Department. As an example, the Social Security Administration in its handling of medicare reimbursement programs does not follow the guidelines on ambulance care established by its sister organization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Division of Emergency Health Services.

Furthermore, the 1973 budget contains an increase of only a \$1,000 from \$4,267,000 to \$4,268,000 for the entire operation of the Division. Now this is surprising for it comes at a time when the President himself has called upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to play a greater role in ambulance care.

This oversight—if it is one—should be corrected.

The discrepancies between ambulance program handled by the Division of Emergency Health Services and the Social Security Administration is an example of the lack of coordination between Federal offices in this field. This is exaggerated even further in the rivalry between the Transportation Department and the Division of Emergency Health Services. Needless to point out, the Transportation Department now has the upper hand.

But there must be coordination. That is why the Nation needs an Emergency Medical Services Administration to set guidelines and standards for eligibility in the participation in all Federal programs dealing with ambulance care. I think this new administration should have an underlying philosophy and orientation toward health care.

Furthermore, although I have concerned myself only with ambulance care, I must emphasize that emergency health care itself is not confined to that field alone; it encompasses disaster work and primarily hospital emergency departments. The new administration I am proposing should encompass these fields as well, and that is another reason why I think the administration must be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But the Department must give more than just lip service to such programs. It must do more than it has in the past and in this respect I am in complete agreement with the President.

My colleague, the Honorable HOWARD ROBISON, presents an article by Dr. Gerald L. Looney, director of the emergency service section of the University of Arizona Medical Center. That article, I believe, will give a brief explanation of the problems in ambulance care and the direction the Nation should be following to improve the delivery of emergency health care.

I would like now to submit the full text of the Emergency Medical Services Act:

#### H.R. —

A bill to establish an Emergency Medical Services Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist communities in providing professional emergency medical care

*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 "Emergency Medical Services Act".*

#### FINDINGS; DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that countless lives have been and are being lost through the lack of prompt and professional ambulance care, and that many of these lives could be saved if such care were more readily available.

(b) It is the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act to prevent this needless loss of life by upgrading the quality of ambulance care in the United States through the establishment of a Federal entity having the power to set standards for ambulance vehicles, equipment, and personnel training and the authority to provide financial assistance to qualified ambulance services operated by or under the supervision and auspices of local political subdivisions or combinations thereof.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. There is established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Emergency Medical Services Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration"). The Administration shall be headed by a Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

#### DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATION; TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

SEC. 4. (a) The Director, under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), shall carry out the functions and responsibilities vested in or transferred to him or the Administration by or under this Act, and shall perform such related duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(b) The Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President and shall receive basic pay at the rate prescribed for level 18 of the Executive Schedule under subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) With the approval of the Secretary, the Director shall appoint such technical and professional personnel as he deems necessary, in addition to the regular personnel of the Department under his jurisdiction and control, to carry out the functions of the Administration, and shall fix the pay of the personnel so appointed, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS FOR OPERATION OF AMBULANCE AND RELATED SERVICES

SEC. 5. The Director shall establish, keep current, and from time to time publish standards to govern the operation of ambulance and other emergency medical services. Such standards, which shall be designed to ensure that such services are professionally provided and effectively available on the widest possible basis, shall include (without being limited to) standards and minimum requirements for—

(1) the licensing of ambulance services based (in the case of any entity providing such services) upon periodic inspection of its vehicles and equipment, and periodic review of the training level of its personnel and the adequacy of its dispatching and communications system;

(2) the licensing of ambulance drivers, and of ambulance attendants (taking into account the extent to which they meet the standards established by the Director with respect to level of medical training);

(3) the type and amount of equipment to be carried aboard ambulance vehicles;

(4) adequate liability insurance to cover ambulance operations;

(5) the performance of advisory and monitoring functions by physicians in connection with ambulance operations;

(6) the filing of reports on all calls to which response is made in the provision of ambulance services; and

(7) the revocation of licenses, or the imposition of other penalties, for violation of any of the standards established under this section.

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR OPERATION OF LOCAL AMBULANCE SERVICES

SEC. 6. (a) In order to make funds available to local communities and regional combinations thereof to assist them in the development and operation of ambulance services meeting the standards prescribed under section 5, the Director is authorized to allot

funds to qualified States for distribution among their political subdivisions as provided in this section.

(b) (1) The Director shall allocate and pay to each State which qualifies for assistance under this section with respect to any fiscal year, from the funds appropriated pursuant to section 11(a) for such year, an amount (based on the population of the State and other conditions, such as population density and the availability of physicians and hospital facilities, demonstrating or bearing upon the adequacy of ambulance services in the State) which reflects the needs of such State and its political subdivisions for improved ambulance services relative to the corresponding needs in other qualified States.

(2) A State is qualified for assistance under this section with respect to any fiscal year if (and only if) it has in effect throughout such year a fully implemented comprehensive ambulance program, submitted by the Governor of the State and approved by the Director, which provides for financial assistance to political subdivisions of the State or regional combinations thereof for the development and operation of ambulance services, and for the licensing of such services, based on vehicle design standards, personnel training standards, equipment standards, and other standards designed and established to improve the quality of ambulance care.

(c) Subject to subsection (d), funds made available to a qualified State with respect to any fiscal year under subsection (b) shall be disbursed by the appropriate agency of such State, in accordance with the State's comprehensive ambulance program and on such additional terms and conditions (consistent with such program) as such agency deems appropriate, to political subdivisions of the State or regional combinations thereof for the development and operation of improved ambulance services by or under the supervision and auspices of such subdivisions or combinations.

(d) (1) No funds shall be disbursed by a State to any political subdivision or regional combination of subdivisions under subsection (c) unless and until the Director has specifically approved such disbursement as suitably contributing to the achievement of the purpose of this Act on the basis of (A) reports submitted by such subdivision or combination along with its application for funds, and (B) any on-site inspections, review, and other information and data which the Director may deem necessary.

(2) The amount of the funds disbursed by a State to any political subdivision or regional combination of subdivisions under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year for the development and operation of ambulance services shall not exceed one-third of the costs incurred or to be incurred by such subdivision or combination during such year for the development and operation of such services.

(e) Under regulations prescribed by the Director, any funds which have been disbursed by a State to a political subdivision or combination of subdivisions with respect to any fiscal year for the development and operation of ambulance services, and which remain unexpended and unobligated, may be withdrawn from such subdivision or combination (and redistributed to other political subdivisions or regional combinations of subdivisions in that State, or to other qualified States) if the Director deems the withdrawal of such funds warranted on the basis of subsequent inspections made or information received.

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR INITIAL PURCHASE OF AMBULANCE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 7. In addition to providing financial assistance for the development and operation of improved ambulance services under section 6, the Director is authorized to assist in the establishment of new ambulance services

in any political subdivision or regional combination of political subdivisions in a qualified State by making grants to such subdivision or combination of subdivisions for the initial purchase of ambulance vehicles, equipment, and communication systems to be used in the provision of ambulance services by or under the supervision and auspices of such subdivision or combination. A grant under this section shall be in an amount not exceeding 50 per centum of the cost of purchasing the ambulance vehicles, equipment, and communication systems involved, and shall be made only to a political subdivision or combination of political subdivisions which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Director that, with the acquisition of such vehicles, equipment, and systems, it will rapidly be able to provide ambulance services fully complying with the standards established by the Director under section 5.

#### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY SAFETY FUNCTIONS TO DIRECTOR

SEC. 8. (a) All functions, power, and duties of the Secretary of Transportation and the National Highway Safety Bureau relating to emergency medical services (Standard No. 11) which are being exercised under, in connection with, or as a part of the Uniform Standards for State Highway Safety Programs are transferred to and vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be exercised and carried out by him through the Director and the facilities and other personnel of the Administration.

(b) So much of the positions, personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of authorizations, allocations, and other funds of the Secretary of Transportation and the National Highway Safety Bureau as were employed, held, used, or available for use exclusively or primarily in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred by subsection (a) shall be transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare along with such functions, powers, and duties.

(c) The transfers under subsections (a) and (b) shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may prescribe to carry out this section.

(d) With respect to any functions, power, or duty transferred by subsection (a) and exercised after the date of the enactment of this Act, any reference in any law, document, or record to the Secretary of Transportation or the National Highway Safety Bureau shall be deemed to be a reference to the Director of the Emergency Medical Services Administration.

#### APPLICATION OF STANDARDS TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 9. (a) The standards established by the Director under section 5 shall apply to and govern the operation of all ambulance and other emergency medical services which are provided or assisted in any way under Federal law or under programs established, carried on, or supported under Federal law.

(b) No loan, grant, or other assistance in any form shall be provided under any Federal law, directly or indirectly, to any public or private agency, organization, or other entity engaged in furnishing ambulance services, or to any State or local governmental agency exercising jurisdiction, control, or regulatory authority over any such entity, unless such services meet the applicable standards established by the Director under section 5.

(c) The Director shall consult with and provide technical and other advice and services to the heads of the various Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over programs or activities involving the provision of ambulance or other emergency medical services or the provision of assistance in any form, directly or indirectly, to en-

titles furnishing such services, in order to ensure that the requirements of this section will be met and that all such programs and activities of the Federal Government will be effectively coordinated with a view to the widest possible achievement of the purpose of this Act.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. (a) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Director is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any other agencies of the United States and of any non-Federal public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, in accordance with agreements entered into between the Director and the heads of such agencies or institutions, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise.

(b) The Director is authorized to conduct or contract with others to conduct studies and research projects on the problems and conditions of emergency medical care and on methods of upgrading emergency medical services. Any such studies or projects shall particularly be directed toward the utilization of technological advances in the improvement of ambulance care.

(c) The Director, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this Act.

(d) The Director shall annually submit to the President and the Congress a full and complete report on activities under this Act, including such recommendations as he may consider necessary or desirable for legislative or administrative action to improve and make more effective the program under this Act.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 11. (a) For assistance under sections 6 and 7, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and the sum of \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

(b) For other expenses incurred by the Director and the Administration in carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and the sum of \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

(c) Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended, and any amounts authorized for any fiscal year under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1975.

#### ECONOMISTS ENDORSE "JOBS NOW" PROGRAM TO PROVIDE 500,000 PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS

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, on December 2, 1971, I introduced legislation, H.R. 12011, that would create 500,000 federally-financed public service jobs by amending and expanding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971—to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 44358. This legislation is cosponsored by 60 Democratic Congressmen, and is being introduced in the Senate today by Senator WALTER MONDALE and 20 other Democratic Senators. The 60 House cosponsors are:

#### LIST OF COSPONSORS

James Abourezk (S. Dak.), Brock Adams (Wash.), Les Aspin (Wis.), Herman Badillo (N.Y.), Nick Begich (Alaska), Jonathan B. Bingham (N.Y.), Frank J. Brasco (N.Y.),



Phillip Burton (Calif.), Hugh L. Carey (N.Y.), Charles J. Carney (Ohio).

Frank M. Clark (Pa.), George W. Collins (Ill.), William R. Cotter (Conn.), George E. Danielson (Calif.), Ronald V. Dellums (Calif.), Robert F. Drinan (Mass.), Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.), Don Edwards (Calif.), Joshua Ellberg (Pa.), Walter E. Fauntroy (D.C.).

William D. Ford (Mich.), Donald M. Fraser (Minn.), Sam Gibbons (Fla.), Ella T. Grasso (Conn.), William J. Green (Pa.), Richard T. Hanna (Calif.), Michael Harrington (Mass.), William D. Hathaway (Maine), Ken Hechler (W. Va.), Henry Helstoski (N.J.).

Joseph E. Karth (Minn.), Peter N. Kyros (Maine), Robert L. Leggett (Calif.), Romano L. Mazzoli (Ky.), Lloyd Meeds (Wash.), Ralph H. Metcalfe (Ill.), Abner J. Mikva (Ill.), Parren J. Mitchell (Md.), Morgan F. Murphy (Ill.), David R. Obey (Wis.).

Edward J. Patten (N.J.), Claude Pepper (Fla.), Bertram L. Podell (N.Y.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.), Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (N.J.), Robert A. Roe (N.J.), Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.), Edward R. Roybal (Calif.), William F. Ryan (N.Y.).

Fernand J. St Germain (R.I.), Paul S. Sarbanes (Md.), John F. Seiberling (Ohio), B. F. Sisk (Calif.), Louis Stokes (Ohio), Frank Thompson, Jr. (N.J.), Robert O. Tierman (R.I.), Charles A. Vanik (Ohio), Jerome R. Waldie (Calif.), Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.).

On December 6, I wrote to a number of eminent economists seeking their views on the economic merits of this "Jobs Now" program, and asking their suggestions for possible changes and improvements in the bill.

The response thus far has been encouraging.

From Professor James Tobin of Yale University, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the Kennedy administration:

I am very much in favor of your proposal for 500,000 federally financed public service jobs.

From Professor R. A. Gordon of the University of California at Berkeley:

I fully support your amendments to the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

From Dr. Sar A. Levitan, director of the Center for Manpower Policy Studies at George Washington University:

I believe that the proposed amendments of the Emergency Employment Act are grounded in impeccable logic and sound economics.

