

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 3, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Not by might, nor by power but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.—Zachariah 4: 6.*

Almighty God, in the quiet of this moment we turn to Thee ere we face the responsibilities of this day. Give wisdom to our minds, courage to our hearts, faith to our spirits that we may lead our Nation in right paths and along ways that lead to peace and justice for all.

Grant that our greatness may be in our goodness, our strength in our spirit, and our faith bear the fruit of righteousness and good will: to the glory of Thy holy name. 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.

## VICTOR SHOULD REBUILD AND REFINANCE THE LOSER

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I received this interesting suggestion from one of my constituents this morning, and I would like for all the Members to know it:

P.S.—Please tell the President that he has lost the war in Vietnam and that the winner has the right to dictate the terms, and so he might as well knuckle under. Also, let me remind him, if he has forgotten the postwar period after the wars that we won, that the victor has the exclusive right to rebuild and refinance the losers.

Personally, I feel the President ought to make this offer. Among others as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, when I look at that terrible deficit I think this might be the way out.

## PROTECTING PUBLIC AGAINST CRIPPLING STRIKES IN TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1971, I stood before this body and pointed to the necessity for effective legislation to protect the public interest against crippling strikes in the transportation industry. Today, I again urge this Congress to act without delay on the problems of transportation strikes.

The west coast dock strike is having a devastating effect on the economy and is particularly harmful to our Nation's agricultural sector. Accordingly, I urge immediate passage of House Joint Resolution 1025 to deal with the west coast strike and prompt consideration of H.R. 3596, or similar bills, to deal in a positive, equitable, and sensible way with the threat—or reality—of national emergency strikes that arise in the transportation industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate action to remedy this situation.

## AGNEW'S INTERFERENCE WITH LEGAL SERVICES

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure that Vice President AGNEW has interfered with a lawsuit brought by the Camden Regional Legal Services Office is a perfect illustration of why we must have a National Legal Services Corporation which is not vulnerable to political pressure.

Since the establishment of the OEO legal services program, its attorneys have combined quality representation for tens of thousands of individual clients with vigorous litigation of test cases in the areas of welfare, housing, education, and consumer affairs.

The enemies this program has made constitute a veritable "Who's Who" of the most backward and conservative Government officials. Mr. AGNEW's opposition to its representation of the urban poor in New Jersey places him in the same class as Ronald Reagan, who opposes its representation of the rural poor in California.

The opponents of Legal Services customarily overlook the fact that it is not a political action program. It is designed to carry out the principle that a poor person should have legal counsel as good as that available to a rich one. The attorneys who prosecute lawsuits such as these so assiduously are not acting for themselves, but on behalf of clients who are entitled to the protection of the laws as are Mr. AGNEW's big business campaign contributors. I doubt that he would squawk as loudly if Bebe Rebozo brought a successful lawsuit against a Government official to enforce his rights under the law.

Political interference in lawyer-client relationships is iniquitous and unethical, whether the clients involved are rich or poor; the fact that Legal Services attorneys are paid out of Government funds makes no difference. These attorneys are employed to represent not the interests of the governmental structure, but the interests of their clients.

A nonpolitical, independent National Legal Services Corporation must be established, and I hope that this will occur in the near future.

## RESTORING CONGRESSIONAL PREROGATIVES OVER NATION'S REVENUE

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced, with cosponsors, my bill requiring that Congress be notified by the President whenever he impounds or authorizes the impoundment, withholding, or deferring of appropriated funds. The measure has 55 cosponsors thus far, and I am most encouraged by my colleagues' interest and support.

In my statement of January 19, I referred to \$3.5 billion being withheld by this administration from programs within the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Agriculture. In the interim, I have received an up-to-date report from the Office of Management and Budget entitled "Budgetary Reserves and 'Impoundment.'" I refer my colleagues to my statement of February 1 on page 2047 of the RECORD.

The OMB report is similar to the replies my staff received when researching impounded funds—inconsistent and clouded. But despite the rhetoric, billions are being withheld for needed projects such as water and sewer in both urban and rural communities.

Impoundment has been practiced by both Republican and Democratic administrations. It has reached a high point, however, under the present administration to the degree where the lives of many citizens are unduly affected. Yet, the practice of impoundment is contradictory to our constitutional provisions and traditional concepts of government.

Passage of this legislation, I believe, would restore congressional prerogatives over our Nation's revenue. It will make the Executive responsive to the will of Congress and to the people. And it will restore the traditional concept of the separation-of-powers doctrine.

I will continue to reintroduce this bill as long as Members express the desire to cosponsor.

The cosponsors are as follows:

## LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Perkins, Mr. O'Neill, Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Abourezk, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Begich, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Burton, Mr. Clark, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Dent, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Ellberg.

Mr. Flowers, Mr. William Ford, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Harrington, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Helstoski, Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Kee.

Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Link, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. Mikva, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Pryor of Arkansas, Mr. Randall, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Roe, Mr. Roncalio, Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Ullman.

#### VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW INDICATES ACTION TO CUT FUNDS FOR CAMDEN LEGAL SERVICES

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, if further proof were needed for an independent legal services corporation, that proof was furnished recently by the Vice President of the United States in the State of New Jersey.

I was shocked and dismayed that the Vice President is exerting pressure with regard to a specific lawsuit in a specific legal action brought by the Camden Regional Legal Services Office.

Fred Speaker, the former Republican attorney general of the State of Pennsylvania and the present Director of the Legal Services accused the Vice President of bringing pressure on that program which he termed "raises substantial questions of legal ethics."

The Philadelphia Inquirer on Monday, January 10, 1972, says:

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew indicated strongly Sunday that he would act to cut off funds for the Camden Legal Services as soon as he returned to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this type of action, not only raises questions with regard to the specifics of this matter but also, I believe, further demonstrates the insensitivity of this administration to the judiciary and the judicial process.

Vice President AGNEW, a lawyer, now joins President Nixon, also a lawyer, in the commission of legal ethical bloopers which any freshman law student would avoid.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. 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. 21]

Alexander	Gallagher	McKinney
Aspinall	Gray	Mann
Bell	Hagan	Miller, Calif.
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	Mills, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara
Celler	Harvey	O'Konski
Chisholm	Hays	Passman
Clark	Hébert	Pelly
Clay	Heckler, Mass.	Powell
Corman	Heinz	Pryor, Ark.
Dellums	Horton	Rees
Diggs	Jarman	Scheuer
Dwyer	Johnson, Pa.	Seiberling
Edwards, La.	Jonas	Smith, Iowa
Eilberg	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Findley	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Foley	McClure	Udall
Fraser	McCormack	Wolf
Fulton	McDonald,	
Galifianakis	Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12910, RELATING TO THE CEILING ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, February 3, 1972 to file a report on the bill H.R. 12910, relating to the ceiling on the public debt, along with any separate or supplemental views.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 7088, H.R. 12186, AND H.R. 12143 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on the following bills:

H.R. 7088, to provide for the establishment of the Tinicum Environmental Center in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12186, to strengthen the penalties imposed for violations of the Bald Eagle Protection Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12143, to provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12089, SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 792 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

#### H. RES. 792

*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. 12089) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse. 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead

of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 12089, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, S. 2097, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 12089 as passed by the House.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LATTI) and to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 792 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 12089 to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse. The resolution further provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections and that, after the passage of H.R. 12089, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 2097 and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and amend it with the House-passed language.

H.R. 12089 would create a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse prevention, headed by a Director with broad powers over the conduct of treatment, rehabilitation, education and research programs and activities throughout the Government. The office would be in the executive branch and would coordinate the many independent programs which are presently provided.

A 15-member National Advisory Council would be established to make recommendations to the Director of the Special Action Office.

The legislation amends the Community Mental Health Centers Act and the Public Health Service Act to assure that the drug abuse problem is recognized and dealt with under their programs and additional appropriations are authorized therefor. Planning grants are authorized for the States.

The total appropriations authorized are \$12 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$181 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$228 million for fiscal year 1974.

This money falls into two general categories, Mr. Speaker. One is the area of research where there is such a great need to find an effective drug to block heroin addiction. In that category, as will be brought out in more detail during the consideration of the bill here, \$20 million is provided to support section 224, which authorizes by grant, contract and otherwise programs to provide research in this area.

Then there is an additional \$49 million in the President's budget that is also in the general category of narcotic research including research to find an effective antagonist or blockage drug to heroin additions. That is a continuing

authorization for this kind of research for National Institute of Mental Health. That makes a total of \$69 million in present authorizations and in the authorization provided here in section 224 of this bill which may be devoted, if the executive branch finds it is wise to do so, to find an effective blockage or counteracting drug that will either counteract the craving in the body of the addict for heroin or counteract and prevent the euphoria which is the reason why the addict takes the drug, that is, because of the sense of good feeling that he has and that all is well with the world when he takes it.

So that is basically what would be available for narcotic research if the House adopts this bill or, at least, if it authorizes the funds in the general area of research.

In the area of treatment and rehabilitation the total amount available is \$289.2 million, broken down into the sums of \$164.2 million in the President's budget and \$40 million in section 223 of this bill and \$60 million in section 301 of H.R. 12089.

Section 223 is what they call a special fund. That is made available to the Drug Abuse Prevention Office headed by the very able and outstanding Dr. Jaffe, one of the outstanding authorities in the narcotics field. He will have control over that \$40 million and distribute it among the Federal agencies dealing with this subject.

Then, for section 301, \$60 million is available for use through the community mental health centers of the country. Then, there is \$25 million that is available to the States and to the general programs that are engaged in the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts.

May I add one thing further, Mr. Speaker, I, in the warmest way, commend the able chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, and the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS, which has had special jurisdiction of this bill, for their diligent and dedicated effort to bring forth legislation which will adequately deal, through research, treatment, and rehabilitation, with the curse of heroin addiction in our country. But I do hope these distinguished gentlemen and friends and the members of their committee will regard this bill which we consider today as but the foundation for future legislation and effort in respect to heroin addiction. Aware as these distinguished members are of the menace of heroin addiction to our country, I am sure we may confidently expect that they are going to keep in close touch with what is done under this bill and are going to call upon their colleagues in the Congress and the executive branch to take such additional future action as the public interest may require in meeting the heroin menace and to take such action promptly when it is required in the public interest. Only that confidence on my part in my distinguished colleagues and friends prevents my offering amendments which would attempt to put into this bill much larger sums in dealing

with the heroin problem which are contained in the Senate bill than are found in this measure.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of H.R. 12089 to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. The time has long since passed when we can afford to treat the national drug abuse crisis in a half-hearted and unsystematic way. Concerted professional action is required. The effects of drug abuse on the users themselves, on their families, and on the rest of our social system can no longer be tolerated.

I have long been a proponent of more effective and active Federal action to combat drug abuse. I have cosponsored H.R. 6732, which encompasses many of the preventive provisions of the bill before the House today. In addition, several of the enforcement procedures I have advocated in the past have been incorporated by the President in the newly created Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement. I commend the President's action, and sincerely hope that he, and Mr. Ambrose in particular, live up to their responsibility. Stamping out the international sources of the narcotics that wind in our streets, and apprehending and deterring domestic traffic, is an essential part of any serious effort to erase this blight. I have introduced legislation in this regard in the past, and hope that Mr. Ambrose and his agency profit from these efforts.

As important as the law enforcement attempt, however, is the second prong of this attack on drug abuse—the preventive effort that H.R. 12089 creates. The Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention will have wide and important authority to coordinate a comprehensive, interagency attack on drug abuse. His responsibility for drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education and training is tremendous, but so is his opportunity.

The necessity for such an effort is stark and overwhelming. An estimated 200,000 to 300,000 U.S. citizens are addicts. The mayor of New York City has estimated that 50 percent of the prisoners in New York City jails are addicts; and, it is altogether likely that an even greater percentage of crimes are drug-connected. It is evident that massive Federal effort is long overdue.

It would be my hope that the Director will follow an aggressive, yet humane, course in fulfilling his mandate. A crucial part of any effort in this area is educating all our citizens, but especially our young, about the hazards of drug abuse. This deserves our fullest attention and support. The level to start at is the elementary school—not with older children who too often find about drugs through firsthand experience on the street. The specter of 12-year-olds, black and white, poor and rich, dead from overdoses should be evidence enough for the importance of early education about drug abuse. When drug addiction has become the greatest single killer of young peo-

ple between the ages of 18 and 35, when an estimated 25 percent of the Nation's addicts are teenagers, early educational efforts are mandatory.

In connection with this, I would like to express my disappointment with a New York budgetary action which mandates that funds for drug programs can only be used for treatment and not for education and prevention. I support the statewide citizens' lobby being organized to insure continuation of educational programs, and I will investigate the possibilities of Federal action on this problem.

The State has allocated \$23 million for the present school year for drug education and prevention programs. But under the Governor's recent budget restriction, funds for drug programs after June 30 can be used only for treatment and not education and prevention. This strikes me as not only an unbalanced, but an unwise decision, especially in light of the evidence of success school officials report for current drug education programs. It seems to me, if I may quote an old cliché, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

I would like to call attention once again to an area of drug abuse in which I recently introduced legislation. We must insure the most humane and helpful treatment for drug-addicted servicemen, many of whom are Vietnam veterans or are still there. We must insure confidentiality between doctor and patients in the Armed Forces. We must provide for honorable discharges for GI drug abusers, not only in the future but, retroactively and for their civil commitment to Public Health Service drug treatment facilities. Of the 16,000 U.S. servicemen discharged for drug related reasons, an astounding 11,000 have received less than honorable discharges. This cruel practice makes them ineligible for the slim Veterans' Administration drug treatment facilities and closes them off from future jobs. Such a situation must be prevented for the estimated 20,000 to 30,000 servicemen in Vietnam alone who are using drugs today. To my mind, our treatment of GI drug users has been an unbearable national disgrace. I urgently hope that the Director of the Special Action Office shares that view and will use his wide powers to extend all the aid he can to these men.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat a point I have made on this floor in the past. We must, once and for all, recognize and treat drug abuse as an illness, not a crime. Acting as though these people are lawbreakers only creates a self-reinforcing cycle that forces addicts farther out of society.

If there is an illness, if there is a germ that must be combated and eradicated, it must be in our social body. The disease is national. If conditions of poverty, despair, alienation and war were not prevalent then drug abuse would largely be a problem of the past. Priorities in this Nation must be reversed so that people, not things, so that earth, not space, so that peace, not war become paramount. In this way, will we research the ultimate cure for drug addiction.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of \$49 million being budgeted but he did not apply the same criteria to the other sums. Are all sums in this bill budgeted—to be found in the budget? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. PEPPER. No, not all of the funds in the bill. However, that will be explained in more detail by the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS). The \$49 million is budgeted pursuant to a previous authorization and a continuing authorization for the National Institute on Mental Health. But I do not think all of the items in the bill are yet budgeted. I think, however, that this bill has been prepared in the closest cooperation with the parties connected with drug prevention and abuse. I will anticipate that there will be a subsequent or a supplemental budget request to embody what is proposed in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the rule is there some reason other than expediency that the rule provides the bill be read by titles instead of sections?

Mr. PEPPER. That is all, according to my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman at the appropriate time, and I suppose this would be the appropriate time, I would like to know why the gentleman has chosen this language which appears on page 11 of the report:

The Director may prescribe any requirements, limitations, or criteria that he deems appropriate with respect to the expenditure of funds in any manner for drug abuse prevention function, as long as those which he prescribes do not conflict with statutory provisions.

I would like to know whether the gentleman construes this language as giving the Director of the Special Action Office authority to regulate the Veterans' Administration budget request or to withhold money appropriated?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will speak on this as we make the legislative history here.

However, my understanding is that the prerogative of the Director, Dr. Jaffe and his able staff is that he is the principal maker of drug policy. If he cannot get an agreement on the part of the Federal agencies and the programs and the programs he recommended, he can make a recommendation to the President to exercise this authority.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia for a further explanation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Insofar as drug prevention is concerned, the answer is "Yes." Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would like to ask one other question and that is whether he has authority to transfer money available to the Agency from one function to another.

Mr. PEPPER. To refer it to one agency from another?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. That would be with respect to his agency dealing with drug abuse prevention, but as I stated earlier, I think it is the intention of the President and the intent of this law that Dr. Jaffe is to have overall policymaking prerogative in the drug abuse area.

Mr. STAGGERS. The answer is "No." Each group has a line item and they must stay by that.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But the answer to the first question is "Yes."

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But he would have authority to regulate the Veterans' Administration budget request and to withhold money appropriated or order the transfer of money available to the agency from one function to another?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only insofar as drug abuse prevention is concerned.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As far as drug abuse is concerned with reference to the Veterans' Administration he has authority to do this under this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. However, he does not have the authority to transfer money from one agency to another?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am abundantly opposed to giving this man the authority to withhold veterans' money that has been appropriated or to regulate the Veterans' Administration request.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PEPPER. 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. 22]

Abourezk	Galifianakis	Murphy, N.Y.
Alexander	Gray	O'Hara
Anderson, Ill.	Griffiths	O'Konski
Aspinall	Hansen, Idaho	Passman
Bell	Hansen, Wash.	Patman
Blanton	Harvey	Pelly
Blatnik	Hays	Powell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Cabell	Heinz	Pryor, Ark.
Carey, N.Y.	Horton	Rees
Casey, Tex.	Jarman	Reid
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Roy
Celler	King	Scheuer
Clark	Koch	Schwengel
Clay	Leggett	Selberling
Corman	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Dellums	McCloskey	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	McDonald,	Springer
Dwyer	Mich.	Teague, Calif.
Eckhardt	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	McKinney	Udall
Erlenborn	Macdonald,	Widnall
Evins, Tenn.	Mass.	Wilson,
Findley	Mann	Charles H.
Fisher	Michel	Wolff
Fulton	Mills, Ark.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12089, SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add briefly that this may well be one of the most important pieces of legislation that this House will consider either now or in the immediate future, because it has tried to make a comprehensive approach to one of the worst, one of the most serious curses facing this country today and that is the problem of heroin addiction.

Mr. Speaker, we have testimony that there are between 250,000 and 300,000 heroin addicts in this country today, most of them young people.

In the city of New York alone, three people a day on an average, will die from heroin addiction.

In my county of Dade in Florida where Miami is the principal city, 48, mostly young people, died last year from heroin addiction.

The head of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Mr. Ingersol, an able man in this field, testified before our Crime Committee that it is his estimate that drug addiction, particularly heroin, was costing this country between \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion a year. I think that estimate is very low.

In addition to that, the authorities tell us that about 50 percent of the violent street crime in this country is attributable to heroin addiction, to the addicts going out and committing crime in order to get the money with which to buy heroin at the price of \$50 or \$75 a day in order to support their addiction to this drug.

We had a hearing in New York a little while ago where the prosecuting attorneys for New York County and the Bronx testified that 48 percent of the cases in their respective counties—the largest counties in that complex—were attributable to heroin addiction and that another 25 percent were crimes committed by heroin addicts to get the money to buy heroin.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with something that is responsible for 50 percent of the violent crimes in this country, something that is taking the lives of so many of our youth and ruining the lives of so many more, something that is congesting many of our courts and costing our country many millions of dollars a year.

It has now permeated the Armed Forces, particularly those of our young men who are serving and have served in Southeast Asia.

So, it is a very challenging job. This bill which has been given very careful thought is designed to provide the money and the means for the research programs through which it is hoped that something better than methadone or better than the other treatments that we are now employing as counteraction drugs can be found and the bill is designed for treatment and rehabilitation programs that will reach into every community in America in order to give them an opportunity to try to do something for these people who have fallen victim to heroin addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I hope that this rule will be adopted in order that this important legislation may be considered by the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements just made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER). This resolution calls for an open rule with 1 hour of debate. The purpose of H.R. 12089 is to bring about the most effective deployment of Federal resources against the growth of drug abuse in the United States by providing for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under a Director having broad powers over the conduct of drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs and activities throughout the Federal Government. In his message of June 17, 1971, the President called for the establishment of such an office, and while H.R. 12089 confers less sweeping powers on the Director than would the original administration proposal, he nevertheless is given substantial authority.

Although policymaking powers of the Director extend only to the so-called demand side of the drug abuse problem, the bill makes clear that in the exercise of his responsibilities he is to maintain communication and liaison with governmental officials concerned with the "supply side," that is, illicit trafficking both domestic and foreign.

The bill also amends the Community Mental Health Centers Act and the Public Health Service Act to assure that there is recognition of the drug problem in the conduct of programs carried out under those acts, and additional appropriations are authorized for planning and evaluation and for the support of special projects in areas where the need is greatest.

Cost: This bill will authorize \$12,000,000 for fiscal 1972, \$171,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, and \$228,000,000 for fiscal year 1974.

The major amendment added by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce provides:

The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress or committees of either House (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of or conducted by the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some amendments necessary to page 13, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), has already indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House that the President has recognized the need for this legislation and in his message on June 17 to this Congress he requested it. The next day, on June 18, 1971, the legislation was introduced, and here we are on February 3, 1972, just debating it on the floor of the House. In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, with the crisis we are facing in this Nation in the area of drug abuse it is high time that this Congress acts and that it act today without further delay, and I hope we can pass this rule and eliminate some of the objections that might be raised to the bill and

get the bill passed because, as I say, I think the country needs it and it needs it now.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. PEPPER. 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.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
February 3, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with a great deal of regret that I must ask you to accept my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

For some time there has been a conflict in duties between my two Committees and the situation has recently become more strained by my assignment to the Research and Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services. I have attempted to give full and good service on both my Committees and when I began to feel that one duty might suffer because of the other, I reached the decision that in all good conscience I would have to relinquish my assignment to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I have greatly enjoyed my service on this Committee and am very sorry that it must come to an end. It is requested that my service with this Committee be terminated as of February 3, 1972.

Sincerely,

C. W. BILL YOUNG,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this, on last Thursday several bills which I had been working on for months, but had not yet introduced, were dropped in the hopper with the names of Members on them who had no knowledge of the contents of the bills or that they were sponsoring the legislation. The bills dealt with the improvement of firefighting and the reduction of the casualties of fire in America. I believe this incident points out a serious hole in the House's procedures which could work to the detriment of all Members of the House. I believe it is essential that we take immediate steps to correct this situation. My inquiry is whether steps are being taken to prevent such a recurrence for the protection of all of us.

The SPEAKER. In response to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Connecticut, the Chair desires to make a statement concerning the introduction of bills.

It has come to the attention of the Chair that several bills have been introduced recently in the names of Members who have no knowledge of or responsibility for their introduction.

Rule XXII of the rules of this House makes it clear that Members, and Members alone, have the right to introduce bills—that is, to cause them to be placed in the hopper here at the Clerk's desk. When a bill is found in the hopper, it has been assumed to be authentic.

The Chair has observed, and knows it has become common practice, that Members' offices often send bills to the floor by messenger or page and ask that they be dropped in the hopper by a page or a doorman. The pages and doormen, of course, have no way of knowing the authenticity of bills which they receive by messenger or otherwise.

It would seem to the Chair that it would be a much safer practice if Members, in addition to having their names typed or printed on the bills, would also affix their signatures thereon. Members would also be protecting their own interests if they would personally place their bills in the hopper.

The Chair feels that the right to introduce legislation is one of the most important and fundamental rights of the Members of this House. It should not be a slipshod or casual practice. In the interest of safeguarding the integrity of this process, and to protect Members against future instances where bills are introduced without their authorization, the Chair is issuing instructions that the pages, their overseers, and other employees in the Chamber shall have no authority to place any bill, memorial, petition, or other material in the hopper unless it bears the original signature of a Member thereon. In the case of a bill or resolution which is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature of the Member.

Finally, the Chair suggests that the Clerk of the House notify all Members of this statement so that they will be aware of this new policy and procedure for the introduction of legislation.

#### SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Mr. STAGGERS. 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. 12089) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

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. 12089, with Mr. FRASER 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 West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, you heard the two members of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) explain the bill and say that it was a very important bill. In fact, both of them agreed that it may be one of the most important bills being considered by this session of the Congress. This is a bill affecting human beings and the health of the land.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) and all the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment for the lengthy hearings that they had on the bill. They held hearings for 20 days and took 4 days for the markup. They heard 110 witnesses. So you know the bill was not just summarily put together and brought to this House in a hasty fashion.

When you hold 20 days of hearings and hear 110 witnesses, you know a lot of time has been put in working on the bill. So I would like to compliment the subcommittee for all the work they have done. I think they have done an excellent job.

The bill came out of the subcommittee unanimously. It came out of the full committee unanimously. A similar bill has been passed by the other body and it was passed unanimously.

The bill which came out of the Senate authorized an appropriation of approximately \$1,800,000,000. The House bill which we are now considering authorizes \$411,000,000 over 3 years, and is one that will do the job. It will bring the many different agencies handling this matter together.

As was stated by the two gentlemen who appeared for the Rules Committee, one of the purposes of the bill is to combat crime in this country and to prevent the degradation of the human being. An example of such degradation was depicted in a picture in a magazine the other day. It showed a boy hanging on a rope, and the statement accompanying the picture was, "This is the kick that most of these boys get." We know our young people are really hanging themselves when they get hooked on the different drugs. That is what we are trying to prevent, and where prevention fails, we hope to provide a cure.

We are trying to combat drug abuse not only by prosecuting those who manufacture drugs, and those who peddle and sell them, but also through research into blocking agents, and through treatment and education, and helping those who have been addicted, in an attempt to keep youngsters and older people from getting hooked on drugs.

I think it is essential now that the Congress have the vision to look ahead and do something about this problem.

We have provided for a combined approach by all of the agencies that have anything to do with drug research, rehabilitation, correction, treatment, and so forth. We wanted to bring them all up to date and to provide that they have a unified approach so that they might have the best program that could be devised. If we would leave one agency out, we know we would have a weakness in the chain. So we have taken in every one of them and have said, "We want to make the program strong, as strong as we possibly can, by placing them under the umbrella." That is the reason for several of the agencies being brought into the scope of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill incorporates recommendations made by the administration to provide for the establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President. The principal purpose of this Office is stated in section 221(a) of the bill, which states that—

The Director shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all federal drug abuse prevention functions.

The term "drug abuse prevention functions" means any program or activity relating to drug abuse training, treatment, rehabilitation, or research.

There are a number of Federal programs dealing with the overall subject of education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, and research in the field of drug abuse. These programs are carried out by a variety of agencies, whose roles and missions differ. This means, as a practical matter, that the programs of these agencies are not necessarily consistent with each other as they relate to drug abuse prevention. Among the programs and activities of the Federal Government in this field are the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, which is administered by the Department of Justice, as well as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The Department of Labor has a drug abuse program under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The National Institute of Mental Health conducts a number of programs relating to drug abuse, both under the Public Health Service Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administers the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970. The Office of Economic Opportunity has programs in this field, and two of the largest programs in the Federal Government are run, respectively, by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration.

The function of the Director of the Special Action Office will be to see that all these various programs are carried out in a consistent manner.

The Director is given the same authority over projects and expenditures in the field of drug abuse prevention as is presently exercised by the Office of Management and Budget, but the bill specifically prohibits the Director from waiving or disregarding any limitation or require-

ment prescribed by law with respect to any Federal program or activity. The administration proposed even more far-reaching authority which the committee was unwilling to provide, under which the Director could have transferred funds from one agency to another. We have limited the Director's authority to grant him the same, but no more, authority as is exercised by OMB.

Some concern was expressed that the Director, in exercising his authority under this bill, might limit or restrict other agencies from carrying out their primary mission. For that reason, the bill was amended to make it clear that the Director's authority is limited to the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions, and does not extend to other programs or activities of the Department of Defense or the Veterans' Administration.

The bill is a 3-year bill, with the authority of the Director terminating June 30, 1974. The Special Action Office is authorized appropriations totaling \$200 million, for the purpose of establishing new programs of drug abuse prevention, research into drugs for treatment of drug abuse, and for training.

In addition, another \$211 million in new funds is authorized for programs under the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and for grants to the States for planning and evaluation of more effective drug abuse prevention programs.

The bill is designed to insure that, in the field of drug abuse prevention, the Federal Government will begin to speak with one voice, instead of a multitude. We feel that this bill will make a significant contribution to more effectively meet the problem of drug abuse in the Nation, and I think the bill should pass the House unanimously.

If there are any questions about the bill, I shall be glad to answer them, or I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PAUL ROGERS, or Mr. NELSEN, the ranking member on the other side, would be glad to answer any questions at all.

The bill is one should have been passed a few years ago. The time is now late. The time has come when we must pass this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think any Member of this body who would read the hearings that the gentleman's subcommittee had, and particularly when it had Dr. Jaffe before it, could not come to any conclusion except that he was arrogant and egotistical. He came from Chicago to be God over the drug abuse prevention program.

As the gentleman knows, I am interested in the veterans program. I think the Veterans' Administration has done a good job in drug abuse prevention, and they are now doing a good job. It is my understanding that there is a stay order on the VA hiring any new personnel for its 32 centers. This causes me to fear this bill as far as the VA is concerned.

I think Dr. Jaffe is going to set himself on a pedestal over everyone, and eventually we will wish we had never heard of him.

I should like to ask the gentleman this question: On page 11 of the report the committee has included language which makes clear that the Director of the Special Action Office may not interfere with the basic mission of the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. On the other hand, the report contains this language on page 11:

The Director may prescribe any requirements, limitations, or criteria that he deems appropriate with respect to the expenditure of funds in any manner for drug abuse prevention functions as long as those which he prescribes do not conflict with statutory provisions.

I should like to ask the gentleman whether he construes that language as giving the Special Action Office the authority to regulate the Veterans' Administration budget request or to withhold money appropriated.

Mr. STAGGERS. I did not catch the gentleman's question. I am sorry.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The question is whether Dr. Jaffe will have the authority to regulate the Veterans' Administration budget request or withhold services out of money appropriated?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only insofar as it has to do with drug abuse prevention functions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, drug abuse is what the bill is all about.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But he does have the authority to withhold money?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, I would say not. Let me put it this way, that if this ever happened and was brought to the attention of this Congress, certainly action would be taken immediately. But I would say to the gentleman, Dr. Jaffe has no jurisdiction to withhold funds, except where drug abuse prevention is concerned.

We want veterans to have the same treatment as the armed services people. We say to every man in the armed services that he will be brought under this protection of rehabilitation and treatment and counseling. We say the men who are veterans now, or in the VA hospitals, should be entitled to the same thing.

We are not giving the Director any more authority than the OMB has today. We want this to be a uniform bill to take care of our veterans, and our servicemen, and those in the ghettos, as well as those who live in the country 20 miles from anywhere.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Someone may correct me if I am wrong, but I think if the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that Dr. Jaffe testified before the gentleman's committee that Dr. Jaffe had authority to do this under the bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. No more than OMB has.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If OMB has authority to do this, why does the gentleman want to give this to Dr. Jaffe?

Mr. STAGGERS. There was very broad authority in the original bill, and Dr. Jaffe testified to that, but this bill changed that authority to limit it to the same as OMB has. The Director of Veterans' Affairs, Donald Johnson, came up and testified on this, and testified they

were for it wholeheartedly. They thought it would be a good thing for the veteran.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman knows that Don Johnson is given his orders in the Office of Budget and Management, so his testimony is not so important. But I have much fear of turning this over to Dr. Jaffe, and from reading his testimony and hearing what he said, I do not trust him.

Mr. STAGGERS. This committee will keep watch, I assure the gentleman from Texas, over what is going on, and if there is any protest, I hope the gentleman from Texas would let me know.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, let me say I appreciate the assurance given by the gentleman from West Virginia to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The committee is concerned about having an effective continuation of the VA program on this problem, and it is reassuring to know that there is going to be some oversight on the operation of this program.

We have in Oklahoma, of course, two major VA hospitals, and we do not want to see those hospitals handicapped or crippled in any way in the overall problem they have in dealing with the drug situation in connection with the returning veterans.

I note in the gentleman's report that the Director of this new agency is going to have a considerable amount of leeway in the exercise of his responsibilities for communication and liaison with government officials concerned with the supply and sale of the drugs, concerned in the problem of illicit traffic, both domestic and foreign.

I wonder if the committee in its inquiries found out anything from the administration about why they have delayed so long in putting additional available Federal manpower on this law enforcement problem? Some of us on both sides of the aisle have been urging the administration for 2 years to give some added authority and responsibility to the FBI and U.S. marshals and other Federal law enforcement officials to beef up this slender narcotics force we have on this problem. The Federal Narcotics agents are doing a great job, within their slender manpower capability, but we could add 10,000 men overnight by giving some concurrent jurisdiction to these other Federal law enforcement agencies. Why it has not been done, I do not know. If the gentleman has an answer, I would like to hear what it is.

Mr. STAGGERS. First, I would like to take up the question of the veterans. If this legislation does not improve drug abuse treatment in the veterans' hospitals of this Nation, certainly this committee is going to be very directly concerned.

We are going to try to see that it is done not only for them but also for every other human being in the Nation.

In relation to the enforcement part, this bill has nothing to do with it, except we want to keep liaison. Last year we passed a bill authorizing 300 additional personnel on the enforcement side.

There should be close liaison between those dealing with demand and those dealing with supply. This bill only has to do with demand, not the supply. The gentleman is talking about something else. As I said, we passed a bill last year authorizing 300 additional personnel.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Three hundred additional personnel would not begin to meet the problem in the State of New York alone, much less nationwide. I have a district attorney in my district, representing several counties in my State, who spent months trying to get a Federal agent into the area to investigate a drug ring which was operating there. They said, "We just do not have the manpower to do it."