From Professor Robert M. Solow of MIT:

I am glad to endorse H.R. 12011 as an effective means to create badly needed jobs.

From Robert R. Nathan:

I believe that such a program is highly desirable and fully merited on a number of grounds.

From Garth L. Mangum of the Center for Manpower Policy Studies at George Washington:

I would be happy to endorse an expansion of the public service employment provided under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

From V. Lewis Bassie, director of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Illinois:

I believe this proposal has a great deal of merit and favor it.

From Prof. Lester Thurow of MIT:

I think that the idea of a public service jobs program is a good idea that can be used as an anti-recessionary weapon.

From Prof. Otto Eckstein of Harvard, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers during the Johnson administration:

Under the present circumstances, it is only common sense to try to put together a program which would use federal money to hire some of the unemployed to help the quality and quantity of public services provided by the states and localities.

From Prof. Robert Eisner of Northwestern University:

I can report general sympathy with the proposal to create additional federally financed public service jobs.

From Prof. Gardner Ackley of the University of Michigan, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Johnson Administration:

I... favor measures which will quickly and directly increase employment, and yours is such a proposal.

#### PRESENT POLICIES UNLIKELY TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Most of these economists made the point that present policies and programs, including the current token 130,000 job, public service jobs program, will not be enough to reduce unemployment significantly.

Professor Tobin:

In my opinion unemployment is the most serious economic problem now facing the country, and even the most optimistic forecasts for 1972 do not contemplate substantial improvement in the rate of unemployment.

Professor Gordon:

Given the Administration's present game plan, few economists expect unemployment to be as low as 5 percent by the end of 1972. The consensus among 76 forecasts by business, government, labor, and academic economists puts the unemployment rate at 5.3 percent in the fourth quarter of 1972, and the average rate for the entire year 5.5 percent.

Professor Eckstein:

It is already evident that a major unemployment problem will still exist a year from now, and our projections indicate that even in 1973 there will be too much unemployment.

Professor Ackley:

My own present forecast is that the rate of unemployment, based on present and expected Federal policies, is unlikely to fall much below 5½ percent by the end of 1972. I regard this prospect as unacceptable and, indeed, socially dangerous.

Professor Solow:

I fully agree that the Administration's economic program to date is insufficiently expansionary, and will leave us with a hangover of excessive unemployment at least into 1973. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 is obviously utterly inadequate to the problem.

Professor Eisner:

I consider the current rate of unemployment, still as high as 6% by last reports, a major failure of our economic policy. It is indeed a much more important failure than the rate of inflation which has apparently been the major concern of the Nixon Administration. Unemployment means a real loss in current output and untold further losses in destroyed human capital.

The Administration's presumed efforts to meet the problem of unemployment have consisted overwhelmingly of long run tilting of the tax program in favor of business and hence the generally wealthy owners of business. The equipment tax credit is quite misnamed as a job development credit, will do little to relieve short run problems of unemployment and in the long run may even be counterproductive. Similarly, the asset depreciation range revisions of our tax laws will mean billions of dollars of lower business taxes and hence higher earnings and capital gains to stockholders but relatively little for capital expansion and even less for employment.

Professor Bassie:

There is an immediate need for reducing unemployment and nothing in the present situation indicates that this need will be taken care of automatically by other programs. An unemployment rate of six percent is far too high, and I think that attempts to justify it on the basis that the teenagers, women, and other unemployed workers are not qualified for available employment are shocking rationalizations.

Unemployment is not likely to decrease as a result of general economic developments in 1972. Business prospects are not favorable. On the contrary, we shall probably experience the same sickly economic performance this year as last.

Mr. Nathan:

It seems to me quite clear that the weakest part of the President's program of August 15th, 1971 related to the recovery of the economy... Therefore, I believe it is important to stimulate the economy much further than is called for under the President's program.

"JOBS NOW" PROGRAM IS BEST WAY TO CREATE JOBS WITHOUT INFLATION

The administration's hope that unemployment can be reduced by simply running enormous budget deficits reflects a kind of vulgarized Keynesianism. It is not the size alone of the budget deficit that is crucial; it is necessary to pay attention also to the kind of tax and expenditure policies which produce the deficit. To take an extreme example, it would without doubt create a very large budget deficit if all those earning over \$100,000 a year were excused from paying Federal taxes and supplied with free yachts by the government. This might create a few jobs for yacht builders and deck boys, but the overall impact on the unemployment rate would be scarcely measurable. Job-creating efforts must be direct to be effective. Trickle-down methods may be congenial to the tricklers, but they are not much help to the tricklees.

The economists who commented on the "Jobs Now" program frequently made this point, emphasizing that an expanded public service jobs program was the kind of direct, rifle-shot method that was needed to reduce unemployment quickly and without inflationary side effects.

Professor Bassie put it this way:

Direct employment of workers as in your proposal is the most efficient method of dealing with the unemployment problem. For any given number of new jobs, trickle-down procedures are more costly—whether by tax relief, subsidies, or expenditures on sophisticated programs such as military-space hardware. With the federal deficit running at a rate of over \$30 billion, efficiency in job

creation becomes increasingly important. The use of inefficient methods of stimulating employment will result in increasingly greater deficits. This is undesirable because building up the deficit too much will merely replace one kind of instability with another.

Professor Gordon went into greater detail:

Federal financing of local public service jobs works rapidly to increase employment. Most of these job slots have already been designed by local governments but have been left unfilled due to lack of revenue. As soon as Federal funds are allocated, local governments can immediately begin to hire individuals for these positions. This direct and immediate hiring contrasts with the employment effects generated either by Federal purchases of goods and services or by increased private expenditures resulting from a tax cut. Private employers do not necessarily and immediately respond to increased spending by increasing employment. To some extent, they can reduce inventories, increase hours for the existing work force, and even raise prices to some extent. Only gradually, as employers are convinced that the increase in spending is permanent and as they come more effectively to utilize those already employed, will they hire new workers. And the delays in hiring will be significant as the increase in demand works its way backward from retailers and manufacturers of finished goods to the suppliers of parts and raw materials. In contrast, for the same amount of government expenditure, public service employment would put a larger number of people to work considerably more promptly.

Public service vacancies bid directly for the unemployed, for labor which by definition is in surplus. A general increase in spending, in contrast, bids across the board for all kinds of labor and also for capital. Skilled labor is likely to become scarce while unskilled labor is still in surplus. The increase in demand needed to absorb the unskilled presses on capacity, tends to raise prices and creates new bottlenecks. The creation of low-skilled public service jobs is an alternative to this inflationary expansion of general demand. It selectively bids for the labor still in surplus, without overbidding for skilled labor. Thus, it is the best way to achieve low levels of unemployment with minimum inflation.

Professor Tobin agreed:

Your proposal has the special merit that these jobs can be targeted for those unemployed who are least likely to be put to work by general economic recovery. Experience shows that the unemployment of these disadvantaged workers does very little to retard wage inflation, and by the same token the creation of jobs to employ them will not significantly increase wage-inflationary pressures.

The full text of all the letters I have received thus far follows:

CENTER FOR MANPOWER POLICY STUDIES,  
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1971.  
Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: In response to your letter of December 6, I would be happy to endorse an expansion of the public service employment provided under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

The present program has proven the need and the potential. Naturally there have been a few areas lagging in the filling of their "slots" and there have been a few abuses. But these are minor in the whole. Most jurisdictions has grasped the opportunity to provide jobs for their unemployed while simultaneously meeting critical need for public services. In the areas where I have had the

opportunity to observe, I have been impressed with the quality and usefulness of the jobs provided.

No one knows at this point how many people can be usefully absorbed in this fashion but it is apparent that it is far more than at present authorized. As you have wisely observed, when over five million people need jobs and more than that need better jobs while all 200 million of us need more and improved public services, it is only logical to marry those needs.

In an economic, if not budgetary sense, it is costless to employ the unemployed.

Sincerely,

GARTH L. MANGUM.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF  
TECHNOLOGY,  
Cambridge, Mass., December 10, 1971.

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: This letter is in response to your request for comments on HR 12011.

I think that the idea of a public service jobs program is a good idea that can be used as an anti-recessionary weapon, but a device that should not be thought of primarily as a countercyclical weapon. To limit it to countercyclical periods would be to destroy its usefulness.

First, the goods and services that are to be provided are needed in full employment periods as well as periods of unemployment.

Second, bureaucratically, it is very difficult to make programs rise and fall with the business cycle.

Third, there are a large number of people who want to work, but need semi-sheltered employment in that they cannot earn above poverty lines incomes in the private economy even in periods of full employment. In a work-ethic economy, governments should seek to fulfill these desires to work.

Fourth, to provide motivation for learning new skills and for doing a good job, it is necessary to convince the workers that they are doing something important with a future. If the program is to be abandoned whenever unemployment hits 4.0 percent, they will all know that they are not doing anything worth doing. Like some of our current programs, it will become a defacto income transfer program and nothing more.

As a consequence, I do not like the provision calling for the elimination of the program when unemployment hits 4.0 percent. Such a provision is also partly unnecessary since the number of people wanting such jobs will drop as private job opportunities expand as the economy reaches and exceeds 4.0 percent unemployment.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER C. THUROW.

Professor of Economics and Management.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Cambridge, Mass., December 16, 1971.  
Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: Thank you for sending me the material on the legislation to create 500,000 federally financed public service jobs. It is already evident that a major unemployment problem will still exist a year from now, and our projections indicate that even in 1973 there will be too much unemployment. At the same time, the ability of state and local governments to provide public services has been severely affected by the recession and the slow recovery. Revenues have fallen far short of normal growth, education budgets have been cut, and the average effective tax rates on the property base and other traditional revenue sources have gone up.

Under these circumstances, it is only common sense to try to put together a pro-

gram which would use federal money to hire some of the unemployed to help the quality and quantity of public services provided by the states and localities. Such a program solves two problems with one stroke.

There still are some unsolved problems in the design of an effective program. The initial program under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 spreads the money thinly over a large fraction of all localities, so that the administrative burden in terms of grant applications, community coordination for joint applications, screening of numerous job applicants and selection of positions to be filled has become totally out of line with the magnitudes of the grants actually being made. This at least has been the experience that I could observe in my own home area. A larger program, administered with objectives more clearly defined, is likely to show better results.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

OTTO ECKSTEIN.

ROBERT R. NATHAN ASSOCIATES, INC.,  
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1971.  
Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I have your letter of December 6th concerning the legislation you have introduced to create a half million Federally financed public service jobs. I believe that such a program is highly desirable and fully merited on a number of grounds.

First of all, it seems to me quite clear that the weakest part of the President's program of August 15th, 1971 related to the recovery of the economy. There can be a great deal of controversy about the techniques under which stabilization was to be pursued and is being pursued and also concerning the techniques in the international exchange and trade field but these can be corrected. However, I think that there was a negative element in the expansion program and, even though it did appear that for a time Congress might rescue the program by changing the emphasis in the President's proposals, this does not now seem likely to take place. Therefore, I believe it is important to stimulate the economy much further than is called for under the President's program.

What is particularly distressing is the emphasis in the President's program of private spending over public spending. Every time we need a stimulus in the economy there is too much emphasis on tax reduction and not enough on spending for truly essential public needs. It wouldn't be so bad to provide the tax relief for the very low or lower middle income levels but we are giving huge tax benefits to the higher income groups as well as to corporations and this is going to impair public revenue resources for a long time to come and make it difficult to undertake the essential public facility and public service program so desperately needed.

I agree that there are many, many public services that are being neglected and that a half a million jobs could do a great deal to improve our environment and to provide much greater satisfaction and to fulfill many of our unsatisfied public wants. It certainly is a direct and desirable way to reduce unemployment and it will serve the country's needs more fully than practically any other method.

I would add another point concerning the relationship between economic expansion and stabilization. We do have tremendous underutilization of capacity and I am convinced that the rapid recovery will bring with it a very rapid and sustained rise in the rate of output per man hour. This sharp increase in productivity should make it possible for us to slow the pace of price increase quite materially and help overcome inflation. There isn't much prospect for excess aggregate demand for the next year or prob-



ably two years and therefore quick expansion will stimulate productivity and the price stability.

You have emphasized the important element of equity and this certainly is deserving of serious consideration. Tax reductions seep through to the unemployed in a slow and highly uncertain and often purely spurious manner. On the other hand, providing public jobs means direct assistance to those who are unemployed and in need of an income. It's an equitable way to afford opportunities for the less fortunate to participate in the production of our economy and also it will provide the kinds of goods and services needed by so many people as distinct from helping those at the top and hoping that benefits will trickle down.

There is perhaps only one thought I might suggest and that would be for pushing the program up as rapidly as possible in the earlier part of the two years for which provision is made. I think we need more jobs in '72. The year '73 is still somewhat uncertain and, while I do believe that continued public service employment will be needed, it may well be that if this kind of a program and others like it are introduced early in 1972, there may be some vigorous overall expansion which might necessitate a leveling off or a decline in such program in '73. Therefore, the levels for 1973 should be subject to some flexibility as the measures of economic activity are made available.