Let me tell the gentleman that we are going to have to couple this treatment program, which I thoroughly support, with a strong, beefed-up law enforcement effort in this field. I believe if we do not have both of them we are not going to succeed with either one of them.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman that we are the authorizing committee. Of course, we have an Appropriations Committee, to make the appropriations. The gentleman might have a little quarrel with some of the appropriations members and I would ask him to check into some of those items.

I would say our great faith in this is that we are going to make available to the people of America the very best methods we can to keep drug abuse from spreading, and to stop it, and to get rid of the problem.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his assurance and for the leadership which his committee has provided in this treatment program.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is needed. It will do the job, I believe, because it is targeted to hit the significant problems of drug abuse in this Nation.

In recent years, drug abuse has become virtually an epidemic in the United States with very serious consequences to the health and welfare of the American people. Last spring we were all greatly disturbed by reports in the press and other sources relative to the use of drugs by members of our Armed Forces particularly those stationed in Southeast Asia. We have all been concerned by the great increases in the amounts and availability of illicit drugs, particularly heroin, here at home.

In March 1971 our colleague Mr. SCHEUER and over 60 of his colleagues introduced H.R. 6732, which called for coordination of drug treatment programs within the executive branch. On June 17, 1971, President Nixon in his message to Congress on Drug Abuse, announced his proposal to set up a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. This proposal was introduced on June 18, 1971, by Chairman STAGGERS and Mr. SPRINGER as H.R. 9264. Shortly prior to this action, on June 10, 1971, I joined with eight members of the Subcommittee

on Public Health and Environment to introduce H.R. 9059 which provides vastly expanded drug abuse prevention efforts in conjunction with community mental health centers.

Because of the extent of this drug abuse epidemic and the need for swift congressional action, the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee began hearings on June 28, 1971. In all, the subcommittee held 21 days of public hearings in Washington, D.C., and throughout the country, and it heard testimony from 110 witnesses. I want to compliment all members of the subcommittee—Mr. SATTERFIELD; Mr. KYROS; Mr. PREYER of North Carolina; Mr. SYMINGTON; Mr. ROY; Mr. NELSEN; the ranking minority member; Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SCHMITZ—for their efforts in what was a very difficult job.

During August of 1971, I and several members of the subcommittee made an official visit to the Far East. The principal purpose of this visit was to investigate the sources of traffic in illicit drugs and to determine the extent of drug abuse among U.S. servicemen in Southeast Asia.

The end product of this exhaustive study is before you now in the provisions of the bill (H.R. 12089) which was reported unanimously by the interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on January 25, 1972.

The major provisions of the bill are as follows: Title I of the bill sets out the congressional findings which support the legislation and a number of important definitions. The bill sets forth that—

It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to focus the resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on drug abuse to significantly reduce the incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse in the U.S. within the shortest practicable period of time and to develop a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy to combat drug abuse.

Title II establishes the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention as a component of the Executive Office of the President, and prescribes the functions of the office and the character of its relationships with other agencies. The office shall be under a presidentially appointed Director and Deputy Director and up to six Assistant Directors appointed by the Director.

The key provision in the bill is the mandate that the Director "shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions." In this capacity the Director is empowered to review the drug abuse functions of all Federal entities, recommend changes to correct inconsistencies with his policies, and review related Federal legislation and recommend changes to Congress where necessary.

He is also empowered to make studies of the performance of Federal drug abuse functions and potential alternatives.

The Director is further authorized to review and if necessary, modify implementation plans and budget requests for any Federal drug abuse function.

A Special Fund is authorized from which the Director may fund promising new concepts or methods as well as expanding existing activities for which

there is a particularly acute need or one which has been exceptionally effective. The bill authorizes \$80 million over a 2-year period for this fund.

The bill also authorizes \$45 million over 2 years to encourage and promote research especially in the areas of nonaddictive synthetic analgesics, long-lasting nonaddictive blocking or antagonistic drugs for treatment of heroin addiction, and better detoxification agents. This section also provides for establishing clinical research facilities.

A National Drug Abuse Training Center would also be established.

A 15-member National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention would be established by the bill. It would be the function of the Council to advise the Director with respect to planning and policy objectives and make recommendations concerning drug abuse prevention functions which are or should be conducted by the Federal Government.

In order to supplement the present Federal programs dealing with drug abuse, the bill expands the authorizations and operations of a number of Federal agencies. The sum of \$120 million is provided over 2 years to initiate drug treatment and rehabilitation programs in community mental health centers.

The sum of \$31 million is provided over 3 years for planning grants to States and local units of government. This is coupled with a requirement that State plans submitted under section 314 of the Public Health Service Act—the partnership for health amendments—include provisions for licensing treatment facilities and expansion of State drug abuse treatment programs.

Authorizations for appropriations under section 256(e) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act are increased by \$100 million to a 2-year total of \$135 million for fiscal 1973 and 1974. These grants are meant to be used for grants to States and localities for special projects in areas having the higher percentage of narcotic addicts. This presents a targeted approach designed to serve areas where the need is greatest.

The bill would also provide for the establishment of drug treatment and rehabilitation programs in the hospitals and clinics of the Public Health Service.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the first real effort by the Federal Government to mount a comprehensive coordinated attack on drug abuse. It authorizes a total of \$411 million in additional moneys for drug abuse prevention at the Federal level. At present we have at least nine different Federal agencies and departments conducting drug abuse functions, with little or no effort at coordinating their functions into an all out attack on this problem. In speaking for the administration, Dr. Jerome Jaffe, the President's choice to head this new office, stated:

We can no longer afford the luxury of having each Federal agency respond to one part of the drug problem without linking its efforts to others underway.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly concur with the thinking of Dr. Jaffe that we cannot afford this luxury, a luxury the cost of which can be counted in the lives of the many thousands of its victims and

the monumental human suffering it causes. I would urge support of this vitally important piece of legislation.

We have not come in just with a big money bill, saying we will dump in a lot of money to try to make people believe we can solve the problem overnight. We have tried to be realistic.

We have put in enough authorization for adequate moneys to meet the problems that exist. We have provided for \$411 million over 3 years. We have tried to protect the administrative agencies like the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, by clearly stating in the bill that the bill's provisions will only affect the drug abuse programs of these agencies.

We worked out the language of the bill in conjunction with the staff of other committees, including the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The Special Action Office in the White House has authority primarily over rehabilitation, treatment, and education, and we have also established in the bill a liaison between this office and law enforcement groups, so that there is a feed-in and a conscious knowledge of what is going on in the law enforcement field. If those programs of law enforcement are acting contrary to what is in the national interest, then Dr. Jaffe is directed to go to the President and raise this issue.

I believe Members will find this is a well-thought out bill with a proper approach.

Also, I should like to assure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that we did work closely with his staff in developing this legislation. One of the most distinguished members of the VA Committee, who is a very active and distinguished member of our committee, was satisfied with the language with respect to the Veterans' Administration which I believe he has been concerned about.

We will assure that the authority of the Special Action Office with respect to the VA is limited to its drug abuse treatment programs and the authority is no greater than that which OMB presently has.

There is another point I believe will reassure the gentleman. We have said we are not going to allow Dr. Jaffe to go off on his own. We have established an advisory council to help him and his staff make policy, and have placed on that advisory council the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. So we want the VA to have an input along with the Department of Defense and the State Department as well, to try to make sure we are getting input from everyone who should be concerned with this problem.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House his opinion and interpretation of Dr. Jaffe's testimony before your committee?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I would be glad to respond to that.

As a matter of fact, when Dr. Jaffe first came up he was testifying on a bill that the administration had submitted which gave broad and sweeping powers and where functions of one agency could

be transferred to another. He testified in that hearing on that legislation.

But the committee did not accept that. The committee changed the whole thrust of it. The committee rewrote the administration bill and introduced a clean bill. This is all changed, and I think you will find that Dr. Jaffe understands the functions and limitations on his office. We put in the advisory council and the protective language.

So I think I can reassure the gentleman from Texas that this committee will watch very carefully and keep the Special Action Office's functions within the limitations set forth in this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. How would the gentleman interpret the fact that this Congress appropriated money this year for drug centers and there has been a stay-over placed on the Veterans' Administration for hiring people to staff those drug centers?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not have all of the details, but I understand they have increased the number of drug clinics in the Veterans' Administration from five to 32.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. I also understand all of those are not even presently used. The armed services have not perfected their program yet to refer people to the Veterans' Administration so that they are not even adequately using the facilities they presently have. This causes us some concern, too, and I am sure it does the gentleman from Texas. I think we need to go into this whole problem, and I am sure the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD) who is your chairman on hospitals is very cognizant of this situation and is looking into it.

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

Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned by other Members that this is perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation that this House has handled in a long time. Those of us who serve on the committee do not necessarily set ourselves up as experts, but we listened to the problem and tried to come up with some sensible answers to meet the problem.

Those of us in the House who were at the White House when Art Linkletter appeared and the President asked us to proceed with legislation dealing with the terrific problem of drug abuse I think were all frightened and impressed and became dedicated to trying to do the best we could to meet all of the problems.

In this bill a Special Action Office would be set up which would attempt to coordinate a special fund, incentive programs, and will establish a national drug abuse training center. It will also provide technical assistance to local agencies and establish a national advisory council. It would also set up funds to run the office for the special fund, for research and training centers in the amount of \$160 million.

The chairman of our subcommittee (Mr. ROGERS) has insisted that we make use of what we already have in the community health centers, feeling that they could perform a function and we would not have overlapping functions in this

effort of ours. Therefore, we would harness already existing facilities to help on the total job.

This is provided for in here with a grant of \$60 million for the community mental health centers that we have all over the United States. In addition to this, we have our Public Health Service hospitals and there will be money here for treatment in the Public Health Service hospitals.

We have State plans for mental health activities and they will get some help. Overall, the total dollars involved is \$411 million.

Now, I want to point out, as has been mentioned already, that in the State of New York there were 1,000 addict deaths in the city of New York. Two hundred and fifteen were teenagers.

We learned in our hearings in the committee that 90 percent of the inmates at the Women's Detention Center here in Washington were hard narcotic addicts.

This, of course, presents a frightening problem, a part of which is going to have to be education. Some will be in the area of law enforcement. But, certainly, one of the crying needs will be the coordination of the many, many programs that we have going at the present time.

So, our committee, recognizing that we had about 24 or 25 different programs in various agencies and all of them going in different directions with different methods, there was apparently little coordination among them.

Therefore, our committee has done something that very few committees do, in my opinion, and that is when we sit down for the final draft of a piece of legislation, we do not go on our own and forget about the agencies involved. We have, time after time, called people in from the Department of Justice, the Veterans' Administration, and other agencies for their recommendations and advice with the idea that when we got through the legislation ought to be acceptable to the extent possible.

In the committee, of course, we have to consider the ongoing programs. One that we gave the most attention to was the Veterans' Administration. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), one of our very competent members of the committee, is guarding carefully an agency that is near and dear to him. We had representatives from the Veterans' Administration sit down with us in the drafting of this bill.

I think it must be said that all programs ought to be coordinated. If the Veterans' Administration program is the better one, we ought to buy it nationwide and we ought to build on it and use it. However, I do believe there is need to have all involved. I have faith that our committee, in the event that there is any arbitrary attitudes on the part of those in charge, to see to it that they square away a bit and follow the mandate of or the intention of the legislative process.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say now I believe that this is one of the most important efforts that we have ever attempted and I hope that this bill will pass. I believe it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I must also compliment

my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because I do believe the gentleman has done an outstandingly good job and guards the interest of the veterans for which he should be complimented. However, we took all of that into account.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), a member of our committee, did a careful job trying to convey the feelings of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) in which I think we all believe.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill passes. I believe it is one of the most important pieces of legislation which we will be called upon to consider during this session of the Congress.

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

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

Mr. ZWACH. I must compliment the gentleman in the well and the committee for the work they have done. However, I share very much the concern of the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee with regard to the powers that we are prescribing here for this so-called Director. I am referring to page 11 of the report, near the bottom of the page, where I find there the language that such functions are to be carried out in such manner as the Director may prescribe.

It seems to me that this represents the imposition of a complete direction over the Veterans' Administration. We think the Veterans' Administration's experience in Vietnam in dealing with drugs is very, very knowledgeable in this field.

This language concerns me. I am wondering if we ought not to get some clarification.

Mr. NELSEN. My only answer would be that it has already been answered by the other members of the committee. I believe that we attempted to carefully guard the Veterans' Administration and their budgets and also sought to soften the enforcement language that was in the original bill. Much of the testimony speaks to the original version of the bill. I think that perhaps the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD) could better answer the question than I, and I will now yield to the gentleman from Virginia for an answer if he wishes to do so.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think this is indeed an important question. It is one that has concerned me from the beginning and I know it has concerned the whole subcommittee. After Dr. Jaffe testified we did, as our chairman has indicated, amend the bill. We were then careful to make it abundantly clear that neither Dr. Jaffe or anyone else who occupied this special office would be able to exercise the kind of control that he felt he would have and should have. I think we have succeeded in that objective.

With respect to the question the gentleman has raised, I would point out the fact that we have written this bill without limiting the basic function of the Veterans' Administration in terms of

rendering care and medical service to veterans. I would point out three other statements on page 11 which I think bear upon this point. One of them is that this office will not unilaterally have any authority to prescribe the personnel or the type of treatment that will be provided by the veterans hospitals.

The second states that the Director of the Special Action Office shall not inject himself into the management of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Lastly, it states that insofar as implementation of policy directives which he lays down he shall look to the agencies themselves and the people in charge of those agencies for that implementation.

I think this in and of itself spells out the fact that the Director of this Special Action Office will not interfere with the operations of the Veterans' Administration hospitals, their management or control in the delivering of medical services to veterans.

Mr. ZWACH. If the gentleman will yield further, was there a feeling, or did this gentleman, the Director, have the feeling that he ought to have this exclusive authority and that you have sort of circumscribed it? Is that what is involved here?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I think that was the authority he was seeking. I think we have effectively prohibited him from having exclusive authority, and I think we have prohibited him from injecting himself into the affairs and the management of the Veterans' Administration hospitals or the Veterans' Administration medical program.

Mr. ZWACH. I certainly know of the concern of the gentleman from Virginia for the veterans, the gentleman serves on that committee with us.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas in just one moment, but first I would like to point out that when Dr. Jaffe appeared he was testifying on the earlier bill that had been introduced and on the powers granted to him in that bill that went far beyond, as has been mentioned, where our committee wished to go. We then changed the bill and changed the language of the committee report.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was with the gentleman at the White House and I think the gentleman will agree with me that in response to questions asked by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that this Dr. Jaffe did not have any more information about veterans than the man on the moon. He just knew nothing. Then he came and testified on this first bill, and anybody who will read his answers to the questions, and from what he had to say, will know that there is not any mistake about his attitude toward the Veterans' Administration. He is going to take over everything.

Now they have come along and there is this great increase in use of drugs by the veterans, and yet they still will not put into effect the 32 drug centers that we have already provided money for.

So again I say that I am afraid of Dr. Jaffe.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, it is with great satisfaction that I speak today on behalf of legislation to combat the progressively worsening problem in this country of illicit drug use and dependence. It is estimated that there are now approximately 250,000 heroin addicts in America. In 1970, in New York City alone, drugs killed more than 1,000 persons of which 215 were teenagers. Inasmuch as this affliction knows no social, economic or geographic boundaries all segments of the population are affected. It is past the time when we should make a concerted effort to stem the devastating growth of drug abuse in the United States.

In hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, testimony indicated that there were approximately 100 separate drug abuse programs within the Federal Government. It is apparent that the resources provided for these are being inefficiently channeled and that duplications of drug control efforts are creating waste in the absence of a central coordinating authority.

Our bill attempts to deal with this situation by providing for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under a Director having broad powers to coordinate a national effort against drug abuse. How does this Director accomplish all this coordination? How does he get a hundred separate programs going in the same direction? We hope and intend that the bill will give the necessary authority and clout to force the many agencies of Government to make changes where necessary in their drug abuse programs. The Director speaks for the President in this field and the agencies had better listen. He can suggest substantive changes in policies and in priorities. He can suggest changes in rules and regulations. But the best persuader of all will be his authority to review and modify budget requests of the departments and agencies as they relate to drug abuse activities.

In addition to these direct interventions in the affairs of the agencies, the Director will have available a fund which can be used to support and exploit promising approaches and new concepts in dealing with drug problems. He has a juicy carrot as well as a stick to help get enthusiastic cooperation and forward thinking by the people working on the drug problem throughout the Federal Establishment.

If and when the Director finds some part of the Federal Government not charging ahead as fast as necessary or charging in the wrong direction he has the ear of the President and the support of the President to bring the wayward agency into line. This same close relationship will make it possible for the Director to have great influence upon international aspects of drug abuse and illicit drug traffic.

Another very promising aspect of this new office is the fact that State and local governments will have one place to go in the Federal Establishment to get assistance, information and advice. These governmental units have the drug problem on their doorsteps and need unified rather than diversified help from Uncle Sam.