I think on the whole you are proposing something exceedingly worthwhile and I hope it gets positive and widespread support. Best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. NATHAN.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,

Cambridge, Mass., December 23, 1971.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Thank you for sending me material on H.R. 12011. I fully agree that the Administration's economic program to date is insufficiently expansionary, and will leave us with a hangover of excessive unemployment at least into 1973. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 is obviously utterly inadequate to the problem. I am glad to endorse H.R. 12011 as an effective means to create badly needed jobs—badly needed in two senses.

I'm not in any position right now to produce a careful analysis. Two thoughts occur to me, however. The first is that the President is unlikely to let January go by without some expansionary moves in the Budget. He can hardly want to face the November election with unemployment still at some 5½% of the labor force. Budget moves made in January, however, are unlikely to have much effect on the economy by Fall. Your legislation has the merit that if the administrative details are already working smoothly, if states and localities already have a list of jobs they would like to fill under the law, then a job is created as soon as a man or woman is hired. If the President implicitly or explicitly acknowledges the need for stimulation in January, you could perhaps press this legislation as one of the few devices that can have a quick effect. (Will this appeal to the President? I doubt it.)

The second point I would like to make has to do with the wage to be paid people hired under the legislation. I don't remember what the Act itself specifies. Discussion of employment guarantees usually talks about paying the statutory minimum wage. This has the advantage that it interferes very little with private employment. One must remember that an effective guarantee of employment at a specified wage means that no lower wage can be paid by anyone who hopes

to find workers. The disadvantage of paying the minimum wage is that some of the jobs available would "naturally" pay more. Perhaps some method of job classification could be found for setting wages. I merely suggest this problem needs study.

With best wishes for the legislation,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. SOLOW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Ann Arbor, Mich., January 3, 1972.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I am happy to reply to your letter of December 6, asking my views on the merits of your bill, H.R. 12011, amending the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

My position on this proposal can be summarized as follows:

1. My own present forecast is that the rate of unemployment, based on present and expected Federal policies, is unlikely to fall much below 5½% by the end of 1972. I regard this prospect as unacceptable and,

2. I therefore favor measures which will quickly and directly increase employment, and yours is such a proposal. The Emergency Employment Program has the great merit that its effects automatically terminate once an adequate number of jobs becomes available from other sources. I believe, however, that your proposal to reduce from 4½ to 4% the unemployment level which will terminate the program is mistaken, and I would oppose this part of your bill.

3. I have two reservations. It is conceivable—although I do not expect it—that the Administration's Budget for 1972-73 might involve so large a proposed increase in expenditures or reduction in taxes as to change materially the outlook for economic expansion and employment growth. In that event, your proposal might appear unnecessary or even unwise. My only other reservation relates to the ability of State and local governments to make good use of the expanded funds provided. It is my impression that some localities have apparently still not used the funds made available under the Act. However, I am not in a position to evaluate the significance of this failure on a national basis.

With warm regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

GARDNER ACKLEY,

Henry Carter Adams University Professor of Political Economy.

CENTER FOR MANPOWER POLICY STUDIES,  
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1972.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: In response to your recent request inviting comments on H.R. 12011, I believe that the proposed amendments of the Emergency Employment Act are grounded in impeccable logic and sound economics. Based on the persuasive assumption that the best way to combat unemployment is to create jobs, the bill proposes a direct attack on the problems of unemployment.

The Emergency Employment Act has amply demonstrated the flaws of the conventional wisdom about the snail's pace of governmental activity. Government can act not only as fast but more massively than can private decisionmakers. Within four months after Congress appropriated funds for the Emergency Employment Act, state and local governments hired some 79,000 persons, most of whom would have been unemployed in the absence of the legislation; and many more could have been hired if funds were available. Obviously, much unemployment would have been avoided during 1971 if President Nixon had not vetoed the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970.

By providing a trigger mechanism which would automatically release federal funds when unemployment rises above 4 percent, H.R. 12011 avoids future debate about the need to create public employment and saves future administrations from the embarrassment of admitting that the economy is not functioning as well as it might.

Although H.R. 12011 has much to contribute, it suffers from a familiar ailment of promising more than it can deliver. Although H.R. 12011 may be an effective weapon to fight unemployment, the bill as it now stands lacks the flexibility necessary in a counter-cyclical tool. Section 5 of the Emergency Employment Act would trigger \$3 billion of public employment expenditures as long as unemployment remains above 4 percent, but would become completely inoperative when unemployment falls below that level. The annual outlays for public employment would remain unchanged if unemployment remains at 4.1 percent or rises to 5 or 6 percent. The formula should be revised to avoid the notch problem of an abrupt cutoff of federal aid when unemployment drops below 4 percent and also the danger that the emergency employment subsidies might become a source of inflation.

There is a very definite limit to the number of useful jobs that can be created on short notice, and the number of jobs generated by the federal government should vary with the extent of unemployment. The trigger mechanism proposed in Section 5(b) could be perfected by adjusting the amount of funds released according to the level of "excessive" unemployment. The amended Act might provide that enough funds be triggered to absorb a given percentage of the total job deficiency. In round figures, the "interim goal" of 4 percent unemployment connotes 3.2 million persons unemployed. Thus, at the current (December 1971) level of unemployment, there is a 1.6 million job deficit. At \$8,000 annually per job, as suggested in the illustrative material explaining H.R. 12011, the cost of absorbing the total excess unemployment would be \$12.8 billion. For the federal government to generate enough employment to absorb one-fourth of this excess unemployment, the annual price tag would be \$3.2 billion.

There should be little concern that the need for the additional funds would suddenly disappear because experience has shown that unemployment is slow to drop during a period of recovery. The federal funds could not only help unemployed workers but also provide needed public services.

Provision should be made, however, to adjust gradually to the reduction in unemployment. Consequently, if unemployment drops by the end of 1972 to 5 percent, for example, then the excess forced idleness would amount to 800,000; if the federal government should provide for only one-quarter of all the unemployed, the annual federal outlays for 1973 would be reduced to \$1.6 billion (\$8,000 per job for 200,000 unemployed).

Many unemployed will remain stranded in depressed areas—either complete labor markets for central cities—when unemployment drops below 4 percent. These unemployed will be provided for under Section 6. Here again the flat \$1 billion appropriation might be adjusted in accordance with the formula proposed for Section 5.

The desirability of making every community with a thousand unemployed persons eligible to apply directly for emergency employment funds is also open to question. Although this provision is not much different from the current measure which allows communities with a population of 75,000 to apply directly for aid, it seems to complicate unnecessarily the administration of the program. Under the amended provision, a community with a population of 60,000 would yield, on the average, a labor force of 24,000 and, at 4.2 percent unemployment rate, would qualify for direct assistance. But if

unemployment drops to 4.1 percent, the community would no longer be eligible for direct assistance. Obviously, if the unemployment rate is higher, even smaller communities would be eligible for assistance. Changing economic conditions would therefore make some communities ineligible for direct assistance as their economic conditions improve. Such potential volatility would be a further obstacle to orderly administration of the Emergency Employment Act. The surer responsiveness to local needs promised by greater decentralization must be balanced against the administrative benefits of more centralization. Direct pass-through to communities of 75,000 population already yields some 700 direct prime sponsors. The goal should be to reduce paper shuffling and red tape rather than to compound the difficulties of the federal administrators in helping the unemployed.

The need for job creation when unemployment rises above an acceptable level is persuasive. Such a bill might have avoided billions of dollars of deficit financing which spurred inflation and the current regrettable controls. With the wisdom of hindsight, we can assert that if H.R. 12011 had been in effect two years ago when the recession began it would have been sound economic policy.

Sincerely,

SAR A. LEVITAN.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Evanston, Ill., January 7, 1972.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: While I am not able to respond in detail, I can report general sympathy with the proposal to create additional federally financed public service jobs.

I consider the current rate of unemployment, still as high as 6% by last reports, a major failure of our economic policy. It is indeed a much more important failure than the rate of inflation which has apparently been the major concern of the Nixon Administration. Unemployment means a real loss in current output and untold further losses in destroyed human capital.

The Administration's presumed efforts to meet the problem of unemployment have consisted overwhelmingly of a long run tilting of the tax program in favor of business and hence the generally wealthy owners of business. The equipment tax credit is quite misnamed as a job development credit, will do little to relieve short run problems of unemployment and in the long run may even be counterproductive. Similarly, the asset depreciation range revisions of our tax laws will mean billions of dollars of lower business taxes and hence higher earnings and capital gains to stockholders but relatively little for capital expansion and even less for employment.

While fiscal and monetary policy should be directed to maintaining full employment by a variety of means, including adequate stimulus to private demand for goods and services, I have long felt that government has a particular obligation to provide employment as well as an obligation to provide the public goods, which we cannot expect from the private sector of the economy. We have finally apparently broken the ties of the dollar to gold and in a sense it has no formal backing. What better backing than the value of human labor?

I would argue that the government should be ready to buy labor services at some fixed price scaling up from the minimum wage. No person should be involuntarily unemployed. If he can find no better alternative, he should always be able to get employment from the government.

Ideally, I would have no limit on the amount of such employment available. It

would provide an automatic fiscal corrective to unemployment elsewhere. For the increased government employment would not only relieve unemployment directly but would increase aggregate spending and thus increase the private demand for goods and services, thus indirectly increasing private employment.

It would of course be important that such public employment not be wasteful. There is much in the way of provision of public demand planning for such public production so that public service jobs can prove rewarding to the individual and fruitful to society. There should also be provision of adequate training facilities so that applicants for public service jobs who are not qualified for public services employment or perhaps any other employment can receive appropriate preparation. This training would itself be treated as employment in production by government of the human capital that is so important to long term growth and prosperity.

I hope this is of help to you. Please let me know if I can be of any other assistance by way of correspondence or personal appearance.

Sincerely,

ROBERT EISNER,  
Professor of Economics.

IRVING H. SIEGEL,  
CONSULTING ECONOMIST,  
Bethesda, Md., January 10, 1972.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: This replies to your letter of December 6 regarding H.R. 12011.

Since I expect the national unemployment rate to remain above 4 percent and many local rates to remain above 6 percent in the next few years despite a broad gain in economic activity, I do not think that the country would best be served by the mere revision and enlargement of an "emergency" act addressed to a "temporary" (if not "transitional") problem and promising "countercyclical" benefits.

There is room indeed for a sizable, non-emergency, long-term "public service" job program designed to overcome our well-advertised domestic blights, but such a program should envisage government as "employer of first resort", not last resort. I spelled out this preferred government role in my testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on the Kerner Report in 1968 and in a paper published by the Committee in the hearings on the 1970 Economic Report (Exhibits A and B, respectively).

If requested, I shall be glad to amplify these brief remarks.

Sincerely,

IRVING H. SIEGEL.

#### EXHIBIT A

Excerpt from statement by I. H. Siegel before the Joint Economic Committee, published in *Employment and Manpower Problems in the Cities: Implications of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, 1968, pp. 129-138:

A comment is required on public-service jobs. It is a mistake to think only of new low-skill and low-training employment opportunities when we consider the induction of the hard-core unemployed into the world of work. Actually, significant jobs could be provided for a very wide assortment of occupations and at all levels of skill if the various layers of government saw themselves as the logical employers of first resort, not last resort, for certain services that the private sector cannot or would not normally supply. These new or expanded services pertain to health, education, antipollution, recreation, police and fire protection, mail delivery, urban development and reconditioning, and many other categories of public interest.

Although governments alone are the potential entrepreneurs, they could enlist extensive private participation on a contract basis. These government-operated or government-sponsored undertakings could provide on-the-job training opportunities and career ladders for new workers as well as jobs for better qualified manual, service, office, technical, professional, and managerial employees. But, of course, time would still be required—and a "new will," too—to meet these long-neglected public needs. Thus, "new will" is demonstrably absent to meet perennial, accumulating, public-service requirements in general. The "white society," in short, neglects itself too; it does not tend to neglect the area of the Kerner Commission's primary concern on racist grounds merely.

#### EXHIBIT B

Excerpt from paper by I. H. Siegel and A. H. Belitsky, "The Changing Form and Status of Labor", prepared for *Journal of Economic Issues*, March 1970, and also published by the Joint Economic Committee in *The 1970 Economic Report of the President*, Part 2, 1970, pp. 405-414:

The most significant change that we expect is the emergence of government—federal, state, and local—as a dominant employer of first resort (not "last resort") in meeting critical and social needs. Government is the natural medium for improving the quality of living on behalf of society at large. It is the logical agent of the people for the performance of tasks that would not normally attract private firms. Such tasks may lack clear profitability, or require large capital outlays for long periods, or demand a coordination of opposing interests. Indeed, government could collaborate with private companies in setting up joint ventures of appropriate structure, power, and scope for the achievement of public objectives. Precedents already exist that offer suitable incentives for private participation. Collaborative public ventures that involve more than one governmental jurisdiction are also familiar, and their proliferation could be encouraged by the adoption of various revenue-sharing schemes. Incidentally, although we say "employer of first resort," we do not mean the term to exclude related roles of governmental leadership—for example, as financier or guarantor.