Besides creating this new coordinating entity the bill also tries to capitalize upon the existence of present programs which can have significant bearing on the drug problem at the local level. For example, we have had for some time now a program to help create community mental health centers. Many have been established and many more are in progress. Rather than superimpose upon this idea a whole new set of institutions to be planned and built, this bill provides that funds be made available to extend, expand, and adapt community mental health centers to the further purpose of providing treatment for drug abusers. Some communities may find this impractical, but many may decide that it is compatible and certainly quicker and easier than starting from scratch to provide separate space, separate staff and separate support facilities.

Federal facilities such as Public Health Service hospitals may also be used and adapted to drug abuse activities. In short, this bill tries to capitalize on everything we presently have that might be useful in fighting the drug problem and bring it all together. We have been thrashing around up to this point trying desperately to get hold of the drug problem. Too often we have been going at cross purposes. With the best of intentions we have been wasting manpower and money. This legislation should give all of our activity the direction it sorely needs.

In order to fund the programs provided by the bill, appropriations are authorized in the amounts of \$12 million for fiscal year 1972, \$171 million for fiscal year 1973, and \$228 million for fiscal year 1974.

It is my sincere judgment that this legislation will help curb the growth of illicit drug use and dependence in our country and I strongly urge the unanimous passage of this bill.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we look at this legislation to understand the reason why, in fact, any bill had to be written. We talk of the concerns of certain existing agencies and their respective drug rehabilitation programs, but I think it has become rather evident to us in fact that the hundreds of millions of dollars that we spend in the rehabilitation of drug abusers in this country have been an abject failure.

To be completely honest with ourselves, if we had to estimate the present rate of success with drug abusers, we would be fortunate if we could reach a percentage of 10 percent.

We have throughout the Federal Government a proliferation of programs in, I believe, nine different Federal agencies that take at least nine different approaches to the problem of rehabilitation of drug abusers.

I think then when we look at this legislation, we should look at it in the light of the fact that in fact we do not have the answers on how best to provide a system of rehabilitation of the drug abusers in this country.

The additional questions of research and education that are included in this bill have received attention from various

agencies, without any unanimity or suggestion as to what is the best approach to take in the interest of this country. This is what this bill tries to do. It tries to set up an agency, and I certainly concur with the gentleman from Texas—I am always concerned about putting that kind of power into the hands of one man whoever that man might be—but I will say that this problem of drug abuse and rehabilitation is serious enough in this country and in 2½ years that the Special Action Office will be in effect, we would have to come to some common understanding on how best to approach the problem of rehabilitation, because we had better admit, as I have mentioned, that we have failed up to this point—and that is what this bill is all about.

The bill says—yes, the Director shall have authority to also try to make a determination as to what is the best direction to go in and then to say—every Federal agency that is participating in drug abusers rehabilitation shall receive the leadership of that action office.

I will say this. If Dr. Jaffe is not the man who does pull it all together, then we should look for another man. But the system, I believe, proposed by the President in this bill is right to try to determine what we should do and how best to proceed.

I want to add this note of pessimism. I do not believe this bill or any piece of legislation we can write is going to solve the problems of drug abusers. But I can say that this is the best effort and the best direction we can take. But then when you look at the supply, I am not satisfied that we will ever stop over 30 or 40 percent of the supply of illegal narcotics in this country.

I will say, I do not believe it is going to be totally successful, but we have to go as far as we can and that is what we accomplish by this legislation.

Again I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) to express my sincere concern as to the Veterans' Administration, and I along with everybody else on the subcommittee will be watching carefully to make sure that the veterans, and I am one, I am concerned and I know the problem—to make sure that they receive the type of concern that you have expressed here today. I can pledge that to you on the part of myself and certainly we have heard that pledge expressed by every member of this subcommittee and, in fact, the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a special sense of urgency that I join with my colleagues on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in bringing to the floor H.R. 12089, a measure which provides for the establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

The legislation represents weeks of work by the full committee and its Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and to my way of thinking it is the most workable machinery yet devised to combat an epidemic which is increasingly infecting every region in America.

What was once a problem of major cities has now become the concern of every suburb and rural hamlet in the country. The drug peddler no longer restricts his operation to a corner in a

shady section of the big city. He has extended his sales territory to the quiet neighborhood streets of suburbia and unfortunately has found a ready market for his product.

The cost in human misery and suffering to victims of drugs and their families can never be measured. For society as a whole it has meant an incalculable loss in youth and their talents. Drug abuse has become an evil catalysis which yearly not only robs us all of billions of dollars in drug-related crime but could destroy an entire generation of young people.

H.R. 12089, which we take up today, will marshal the most effective tools we have available to us at this time to deliver a coordinated attack against these dangers posed by drug addiction.

Under the roof of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, policies, programs, and priorities will be established and channeled so there will be a minimum of duplication and a maximum of utilization of Federal energies, talent, and funds.

There are two sections of H.R. 12089 in which I have a special interest. One creates a National Drug Abuse Training Center. The other provides for grants to States for program planning and projects to meet their special needs.

The National Training Center will develop and conduct training sessions for people at the State and local level, making available information sorely lacking now in individual community efforts to combat drug abuse.

The State grants section is particularly important. In my own State of New York, where the majority of narcotic addicts reside, we are spending millions of dollars and still lack the necessary resources to achieve any kind of encouraging headway in the curing of addiction.

A recent report by the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission showed that between 1966 and 1970, New York State spent \$123.8 million for treatment and yet 81 percent of the addicts dropped out of the commission's aftercare program when they were released from treatment facilities in 1970.

There is no simple solution to the drug plague. Education and therapeutic approaches must be coupled with law enforcement programs. H.R. 12089 recognizes this multipronged need and deploys the Nation's treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research efforts to form a single, impact-producing response to the Nation's increasing drug abuse problem.

I should also like to commend Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and his staff for their assistance in the drafting of this legislation. They have been most cooperative and understanding. I strongly urge quick and favorable action on H.R. 12089.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I must say I cannot agree with the gentleman as to the work of the Veterans' Administration being a failure.

In the first place, I think the drug abuse among veterans has been exaggerated. I just came back from visiting veterans hospitals and if the reports I got are true from the officer in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Salt Lake City, Utah, for example, and considering the number of hospitals here in Washington I do not agree that it has been a failure. I think the Veterans' Administration is doing well. Of course, there is plenty to do on drugs.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not say that the Veterans' Administration drug program is a failure in itself. I think we do not have a total answer in any drug rehabilitation program in this country to guarantee to us that we are going to rehabilitate anywhere near a majority or 50 percent of the drug addicts. I wish it were otherwise.

I do not say that critically of any program. Too many people are agonizing over the proposed solution even though up to this time I might add, the proposed solution is what we hope to accomplish through this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD) a member of the committee.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no problem of more importance to the people of this Nation than the rising incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse. One thing which has become apparent in the long succession of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Health and Environment dealing with matters relating to this subject is that there is a need for a comprehensive coordination between the many programs dealing with drugs and a long-term strategy which will bring together for a common purpose and objective all of the Federal, State and other private programs now attempting to deal with this problem.

In my view, H.R. 12089 constitutes a welcome effort to fill this need in that it will provide the means for needed planning and coordination in the areas of drug abuse education, training, treatment, rehabilitation and research.

The measure will create a Special Action Office in the Executive Office of the President headed by a Director to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and a staff consisting of a Deputy Director, also appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, six assistants appointed by the Director, and other employees, including attorneys, necessary to enable the Director to perform the functions of his office. The bill would also provide for the employment of experts and consultants not to exceed a total number of 15 at any given time.

The bill will authorize and direct the Special Action Office Director to provide overall planning and policy and to establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse programs dealing with drug abuse education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, and research after consultation with the National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention authorized by this bill. In order to insure

the implementation of planning and policy, the Director would have the power to review regulations, guidelines, requirements, and criteria dealing with drug abuse, to recommend changes in the organization and management of specific programs and to evaluate and study the performance of the various drug abuse functions within his jurisdiction. In this regard, he would have the right to perform direct oversight in any department or program for a period up to 30 days and further to make such recommendations to the President as he deems will improve the effectiveness and the functions of programs falling within the purview of his office.

Recognizing the need for research, the bill not only specifically directs special attention to improved methods of treatment and a determination of the extent of the drug problem in this country, but it also places special emphasis upon research for a long-lasting nonaddictive blocking or antagonistic drug for use in treating drug addicts.

Recognizing the shortage of qualified personnel in the drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation field, the bill will authorize the Director to establish a National Drug Abuse Training Center in order to develop, conduct and support a full range of training programs relating to drugs and drug abuse. Obviously, this function belongs more properly to the National Institutes of Health. However, it is equally obvious that the Special Action Office would be in an excellent position to establish the center. Accordingly, the Committee elected to assign responsibility for its first 2 years of operation to the Director of the Special Action Office and thereafter to provide that it will be taken over by the National Institute of Mental Health to become a part thereof.

The Director is given further authority to review and modify implementation plans as well as budget requests and to an extent not inconsistent with appropriations acts to make appropriated funds available to Federal departments and agencies dealing with drug abuse programs. In order to insure that the exercise of this right will be limited to drug programs the bill provides that requests for appropriations by the department or agency of the Federal Government submitted after the date of this act, shall break down funds to be used in specific areas of activity on a line item basis.

By this device, it is intended that those agencies and departments will thus identify, as a separate item, those funds requested for use in drug programs for education, training, treatment, rehabilitation and research. The underlying purpose of this provision is to enable the Director to identify in the appropriations bills the specific funds intended for drug abuse programs, to provide the bases for an overall assessment of national effort, and to prohibit unwarranted intrusion by the Director into appropriations for general medical treatment and services which do not specify funds for drug abuse programs.

An indispensable part of the Director's duties is coordinating Federal drug abuse prevention functions with similar func-

tions of State and local government and to provide to States and localities technical assistance and suggested model legislation. To further that cooperation authorization is provided for State planning funds and the convening of conferences. Furthermore, the Director is authorized to promulgate uniform criteria and procedures for drug abuse control and treatment and to provide an all important central clearing house for Federal, State and local governments and for public and private agencies or individuals seeking drug abuse information and assistance.

H.R. 12089 will provide a vehicle whereby experts in the field, including persons in charge of State or local drug functions can communicate their views and recommendations to the Director. To assure this, the bill will establish a National Advisory Council consisting of a total of 15 members, three of which, the Secretary of HEW, the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, would be ex officio officers with the full right of participation. The remaining 12 would be appointed by the President with the requirement that at least four of them shall be officials of State and local governmental agencies.

The Advisory Council in addition to conferring with the Director with respect to overall planning and policy including the objectives and priorities which are his duty to establish, is empowered to make recommendations to him with respect to the conduct of, or need for, drug abuse prevention functions which are, or in its judgment should be, conducted by or with support from the Federal Government.

The bill contains authorization for additional funds to establish treatment and rehabilitation programs in community mental health centers and authorized similar programs in facilities operated by the Public Health Service, except in those facilities which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined there is not a sufficient need therefor.

Finally, as I mentioned, the bill will authorize a total of \$31 million over the next 3 years for the purpose of aiding and assisting the States in effecting the planning of their drug abuse functions for the purpose of assisting them in planning projects for the development of more effective drug abuse functions and for evaluating the conduct of those functions within the several States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 12089 is a good bill which will provide for the type of central coordination so obviously needed for making more effective our total drug program. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support it.

I would like to address myself now to the second point which the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has raised, a point which I consider to be very important, and that is the question of the Director of the Special Action Office having the right to withhold funds in all drug programs, including the Veterans' Administration.

I am as concerned, as he is, that notwithstanding the fact that Congress has determined that there shall be 32 drug

treatment centers in Veterans' Administration hospitals, we do not have them. Obviously someone downtown has blocked the release of these funds—the Office of Management and Budget.

What this bill does is to put in the place of the Office of Management and Budget, insofar as the release of funds for drug abuse programs is concerned, the Director of the proposed Special Action Office. I do not like the idea of anyone downtown arbitrarily blocking funds, but it does seem to me to be the better part of judgment to place that decision in the hands of the person on whom the full light of public opinion and pressure will shine. I feel that we stand a better chance to have these funds released by someone with a specific plan in mind and a responsibility to act affirmatively rather than the Office of Management and Budget, which has an entirely different objective.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure the House that our subcommittee did what it could to proscribe the authority of the Special Action Office Director insofar as the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration are concerned. We did this by including section 304 in the bill, which provides unequivocally that budget requests for drug abuse functions, and this includes the VA budget requests, shall be by line item. We are thus limiting the area in which the Director of the Special Action Office can manipulate funds, that is, to limit or deny their release by way of denying their use, and we are requiring—and I hope that this will be followed by the Appropriations Committee—that funds intended to be used for drug treatment programs, or, for example, drug treatment centers as separate from the request for funds for the overall hospital and medical care program of the Veterans' Administration. By this requirement we limit the authority of the Special Office Director to drug programs.

I can assure the House and the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that our subcommittee felt strongly about this and that we are going to watch very carefully what happens if this bill becomes law. Should it develop that the Director of the Special Action Office goes beyond what we think he should do and what we have said in this bill that he can do, I assure the House we will consider action without delay to correct the situation.

Mr. NELSEN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER, Mr. Chairman, we face a crisis in our Nation today with the ever-increasing use of harmful drugs. There has been a rate of recidivism of 90 percent of heroin users treated at our best hospitals. Today we have an opportunity to continue our efforts to reduce the terrifying spread of drug abuse by the passage of H.R. 12089, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. Many treatment centers should need close supervision.

This important measure would establish the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse to provide overall planning, policy, objectives and priorities in the Federal effort for drug abuse prevention. The

director and deputy director of the office would be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the other body.

There would be the establishment of a 15-member National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention. This council would recommend actions to the Director of the Special Action Office which would help curb drug abuse in our country.

The Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be ex officio members of the Council, with the other 12 members to be appointed by the President.

It is important to point out that this bill would also amend existing law to provide that Public Health Service facilities and community health centers provide various services for treatment and rehabilitation.

Appropriations for this Special Action Office would be authorized in the amount of \$12 million for fiscal year 1972, \$171 million for fiscal year 1973, and \$228 million for fiscal year 1974.

My colleagues and I on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment feel that it is a good bill, an effective bill, and one worthy of your full attention and final passage.

We in this country need to be able to see a day when drug abuse will no longer be the threat that it is at this time. Let us work to shape our society so that the need for abusing drugs will not be enticing—a society in which each person would feel a desire to face reality, rather than the feeling by many the need to escape from it through artificial means.

By passing this legislation, we can feel that we are making a beginning on the road toward solving this grave problem. But do not let us stop here. We must continue to tirelessly search for answers in this area, and we must eventually seek to isolate and eliminate the ills of our society which might cause some of the causative ills in our people.

Again, I urge my colleagues to pass this excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the subcommittee (Mr. PREYER).

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I take this time—and I appreciate the gentleman yielding—to establish a minor but perhaps, I think, significant matter of legislative history. Section 224, which deals with research and development, subparagraph (3), authorizing investigations in the field of detoxification agents, says:

(3) detoxification agents which, when administered, will ease the physical effects of withdrawal from heroin addiction.

I would assume that would also relate to agents which are already on the scene, such as perhaps the new modality which is commencing testing, involving use of the gas carbon dioxide. I would assume that this promising type or procedure would be covered.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I congratulate all the members of the full committee, the distinguished chairman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for the outstanding start they have made in finally bringing the scourge of drug abuse under control.

The bill provides neither as much funding as I would have liked nor as much coordination and control as I would have liked, but it is a major step forward.

Those Members of Congress who have worked so long and so hard with the gentleman from West Virginia, and the gentleman from Florida, the subcommittee chairman, are greatly to be congratulated.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill. The problem of drug abuse and the Federal Government's efforts to combat it have been of deep concern to me and to many of my colleagues for several years. We have seen and read about the magnitude and gravity of the problems of drug abuse so often that many of us are numb, yet the facts and figures and the fears continue to get worse.

Last year 1,280 New Yorkers died from drug abuse, an increase of 200 from the year before. Each year in New York City more than 1,000 babies are born addicted to heroin as a result of the addiction of their mothers. Drug-related crimes and arrests are constantly increasing in cities across the country.

Drug abuse is literally destroying our youth, overwhelming our police, clogging our judicial machinery, and turning our cities into jungles. Drug addiction is no longer a problem only in large cities, for it is increasingly spreading to suburbs, small towns, and even such States as Alaska.

How have we responded to this worsening crisis? After intensive investigation both here and abroad in Europe, the near East, and Asia over several years, I have been convinced that the Federal Government's response over the years has been completely inadequate. Throughout this century, we have constructed a crazy-quilt, disjointed, uncoordinated, overlapping, conflicting patchwork of programs aimed at parts of the drug abuse problem. No overall plan exists and no administrative machinery has been created to enforce one anyway. Federal programs are feeble and dwarfed by the size of the problem they are aimed to correct.

On March 24, 1971, I introduced legislation with the cosponsorship of over 60 of my colleagues to provide new muscle for the Federal effort to control drug abuse. This legislation would have established an Office of Drug Abuse Control in the Executive Office of the President, with authority to coordinate the plans, goals, procedures and, most importantly, the budgets of every Federal program in the field of drug abuse. This call for coordination was not original with me.

In 1903, when Federal programs were nowhere near as extensive as they are today, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic Drug Abuse—the Prettyman Commission—recommended that the President appoint a Special Assistant for Narcotic and Drug Abuse from the White House to provide continuous advice and assistance in launching a coordinated attack on the problem. The drug problem has ballooned since 1903, as have the Federal Government's antidrug abuse programs, but our efforts are as fragmented and uncoordinated as ever.

I carried this message and my legislation all over Washington soliciting suggestions and support. I spoke to officials in and out of the executive branch. Finally, the President sent a special message to the Congress on June 17, 1971, calling for the establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President, citing the fragmentation of the Federal effort which had led, in the words of the President, "to lack of communication, multiple authority and limited and dispersed resources."

I have been and I remain critical of some features of the President's proposal, but to applaud him for the additional momentum his administration has given to a comprehensive overhaul of the Nation's drug programs. The administration proposal has been rewritten by no less than three subcommittees of two standing committees of the Senate and then passed by the Senate. The bill we have before us today is a further rewrite of the Senate version of the President's bill by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment under the distinguished leadership of Representative PAUL ROGERS of Florida.

H.R. 12089 is a good, strong bill in many ways.

It establishes an office with what I hope are sufficient but not excessive powers to provide the planning, the policymaking, the goal-setting, resource-allocation, and coordinating that Federal drug programs so desperately need.

It establishes a special fund for the use of the Director of SAODAP to augment existing treatment programs or to establish new ones.

It authorizes planning grants for the States to draw up plans of attack on drug abuse and the administrative machinery to run them.

It greatly increases the funds for pharmacological research into non-addictive synthetic analgesics to replace opium and its derivatives in medical use, as well as research on long-lasting, non-addictive blocking drugs and detoxification agents. I have long urged a great expansion of such research and am encouraged by the committee's inclusion of this provision.

The committee bill also establishes a national drug abuse training center, and increases the authorizations for the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

It all adds up to an impressive bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, I feel there are still some flaws and omissions in H.R. 12089. The essential thrust of my bill was to place all the drug abuse control activities of the Federal Govern-

ment under one umbrella organization which could provide centralized coordination and leadership. I hoped to see one clearly visible, and therefore, accountable, executive with the responsibility of developing a comprehensive plan of attack involving all of the Federal agencies concerned with drug abuse problems and then give him enough authority, within limits established by Congress, to order our priorities in accordance with that plan.

The Director of SAODAP can not mount such a comprehensive attack because his authority does not have sufficient scope. While he has powers to set goals, policies, procedures, and budgets for drug prevention, treatment and research, he can only consult and have liaison with those officials involved in law enforcement and international control. In extreme cases he can appeal to the President to reverse a decision by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs or the Department of State, when he disagrees with their practices or procedures. But this is hortatory language and is likely to have little or no effect on the operations of, and conflicts between, the Departments of State, Justice, Treasury, and Defense on the one hand, and SAODAP on the other.

The committee bill gives SAODAP authority over only one-half of the drug control pie. This is not enough, for it will leave unresolved some of the most important questions about where our efforts to control drug abuse should be directed.

For example, we have never really settled on the proper interface between the criminal justice system and the health and treatment community.

Are drug abusers to be arrested and incarcerated or are they to be treated and hopefully cured?

What is the difference between those addicts who make up half the prison population in New York City and the clinics and hospitals?

Until we bring together both the police and the doctors, the district attorneys and the social workers, the narcotic agents and the psychotherapists, these two conflicting approaches to the problem of drug abuse will continue to work at cross purposes with each other. And the Nation will suffer.

Overzealous law enforcement officers can destroy the effectiveness of any treatment program, for example, by insisting on excessive controls on methadone supplies which might prevent patients from receiving weekly supplies and thereby limit their geographical and occupational mobility. A highly effective, large-scale treatment program can, on the other hand, damage respect for the laws regulating dangerous drugs by creating the impression that drug abusers are not punished but given sympathetic treatment.

The conflict between the need of law enforcement agencies for information on drug abuse and the need of treatment programs to protect the confidentiality of their patients' treatment records has not been addressed. The Senate bill contains language guaranteeing the confidentiality of records on drug patients in treatment, but the House bill is silent on this point. I wonder if the Director of

SAODAP will have sufficient authority to decide such questions expeditiously himself.

What is the effect of changes in drug supply on treatment demand and criminality and vice versa? If law enforcement agencies get increased budgets and are more effective in cutting off drug supplies and arresting users, what will happen to the demand for methadone treatment programs? Who is going to balance and weigh these considerations? And if supply is cut down and there are insufficient methadone and other treatment facilities for addicts eager to shake their habits, will soaring prices drive them to intensify their lives of full time violent crime? If supply is cut down and addicts cannot get treatment, will crime rates soar along with rising drug prices?

These conflicts and questions, both potential and real, must be addressed squarely and resolved before we can begin to allocate resources in a rational manner among the wide variety of approaches to the problem of drug abuse.

Yet the bill we are considering today maintains the separation between law enforcement—or drug traffic prevention as it is referred to in H.R. 12089—and treatment—or drug abuse prevention.

There is also a desperate need for cooperation and coordination within the drug traffic prevention functions of the Federal Government.

U.S. representatives to United Nations commissions, Foreign Service officers, customs officials, BNDD agents and Air Force colonels, for example, are all involved in attempting to track and suppress heroin and opium traffic moving from Southeast Asia through Hong Kong to the United States. Yet they all report to different bosses and jealously guard their own information.

There is a constantly bubbling rivalry between BNDD and the Bureau of Customs over controlling the narcotics import trade, as another example. Both agencies want exclusive responsibility for overseas operations against heroin trafficking. This dispute flares up from time to time when new, improvised, ad hoc attempts at coordination and resolution of differences must be made.

The administration has apparently recognized this problem of many years standing and recently announced the establishment of a new coordination office in the Department of Justice for "all" law enforcement programs in the field of drug abuse. Yet the Departments of State and Defense are not to be included in the activities of this new office. This omission, sadly, condemns our efforts at improving international control of narcotic drugs to their traditional status of "mostly show, little go." The crying need for a careful balancing of goals, priorities, and resources and an overall sense of coordinated direction cannot and will not be met by this new office or by the bill we are considering today.

A second serious flaw in this bill is the inadequate increase in funding for treatment and rehabilitation programs. Cities and States all over the country are crying for additional funds to commit to these programs.

New York City's need for greatly ex-

panded treatment funds is an urgent example. I am sure cities across the country could point to similar needs. There are estimated to be 150,000 to 200,000 addicts in New York City, of which about 18,000, or 9 to 10 percent, are in treatment. This means that nine out of every 10 drug addicts is not receiving any assistance whatever in trying to shake his addiction and is more likely than not committing daily crimes to support the monkey on his back. City experts estimate that 15,000 to 20,000 people have signed up on waiting lists for publicly supported methadone maintenance programs. In the last 14 months, the Health Services Administration alone has opened up 4,500 slots in such programs but has had over 17,000 applicants, with 8,000 now active on the waiting list. Every time a program expands its capacity, the waiting list expands proportionately. It is like digging a hole in soggy ground: You do not see much water, but as soon as you dig a hole it fills right up. If you bail it out the water rushes right back in. Piecemeal efforts like that are hopeless—you must do a major operation or nothing at all.

The Borough of Queens had no methadone programs 18 months ago and few indications of a large addict population. Over the last 12 months, however, after just one clinic was opened a whole new addict population surfaced and requested treatment. Now there are more than 1,200 in treatment with a tremendous waiting list.

Still another example of the need for more funding is found in the city's jail system. Eight months ago the department of corrections instituted a methadone detoxification program for addicted inmates, and has detoxified over 30,000 addicts in that time. Yet few of these addicts can be referred to further treatment on release from prison because the waiting lists are already so long that it would be futile to contact them. If they are contacted and put on a waiting list society is in effect saying to them to go back out and steal and shoot up, and if you can survive another 6 months on the street then maybe we will be able to get you into treatment. It is obvious that our drug treatment programs are desperately underfunded, not only in New York City, but also across the country.

In 1972 the Federal budget committed only about \$180 million to drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education, and training. The bill before us today proposes to increase the authorization for such expenditures in the following ways: \$40 million for a special fund for the Director of SAODAP in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974, \$60 million for drug programs at community mental health centers in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974, and increases of \$25 million in fiscal year 1973 and \$40 million in fiscal year 1974 for section 256 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act which allows for drug treatment and rehabilitation grants to public and private non-profit organizations. This will allow for \$125 million in new funds in fiscal year 1973 and \$140 million in fiscal year 1974 for treatment and rehabilitation. This is not enough. Chicago and New Orleans

could absorb that much money easily all by themselves.

Out of a total of \$117 million requested for treatment funds from November 1970 through January of 1972, the National Institute of Mental Health awarded only \$18.6 million in section 252 and 256 money. Only \$1 of every \$6 that was requested could be funded. The increases proposed in this bill might be sufficient to meet past demand but are doomed to fall far behind future needs.

Further, the States with the highest concentration of drug addiction problems have not fared well in competing for these funds. The funds are not controlled by a State allocation formula, but are supposed to be targeted toward those States and areas within States having the higher percentages of population who are narcotic addicts or drug dependent persons. By any reading of this language, one must conclude that New York is such a State since New York City has one-half of the Nation's addict population. Yet New York has only received two grants under this section from NIMH. What hope is there in this bill for States like New York if the new funds authorized are not only small but apparently unavailable to large urban States with tremendous addiction problems?

To make the picture even worse we need only think through the implications of this legislation's proposed planning grants for every single State which will enable them to develop a comprehensive drug abuse treatment plan and establish administrative machinery to put that plan into effect. The Federal Government is thereby bending over backward, in a much needed way, to be sure, to help States develop the ability to compete for already severely oversubscribed treatment funds. But I think the frustration index is bound to rise over the next year or two as communities across the country begin to see the severe limits on the scope of SAODOP's authority, the continued inadequate funding of treatment needs, and the inequitable treatment of a few large urban States with the highest proportion of narcotic problems, and the overwhelming bulk of the Nation's addict population.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) or the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) several questions.

I am not entirely clear on the relationship of drug law enforcement functions with the drug education, treatment, rehabilitation, research and training functions of the Special Action Office. Can the gentleman explain how this Special Action Office will relate to the new Office of Drug Law Enforcement recently established by the President in the Department of Justice?

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Certainly the offices are related.

Ours has to do with demand, and the other with supply. We passed a bill last year on the law enforcement. We have interrelationships with them now in this bill.

Mr. SCHEUER. What will the Special Actions Office's relationship be with the administration's international drug control efforts and the Cabinet-level working group formed to take action in this area?

Mr. STAGGERS. Dr. Jaffe will be consulted, and can be appointed to represent the United States on any international conference, and in respect to what we are trying to do to keep drugs out.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is it the congressional intent that methadone's continuing IND status should inhibit the Special Action Office from encouraging a broad-scale expansion of treatment programs which include methadone treatment or detoxification as one of the options? Or is it the congressional intent that methadone maintenance programs can continue to expand as one of a range of drug treatment programs?

Mr. STAGGERS. The answer to the latter part of the question, because I believe that is the pertinent part, is that I would say it is the intent that methadone maintenance programs can be. I would say "yes."

Mr. SCHEUER. And to expand?

Mr. STAGGERS. And to expand, yes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is it the congressional intent that the Special Action Agency be an aggressive, action-oriented agency designed to get a broad-scale Federal attack underway on the problems of addiction?

Mr. STAGGERS. On the question of congressional intent, that there be an aggressive, action-oriented agency, I would say "yes." This is our intent, and it is spelled out so much in the bill.

Mr. SCHEUER. If so, can the gentleman describe the powers it will have vis-a-vis the bureaucracy to insure that its policies and priorities are followed?

Mr. STAGGERS. On the question of the powers, vis-a-vis the bureaucracy, to insure that policies and priorities are followed, they are all spelled out in section 222, on page 13 of the bill, exactly in the various categories.

Mr. SCHEUER. Can the Special Action Agency funnel resources from its special fund through an existing agency program and insist that those guidelines which impair the effectiveness of the program be disregarded so long as they are not specifically required by the authorizing legislation itself?

Mr. STAGGERS. On the question of funding resources from the special fund to an existing agency, this is a definite "yes". This certainly is the case.

Mr. SCHEUER. The final section of this bill increases the authorization for section 256 funds of the Community Mental Health Centers Act. As the gentleman knows, subsection (d) of section 256 states that grants are to be made "in accordance with the criteria determined by him"—the Secretary—"designed to provide priority for grant applications in States, and in areas within the States, having the higher percentages of population who are narcotic addicts or drug dependent persons."

It seems to me that States like New York and California should be given priority, but this is not the case, or has not been the case. New York has approximately one-half of all the Nation's

addicts, yet New York has had only one-sixth of the dollars under this section, a tiny fraction of these funds in the past, and guidelines implementing this section have never been issued.

Does the gentleman expect the Special Action Office to give careful attention to the proper implementation of this section?

Mr. STAGGERS. Certainly we know of the problem in New York and California, and I say to the gentleman the answer would be "Yes" to that question.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HASTINGS. I should like to refer to section 306, and the gentleman's last question, for assurance to the gentleman from New York on this amendment. As a matter of fact, a large share of the funds should go to the State of New York.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MCCOLLISTER).

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, although a member of the full committee but not of the subcommittee, I would like to add my congratulations to the subcommittee for its very constructive approach to this legislation.

Too often when we try to solve problems of this magnitude we create a new agency and appropriate vast sums of money, and when the efforts are not successful we try another approach. Here the effort has been to coordinate, harmonize, and make an agency and an administrator accountable.

For this approach, which I think ought to serve as an example on many other things, I think that the subcommittee should be congratulated.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN).

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to state I feel this legislation is vital. In fact, I think it is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to come before the 92d Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this is a superb bill, workable and realistic. In my opinion, it is not only a very needed but essential piece of legislation in order for us to meet this horrendous and terrifying scourge of narcotics addiction which is sweeping this country.

I simply wish to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee and, of course, extend my enthusiastic compliments to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the full committee, and the members of the committee for the priority, the effort, and the outstanding work that the committee has given to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, neither I nor any Member of this House has to illustrate the horrendous proportions of the narcotics scourge in this country. For the past few years, daily news reports have related only too tragically the havoc which this disease wreaks upon American society. The statistics on the extent of addiction, the overdoses, the costs to society, and

the resultant devastating human misery are staggering and terrifying.

My own interest in this field was inspired by many years of continuing concern during which I participated on every level in my activities as a public official and private citizen. My concern has been long and deep rooted. It goes back 19 years when, as a New York State senator, I sponsored, and became chairman of, the State's investigation of drug abuse, particularly as it related to our young people.

Even then we tried to awaken officialdom and society to the severity of the problem. But most of the pleas fell on deaf ears. Everyone seemed to blind himself to the stark reality of the developing crisis. It was considered a ghetto problem—one that did not affect the average parent's own children or his own neighborhood. But, tragically, time has shown that it does affect their children. It has affected all levels of society. It has become a scourge that has reached epidemic proportions. And the related crime and devastation brought by narcotics abuse has hit every community in this Nation.

For 8 years I served as chairman of the board of the first and only facility of its kind in the world devoted solely to the treatment and rehabilitation of teenage addicts—Riverside Hospital on North Brothers Island in New York. In that capacity I observed over 4,000 youngsters going through this institution and got to know most of them on a first-name basis. I learned much of their backgrounds, motivations, and agonies.

I report, with regret, that I cannot point to one teenage addict who was fully cured of his dread affliction at the Riverside Institution—so few were the resources our society was then willing to dedicate to the constantly worsening problem of drug abuse.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the situation has further deteriorated. Now, over a decade later, we are faced with nothing less than a societal crisis.

Only this week I compiled a new inventory of the extent of the addiction problem as it exists in the United States today. Mr. Chairman, just think, \$920 million worth of narcotics was confiscated by Government authorities in 1971 in 1 year, almost a billion dollars of hard drugs seized, as compared with \$302,700,000 in the previous year. Three times more seizures in a single year. Yet, Mr. Chairman, despite this unprecedented seizure total, there seems to be no apparent dent in the deadly supply. Unquestionably there remain tremendous stockpiles of illicit narcotics in this country, and new quantities pour in each day from new transshipment points.

The estimated number of addicts in the United States was officially set last year at 330,000. This figure was based on a compilation of estimates made by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and by other agencies dealing with the drug problem. Based on the same estimate guidelines, the total of drug addicts today in this country of ours can be conservatively estimated at 400,000—the largest addict population in the world. Indeed, even this figure could be low.