In seeking amenities for themselves through government, majorities would also improve the quality of living for others—and significantly strengthen the sense of community in additional ways. In particular, majorities would be opening up realistic paths for the incorporation of the disadvantaged into the larger economic, social, and political life. Thus, the pursuit of comprehensive, non-crash programs to improve air and water supplies, to revive cities, to make adequate health care widely available, and so forth would incidentally provide "meaningful" training situations and career ladders for the less skilled and less educated members of the labor force. These special opportunities could not be stigmatized as low-grade since government would be functioning as the instrument of first resort for meeting widely recognized problems endowed with new high priority.

The corrective programs, furthermore, would entail the definition of jobs and the hiring of employees over a wide spectrum of skills, occupations, and salaries. Educated social dropouts and volunteers could be accommodated, in addition to the disadvantaged, in work having clear social importance. Furthermore, many initial volunteer tasks could be supplemented with ladders to subprofessional and professional employment; the provision of pay could help assure a sufficient supply of personnel. The new respectability of the entire public enterprise would spread to all the parts.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Berkeley, Calif., January 17, 1972.

The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: This is in reply to your letter of December 6, in which you request my views regarding new legislation which you have introduced to amend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 and thereby create 500,000 new federally financed public service jobs.

I fully support your amendments to the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. I do so for a number of reasons. First, the Administration's fiscal measures will not bring unemployment down to a satisfactorily low level, and it will take a relatively long time to bring about even this reduction in unemployment. Secondly, the creation of Federally financed public service jobs will rapidly increase employment. Third, this employment increase should generate minimal inflationary pressures. Fourth, public service jobs aimed at the unskilled should, in my opinion, be a permanent component of our stabilization policy, not transitory. Fifth, the services created by these jobs are urgently needed at the local level. Sixth, there will be no problem of absorbing this labor with 100% Federal financing, in the range of 500,000 jobs. Seventh, local governments are well situated to reach the hard core unemployed, once the program is expanded enough to reach these individuals. Indeed, I suggest that probably more than 500,000 public service jobs may be needed, given the magnitude and character of present unemployment.

I shall elaborate on each of these points in turn.

Given the Administration's present game plan, few economists expect unemployment to be as low as 5 per cent by the end of 1972. The consensus among 76 forecasts by business, government, labor, and academic economists puts the unemployment rate at 5.3 per cent in the fourth quarter of 1972, and the average rate for the entire year at 5.5 per cent.

Federal financing of local public service jobs works rapidly to increase employment. Most of these job slots have already been designed by local governments but have been left unfilled due to lack of revenue.

As soon as Federal funds are allocated, local governments can immediately begin to hire individuals for these positions. This direct and immediate hiring contrasts with the employment effects generated either by Federal purchases of goods and services or by increased private expenditures resulting from a tax cut. Private employers do not necessarily and immediately respond to increased spending by increasing employment. To some extent, they can reduce inventories, increase hours for the existing work force, and even raise prices to some extent. Only gradually, as employers are convinced that the increase in spending is permanent and as they come more effectively to utilize those already employed, will they hire new workers. And the delays in hiring will be significant as the increase in demand work its way backward from retailers and manufacturers of finished goods to the suppliers of parts and raw materials. In contrast, for the same amount of government expenditure, public service employment would put a larger number of people to work considerably more promptly.

Public service vacancies bid directly for the unemployed, for labor which by definition is in surplus. A general increase in spending, in contrast, bids across the board for all kinds of labor and also for capital. Skilled labor is likely to become scarce while unskilled labor is still in surplus. The increase in demand needed to absorb the unskilled presses on capacity, tends to raise prices and creates new bottlenecks. The creation of low-

skilled public service jobs is an alternative to this inflationary expansion of general demand. It selectively bids for the labor still in surplus, without overbidding for skilled labor. Thus, it is the best way to achieve low levels of unemployment with minimum inflation.

For this reason, public service jobs will also be important in prosperity. As recovery occurs, unemployment will remain substantial for particular groups. I have done considerable research on the dispersion of unemployment rates among different groups in the labor force. For example, the effort to reduce unemployment among ghetto residents to acceptable levels by merely expanding aggregate demand will cause inflation. Certainly, a better policy is to hire many of these individuals directly, without indiscriminately bidding for other labor in short supply. This can effectively be done through Federal financing of local public service jobs. Thus, the elimination of the word "transitional," and the change from 4.5% to 4.0% are completely justified.

These services are needed at the local level. Experience with the Emergency Employment Act in San Francisco, for example, indicates that urgent departmental requests substantially exceed the current EEA allocations. By reducing tax revenues, the recession has compounded the usual financial difficulties of local governments. Thus, there is no danger of make-work.

While there may be difficulties, in prosperity, in absorbing the truly "hard core" unemployed (although I am inclined to think these can be overcome by intelligent planning), no such obstacle will confront the current proposal for 500,000 more jobs. With high unemployment, there are many unemployed who are reliable, competent workers, who are simply victims of the current recession. They do not require special training, nor are they psychologically averse to work. Indeed, the EEA experience in San Francisco indicates that many of the new hires had recently been laid off. Not until unemployment falls much further will the absorption of unemployed labor become a more difficult problem.

Finally, part of our unemployment problem, even in prosperity, is geographic. Jobs are leaving the central city while the underprivileged remain. Similarly, rural Appalachia loses private employment, but many of the people remain. Unlike private industry, local government stays in the central city, and in rural Appalachia. These governmental units are thus able to reach these pockets of unemployment. Indeed, the employment center can easily locate in the center of the high unemployment area. Jobs can be created within reasonable reach of the individual's residence.

Although an important step in the right direction, 500,000 public service jobs will still leave unemployment too high. You might well seek to provide for a larger number of jobs. If the local governments incur capacity constraints, then not all the funds will be allocated. As prosperity gradually returns, some of the new hires will choose to leave for private employment. The creation of these slots, however, will then make it easier to absorb the hard core. In this connection, it is important to recognize that more additional jobs will appear to be created than in fact occurs. This is because the local government will partly substitute Federal funds for local revenues. The Federal funds will "free up" local funds for other uses (purchase of other inputs, hiring of employees at salaries above \$12,000, etc.), including possibly some reduction in the size of the tax increase that would have occurred without the Federal program. While the Secretary of Labor is supposed to prevent this, this is almost certain to happen to some extent. Thus, the increase in jobs under \$12,000 above that which would have occurred anyway will be less than 500,000. This

leakage is not to be regretted, since it substitutes financing by more progressive Federal income taxes for financing by regressive local property taxes. The leakage does mean, however, that 500,000 is an overestimate of the net increase in public service employment to be expected. To offset this attrition and secure a net increase of 500,000 jobs, a larger number of jobs should be provided for in your bill.

You are free to make such use of this statement as you wish.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. GORDON,  
Professor of Economics.

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
New Haven, Conn., January 17, 1972.  
The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,  
Congress of the United States,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: Thank you sincerely for the copy of the Congressional Record in which I read your public-service proposal with much interest. I will take the liberty of sending you in a few days a piece of analysis of mine on the subject (I am out of copies at the present moment).

To me it seems that the main difficulty standing in the way of a reasonable long-run employment policy arises because we become faced with acute shortages in some specific labor categories before we succeed in reducing the unemployment rate of other categories to the desired extent. Basically this results from rigidities in our real-wage structure but while we should be able to reduce these rigidities we cannot in practice reduce them to insignificance.

Consequently, a public-service program would be helpful in the long run only if it were selective in the sense of reducing the excess supply of worker categories that will have high unemployment rates even when we have arrived at low unemployment rates for the most-demanded categories. A public-service program that is not selective in this regard would aggravate the shortages in the most-demanded categories by the time we get down to lower national unemployment rates, and would thus force us to stop at a time when the unemployment rates of the vulnerable categories are still very high.

With repeated thanks for your interesting letter and its enclosure I remain,  
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FELLNER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, BUREAU OF  
ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH,  
Urbana, Ill., January 21, 1972.  
Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I am writing in response to your letter of December 6 concerning the proposed legislation to amend the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. I believe this proposal has a great deal of merit and favor it for the following reasons:

1. There is an immediate need for reducing unemployment and nothing in the present situation indicates that this need will be taken care of automatically by other programs. An unemployment rate of six percent is far too high, and I think that attempts to justify it on the basis that the teenagers, women, and other unemployed workers are not qualified for available employment are shocking rationalizations.

2. Unemployment is not likely to decrease as a result of general economic developments in 1972. Business prospects are not favorable. On the contrary, we shall probably experience the same sickly economic performance this year as last. Enclosed is a short article which I have prepared for our *Illinois Business Review*. It is a critique of the current optimistic forecasts as well as an explanation of why I

believe unemployment is likely to rise in the months ahead.

3. There are so many aspects of the current situation with similarities to 1929 and 1930 that the threat of a deeper recession has to be taken seriously. The economy does not hold steady for long. If it cannot progress, downside instabilities will come into play, and if these are not dealt with promptly they will cumulate to such an extent that it will be very difficult to counteract them later. Therefore it is desirable to have some remedial mechanism operating and capable of expansion in the event that adverse conditions so dictate.

4. Direct employment of workers as in your proposal is the most efficient method of dealing with the unemployment problem. For any given number of new jobs, trickle-down procedures are some costly—whether by tax relief, subsidies, or expenditures on sophisticated programs such as military-space hardware. With the federal deficit running at a rate of over \$30 billion, efficiency in job creation becomes increasingly important. The use of inefficient methods of stimulating employment will result in increasingly greater deficits. This is undesirable because building up the deficit too much will merely replace one kind of instability with another.

5. The experience with the WPA program in the 1930s confirms the effectiveness of the direct approach: When the number of WPA jobs was cut severely in 1937, the economy fell back into a new recession. When jobs were again built up to the three million level, the economy recovered to new highs in 1939.

I should also like to make two comments that may suggest modifications of the proposed legislation:

First, even though the new version is an improvement, we should be concerned not to make any cutoff of the funding too abrupt. Any cutoff on the basis of three months experience with reduced unemployment tends to incorporate the fallacies of pump-priming that were exposed by the 1937 recession. To avoid a setback, a more extended period for program reductions may be desirable, beginning, say, when the national average was down to the 4.5 percent rate—with immediate impact in communities that were then down to 4 percent—but with funds continuing until it became clear that the private economy was capable of sustaining output at a level equivalent to the 4 percent rate. Thus, the "reconversion" period might run for a year or more, or even indefinitely if conditions in the private economy did not meet adequate expansionary goals. Since the jobs are designated for areas of desirable public service, their indefinite continuation would not be unwarranted; rather, they would help maintain more favorable economic conditions on a continuing basis.

Second, by reason of the necessity for making government expenditures efficient, every effort should be made to protect the federal treasury against abuse by state and local government units. The jobs provided should as far as possible be additions rather than replacements for other government workers. I know this is the present intention; however, there are so many ways to reclassify and divert jobs that such practices could become a serious problem. This means that there should be some restriction on reductions of work forces financed by other means during the period when this program is in effect. Regular reporting of employment by each participating government unit, by program and source of funds, would be necessary to enforce this restriction. Some requirements for reporting should therefore be made, and the reports should be frequent enough to make window-dressing changes on the reporting date difficult.

I trust you will find the above helpful and suggestive. Please let me know if I can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

V LEWIS BASSIE, Director.

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
New Haven, Conn., January 24, 1972.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I am very much in favor of your proposal for 500,000 federally financed public service jobs. In my opinion unemployment is the most serious economic problem now facing the country, and even the most optimistic forecasts for 1972 do not contemplate substantial improvement in the rate of unemployment. Your proposal has the special merit that these jobs can be targeted for those unemployed who are least likely to be put to work by general economic recovery.

Experience shows that the unemployment of these disadvantaged workers does very little to retard wage inflation, and by the same token the creation of jobs to employ them will not significantly increase wage-inflationary pressures. At the same time, it is clear that expansion of public service jobs can provide needed and useful social product; we need not engage in boondoggling.

I know this reply is late; I hope not too late.

Sincerely,

JAMES TOBIN.

#### THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION IS VITAL

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR), within the Department of the Interior, has been, since its inception in 1962, a vital and integral part of our national recreation and parks network. Besides having the responsibility for administering the Nation's largest Federal recreation grant program—the land and water conservation fund—BOR is also the principal catalyst for both the coordination and implementation of the more than 100 national summer youth recreation programs. It has been the mission of the BOR to untangle the conglomeration of programs which are scattered throughout eight different Federal agencies in order to make them functional and productive instruments for servicing the public—particularly America's youth.

Mr. Speaker, inadequate recreation facilities ranked fourth on a 12-point scale in a 1971 grievance survey of poor urban residents of cities that were ravaged by the riots of 1967. To date, Federal recreation investments have obviously not met the needs of our poor and urban residents. Congressional efforts have been both sporadic and grossly underfunded, and, most crucially, they have not adequately served those areas where the need for recreational services is paramount.

Mr. Speaker, if these recreation programs have been effective at all, it is mainly because of the overriding influence of the BOR. Although the bureau does not have the power to fund any of the programs and can work only in an advisory capacity, the role they play has been of immeasurable importance to the survival of our national recreation scheme. The sole concern of BOR is recreation and its place in society. Unlike

those agencies who presently administer summer programs, BOR has a vested interest only in insuring that recreation fulfills its intended role.

Despite this perennially late and often inadequate funding, and despite the confusion that seems to surround the numerous agencies involved in recreation support, it is a great credit to BOR and to the Department of the Interior that summer youth programs have been as effective as they have been over the past 5 years. But, the BOR will not be able to compensate for the shortcomings of our recreation system much longer. The lack of city moneys needed to match Federal grants, the costly and frustrating duplication of program efforts, and the inevitable late and inadequate funding of programs, all add up to a loose network that becomes progressively more porous with each summer. Something must be done to consolidate this bureaucratic mishmash. Something must be done to reorganize and reestablish guidelines and objectives for recreation in the United States. If we allow 1 more year to pass without attending to this desperately needed housecleaning, we will find ourselves in a most untenable position. All that will be left for the Congress to do will be to mop up the remains of what was once a potentially effective means of fulfilling a major national need.

#### COST OF LIVING COUNCIL'S DECISION TO EXEMPT FROM CONTROLS WAGES ONLY UP TO \$1.90 AN HOUR A FLAGRANT VIOLATION OF CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cost of Living Council has frustrated the will of Congress by refusing to implement the low-wage worker exemption enacted as part of the economic stabilization legislation. Despite the legislative history, it announced on January 29 that the exemption would apply only to workers earning up to \$1.90 an hour—or \$3,968 annually. The clear intent of Congress was that the exemption be keyed to the level of annual earnings of \$6,960.

The provision involved is title II, section 203(d) of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971 which provides:

(W)age increases to an individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor shall not be limited in any manner, until such time as his earnings are no longer substandard or he is no longer a member of the working poor.

The legislative history of this provision makes it quite clear that the intent of Congress was to define "substandard earnings," and "working poor," to mean a level of income of \$6,960 annually, or approximately \$3.35 an hour.

The language exempting low-paid workers originated in the House—my bill H.R. 11406. The House Banking and Currency Committee report states with respect to this language:

It is the intention of the Committee that this exemption from control apply to all persons whose earnings are at or below levels established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics



in determining an income necessary to afford adequate food, clothing, and shelter and similar necessities. (Report No. 92-14, p. 5).

The Bureau of Labor Statistics 1970 cost estimate for a family of four in an urban area is \$6,960 annually. This was based on 1969 data.

Yet in the face of this clear legislative history, the Cost of Living Council has decreed that only workers earning up to \$1.90 an hour—\$3,968 a year, assuming a 40-hour workweek, 52 weeks a year—will be exempted from wage controls. The Council arrived at this \$1.90-an-hour figure through a tortured process of reasoning. It first explicitly conceded that the Congress intended the annual \$6,960 figure as a definition of substandard earnings. It then subjected this figure to a series of statistical computations, making supposed corrections in the BLS methodology relating to assumptions about typical family size and number of workers in a family. The upshot of this statistical exercise was to reduce the \$6,960 figure to \$3,968 annually. This constitutes a reduction of \$3,000, or over 40 percent from the BLS figure. Congress certainly did not intend that the BLS figure be distorted by the Cost of Living Council to set the exemption at the poverty line. In fact, the Conference Committee specifically rejected any reference to the OMB poverty line.

In enacting this legislation, Congress made a determination that the exemption should apply to earnings which would yield a minimum budget for a family of four in an urban area. It determined that the BLS figure should be applied to insure that those members of the population who were below a minimal standard of living should not be subjected to wage controls. Congress specifically made reference to the widely accepted, methodologically sound BLS budget cost for an urban family of four at a lower level, which provides \$6,960 a year. This is the figure which must be used to define substandard earnings.

Furthermore, the decision by the Cost of Living Council to exempt workers earning only up to \$1.90 an hour was reached in the face of a unanimous opinion by the Pay Board on January 19 that the figure of \$1.90 an hour was so low as to be violative of congressional intent. The Cost of Living Council had, early in January, submitted this \$1.90 figure to the Pay Board and asked for the Pay Board's views on it. The Pay Board rejected this figure unanimously saying:

It is the sense of the Pay Board that the \$1.90 figure recommended by the Cost of Living Council is inconsistent with the purposes of the Amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act and supporting analysis. (Pay Board Press Release, January 19, 1972).

Yet the Cost of Living Council has now promulgated the figure of \$1.90 an hour, contrary to the unanimous recommendation of the Pay Board.

In reaching this decision the Cost of Living Council has broken faith with Congress and with millions of working poor people in this country. It is inequitable to control the wages of the working poor, preventing them from receiving wage increases sufficient to lift them out of poverty. I have called upon President

Nixon to rescind this unfair decision and abide by the law which Congress passed and which he signed.

### FIREMAN'S STORY

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the tradition of the professional firefighter in America represents the epitome of courage and stamina in serving the interests of the community. The Nation's full-time firemen, whether they be from a small rural town or municipality or from the large cities, have devoted their lives and efforts to the saving of lives and property from the ravages of fire. Joseph E. Galvin, who authored an article which appeared in the Boston Globe of January 21, 1972, points up the unusual dilemma which firemen of the Nation face. While Congress appropriates millions of dollars to aid local towns and communities in the problems of law enforcement, there is little being done to aid and assist the fireman who braves not only the physical dangers concomitant to fighting a blaze, but must also brave the collateral hazards of hostility by certain community members, and the malicious acts of arson, false alarms, and actual assaults.

I believe that any Member truly interested in promoting the important role which the firefighter plays in our overall scheme of social responsibility will want to read this article. Mr. Galvin makes a good case for increased concern on the part of the legislative branch in an area whose importance to the community and the Nation cannot be overemphasized.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 21, 1972]

### FIREMAN'S STORY . . . PLEA

(By Joseph E. Galvin)

During my firefighting career I've been blown from the roof of a blazing pier, have had the man next to me on a hose line gasp and die as we tried to advance into a burning tenement, have had a woman relieve herself as we carried her down an aerial ladder from a blazing Harlem tenement in a snowstorm.

I've worked seven hours in a blizzard while soaked to the skin, and had to be taken to a hospital as a result; I once literally tore the arms from a dead firefighter who was trapped beneath a truck.

I've saved lives and have had mine saved several times by my brother firefighters. I've suffered injuries ranging from scalds and burns to a form of "combat fatigue." I've been taken to the hospital, unable to walk, due to the swelling in my heels resulting from sliding the firehouse pole over 20 times during one single night tour in Harlem. I've been in building collapses to assist in the removal of victims when the building was threatening to collapse over our heads and bury us.

I've also been cursed, punched, assaulted and insulted by so-called "toughs" so many times that, incredibly, I'm almost inured to it. I've fought off a group of hoodlums who had surrounded our apparatus and were attempting to steal our tools and equipment. However, and this is quite important, I am not alone nor am I unique. Many other professional firefighters have endured much more than I, and will carry terrible physical and emotional scars to their graves.

To be a member of a ladder company crawling around the smoke-filled rooms of an

occupied tenement, searching for possible fire victims, while three or four rooms are afire in the apartment directly below, is one of the most demanding tasks required of a human being. To be given the assignment of cutting a hole in a building's roof to effect ventilation so that the engine company down below can advance its line, when every enlargement of the hole allows superheated smoke and gases to blast into one's face, demands the ultimate in dedication and raw guts.

The human body is subjected to such a high level of punishment during the performance of these tasks that no one, and I mean no one but a firefighter, would place his body in close proximity to the immediate area. You see, professional firefighters as a rule have life spans approximately seven years less than the average male.

Few of this city's citizens realize that some fire units respond to over seven thousand alarms during the year, and that each time they do the firefighters are subjected to tremendous emotional strain—not knowing whether the alarm will be a tragedy or a false alarm. I've seen some of my men leave their firehouses after the completion of their tour of duty almost disoriented from fatigue and the effects of noxious gases. To respond to over 20 alarms during one night tour and get three or four tough fires, back to back, is a terrible experience. What motivates men to perform this task?

After almost 20 years of working with and observing firefighters in every conceivable emergency, I've concluded that the glue which holds this great department together is a combination of brotherhood and love. The misery, suffering and pain which we firefighters share creates a bond which those outside the fire service cannot comprehend. Wives, mothers, sweethearts—none can intrude into this unique fraternity that comes from being truly brothers. This spirit of comradeship grows from the development of mutual respect and admiration which each man has for another; and is a form of love. And that special love which men in combat develop for one another is indeed a wonderful thing to share in, or even to observe.

We firefighters endure hardships and share experiences which we'll never forget even if we live to be 200. The crucible of arduous fire duty welds us into a tough steel-like chain, which may be strained, but never parted.

In recent years we have all but been inundated by television shows, newspaper and magazine articles, movies and books describing the problems of the law-enforcement officer (all valid) during this era of "crime in the streets." This has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars being granted by both state and Federal agencies to police departments throughout this country.

Doesn't "crime in the streets" and the Safe Streets Act relate to the malicious false alarms, arson, assaults on and shooting at professional firefighters? Cannot we in the fire service acquire the aid of someone to forcefully bring to the attention of our citizens a truly honest picture of the firefighter's life? And death? Does it have to be left to a nonerudite individual like myself, so obviously out of my element, to attempt to get across the message that this noble calling—the saving of lives—takes a terrible toll?

What is needed is the effective spotlighting of the firefighter's problems; the unique skills required of the job and the need for aid—new equipment, research and development programs, a newer type of lightweight mask (the mask widely used now, developed for World War II, weighs 30 pounds and can be used up in less than 10 minutes).

It should be just as easy for a firefighter to attend a course at a university as it is for a policeman, but the work schedules now in effect in the New York City Fire Department make it very difficult for a fireman and almost impossible for an officer.

Won't someone please come forward to help us?

# THE SUGAR ACT PROVES ITS VALUE

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the world's sugar crop is short. The supply is very tight. With sugar being a basic food needed by virtually every person in the world, world prices have soared. In some areas it has more than doubled. Prices might soar to even greater heights. Many nations and many people will feel the high price and the shortage.

Thanks to the National Sugar Act, the sugar situation in the United States is normal. The supply is adequate. The price in our marketplaces is reasonably steady. We will not feel the current shortage.

This is the very situation that the Sugar Act, which was first enacted many years ago, was designed to bring about in the United States—a guaranteed steady supply at reasonably steady prices. Contrary to the criticisms of a few—some who do not understand the act, others who simply refuse to understand it and others who demagog over the legislation every time it is before the Congress—the Sugar Act has once again proved its worth and great value to the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include a report of the world supply and market situation which appeared in the New York Times on January 23, 1972, entitled "Sugar Price Soars." In this article the matter I have just dealt with is reported in further detail. The article follows:

## SUGAR PRICE SOARS

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

If commodity price charts were fever thermometers, the almost vertical rise in sugar prices in the four recent weeks would spell disaster. As a matter of fact, it indicates that the world is thriving.

Demand for sugar increases about 3 per cent a year, and this year will be no exception. The increase may even be about 4 per cent, despite discouragingly high world sugar prices.

Sugar is a basic food needed by virtually every person in the world. Its use measures to a certain extent living standards because sugar also goes into such consumer items as chocolate candy ("cocoa plus sugar"), soft drinks, dessert and other food extras that make life more enjoyable for many. And this is not even to mention the inevitable sugar in coffee cups.

Why the sudden price increase that took world sugar quotations from about 5.1 cents a pound for nearby delivery early in December to 8.97 cents on Jan. 5? This was more than double the year's low in 1971 of about 4.25 cents a pound.

A multitude of factors conspired to propel the price upwards, to the amazement of many sugar experts, who hadn't seen such a rise since 1963. Even then the rise did not occur within such a short space of time.

The chief reasons:

Every year Cuba is inclined to exaggerate her crop estimates, and a guessing game begins. The current consensus is that Cuba, which has begun to harvest its cane sugar, cannot expect more than 4.5 to 4.6 million metric tons. Lack of experienced cane cutters, overaged equipment and other factors have cut Cuban production well below the yearly 8 to 10 million tons it would like to produce. The Soviet Union the world's largest sugar producer (beet sugar) and Cuba's major buyer, has had a "shortfall" this year, not a disas-

ter but a smaller crop than expected. In bountiful years, the Soviet Union buys Cuban sugar and "dumps" it on the world market where possible. However, just a few weeks ago it surprised the experts by placing a big order for sugar for nearby delivery in Brazil. According to Farr, Whitlock & Dixon, a large sugar brokerage firm, about 350,000 tons are being shipped or will be shipped soon to the Soviet Union from Brazil and some Caribbean countries. In addition, Fabio Freyre, the company's vice president, speaks of 115,000 tons bought from Australia.