For in New York City alone, according to reports given to me this week by that city's addiction service agency, between 150,000 and 200,000 addicts are hooked on hard narcotics—in the vast majority of cases, heroin; 27,000 of these addicts are presently undergoing treatment in public and private rehabilitation centers—an amazing increase over the 18,000 who were being treated last August. Whether this is a sign of an increasing public commitment to the elimination of drug addiction, or merely a frightening indication of the ever-escalating addict population in New York City, we will experience little success in the fight against narcotics abuse unless we adopt the kind of comprehensive legislation which is before the House today.

As every American citizen is aware, heroin addiction on the domestic scene has been aggravated in the past few years by the problem of returning ex-GI addicts. In a section of my report on the findings of a study mission submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee, I stated, on the basis of an extensive review of the drug situation in Vietnam, that there were conceivably as many as 60,000 Vietnam GI's using hard drugs there as of April of last year—when our troop strength was, of course, at a much higher level.

A safe estimate of the number of addicted Vietnam veterans who have returned to our urban, suburban and rural communities would be at least 50,000 to 70,000. I base this figure on the fact that, as of last November, after the Veterans' Administration had established 32 drug treatment centers—an increase of 27 over the previous year—VA medical personnel were treating as many as 9,542 addicted ex-GI's. Of this number, 6,014 were Vietnam vets. It is safe to assume that only one out of ten has come forward for such treatment, which could even be a conservative estimate. Thus, if that figure were multiplied by 10, the true number of addicts who have returned from the Armed Forces would surpass the staggering estimate of 60,000 referred to earlier.

Commendable as the VA drug treatment programs may be, there is considerably more to be learned in the areas of training personnel, research, and drug education before these treatment and rehabilitation programs can be expected to have any dramatic lasting effect on this huge addict population. I was most encouraged, Mr. Chairman, by the fact that the new Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention, as described in the bill before this chamber today, will have jurisdiction over Federal funds used for VA and non-VA treatment programs alike.

There is another tragic episode in this nightmare of addiction that can only get worse unless legislation like this is enacted. I refer to the ever-increasing number of heroin-addicted babies being born to females who maintain their own habit during pregnancy.

In New York City alone, 550 babies were born last year already in the throes of heroin addiction. In more than a few instances, these babies must remain in the hospital for as long as 40 days until their pitiful tremors—marked by con-

vulsive twitching and clawing—finally subside.

No one knows at this point just how much lasting damage to the babies is being caused by women who continue to take heroin while pregnant. Will their children crave narcotics in later years? Will these children become abnormally susceptible to the effects of drugs? The question of chromosome and brain damage has not even been determined yet. This terrible subjection of innocents, yet unborn, to the horrors of drug addiction is one more reason why this body must approve today the sweeping provisions of H.R. 12089.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I called attention to the 50,000 to 70,000 addicted GI's who have already been returned, uncured, to our city streets. Let me remind my colleagues that unless the drug abuse program is attacked immediately on every front, the white plague of heroin abuse could doom our society to self-perpetuating generations of addicts.

For experts contend, Mr. Chairman, that these 50,000 to 70,000 ex-GI addicts could "turn on" as many as 3 million others in the next 5 years. Obviously, many of these would be women of child-bearing age.

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 the critical drug bills presently before this Congress? Now that even our unborn children are falling victim to the plague of heroin addiction, perhaps we will realize that we must take bold actions and pass such legislation as this sweeping measure before us.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12089 is an excellent beginning in finding the solution. Clearly there is a need for coordination of the antidrug effort at and among all levels of government. This is one of the many reasons why I enthusiastically support this legislation.

H.R. 12089 provides for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under a director having broad powers over the conduct of narcotics abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs and activities throughout the Federal Government. Hopefully, the patchwork pattern of drug prevention efforts presently being conducted by nine executive departments will be efficiently coordinated by the Director of the Special Action Office.

Of special merit, Mr. Chairman, is that provision in the bill which creates a National Drug Abuse Training Center for the purpose of developing, conducting, and supporting drug training programs for Federal, State, and local government officials and their respective staffs; medical and paramedical personnel, and educators; and other applicants, including drug-dependent persons, requiring training or education in drug abuse prevention. For too long, our knowledge of the causes of drug addiction and of effective methods for its cure has remained primitive. The \$10 million set aside for the funding of this training center, to be used over the next 3 years, is the very least we should invest at a time when the methods for rehabilitating drug addicts

are as numerous as the centers themselves, and when not one of these techniques has proven to be anywhere near 100 percent reliable.

Another particularly promising feature of this measure is the insistence that such existing Federal programs as the community mental health centers and the public health services programs be modified to include treatment and rehabilitation services for addicts. As is pointed out so well in the committee's excellent report on H.R. 12089, many areas demonstrating great need, such as the city of New York and the State of New York, have not received funds under the Community Mental Health Centers Act. The increased appropriation of \$100 million for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 is a most needed provision. It will then be the task of the Special Action Office Director to see to it that these funds are not frozen, as has happened so often in the past.

The question of whether this extra allotment for the operation of local programs will suffice is a matter to be decided in conference. The Senate-passed version of this drug legislation, as well as my own bill on the House side, calls for substantially more funding for use by States and localities in the actual operation of on-site programs. There are separate moneys in H.R. 12089 to assist States and localities in the planning and evaluation of their programs, but it may be found that new direct operating grants should be made to local agencies.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would sound a note of caution. In order for the United States to clear up the drug addiction problem within its borders, there must be close cooperation between those agencies which now deal with drug education, research, training, treatment, and rehabilitation, which this bill does—and those agencies which specialize in domestic and international control of the illicit narcotics supply.

Whereas the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention has considerable funding and review jurisdiction on the demand side of the drug problem, it has only consultatory and advisory powers on the law enforcement and international agreement side of the overall attack. Later this year, for example, U.S. negotiators will attempt to eliminate the many loopholes in the 1961 Single Convention on Drugs and to strengthen such United Nations drug-suppression agencies as the International Narcotics Control Board. These efforts, as well as the drug-control policies of Customs, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and the newly established Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement, must be synchronized with prevention and rehabilitation activities within our own borders.

H.R. 12089 is not a final solution for the narcotics crisis in America, but it does represent a significant, long step forward. Again I would commend the House Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment for its painstaking efforts in developing this legislation, and I trust that the bill before us today will meet with swift House approval.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield

the balance of my time to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), because I understand he has some additional requests for time on the other side.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman very kindly because we were a little pressed for time over here.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have one question: Will you tell me whether or not this bill authorizes the admittance into a veterans hospital of someone other than a veteran?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, it does not. That authority was, at least arguably, contained in the original bill but that provision was taken out. This bill does not change in any way the authority for hospitalization in VA facilities.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. On the last page of the report, page 24, there is the following statement:

(c) The Secretary may enter into agreements with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the Government under which agreements hospitals and other appropriate medical facilities of the Service may be used in treatment and rehabilitation programs provided by such department or agency for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems who are in areas served by such hospitals or other facilities.

Mr. STAGGERS. That section deals with authority of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It does not apply to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. STAGGERS. No; it does not.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Roy), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROY. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate one point which has been made, and that is the importance of this legislation. I am thoroughly convinced that drug abuse is something which can indeed destroy our entire society if it continues to expand at the rate in which it has in the past few years.

Mr. Chairman, the second point is that of the 32 veterans' facilities for the treatment of drug addiction, one is located in the Second District of Kansas. I have visited it. I am aware of the dedication and of the setup that is present there and I intend to be sure that this is used to the maximum extent for the veterans of the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and others on the Veterans' Affairs Committee that it is not the intent of this member of the committee to see that program decreased in any way, but to be an integral and integrated part of a coordinated program of drug education, research treatment and rehabilitation throughout the country.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how much hope this legislation has given to the people in Harlem and, indeed, to those throughout the United States who are addicted to drugs or who are living in conditions beyond description as the result of drug addiction.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that the United States of America, through its Congress, has attempted to make this national effort and to coordinate our efforts in order to make certain that we will find a solution to this terrible epidemic that has swept over us.

I feel extremely proud to be a Member of Congress and I feel certain that this legislation is going to pass. I only hope that it will speedily go to conference and that we do not lose days or weeks waiting for this bill to become law. There are too many lives dependent upon the treatment of this terrible disease.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we would be able to get the conference report agreed upon by both Houses before the President leaves the United States for his trip abroad.

Mr. Chairman, no people have suffered more from this Nation's inability to stop the drug epidemic than the people of Harlem. On street corners, in alleyways, and in vacant tenements the heroin trade flourishes. Suppliers grow rich while their victims are pushed even deeper into a life of degradation and despair.

We know that to speak of drug abuse is to speak of many abuses. The lack of equality and opportunity which daily faces so many members of my community convinces them that there will never be a better way of life, a happier or more prosperous time. It is no surprise that they find this escape in mind-twisting and body-destroying heroin.

There will never be a cure for America's drug epidemic until there is a cure for America's social injustices. As long as men are held in bondage by a system which offers unemployment, substandard education, and poor housing, they will seek escape by any available means—even if those means result in self-destruction.

It is vital, Mr. Chairman, that we view the legislation before us with proper perspective. In light of all I have said, I do not believe the provisions of this bill represent all that is, or will be, needed to eradicate drug addiction. H.R. 12089 does, however, represent an important, though limited, step in the right direction.

To date there has been no truly effective anti-drug-abuse effort in this Nation. Program after program has been passed, and there is still no true progress apparent. It is time that a unified sense of direction be given to these myriad programs, and that Federal agencies be forced to work together.

The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to be established by this bill would perform these tasks. The Director of this Office would have responsibility for developing a totally coordinated drug abuse effort. He would, I hope, put an end to the wasteful overlap

and duplication now existing. Instead of competing against one another, our agencies and departments could cooperate at last.

The coordination should have positive effects at the research level and at the recipient level.

For researchers, it can mean more clearly defined objectives, with sufficient resources to assure thorough studies and experimentation. They will, perhaps, be able to build more efficiently on the findings of other researchers as the exchange of information is facilitated.

For the recipient, it can mean one central place to go to for help. People are now confused and discouraged by the bits and pieces of programs lying about. More than one addict—after having made the agonizing decision to kick his habit—has sought unsuccessfully to find a program which will accept him. Often he travels all the way across town only to find that, for some technical reason, he is ineligible or that the program is filled. A better organized services delivery system could put an end to this deadly confusion.

The people of Harlem, and inner cities throughout this Nation, have the greatest stake in the ultimate results of the administration's efforts to control drug abuse. In 1970, narcotics-related deaths in New York City reached 1,050—nearly three a day. Many of these were in Harlem where the supply of heroin and other drugs is as plentiful as groceries are to the suburban housewife.

It is for these reasons that I am so concerned about the efforts of our Government to stem the flow of illicit narcotics into this country and have sponsored legislation—finally enacted—to suspend foreign aid to those nations which fail to take appropriate steps to prevent the production, processing and smuggling of heroin and other dangerous drugs.

We are all too aware of the unfortunate and grim authenticity of the movie, "The French Connection," and we know that the officials of France simply have not cooperated to the fullest extent possible with us to close the clandestine processing laboratories in southern France. While the record is replete with promises and alleged cooperative agreements, the truth is that heroin continues to be available on the streets of New York—and its supply is growing. While the human toll of the situation is tragic, the cost to society as a whole has reached staggering proportions. It is estimated that \$2 billion worth of crime is committed in Harlem each year by addicts. Annually, the city of New York spends \$50 million just on prisons, court, and police costs for criminal addicts.

While it is absolutely essential for the tide of illegal drugs to be ebbed, we must be realistic and understand that even if every international lever available to us were applied against every foreign nation in any way involved with drug traffic, some heroin would still reach our shores and find its way to our streets. As a result, the problem of dealing with the suppliers of drugs is critical in the short term, for if we can eliminate these merchants of death from peddling their fatal wares on the streets, we at least stand

a chance of preventing new addicts. I have told the House of Representatives that there are great disparities to be found within New York City in the sentencing of narcotics pushers. The situation was highlighted in a report of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Crime. Without repeating the details of the report, it is enough to say that there is a most urgent need for more action on this front. I am hopeful that the announcement last week of a new office in the Justice Department headed by former Customs Commissioner Myles Ambrose will insure a greater effort by the local and State governments, as well as the assured action by the Federal Government against the pusher and supplier. I recently discussed his new position with Mr. Ambrose and I am convinced that he is sincere in his commitment. I am also convinced that he and Dr. Jaffe will affect a cooperative arrangement to coordinate the law enforcement and the so-called demand side activities of the Federal Government's offensive against drug abuse.

Mr. Chairman, while the bill before us is not perfect and fails to deal with some of the critical supply problems in a realistic way, it is a definite step in the right direction in the fight against drug abuse. Passage is essential if Dr. Jaffe is to move forward in his efforts, and I urge its support by my colleagues.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The drug abuse problem in this country has reached epidemic proportions. It is a major concern to all Americans, young or old, rich or poor. It is no longer a problem confined just to the inner cities, the ghettos, the poverty areas; it has spread to rural areas, suburban communities and metropolitan limits. It not only affects the college student, or the high school adolescent; it now reaches even children in the first and second grades, youngsters who are just beginning to learn the fundamental three R's.

When I read newspaper accounts of 5-year-olds hooked on heroin, I say the drug problem is serious; when Federal Government administrators report that there are an estimated 250,000 heroin addicts in America, I say the drug problem is serious; when our Military Establishment tells us that the number of military members investigated by law enforcement agencies for drug use has increased 118 percent over the last 2 years, I say the drug problem is serious. When the mayor of one of our largest cities testifies that in 1 year in that city alone, drugs killed more than 1,000 persons and 215 of these were teenagers, I say the problem is serious.

Several steps have been taken by Congress. But these steps are not enough. We need an overall comprehensive program which will coordinate the domestic activities of the nine different agencies and departments, ranging from programs to educate teenagers to those which train ex-addicts. We need also a comprehensive program to attack illicit drug traffic

which supplies the 250,000 heroin addicts in this country.

I believe there is a relationship between the availability of drugs and their use. H.R. 12089 is a progressive approach which attacks the demand aspect of the problem. The Special Action Office created in this bill will insure a central, comprehensive coordination of the Federal effort in combating the national drug problem. No longer can we have each Federal agency responding to only one part of drug abuse, irrespective of any other agency involved in the drug problem. Every aspect of the domestic drug problem must be inextricably linked to an office which provides overall planning and policy and establishes objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention. The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention accomplishes this goal.

While this bill is meritorious—it coordinates all domestic drug abuse and prevention efforts and offers ways to find new initiatives in resolving this problem—it does not resolve the supply aspect of the problem in which 50 to 60 tons of opium are channeled annually through underground markets to supply the 250,000 heroin addicts in this country. The administration has made overtures to decrease the flow of illegal drugs into this country and should be applauded for its efforts.

But much, much more work needs to be done. Neither this bill nor the several proposals of the administration are the final utterances in drug abuse control and prevention. We in the House will continue to work to alleviate this national anathema, which has penetrated all levels of our society.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, for yielding me this time.

The House Committee on the Judiciary has a certain amount of jurisdiction over drugs as the result of the enactment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act and the Narcotics Addicts Rehabilitation Act, and we share this jurisdiction with the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and work together in a most harmonious way.

I want to congratulate the committee on bringing out this very important bill. I trust that it will be enacted overwhelmingly. I certainly, in particular, want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for the cooperation that he has extended to the Committee on the Judiciary in this area in the past and to assure the gentleman and the entire committee of our continued cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12089 and to commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for their achievement in producing so comprehensive a piece of legislation to meet the national crisis of drug addiction. Special praise and commendation is due

my able and knowledgeable colleague, Representative PAUL ROGERS, who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, presided over extensive hearings on this important bill, and this praise must extend as well to the other members of this subcommittee.

H.R. 12089 sets forth as a declaration of national policy the commitment of the Federal Government to focus its resources and bring them to bear on drug abuse for the purpose of significantly reducing the incidence of drug abuse and drug addiction in the United States within the shortest practicable period of time. This commitment to a national war on drug addiction has been a long time coming. For many years a scourge, largely contained behind the walls of the Nation's ghettos, drug addiction was not recognized as a national crisis until the mid 1960's when the drug epidemic reached beyond the ghetto to infect the white middle class.

Yet even this belated recognition of crisis failed to stir the Federal Government to significant action. Until this bill, and its companion measure recently passed by the Senate, we have seen the enactment of several important programs by the Congress, including the pioneering Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 which was introduced by Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee, but we have not seen the kind of leadership and coordination of these drug abuse programs which has been needed to make them effective against the growing ravages of drug addiction, intensified by the tragedy of the Vietnam war.