Other Eastern European nations have been buying more sugar, perhaps to satisfy growing insistence for more consumer items such as candy and soft drinks.

The quick flareup in Pakistan also impelled world sugar prices upward. Generally wars make sugar buyers nervous because of shipping space problems.

Dollar devaluation wrought an upswing in world commodity prices, including sugar.

World production has not been keeping pace with demand. In some nations land values have been increasing for real estate and industrial use so much that it is more profitable to build on land than to harvest sugar.

To confuse matters, F. O. Licht, the world sugar statistical firm, and the Department of Agriculture have been quite far apart in sugar production estimates, with one putting the 1971-1972 output at 74.8 million tons and the other insisting on 72.4 million tons. Consumption figures have been put at about 78 million.

Carryover stocks could run about 18 million tons, but much of this might not be available to the world market.

Where does this leave the United States consumers? With very little to worry about. For years the United States has operated under a Sugar Act that provides a flexible quota system for imported sugar based on demand and target prices. It also sets limits on the amount of homegrown beet and cane sugar that can be used domestically.

It is designed to help underdeveloped nations friendly to the United States by assuring them good prices, usually over the world level, and a stable market for their sugar. So, while world sugar prices were zooming the past year's range for United States sugar was about 8.67 to 9.16 cents a pound.

As the price rises the Secretary of Agriculture increases the quota to help depress it and to meet demand. Recently, for example, he raised the quota by some 400,000 tons. Other major nations such as Great Britain and France also have such arrangements to help underdeveloped sugar-producing nations.

While some suppliers might complain at having to supply sugar here when world prices are so high, they won't be likely to renege because that would "jeopardize" the continuation of the Sugar Act, according to Bache & Co.

After all, the beet and cane growers in this country clamor for larger shares of the total United States market.

World sugar prices at today's high level naturally are vulnerable to a fast turnaround. However, C. Czarnikow, London sugar brokers, said recently that "the outlook is one of increasing tightness." High prices, however, eventually discourage some buying and encourage greater production efforts.

A look back at 1963 shows that prices rose with roller-coaster sharpness in about two months from about 6.7 cents a pound to just under 14 cents, and then plummeted to about 6.2 cents in a few more months.

## FCC REINSTITUTES INVESTIGATION OF A.T. & T.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from New York, where telephone rates are skyrocketing, I am encouraged by the Federal Communication Commission's apparent renewed commitment to an investigation of A.T. & T.'s internal structure and finances. Such an investigation is essential if consumers are to be protected from unjust increases in telephone rates. Today's reinstatement by the Commission of the investigation which it recently terminated for lack of funds and personnel achieves the immediate purpose of legislation I introduced on January 18 with more than 20 House cosponsors. In that sense, it certainly is a first-step victory.

But the Commission's announcement today does not firmly convince me that this will amount to anything more than a resumption of the charade the Commission has been engaged in on this matter since 1965.

The last full investigation of A.T. & T. by the Commission, from 1935-39, involved at its peak over 300 professional staff. The Common Carrier Bureau of the FCC, which will presumably have most of the responsibility for this investigation, currently has a total staff of only about 150 professionals, only a handful of which are economists needed to analyze A.T. & T.'s internal corporate finances. The Commission apparently now has an exemption from the general White House freeze on hiring. But more than a token exemption will be needed to do this job right, and the Commission is disturbingly vague on that point.

If the Commission now has the power and the will to put together the extensive expert manpower required to make this the vigorous and penetrating investigation it ought to be, as I certainly hope is the case, then this is a most significant and promising development for consumers and the communications industry. That, however, is not yet clear.

The Commission should reassure the Congress and the public, and thereby improve prospects for congressional approval of the requested extra funds for the project, by releasing specific details of its plans for this investigation as soon as possible.

A report on this matter from today's—January 31—Wall Street Journal entitled "FCC Wrestles on How To Push Study of A.T. & T." follows:

FCC WRESTLES ON HOW TO PUSH STUDY OF A. T. & T.: AGENCY, HAVING REVERSED ITS DECISION TO DROP INQUIRY, PONDS ITS NEXT MOVES—CASH AND STAFF BIG QUESTION

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Communications Commission begins this week to face the tough aspects of its off-again on-again decision to investigate American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Deciding to reverse itself and reinstitute the formal AT&T inquiry, as the FCC did last week, was relatively simple. It cost the agency little except the embarrassment of having to publicly change its mind in the wake of sharp criticism of its earlier stand.

But this week the commission begins the process of discovering whether anything except its mind has really changed. The FCC called off a portion of the investigation in December, citing a shortage of staff and



money. Now it will try to do some internal rearranging of staff and money to get the inquiry going again. It also will appear before a Senate commerce subcommittee on communications tomorrow, trying to explain its position and problems. And it will be worrying even more about whether Congress is going to give the agency extra funds.

"Everything depends on whether we get some more bodies around here," says an FCC source.

Debate already is emerging over the significance of the FCC's latest action. The commission, itself, seemed confident of moving ahead with a meaningful AT&T inquiry, noting that President Nixon's 1973 budget proposed an increase in funds for regulation of communications common carriers such as AT&T.

"This will require affirmation of Congress," the FCC conceded, but we believe it is reasonable to expect that we will be able to build up the staff resources of our Common Carrier Bureau and to devote a major part of these resources to the AT&T proceeding.

That position drew some support outside the agency. "The inquiry is going to get back on the track in a hurry," argued one Washington communications attorney involved in the proceeding. "It's the real McCoy this time," he added.

#### JOHNSON IS SKEPTICAL

Others weren't so sure. FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson called the agency's reversal a "retreat under pressure, with absolutely no guarantees that the resources will be asked for and received by the FCC to carry out its obligations, or that the agency's historic willingness to trust all the Bell System tells us has been replaced with the healthy regulatory requirements of testing and proof."

Mr. Johnson was one of two FCC commissioners who dissented from the original decision to drop part of the inquiry. The decision to reinstitute the proceeding was unanimous. Mr. Johnson made the comments in a concurring statement.

What the commission originally decided to drop was the so-called "Phase 2" of its investigation. This was to have dealt with the reasonableness of the prices and profits of Western Electric Co., the AT&T subsidiary that makes equipment for the Bell System, and with the amounts claimed by AT&T for investment and operating expenses. The commission said it would deal with those matters in an informal way, rather than the more costly formal hearing.

The decision prompted intense criticism from several Congressmen, plus a raft of petitions for reconsideration. The commission's decision to reinstitute the inquiry technically was in response to those petitions.

#### AT&T CHIEF RESPONDS

In New York, H. I. Romnes, AT&T chairman and president, responded: "The decision to reinstate Phase 2 is just fine with us. We didn't seek its dismissal in the first place and we aren't in the least dismayed now that it is back on the track."

"We are confident that a rigorous examination of the Phase 2 issues will reassure the public that its interests have been well served. We have been ready all along to respond to the commission's interest in whatever aspect of our operations the regulators might want to look into. We are ready now," Mr. Romnes added.

Sen. Fred Harris (D. Okla.), who sharply criticized the agency's original decision, warned that its latest action could become a "hollow victory" unless the FCC gets more money and staff. Another critic, Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D., N.Y.), echoed that concern, adding that the reversal "doesn't fully reassure me that this will amount to anything more than a resumption of the charade the commission has been engaged in on this matter since 1965."

A decision is expected soon on the first phase of the AT&T inquiry, which dealt with the rate of return the company should be allowed to earn on its interstate operations. AT&T has asked for 9.5% but an FCC hearing examiner, after several weeks of formal hearings, recommended only 8.25%. The company has been earning a rate of about 8.15% since the FCC granted an interim \$250 million a year long-distance telephone rate increase last January. Still pending at the commission is AT&T's original request for a rate increase that would produce \$545 million a year in revenue.

#### ADDRESS OF JOHN S. KNIGHT, EDITORIAL CHAIRMAN, KNIGHT NEWSPAPERS, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1972, UPON AWARD TO HIM OF 1972 GOLD MEDAL OF ACHIEVEMENT BY POOR RICHARD CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 17, 1972, before the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia, the Honorable John S. Knight, editorial chairman of the Knight Newspapers, one of the great newspaper groups of America, was given the 1972 Gold Medal of Achievement award.

The address Mr. Knight made on this occasion, coming out of his rich and broad experience as a newspaper editor and publisher—and dealing primarily with the role of the press in our Nation today—was most interesting, informative, and stimulating.

Few men can speak with greater knowledge of the subject than Mr. Knight. He has been an eminently successful publisher and a very able, far-sighted, and courageous editor.

Mr. Knight symbolizes, in his own papers, the integrity which he believes most of the press in America today possesses. Mr. Knight clearly sets forth the obligations of the press in a free society like ours and the manner in which, in his opinion, those duties should be discharged. He holds the press to a high standard of excellence, integrity, and performance, but, at the same time, he minces no words in his adverse criticism of those who do injustice to the press in their criticisms of the press.

Speaking on the historic occasion representing the 266th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, great editor and publisher, Mr. Knight's address commanded wide attention in the country. Mr. Knight recognizes the public interest in a free and fearless press, especially in these critical times, when so many are influenced by the press in the discharge of their heavy duties as citizens of our country, and Mr. Knight vigorously presents his views that the survival of our country, as Thomas Jefferson thought, is dependent upon the survival of a free and fearless press.

Mr. Knight also, in his Poor Richard Club address, made some very significant predictions and comments about the state of the Nation. He said:

I still cling to my prediction that the 1970's may well become a decade of maturity

when extremism and anarchy will not rest well with the American people.

And Mr. Knight movingly spoke of his faith in our country—a faith founded upon the dangers we have conquered and the obstacles we have surmounted in our difficult past. He calls for a new generation of leaders who have the dedication, the wisdom, and the courage of those who guided our destinies through many critical periods.

Mr. Knight finds a calmer mood in America today on the campus, in the ghettos—a return to the fundamental principle of our Republic—peaceful protest and use of the ways of a free country for the solution of problems.

And out of our problems, and protests, and crises, Mr. Knight finds an emerging America, stronger, more stable, with clearer vision and deeper dedication than before.

The voice of Mr. Knight is one of America's strongest voices. It commands respect and thoughtful consideration by all Americans.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Knight's able address to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen:

#### POOR RICHARD CLUB SPEECH

I am proud indeed to be so honored by the Poor Richard Club on this, the 266th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

Until today, I had made but two public speeches in Philadelphia: The first in 1946 upon receiving the Poor Richard Club's Citation of Merit; the second just two years ago following our acquisition of the Inquirer and the News from Amb. Walter Annenberg.

And then, there were several private "speeches," such as advising Wendell Willkie in 1940 at the Warwick Hotel against taking Sen. Charles McNary of Oregon as his running mate.

This observation was made on the theory that McNary couldn't campaign and would gain no votes from the great Northwest.

Another "speech" to my associates concerned the fact that Joe First and Fred Chait, representing Mr. Annenberg, were driving too hard a bargain for the Philadelphia newspapers.

My admonition to Willkie fell on deaf ears; my counsel to several of the Knight people present here today was politely brushed aside.

For, as Benjamin Franklin observed in Poor Richard's Almanack, "Who says Jack is not generous?—he is always fond of giving, and cares not for receiving,—what?—why, advice."

So what happened? Well, Willkie lost, and Annenberg won.

But now, at least, we have Fred Chait in harness for the long pull. As a Vice President of Knight, he is enjoined by Benjamin Franklin to "enjoy the present hour, be mindful of the past; And neither fear nor wish the approaches of the last."

As for Joe, the First, I understand that he is carefully "watching things" for Walter, and making sure that we meet both interest and principal payments on time. Brother Jim Knight advises me that if we do this, Walter plans to add another nine holes to his golf course in Palm Springs.

Since I am told that considerable curiosity still exists about Knight—both corporately and otherwise—may I say that I have been a newspaperman for more than 50 years. As with the late Ralph McGill, I have had a love affair with newspapers for most of that time, while practicing and preaching the need for excellence in journalism.

From long experience in newspapering, am-

ple exposure to politics and the world of business, I have developed the following philosophy of newspaper management—as stated to a civic gathering in Philadelphia on January 20, 1970:

We endeavor to meet the highest standards of journalism.

We try to present the news accurately with a high priority on fairness and objectivity.

We don't play politics, are not beholden to any political party, faction or special interest.

Political endorsements, when made, are determined solely by our judgments of the candidates' qualifications for the offices they seek.

I am certain that there are present in this audience a number of people who may take exception to that last statement. But even so, Mayor Rizzo was kind enough to write me a nice letter which said in effect that I was "esteemed as a leader dedicated to the public welfare, as an independent thinker and as a thorough professional."

By way of reply, I sent the mayor my best wishes in his efforts to solve the grave problems facing Philadelphia, an expression of hope which I am sure is shared by everyone present.

Mayor Rizzo also said he felt that "Freedom of the press is one of our most cherished rights." I applaud that statement, but hasten to add that circumstances may develop when "freedom of the press" may need interpretation and clarification as arguments continue to arise between newspapers and City Hall.

As a final note on publishing philosophy, our chief executives and policy makers studiously avoid conflicts of interest. We serve on no corporate boards or committees other than appropriate civic or cultural organizations, and in the fields of education and communications.

Outside directorships can also prove to be embarrassing, as all Philadelphians know so well.

So we stick to the profession we know best—newspapering.

The role of the press in our society is not always fully understood. The chief function of the press—and I am speaking broadly of all media both print and electronic—is to disseminate information.

Beyond that, and I am talking now only as a newspaper editor, well reasoned commentary and definite expressions of opinion aid in stimulating thought.

The experienced and thoughtful reader is able to differentiate between news and editorial opinion, but sadly, a goodly number either fail or are unable to make the distinction.

As I am sure you know, newspapers are not very popular these days. The current complaint goes something like this: "All you do is to print the bad news; why can't we have more good news?" And then, when we have something which by its very nature could be termed "sensational," the cry goes up that "all you want to do is to sell newspapers."

To the first charge, I would make reply that if editors printed only the bland and sanitized versions of the news our critics say they want, who would read us?

As for "good news" and "bad news," we publish a goodly ration of the former which somehow goes largely unnoticed by critical readers who enjoy instructing the editor.

"Bad news," being in ample supply owing to the fact that we live in an uncivilized world of war, uncontrollable passions and the mendacity of public and private men, tends to overwhelm "good news" by its very volume alone.

Beyond that, the newspaper is rightly the conscience of the community—ferreting out wrongdoing and incompetence in public affairs while building constructively through well reasoned and "plain talk" commentary.

We likewise honor the opinions of our readers, listen to what they have to say and endeavor, if possible, to redress their grievances.

Some have attacked us for sensationalism when newspapers of the Knight group were winning a dozen Pulitzer prizes or because we fight against injustice, audit the government at all levels and denounce plunderings by the privileged as well as by the poor.

What really must concern the editors of today is how well they are able to distinguish between the important and the unimportant news. Equally compelling is the ability to interpret the news fairly, accurately and perceptively.

As you ladies and gentlemen know so well, the name of the game in Washington and in every state and local community is to raise serious doubts about the credibility of the press.

In large part, the aspersions cast upon us by the Vice President and other disgruntled public officials are calculated to make us unbelievable to the general public. We should, I think, accept such criticism philosophically while endeavoring to set the record straight at all times.

An editor, who must or should take vigorous editorial positions on the great issues of the day, is not meant to be loved. If he seeks affection and popularity, he should be in public relations. Newspapermen who formulate policy must base their conclusions upon the facts at hand. The unvarnished truth is frequently unpleasant reading since it so often differs from the reader's preconceived notions of what the truth should be.

At times, I fear, what is popularly known as the press media provide, through their own lack of commitment and perception, some inexcusable transgressions upon the code of truth and accuracy. In these instances, criticism is certainly merited and can not be dismissed with lofty disdain from the ivory tower.

In our newspapers, we do more than endure the shafts and arrows of our critics. Critical comment is carefully evaluated as to its veracity, pertinence and justification. It overcomes smugness, helps keep us alert.

As one Knight Newspaper editor expressed it so aptly: "As long as we have men such as those guiding our newspapers—men who are sometimes proud, sometimes ashamed, and never satisfied, we will make tomorrow's newspaper better than today's."

The press—both print and electronic—is certainly not without fault but in its relentless pursuit of the truth, it stands today as the best if not the only protector of your precious freedoms.

Obviously, all readers do not agree that we try to be fair and accurate. And if an editor wishes to avoid controversy, I suggest that he forego tangling with the powerful education lobby and the police department.

Rank and file readers can put it bluntly, too. Just the other morning my secretary handed me this terse note: "A Mr. Paul Stoy of Homestead, Florida telephoned and asked that you call him. His reason for calling? To raise hell."

Yet I point with pride to the fact that it was the press—not the government—which long years ago and since has been presenting the truth about Vietnam, pointing out the stark tragedy of our involvement and demanding new standards of accountability.

How demeaning it must have been for Gen. Paul Harkins, once our commanding general in Vietnam, to have to admit on NBC's excellent documentary—"Vietnam Hindsight"—that he really didn't know what was going on in Saigon until many years later when he read the Pentagon Papers.

The adversary relationship between government and the press is nothing new. It has existed throughout our history.

Fortunately, the press of today is far more responsible than the editors who called

George Washington "treacherous, mischievous, inefficient, and guilty of the farce of disinterestedness."

Or the underserved attacks upon the martyred Lincoln who was described by a Charleston, S.C. editor as "a horrid-looking wretch, sooty, scoundrelly in aspect, a cross between the nutmeg dealer, the horse swapper and the night man. He is a lank-sided Yankee of the uncleanest visage and of the dirtiest complexion."

Even the great Benjamin Franklin, whose memory we honor today, was not without his critics. His biographer, Carl Van Doren, says Franklin "was the target of cartoons, squibs in the newspapers, and malicious tongues."

Today, we have laws of libel and slander to protect the innocent.

With notable exceptions, today's press is not maliciously motivated. An editor may and does disagree with elected public officials without injudicious name calling. Moreover, the offended public servant or private citizen is accorded the right of reply.

For many years, newspapers have exposed the absurdity of so-called "background" and "off-the-record" discussions with highly ranked Washington officials.

These planned sessions are calculated attempts to use the press—either to float trial balloons, or to mislead reporters into conclusions attributable only to "an authoritative source."

Furthermore, the federal government has a propaganda apparatus estimated several years ago by the Associated Press to cost taxpayers about \$425 million a year. This is more than double the combined outlay spent at that time for news gathering by the two major U.S. news services, the three major television networks and the 10 largest American newspapers.

So when this or previous administrations have complained about adverse stories in the press, let us remember that the overly abused press carries about five times as much of the government's views as are presented by the administration's critics.

Our best Washington correspondents are never satisfied with government press releases but keep digging for more information to which the public is entitled. The loudest cries of "foul" come from bureaucrats who have been singled in the journalistic fires.

Former President Lyndon Johnson once expressed surprise that "any citizen would feel toward his country in a way that is not consistent with the national interest."

I would agree, but would also ask: "Whose national interest?" The national interest is not the President's alone to decide.

It comes from dialogue and debate not only at the White House and on Capitol Hill, but in every place in the land where two citizens can meet to speak freely.

On the whole, I believe the Nixon administration has had—if not an uncritical press—at least a press which has not defaulted on its responsibility to print all of the news.

Those who would prefer a fawning press, a press virtually subservient to government—misconstrue and fail to grasp the role of the press as a public defender.

In my humble opinion, the Nixon administration has fared far better in press coverage than Mr. Agnew would have you believe.

I had hoped to have something to say about "The State of the Nation," but President Nixon is scheduled for that role next Thursday, and I would not presume to intrude upon his territory.

But perhaps we can talk about where we are and where we are headed in the question and answer period.

Two years ago in this city, I predicted that despite the grave questions which plague us domestically and abroad, my instinct was that the 1970s may usher in an era of ma-



turity in which extremism and anarchy will not rest well with the American people.

But then came the avoidable tragedy at Kent State, the Mayday demonstrations at Washington, and the pervading sickness which for a time had enveloped our country.

"We have become," I then said, "an ill-mannered society in which rational dialog is all but submerged in a sea of assertiveness. Let us not be deluded by those who cloak themselves in the masks of freedom while forging manacles to deny us our constitutionally guaranteed liberties. We of the press believe in freedom, not repression; and in bringing the truth of light to prevent the darkness of tyranny."

In retrospect, and despite the torment we have endured, I still cling to my prediction that the 1970s may well become a decade of maturity when extremism and anarchy will not rest well with the American people.

And for those who are properly perturbed over the complex problems which now beset us, I ask: Has There Ever Been a Time When We Didn't Have Problems?

The sacrifices made by the Washingtons, Jeffersons, Franklins and a host of patriotic citizens brought this country through the Revolutionary days.

And more than a hundred years ago, our nation was torn apart by a war which turned fathers against sons, brothers against brothers. Yet we endured.

Four decades ago, a depression shattered the security of millions of citizens. Yet we endured.

Today, we are facing some of the most horrendous problems in our history. And yet the most serious problem of all is a loss of faith in our ability to endure as a Republic.

By contrast with the problems of disease, hunger and poverty prior to and during the American revolution, our own vexations stem from the softness of an affluent society.

We are hell-bent on what we can get from the government, and not, as Jack Kennedy said so aptly, on what we can do for our country.

Even during that period when Lyndon Johnson was escalating the Vietnam war and our kids were being killed for an uncertain cause, there was no evidence of any sacrifice at home.

Nor, in fact, were any sacrifices demanded of the people by an administration infected with a super-rich complex.

No, life has never been simple in this country. It never will be. Each new generation will face an array of new problems.

Sorrowfully, we presently have no national leaders with the wisdom, foresight, patience and persuasive traits of a Franklin.

Will they emerge from the new generations of Americans? We need men who not only have faith in themselves but who can instill faith in others by their virtues and qualities of leadership.

Well, there are signs of hope. A few years ago, the mood of America was one of almost unrelieved despair. Students were burning and rioting not only in New York, California and Wisconsin but right in the heart of Kansas.

Routine ghetto riots were so common that we found them on the inside pages. Eldridge Cleaver, Huey Newton, Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Bobby Seale, William Kunstler, Abbie Hoffman and their scrubby counterparts were dominating the headlines.

Today, students are not bombing and burning. The leaders are using an old American device—peaceful political organization. The star of the violent black revolutionaries is being dimmed, as wiser men strive for truth and justice.

Could it be that America is adjusting to change without armed civil combat? Could it be that we bend but do not break? Is the flexibility of our system—and Ben Franklin had a deft hand in that—helping us to recover?

Could it be that while rigid systems collapse, ours does not although it scares the hell out of us sometimes?

Could we liken ourselves to a sick patient? Because a man is sick does not mean that he is going to die, if he has a strong constitution, and the U.S. does have one.

And there, ladies and gentlemen, are some thoughts that all of us might well ponder.

I for one, remain convinced that if we can find the faith and sustain it in ourselves as a nation, we will not only endure . . . we shall prevail.

## CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHOULD BE RESTORED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the President spoke of a "value added" tax to run the Nation's schools. In the following letter to the President, Mr. S. Loyal Frisbie IV, a constituent of mine, expresses the wishes of many in this country that the President not do us any more favors such as establishing new ways to fund our schools. Mr. Frisbie points out that instead of talking about new funding techniques and ways of keeping control of schools locally, the administration should be addressing the problem of restoring control of our public schools to local governments. I commend this article to our colleagues.

[From the Polk County Democrat, Bartow, Fla., Jan. 24, 1972]

### LET'S MAKE A DEAL, PREZ

(By S. L. Frisbie IV)

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President,  
THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PREZ: Down here in Florida, home of sun, sand and the four per cent sales tax, your idea about a classy "value added" (otherwise known as sales) tax to run the nation's schools isn't likely to win you a whole lot of new fans.

We like the sound of replacing the property tax, but with all due respect, Sir, we've been there before.

You see, we had a three per cent state sales tax to help pay the state's share of local education, and the property tax to pay the county's share.

We raised the sales tax by 33 per cent (not one per cent, as a lot of people called it) but we haven't seen any remarkable drop in the property tax.

And we voted for a new corporate profits tax, which is supposed to let us reduce the property tax, and while it's too early to judge that one yet, the property tax still hasn't gone down.

Please understand us, Prez. Us folks down here in Florida believe in the sales tax, because it's something we can share with the tourists and the transient laborers and everybody else who enjoys our state without owning a piece of it.

And we're all for relief from the property tax.

But gee whiz, Sir, we just can't stand much more relief.

And there's another part of that state of the union message I'd like to talk to you about for a minute.

According to the wire services (I couldn't listen to your speech in person, Prez—we're busier than a pepper shaker at a fish fry down here on Thursday afternoons) you figure to put in a national sales tax for education and

still "keep control in the schools in the hands of local boards."

Pardon, Sir, but your age is showing. You obviously don't have any kids in school any more (except for Julie, and she's a teacher, and that's different).

In 1954, the Supreme Court said that segregated schools had to go. Well, Sir, a lot of us down South got uptight over that, but we've adjusted to it pretty well, now. (In fact, Prez, your national statistics show that the Northern schools are more segregated than our Southern ones, but that's a side issue.)

In 1962, the Supreme Court said it was unconstitutional to pray in school. Now admittedly a lot of good churchmen agreed with the decision (and a lot of others didn't) but the fact is, this decision was removed from the hands of local school boards.

Those two decisions, unpalatable though they were to most of us, we've learned to live with.

But now, your federal courts, with their unflagging zeal to do something . . . anything . . . in the name of civil rights are coming up with increasingly absurd requirements that kids be bussed cross-country without regard for their education, their safety, or their simple right not to have their government give them a hard time in order to test some judge's sociological theories.

Mr. President, it's too late to talk about "keeping" control of our schools in local hands. It's time to talk about "restoring" control to the local governments which have always provided the bulk of tax support for education in this country.