H.R. 12089 provides a structure for the coordination of the Federal Government's drug-abuse programs. It establishes a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President and gives the Director of that Office the authority to provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug-abuse prevention functions. As anyone who is familiar with the Federal bureaucracy knows, more important than the authority is the power to bend the bureaucracy to a desired course. This bill gives the Special Action Office that power by providing that the Director will not only review, but will be able to modify the budgets and implementation plans of any Federal department or agency with responsibility over drug-abuse programs. Other important features of the bill include the establishment of a national drug-abuse training center to train drug-abuse treatment professionals, the creation of a program to provide technical assistance to State and local agencies, and the amendment of the Public Health Service and Community Mental Health Centers Acts to provide for a substantial increase in available facilities in local communities for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

We are indeed fortunate that the President has chosen as the first Director of the Special Action Office the very able Dr. Jerome Jaffe. Dr. Jaffe, who has broad experience in the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, appeared before my Judiciary Subcommit-

tee immediately after his appointment by the President in June. He impressed us all with his testimony at that time and we look forward to working closely with him in our efforts to find a more meaningful role for the Federal Government in the treatment of addicts.

H.R. 12089 deserves the support of this entire Chamber. The lack of adequate Federal commitment is a major reason for the presently insufficient funding of treatment and rehabilitation programs. I have hope that this bill will begin to concentrate the full resources of the Federal Government toward the achievement of the stated national goal of significant reduction of drug addiction in the United States.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) for any questions that the gentleman might have.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to ask certain questions concerning this bill.

First of all, on page 13, it says that the Director is authorized "to review and as he deems necessary modify insofar as they pertain to Federal drug abuse prevention functions," and so on.

Does that allow the Director to change grants already made for community programs throughout this Nation?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, it does not.

Mr. WHITE. It does not, and he cannot?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Going down further on page 13 to line 17, I gather from the wording of subsection (2) that the Director allocates all funds concerning all drug abuse programs throughout this country by the Federal Government?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is referring to subsection (2)?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. STAGGERS. It says "to the extent not inconsistent with the applicable appropriation acts, to make funds available from appropriations to Federal departments and agencies," and so forth.

No, not any more authority than OMB has already.

Mr. WHITE. For instance, we have now a program whereby the Veterans' Administration will treat drug addicts after they are discharged from the service. Can the Director reallocate those funds that this Congress appropriates for this program?

Mr. STAGGERS. No. I would say this to the gentleman, that the VA has to make a line item request in the budget for drug abuse programs and the use for the money has to be explained.

Mr. WHITE. On page 17 there is a provision whereby the Director can, after examination, write a letter or contact the President of the United States and indicate that he does not think that the money is being used properly and that the programs are not for the best benefit for the prevention of drug abuse, and the President after studying these can indeed make changes by directives.

Does this mean we are delegating to the President through the activities of the Director the opportunity to change law?

Let us go back to the same illustra-

tion as before where we provide funds for the Veterans' Administration to treat veterans for drug addiction after they are discharged. Supposing the Director determines this is not a proper manner in which to treat veterans. Can the Director then contact the President and the President then, by Executive order, change that feature of our law? Are we delegating that authority?

Mr. STAGGERS. No; we are not changing the law in the least bit. And we are not giving the President any more authority than he has now to change the law.

Mr. WHITE. I believe there is one other feature that we should examine.

On page 19, the bill says that the Director can tap any manpower resources in the Federal Government for a period of 90 days with or without the consent of the particular department, but after that time then he would have to have the consent of the department head in order to use the particular personnel.

Is that the intention of the committee? That is the way I read that particular section.

Mr. STAGGERS. Where has the gentleman been reading from?

Mr. WHITE. Starting on page 19, line 5, subsection (1).

The bill says:

The Director may

(1) take such action as may be necessary to request the assignment, with or without reimbursement, \* \* \*

Which I presume means without reimbursement to the department—

of any individual employed by any Federal department or agency and engaged in any Federal drug abuse prevention function or drug traffic prevention function to serve as a member of any such task force; except that no such person shall be so assigned during any one fiscal year for more than an aggregate of ninety days without the express approval of the head of the Federal department or agency with respect to which he was so employed prior to such assignment.

In other words, he can tap any individual in the Federal Government without reimbursement to that agency, with or without the consent of the department head.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; because this is to help with special task forces to help city and local governments. If we did not have the authority to do this, there would be delays in a lot of places in establishing more efficient methods to put into operation.

I would point out that there must be a request.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, we are today voting on what has to be characterized as the most comprehensive approach to the demand side of the drug problem to come before the House—legislation to create the Special Action Office on Drug Abuse.

As chairman of the Republican task force on drug abuse and a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had the pleasure to work closely with Dr. Jerome Jaffe, who will direct the Special Action Office, in attempting to secure the enactment of this legislation. Dr. Jaffe's experience and background in the area of drug abuse uniquely qualifies him to head the assault on drug addiction.

The key provision in the bill is the mandate in section 221(a) that the Director "shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions." There has been and still is a tremendous overlap in governmental drug programs, with a resultant lack of coordination. For instance, NIMH in fiscal year 1971 spent \$33.5 million on treatment and rehabilitation of addicts; OEO spent \$12.1 million; VA spent \$700,000; HUD spent \$13.7 million; and the Justice Department (LEAA) spent \$7 million. Some of these agencies, such as LEAA, lack the competence to make such grants, as their area of expertise is not in drug treatment.

The Director is also authorized to develop improved methods for determining the extent of drug addiction and abuse in the United States. The current estimate of 315,000 addicts is based on information which is very unreliable. In my own State of Florida, for instance, the estimate of the number of narcotic addicts and drug users is considerably less than the number of addicts or users now enrolled in various treatment programs in the State—a figure which is known.

Further provisions provide for the authorization of \$40 million for fiscal year 1973 and 1974 to finance the development or demonstration by other agencies of new approaches and to finance the expansion of existing activities which are effective or needed.

In addition, \$20 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$25 million are authorized for fiscal year 1974 for drug research and development. The sum of \$2 million is authorized for fiscal year 1972, \$3 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$5 million for fiscal year 1974 for a National Drug Abuse Training Center.

Additional spending for both research into finding an antagonist and blockage drug to drug addiction and the development of trained drug treatment professionals is long overdue. In the first session of the 92d Congress, I introduced an omnibus drug treatment bill which also contained substantial funding for both of these areas.

Although the funding levels for these areas are not as large as I believe may be necessary, they will provide a good beginning. One of the greatest weaknesses in present treatment programs has been a lack of trained professional or paraprofessional personnel. The New York State program to commit addicts has not been as successful as the California commitment program primarily because of a lack of trained personnel.

Other provisions in the legislation will establish treatment programs in community mental health centers and Public Health Service hospitals and facilities. The use of such facilities to treat addicts will provide an immediate, needed increased capacity to treat addicts.

Section 305 of the bill authorizes grants to States for planning with respect to drug abuse prevention functions. This is the first recognition by the Congress that grants for drug treatment should be made directly to the States instead of to grantees within a State—as they presently are—oftentimes, irrespective of

how that program relates to an overall State's needs. I have recently introduced legislation—H.R. 12843—that would expand this and provide that all treatment grants go directly to the States if the State meets certain criteria, including the establishment of a State narcotic treatment agency to ascertain the State's needs, develop a comprehensive State program, and establish standards for such programs.

H.R. 12084 which we vote on today does not provide all of the answers to the enigma of drug abuse, but it does create needed organizational machinery and provides badly needed funding to treat and rehabilitate the burgeoning addict population in this country.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12089, to establish within the executive branch a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, and to concentrate and focus the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is the result of an extensive investigation into the problem by the membership of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, an investigation which included 21 days of hearings beginning on June 19, 1971, and concluding on November 8, 1971. At these hearings over 100 witnesses were heard from, with the subcommittee receiving testimony not only here in Washington but also in St. Louis, Mo.; Fort Worth, Tex.; New Orleans, La.; New York City; and Richmond, Va.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress and, indeed, every American must be well aware of the seriousness and extent of the drug abuse problem in this country. Its effects are all around us—reflected in the increase in violent crimes felt throughout our society; in the pain and hardship suffered by individuals, families, and entire communities; in the physical and psychological threat posed to the health and welfare of the entire Nation. Clearly the problem has reached epidemic proportions. And I must emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that it is an epidemic which knows no social, economic, or even geographic borders. From New York City to rural Maine, the tragedies of drug abuse have affected all segments of the population.

Likewise, among American servicemen stationed overseas, the problem of drug abuse is one which demands immediate and extensive attention. While estimates vary widely on the numbers and percentages of American servicemen in Southeast Asia seriously addicted to narcotics, the figures—even at the lowest estimates—are significant and frightening. And the illicit flow of dangerous drugs from other parts of the world into our country continues despite the efforts of this Government in securing the cooperation of foreign powers. As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment vitally concerned with this problem, I have visited the Far East—most recently in August of 1971—to witness firsthand the extent of drug abuse among our servicemen, and to investigate the sources of international traffic in illicit drugs.

The responses of our Government in the last several years to the growing

problems of drug abuse in our own country and illicit trafficking abroad have not, I am afraid, been so effective as they might have been. But H.R. 12089, I feel, will go a long way toward focusing in a meaningful and workable way the efforts of this Government in this regard. Our hearings revealed that on the "demand" side of the drug abuse problem alone, at least nine different Federal agencies and departments have been involved, with programs ranging from educating teenagers to training ex-addicts for work. H.R. 12089 attempts to coordinate all of these activities, in order to bring about the most effective deployment of Federal resources in this area.

The subcommittee's investigations in five cities outside Washington have pointed forcefully to the need for coordination of Federal efforts in the field of drug abuse. The subcommittee found, for example, that in several cases treatment centers were not even aware of what activities neighboring centers were engaged in. Then, too, there has been a serious shortage of funds for several of our larger cities which are especially plagued by the problem of hard drug abuse. H.R. 12089, which authorizes \$411 million over the next 3 years, will provide the funds necessary to give the problem of drug abuse the high national priority it unquestionably deserves. And these funds will be effectively targeted, under this legislation, to those areas whose needs are greatest.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 12089 will help enable the Government to move forcefully and quickly in the coming years, so that the tragic and pervasive problem of drug abuse in this country can be effectively solved. In closing, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague and friend, Mr. ROGERS, for his devoted, thorough, and consistently outstanding performance in guiding this bill from our subcommittee to the floor of the House.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, too many of our young people have suffered the cruel effects of drug abuse. Too many parents have gone through the agony of sleepless nights and tense visits to the police station or hospital because of a child struck by the ogre of narcotics. Too often this agony ends in tragedy.

H.R. 12089, which is before the House, would permit a hopeful beginning in a coordinated national fight against drug abuse. By establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention within the Executive Office of the President, this bill provides for central coordination of the different Federal activities now in existence in the field of drug abuse.

We welcome this first step. H.R. 12089 also provides for some \$411 million in Federal funds for drug abuse programs, including treatment and rehabilitation services at community health centers and Public Health Service facilities.

Thousands of lives and millions of dollars are wasted each year because of drug abuse and related problems. Today the House has the opportunity to respond to pleas for help by our people. We must support a national drug abuse program that can save lives. It is my

sincerest hope that my colleagues in the House will assert forceful and necessary leadership in the critical area of drug abuse by passing H.R. 12089, and establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12089, a bill providing for a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. In a message to Congress in June of last year, President Nixon called for the establishment of such an office to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government in this area of national concern. An interim office has been established by Executive order but for this new office to have maximum impact, the legislative authority and funding provided in the legislation under consideration today is desperately needed.

We are all aware of the magnitude of the problem of drug abuse in our country—daily, we are bombarded with statistics which document its ever-widening scope. And the alarming facts which have been presented to us have jolted the Congress into action. In the last 3 years there has been an increase of nearly 600 percent in Federal expenditures for treatment and rehabilitation and an increase of more than 500 percent in funding for research, education and training. In addition, the administration has taken a number of significant steps in the international arena in an attempt to block the entry of illicit drugs into the United States, including the negotiation of agreements with Turkey, France, and Mexico.

Yet the proportions of this problem demand even further action and stronger initiatives. At present, the activities of the Federal Government in this area are spread through nine Federal agencies; clearly, a higher degree of coordination is called for if our efforts are to be successful. I believe that the Special Action Office provided for in this legislation will contribute greatly to our efforts to educate the public about the dangers inherent in the use of drugs, to conduct the necessary research into the short- and long-range effects of the use of drugs, and to institute comprehensive rehabilitation programs for those already dependent on drugs who are inflicting harm on themselves as well as on society. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in strongly supporting this measure.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, today an extremely important bill comes before us, a bill to heal an area in which there can be no liberal or conservative, no Republican or Democrat. H.R. 12089 calls for a team and an attack which must be all-American if the terrible scourge of drugs is to be rid from our midst. So far, there has been no really national effort to combat this menace. Now, with H.R. 12089, we have the first few small steps toward the consolidation of such an attempt.

Mr. Chairman, our major cities, as we all know, face the twin and terrible threats of the O.K. Corral and the concentration camp. For, if we cannot stem the drug traffic and stop the lawlessness which it induces, we will see law and order such as only been visited upon totalitarian countries.

But the problem of drugs and the awful toll it exacts on human lives is not a phenomenon of big cities alone. It exists in small towns, in the South, in the North, in the Midwest, in the Rockies. It has become a major threat to my own State of Wyoming, once thought a place of peace and seclusion; but it has come there and it is a problem about which no society can be permissive. Mr. Speaker, I cast my vote for H.R. 12089, mindful of its shortcomings, aware of the hard journey that we will face in conquering this problem. For in my mind there is a small ticking as of a bomb, put there by the following warning article from the Wyoming Eagle of January 19, 1972:

#### DRUGS SAID MAJOR PROBLEM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the seventh and final article in a series on Wyoming criminal procedures. This article deals with Natrona County.)

(By Tracy Ringolsby, Jr.)

A rapidly increasing drug problem faces Natrona County and it shows no sign of letting up in the future, according to the Natrona County Comprehensive Law Enforcement Plan.

"In the category of narcotics the crime rate from the year 1967 is increasing at a tremendous rate," according to the report. "The total line runs at almost zero from 1965 through 1967 and then it wings up to above 60 to 64 in the span from 1967 through 1970."

The report said it was anticipated 76 persons would be arrested on drug charges in the county in 1972, an increase in excess of 13 percent.

The report said County officials were working at controls for the problem. The sheriff is getting a trained dog and full time deputy to work in the search for drugs and Casper's police chief placed a full-time man on the problem.

The report said a trend toward the use of harder drugs would create more problems.

"We can anticipate that narcotics will begin affecting the other crime categories such as robbery and breaking and entering because as these people become more addicted to hard drugs they are going to have to have money to feed their habit," it said.

The report said there was a general increase throughout the county in all crimes.

"Criminal activity on the whole is up in Natrona County and the city of Casper," it was reported. "Crime statistics indicated a disproportionate number of violent crimes and property crimes in relation to population."

The report said juvenile crimes were an increasing problem. It said further help was needed for juvenile counselors who presently obtain background summaries on individuals through a conversation with subjects and parents. From these summaries a decision is made whether to go to court.

"If the counselor had a staff to make these background studies rather than having to go through the court to get the welfare office to do them, he would conceivably be able to cut the number of cases that must go through the court," the report said.

There are no facilities for juveniles or women in the Casper city jail according to the report and "the only ventilation to the cell area is through windows that open outside in the corridor or small windows in the individual cells that are covered with heavy screens that only open into the garage."

It said the only heating in the city jail was from hallway radiators.

"The county jail was constructed in 1930 and met the building codes in force at that time," it said. "Emergency power is available but not on an automatic basis. It would

require at least 10 minutes to get it operational."

The report said a new state law required Natrona County, by January 1975, to adopt a county court system to replace the present justice courts. It would replace the two justice courts in Casper and one in Edgerton with a full-time judge. It would also have concurrent jurisdiction with the district court in civil cases up to \$1,000 and criminal jurisdiction covering any misdemeanor.

The case load was not expected to be too high because presently the justice court arraigned all cases before they are bound over to district court.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 12089. This bill provides for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under a Director having broad powers over the conduct of drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education and research programs and activities throughout the Federal Government.

This legislation has long been needed. There have been too many diversified programs on this serious problem of drug abuse. The diversification has not helped to stem the tide of drug abuse. The coordination of the programs under one person will give meaningful direction and the greater and most beneficial use of dollars appropriated to these programs. It will give greater utilization of enforcement legislation.

Aid given to the law enforcement officers and programs aimed at elimination of the spread of drug abuse in the streets is just as important as destroying the drugs at its source. If there is no market, there is no import. I am indeed pleased that emphasis will also be placed on the illegal dispensing, manufacturing and import of barbiturates which has been increasing in the incidence of drug abuse.