You do that much for us, Sir, and we'll find a way to raise all the taxes it takes to run local schools at the local level.

Respectfully,

THINKING OUT LOUD.

## LONDONDERRY MASSACRE

(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, a tragedy of huge dimensions occurred in Londonderry, Northern Ireland, yesterday. Death came to at least 13 persons who were shot by British troops. Fifteen other civilians were taken to the hospital with gunshot wounds, two of them women. It appears from news reports that about 15,000 demonstrators from all parts of Northern Ireland were marching on the center of Londonderry when they were stopped by a British paratroop regiment. The news reports indicate that at first the British soldiers used tear gas, water cannons, and rubber bullets. Then the paratroop regiment is reported to have driven its armored cars through the marchers and commenced firing with real bullets.

The British Army defended the action of its soldiers, saying they were fired on by snipers. This is a common excuse for violent behavior on the part of officials with the authority to control civil demonstrations. At the present time there is no proof to substantiate the charge that snipers fired on British soldiers. In fact, one member of Northern Ireland's Parliament, Ivan Cooper, a Protestant, and two Members of the English Parliament, Bernadette Devlin and Lord Fenner Brockway—Labor M.P.—who were apparently eyewitnesses to this tragedy, have accused the British soldiers of cold-blooded murder.

Even if later evidence indicates there were snipers, surely we must condemn

the indiscriminate shooting by British soldiers. Police and soldiers trained in crowd-control tactics are required to exercise the greatest restraint in an effort to preserve innocent lives and this the British paratroopers failed to do. Too often we have seen those in official authority—not limited to Northern Ireland alone—use their authority in this barbaric way. Two similar situations come to mind immediately: One was the murder by shooting by the South African Army of 72 black demonstrators in Sharpsville in 1960 and the other was the 1965 incident when Dr. Martin Luther King led a civil rights march from Montgomery to Selma. The marchers were stopped by Alabama state troopers. There were no deaths, but men, women, and children were viciously beaten, resulting in 17 people being seriously hurt and 40 people undergoing hospital treatment. The whole world was appalled by both of these incidents.

Tragically, despite Sharpsville, South Africa continues its repressive policy, while in the United States we have at least passed important civil rights legislation as a result of the civil rights marches in the South.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association, made the following demands for change in Northern Ireland endorsed and supported by the National Association of Irish Freedom:

First. That there be legislation providing for one man, one vote.

Second. That there be legislation to outlaw incitement to religious hatred.

Third. That there be legislation to end discrimination in housing and employment.

Fourth. That there be repeal of the Special Powers Act which permits the concentration camps in which are now held 850 Northern Irish civilians.

Fifth. That an ombudsman be appointed.

This same organization takes the position, and all of us should, too, that no matter what the ultimate resolution is of the thorny question of reunification, no one can deny that the Catholics in Northern Ireland are entitled to full citizenship protected by the British crown now.

While legislation has been enacted to put into effect the principle of one man, one vote, and to outlaw incitement to religious hatred, there has been no implementation of those laws; and the other demands, all reasonable, have not ever been the subject of legislation.

I am a sponsor of H.R. 653, known as the Kennedy-Carey bill, which would, if enacted, request the U.S. Government at the highest level to urge implementation of the following:

First. Termination of the current internment policy and simultaneous release of all persons detained thereunder.

Second. Full respect for the civil rights of all the people of Northern Ireland and the termination of all political, social, economic, and religious discrimination.

Third. Implementation of the reforms promised by the Government of the United Kingdom since 1968, including those reforms in the field of law enforce-

ment, housing, employment, and voting rights.

Fourth. Dissolution of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

Fifth. Withdrawal of all British forces from Northern Ireland, and the institution of law enforcement and criminal justice under local control acceptable to all parties.

Sixth. Convening of all interested parties for the purpose of accomplishing the unification of Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, there need not be any more investigations. The facts are known. What is required is action and action now. Until such time as the internment policy is terminated and all prisoners detained thereunder released, those held in what amounts to be British concentration camps should be placed under the protection of the International Red Cross. I have written to the International Red Cross today urging that they make a request for permission to enter these camps.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that these killings will be the turning point in the Ulster crisis. Surely the English Parliament will recognize that liberty cannot ever be eradicated no matter what the force. It is the responsibility of all leaders of democratic nations to speak out and condemn the British Government's use of this callous and violent suppression which is in stark contrast to its own tradition of democracy and liberty.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of the death of a medical associate.

Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of continued illness with influenza.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of January 21, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through February 3, on account of official business.

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through February 3, on account of illness.

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for the week of January 31, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI), for today 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. REUSS, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, February 2.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. REUSS), for 1 hour, on February 2.

Mr. TALCOTT, today, for 10 minutes. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIS of Georgia) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MOLLOHAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR) to include his remarks during the debate on H.R. 10086 today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHERLE in 11 instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. LATTA in two instances.

Mr. KING in four instances.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. PELL.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIS of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GIAIMO in 10 instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. FLYNT in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. PIKE in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in five instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.

Mr. ABUREZK in five instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. MCKAY in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.



Mr. ROUSH.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.  
 Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in two instances.  
 Mr. DORN in three instances.  
 Mr. FLOWERS in four instances.  
 Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.  
 Mr. DENHOLM in three instances.  
 Mr. PICKLE in five instances.  
 Mr. WALDIE in two instances.  
 Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 1, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 92d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C. title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

RICHARD W. MALLARY, At Large District of Vermont.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1500. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his findings regarding the importation of marble, travertine, and articles of marble suitable for use as monumental, paving, or building stone, pursuant to section 351(a) (2) of the Trade Expansion Act (H. Doc. No. 92-237); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1501. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain acts relating to exportation of tobacco plants and seeds, naval stores, and wool; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1502. A letter from the Deputy Director,

Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Forest protection and utilization," Forest Service, for fiscal year 1972, has again been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the need for a further supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1503. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriations to the Department of Transportation for "Operating expenses" and "Reserve training" for fiscal year 1972, have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1504. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting the report of the 1971 quadrennial review of military compensation, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1008(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1505. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the surplus T-boat, Hull No. T-513, to the Department of General Services of the State of Illinois, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the submarine U.S.S. *Requin* (SS 481) to the city of Tampa, Fla., pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1507. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), transmitting the Department of the Navy's semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over, covering the period ended December 31, 1971 pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1508. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1509. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of Department of Labor activities in connection with the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, covering 1971, pursuant to section 13 of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1510. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the 24th annual report of the Service, covering the fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1511. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the Agency's 36th semiannual report, covering the period ended June 30, 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1512. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the quarterly report on deliveries of excess defense articles at acquisition cost and at the value specified in section 8(c) of Public Law 91-672, covering the first quarter of fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 8(d) of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1513. A letter from the president and chairman, Little League Baseball, Inc., transmitting the audit of financial statements and annual report of Little League Baseball, Inc., for 1971, pursuant to Public Law 88-378; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and

aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1515. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions in the Library of Congress, covering calendar year 1971, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1516. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the FBI during 1971, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1517. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 24, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1518. A letter from the Federal Cochairman, Four Corners Regional Commission, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Commission, pursuant to section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

1519. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1520. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain distributions and sales pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1521. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council on the medicare program for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 1867 (b) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1522. A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 1971 annual report of the Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

#### RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1523. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the National Flood Insurance Program, Federal Insurance Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 92-238); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1524. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ways to increase U.S. exports under the trade opportunities program implemented by the Departments of State and Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1525. A letter from the Deputy Comptroller of the United States, transmitting a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the General Accounting Office during 1971, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

# 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. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1857. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 12736. A bill relating to the nullification of certain criminal records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12737. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical or mental handicap in federally assisted programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DANIELSON, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 12738. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, control multinational corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12739. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GAIMO, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 12740. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide benefits to survivors of police officers, firemen, and correction officers killed in the line of duty, and to police officers, firemen, and correction officers who are disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. JONES of Alabama, and Mr. HARSEHA):

H.R. 12741. A bill to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 12742. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide for the establishment of a National Center for the Homebound; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas (for himself, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 12743. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12744. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which relate to the checkoff procedure for financing presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 12745. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12746. 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. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 12747. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 12748. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BARING, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. MCKEVITT):

H.R. 12749. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1973 to delete section 6(d) of the Saline Water Conversion Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 12750. A bill to provide for the control of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself and Mr. DULSKI):

H.R. 12751. A bill to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act until June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 12752. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 12753. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 12754. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish procedures designed to balance reasonable power needs and reasonable environmental factors in planning and authorizing the construction and operation of bulk electric power facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADELLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H.R. 12756. A bill to promote research and development of drugs or chemical compounds for use in the cure, prevention, or treatment

of heroin addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 12757. A bill to establish minimum prisoner treatment standards for prisons in the United States and to create an agency to hear complaints arising from alleged infractions of such standards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12758. A bill making an appropriation to the Federal Communications Commission to carry out an investigation of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 12759. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business or any business, having 25 or less employees, in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 12760. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12761. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 12762. A bill to raise the Veterans' Administration to the status of an executive department of the Government to be known as the "Department of Veterans' Affairs"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12763. A bill to provide that Interstate Route No. 70 shall be known as the "Disabled American Veterans Memorial Highway"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 12764. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 12765. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 12766. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to exempt from its coverage individuals whose annual earnings are below \$10,000, except with respect to the portion of any increase which raises their annual earnings above \$10,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12767. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 1036. Joint resolution to amend title 5, United States Code, in order to designate November 11 of each year as "Veterans Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.J. Res. 1037. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week begin-



ning October 22, 1972, as "National Records Management Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ABOW-REZK, Mr. HICKS of Washington, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.J. Res. 1038. Joint resolution to suspend for 80 days the continuation of any strike or lockout arising out of the labor dispute between the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.J. Res. 1039. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure the right of States to establish and prescribe the powers of their local educational agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H. Res. 788. Resolution relating to the authority of certain standing committees of the House of Representatives to meet while it is in session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 789. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on House Administration.

L. Prouty, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT introduced a bill (H.R. 12768) for the relief of U.S. Forgecraft Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

182. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Spokane, Wash., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

301. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relative to the death of U.S. Senator Winston

## SENATE—Monday, January 31, 1972

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the source of all power and the giver of all wisdom, we lift our eyes upward to behold Thy holiness, we turn our eyes outward and behold the world's need, we look inward and feel our need of Thee. Qualify us for service by the gift of clean hands and pure hearts and souls receptive to the guidance of Thy spirit. Keep the humblest and the mightiest among us under the shelter of Thy grace that as "one nation under God" we may further the coming of Thy kingdom. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 28, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. JAMES L. BUCKLEY, a Senator from the State of New York, attended the session of the Senate today.

### WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without any reference to the Pastore rule of germaneness, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 568.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### INTEGRATED PEST CONTROL RESEARCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1794) to authorize pilot field-research programs for the control of agricultural and forest pests by integrated biological-cultural methods which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

S. 1794

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of this Act—*

(a) The term "integrated control" means a pest management system that, in context of the associated environment and the dynamics of the pest species, utilizes all suitable techniques and methods in as compatible a manner as possible and maintains the pest at levels below those causing economic injury.

(b) The term "pest" means insects, rodents, nematodes, fungi, weeds, and other forms of plant or animal life or viruses, which are determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to cause economic injury to agricultural and forest crops to the extent that suppression is necessary.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to carry out, through the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, pilot field-research programs for the purpose of (1) developing and testing the suppression of agricultural and forest pests by the employment of integrated control methods, (2) determining the economic and environmental consequences of predicting and modifying agricultural and forest pest occurrences through utilization of integrated control methods, and (3) developing methods of collecting, handling, and interpreting data obtained from such field research.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse farmers and ranchers for any losses sustained by them as a result of any research authorized under this Act being conducted on their lands, crops, or livestock.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of \$2,000,000, and such sum as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of \$2,000,000, and such sum as

may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of expanding its fundamental research on integrated control principles and techniques to suppress agricultural and forest pests.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize pilot field-research programs for the suppression of agricultural and forest pests by integrated control methods."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-595), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill—

(1) directs the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out pilot field research programs in integrated methods of controlling agricultural and forest pests;

(2) authorizes him to reimburse farmers for losses sustained as a result of such research being conducted on their lands, crops, or livestock; and

(3) authorizes expanded research on integrated control by the National Science Foundation.

### HEARINGS

Hearings were conducted on this bill by the Committee's Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation on September 30 and October 1, 1971. Witnesses were generally favorable. The hearings have been printed.

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to develop and encourage the use of a wide variety of pest control measures which will result in protection of the environment, the continued production of high quality foods and other agricultural commodities in abundant quantity, and reduction in the cost of producing such commodities. Such measures would include the use of insect predators, parasites, pathogens, insect sterilization, attractants, hormones, varieties of crops resistant to insect and diseases, crop morphology, chemicals, and various combinations of such techniques for integrated control of pests.

The following abstracts from the testimony of witnesses for the Department of Agriculture appearing at pages 12 through