I applaud the President on his announced choice of Myles Ambrose to be the one to head this program. Mr. Ambrose has served the State of New York well and efficiently with the waterfront commission and in other capacities, and has been an excellent U.S. Commissioner of Customs. He and his department have been in the forefront in the fight to stamp out the illegal smuggling in of narcotics and have one of the most commendable records of seizure of narcotics. We will miss Commissioner Ambrose as our commissioner of customs but are happy in the knowledge that he continues as a dedicated public servant and especially in the fight against drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this legislation will be quickly passed by the House and the Senate so that we may get on with this next effort to stamp out this scourge of drug abuse which threatens our Nation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, drug abuse is a disease, a national disease. Like other afflictions it respects neither age nor wealth, neither race nor status. The epidemic in drug abuse has had telling effects throughout our society. Violent crime, street crime, is a well-known companion of addiction. The Armed Forces have been seriously hobbled by drug use within their ranks. Families, both urban and rural, both black and white, have been disrupted cruelly when one of their members has taken flight from reality through the use of chemi-

cal. The health bill that this condition presents to the Nation is staggering.

As a nation we long regarded the tragedy of drug abuse to be purely criminal in nature. We dealt with the user as with any other felon. We confined him, we ostracized him. To a large extent, we condemned him to a life centered on drugs, and dependent on crime. We chose to turn our backs on the root causes of the problem, and conveniently shunted its victims from sight.

As a nation we viewed drug abuse as a local problem. We consigned the guilt for the continuing failure to make progress on this front to the inadequacies of local programs and personnel. We have now come to realize the national proportions of the crisis.

The bill for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention begins the task of meeting the problem head on. It seeks to provide national coordination in the fields of policy, planning, and objectives. Prevention and treatment must work together if they are to work at all. The creation of a special office gives our commitment its proper emphasis and high priority. The representation on the National Advisory Council of the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare—plus 12 appointed members—properly recognizes their special responsibilities in this field. The inclusion of community health centers and public health facilities in drug treatment and rehabilitation programs affirms the national will to deal with drug abuse.

Some may say that H.R. 12089 is only one step, but it is a strong and necessary step. I heartily endorse it.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12089, to create a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. I commend Chairman STAGGERS and Subcommittee Chairman ROGERS for the expertise and energy demonstrated during the exhaustive committee investigation. I recommend adequate funding for this vital legislation since anticipated results will not be forthcoming otherwise.

This legislation represents a new beginning in the faltering war we are waging against narcotics. Our efforts to date have not been an unqualified success. The number of addicts in this country increases daily despite recent administration efforts to stem the flow of heroin across our borders. Heroin enters the blood streams of our youth and crosses socio-economic boundaries. Heroin overdoses in Cook County alone last year accounted for 310 deaths with no indication that the crisis has reached its peak.

This legislation before us in Congress today provides the coordination necessary to effectively deal with the problem. The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention will be a unifying force for the proliferation of Federal, State, and local agencies now active in drug prevention.

In addition to establishing a National Drug Abuse Training Center, the bill provides that existing community health centers and public health service facilities will be utilized where feasible. Too often in the past, Congress has opted for creating a new agency to deal with a problem without first considering ad-

justments in agencies already in existence.

As a member of the Select Committee on Crime, I am in total agreement with the section of the bill providing for increased pharmacological research to find a chemical substitute for heroin. After extensive hearings in the Crime Committee last year, it became evident that a full-scale research effort must get underway to provide blocking or antagonistic drugs as well as detoxification agents to ease withdrawal for addicts. While the methadone approach is a step in the right direction, I do not consider it a suitable solution to the problem.

Each day we delay, more Americans succumb to heroin addiction. Each time we postpone our legislative responsibility, the problem becomes more insurmountable. The time is now, gentlemen. We may not have too many days left.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12089, creating a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, and I urge all Members to join in supporting this long overdue step toward dealing with drug abuse in America.

The massive drug problems which we face today demand the central coordination of the Nation's drug abuse control efforts which this legislation would establish. There are an estimated 250,000 heroin addicts in the United States today. Together they spend \$7.5 million per day or approximately \$2,737,500,000 per year to buy their drugs. If 75 percent of those addicted resorted to crime to support their addiction, the cost in crime to sustain the heroin habit nationwide would be in excess of \$8 billion per year.

The human cost of heroin addiction is even more shocking. At least five Americans die each day as a result of narcotics abuse. The physical and psychological states of countless more deteriorate to the point where they are unable to function in society. Caught in the endless cycle of "highs," crime, and arrests, they neglect not only themselves but their families. One of the greatest tragedies of drug abuse today is the heroin baby—a child born addicted to heroin because its mother was addicted during pregnancy.

Because of the complex nature of the drug crisis in the United States, it is necessary to approach this problem at many different levels. On the so-called supply side of drug abuse, some striking advances have been made. A beefed-up Customs Bureau has made record seizures of narcotics entering the country during the last year, confiscating a total of 1,309 pounds. Internationally, the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has uncovered some strands of the drug supply network, and the Government of Turkey, perhaps the main supplier of opium in the world, has pledged to eliminate all opium cultivation at the end of the 1972-73 crop year.

I have concentrated much of my own efforts in Congress on the problem of international drug traffic. I was pleased that the Congress accepted an amendment which I offered to the recent foreign aid bill requiring the President to cut off economic and military assistance from countries refusing to cooperate in the international control of illegal narcotics. Much more needs to be done in

the field of international narcotics control, of course, for as one clandestine supply route is severed, another seems to take its place almost immediately. However, the passage of this amendment as well as the other steps which have been taken provide some optimism that we are headed in the right direction on the supply side of the narcotics problem.

The "demand" side of the narcotics problem has been hindered in the past by the fact that at least nine different agencies and departments have had jurisdiction over treatment and education programs. While the various programs at times complemented each other, they too often worked against each other, causing inefficiency and duplication. No authority has ever existed in any individual or governmental body to coordinate the Nation's resources in an overall attack on the demand side of the drug problem.

It is exactly this problem which H.R. 12089 seeks to overcome. This legislation creates a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention with the power to provide central, comprehensive coordination of the Federal drug abuse control effort. It delegates to the Director of this agency sweeping powers over the conduct of drug treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs throughout the Federal Government. These powers include the authority to direct drug abuse prevention functions of all Federal organizations, including the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, and encompass an extraordinary authority over the Special Action Office's own budget, a power traditionally exercised by the Office of Management and Budget.

The mandate of this legislation states that the Director "shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions." The powers given to the Director in this bill should allow him to carry out this mandate with a minimum of redtape and bureaucratic duplication. They should allow him to attack the drug problem in the only way it can be effectively handled—through a coordinated national effort under central Federal direction.

During the past year I have been particularly concerned with the problem of drug abuse in the Armed Forces. Last spring I introduced legislation which would provide drug rehabilitation for addicted GI's right in the military itself. It would require that no addicted serviceman be discharged until judged free of his habitual dependence. This provision would protect both the drug addict by giving him proper treatment, and the society to which the improperly treated GI would return, to a life of crime and sorrow.

The legislation which we are considering today will give the Director of the Special Action Office authority over Armed Forces drug rehabilitation and education programs. Such authority is necessary if the Director is to carry out the coordinated effort which the mandate demands. However, in delegating this power Congress must not abdicate its own authority and responsibility to designate what the military drug abuse control effort should include. I hope that

Congress will supplement the Special Action Office legislation by passing H.R. 8216, my bill for a comprehensive program of drug treatment in the armed services itself. By doing this, the Congress can provide a further mandate for the Director of the Special Action Office—a mandate to assure the effective treatment and rehabilitation of the thousands of GI's addicted to drugs.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about doing something to stem drug abuse and help drug-dependent people, we should pass this legislation. We cannot possibly hope to wage an effective campaign against the drug menace if the resources we have to do it with are scattered throughout the Federal Government, lacking any interdepartmental coordination and direction.

H.R. 12089 follows the President's request last year for the establishment of a Special Office of Drug Abuse Prevention to provide central comprehensive coordination of the Federal Government's activities in the area of drug abuse. The Director of this new Office situated in the Executive Office of the President would have broad powers to conduct overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs throughout the Federal Government.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the extent of the drug abuse problem. Generally, the illegal use of marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates, hallucinogenics, and narcotics is considered to be a big city problem. But evidence clearly shows that it has permeated every income level and every part of the country, including America's small towns and countryside. We do not think of drug use being a problem in rural areas, but increasingly it is. The total drug arrest increase for rural areas from 1964 to 1969 was 600 percent. Arrests of persons under 18 years of age increased 1,400 percent in the same period.

As a Representative of a rural constituency, these figures are of concern because we have seen the emergence and spread of drug use in southeastern Ohio. Researchers conducting a drug survey stated to us that:

There is a true drug problem here and more and more of our youth are becoming tangled in its web.

Local law enforcement authorities, health personnel, and school officials have told us of the problems they are facing and their concern about future trends. One prosecuting attorney conceded:

We have a serious problem at hand, but I am not sure we have the knowledge to cope with the causes of drug use.

Truly, drug abuse is a national menace demanding a full measure of our attention and resources. How well we organize ourselves and utilize our resources will determine our success in fighting this affliction which has grown to epidemic proportions. H.R. 12089 provides for the development of a coordinated long-term Federal strategy that is so essential to effectively curb drug addiction and abuse at the earliest possible time. I support the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill authorizing the establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention with the goal of better coordinating the many and varied Federal programs dealing with drug abuse and addiction. I think that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has brought to the House a sound bill and it is my sincere hope that the overwhelming margin by which it will be passed will help convince the Committee on Appropriations to recommend funding equal to the authorization.

At the same time, I would warn my colleagues that we must go much further than this legislation if we really intend to get at the roots of the drug menace. By all means, let us coordinate and streamline the Federal antidrug efforts. Let us better disseminate the results of drug research. Let us focus even greater attention on the causes and implications of drug abuse.

But at the same time, let us be constantly aware that reorganization cannot be an adequate substitute for resources; that no amount of special offices or advisory councils can take the place of a far greater Federal investment in drug abuse research, programs aimed at preventing young people from getting involved with drugs in the first place, and treatment and rehabilitation programs for those already addicted.

There has been far too much rhetoric and far too little real action in these areas. In New York, for example, Governor Rockefeller has declared all-out war against narcotics at the outset of each of his three terms. Apparently, those declarations of war were never backed up by an offensive, for in his latest message to the legislature, Governor Rockefeller called instead for the Federal Government to take on the challenge, urging:

A total mobilization . . . to save the youth of the world from the devastation of drugs.

At the same time, the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission has informed us that State-funded programs to prevent drug addiction in New York City's elementary, junior, and senior high schools will end by next September 15. Why? Because the Governor's budget priorities find room only for \$9 million for these programs out of \$7.9 billion in the total budget. What this means is that drug prevention programs at 92 high schools and in each of the city's 31 decentralized school districts will be cut off abruptly unless Federal funds are made available.

What good will it do to divert these funds, as the Governor is doing, to treatment services if by turning our backs on the young we merely give impetus to the cycle of drug abuse that threatens an entire younger generation? Treatment and rehabilitation must be high priorities, but there can be no higher priority in the drug abuse war than prevention.

I hope that my colleagues will resolve that the bill we pass here today will be just one phase of a total commitment to win the war against drug abuse. That commitment can only be met if we demand full appropriations for the programs now underway.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to

speak in favor of H.R. 12089 because the creation of the Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention is a necessary first step in dealing with this Nation's grave drug abuse problem. The passage of this bill will bring about positive action in the monitoring and coordination of drug abuse programs. I am aware that some of my colleagues question the advisability of investing money in this effort to bring drug abuse under control. I have no doubt that they share every American citizen's concern about this problem. I sincerely feel we must take positive action to eliminate drug abuse and do it now. However, I am hopeful that this bill will be considered as merely a first step and that in the future Congress will see fit to implement stronger and more comprehensive measures to increase the effectiveness of this country's efforts to halt the illicit flow of all dangerous drugs.

In this regard, I hope that Congress will consider legislation that will coordinate and consolidate the existing programs that deal with the illegal trafficking of drugs. If we are to be successful in overcoming the drug abuse problem we must make a concerted attack on all aspects of the problem. We must unify our efforts on the "source" as well as the "aftereffects" of drug abuse. I am skeptical that this can be accomplished without consolidating the "supply" and the "demand" of drug abuse. It is for this reason that I will strongly support legislation that will unify all Government action in drug abuse control.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support for this measure which would create a Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention.

The scope of the drug abuse problem in this country has expanded in recent years to the point that now, like a cancerous growth, it threatens to destroy the very fabric of our society. One can hardly pick up a newspaper or listen to a news report today without some new story of drug abuse.

Clearly the time has passed when condemnation or mere dismay is enough. This situation demands action; action which is concerted and coordinated toward eliminating heroin addiction once and for all.

It is true that we have done a great deal to eliminate the supply of heroin and other dangerous drugs as they are transported across the country. This effort has succeeded in blocking the traffic of large quantities of drugs before they ever reached the streets.

However, it is apparent that as long as there remains a sufficient demand for these products there will always be a steady supply. Regardless of the legal penalties we impose, regardless of the vigilance of our law enforcement agencies, as long as addicts are willing to pay the price, there will be suppliers of heroin.

Mr. Chairman, that is why this measure is so vital. It recognizes that in order to defeat the menace of addiction, we must attack it on all fronts. We must not only attempt to cut off the supply of drugs but, also wipe out the demand for them. Finally, we must rehabilitate those now victimized by addiction.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that

I have joined with over 100 Members of this House in sponsoring legislation which would allocate funds to find a lasting cure for heroin addiction. At the present time, the most widely used heroin substitute, methadone, falls short of an adequate cure.

Therefore, through research we must develop a heroin antagonist which is long lasting, which is nonlethal and which is neither addictive or euphoric. Methadone meets none of these criteria. To be sure, this is no easy task, but it is nonetheless one which we must undertake.

This legislation takes the first steps toward that goal. Indeed, it goes beyond finding a medical cure for addiction to include a National Training Center for drug abuse study. Additionally, it will provide money to community health centers so that they can provide their patients with the drug treatment which many of them desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, in short, we have an opportunity to create a concerted plan for action that would join private and public sectors in the battle to effectively control and eventually defeat this terrible epidemic.

Faced with a problem of this proportion, one which has afflicted over a quarter of a million Americans, we can ill afford to ignore this opportunity. I therefore respectfully urge that this vital legislation receive the support of all my colleagues.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 12089, to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

The evidence presented here in support of this measure, unhappily and unfortunately, demonstrates, beyond question, that drug abuse throughout this country has reached the most alarming proportions, that this modern plague runs through all segments of our population, and that its impact upon the individual health and military efficiency of the members of our armed services represents an increasingly critical problem. Obviously there is then, as the President recently emphasized, a great urgency to establish, as soon as possible, a national unit to provide overall planning, policy, objectives and priorities in the Federal drug abuse prevention effort.

That is precisely what this bill is designed to do through the creation of this Special Action Office and it will also result in the amendment of our existing law to enable our community health centers and public health service facilities to extend drug treatment and rehabilitation services at the local levels.

Mr. Chairman, the objectives contained in this measure are undoubtedly essential to the national health and safety of our people; the appropriations proposed, over the next 3 years, for the achievement of these objectives are unquestionably within reason.

In summary, this bill constitutes a further, vigorous and timely step to prudently marshal and concentrate, under one office and direction, our present programs and resources for the more rapid and effective elimination of the scourge of drug abuse in this Nation and it merits the resounding approval of the House.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the action of the House today in its resounding passage of H.R. 12089 which will create the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. Perhaps at long last we can untangle the maze of Federal, State, and city programs aimed at the prevention and treatment of drug addiction. Our complex of drug treatment facilities has grown astronomically and has only been surpassed by the growth in the numbers of addicts that populate our city streets, hospitals, and morgues. The frustration of those of us who have seen hope after hope dashed on the rocks of despair reminds me of the recent hit song about the man going 90 miles an hour down a dead-end street. Until now it has been a dead-end street and the legislation we pass today offers the only hope for a breakthrough into an era where we can begin to eliminate the scourge of addiction that is robbing this Nation of the vitality of millions of its youth and billions of dollars of its resources through wasted lives and crime.

I have known of the work of Dr. Jerome Jaffee for many years and of his very able assistant, Mr. Paul Perito, who through his work on the House Select Committee on Crime, chaired by the distinguished Member from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, brought to the attention of the House an unbelievable picture of the spread of addiction throughout our country.

I know they have for many months been eager to get on with the task of solving the Nation's drug problems. I know that they bring an abundance of talent and energy to the Special Action Office and that once the Congress makes this legislation a public law in the not too distant future, they will with all good speed, in the words of President Nixon:

Instill a sense of urgency in Federal and federally supported drug abuse programs.

It is my urgent hope that as part of their efforts they will pay especial attention to those unfortunate servicemen who have become drug casualties while fighting for their country or while serving in distant lands. The ranks of the Nation's junkie corps are swelled daily by ever increasing numbers of GI junkies whose only hope of survival is a massive Federal program to get them off of drugs and keep them off.

While this legislation concerns itself primarily with civilian programs for the treatment of drug abuse, it cannot separate the civilian drug problem from the military drug problem. The bulk of the hard core drug abusing GI's will eventually turn up in one of the programs covered by H.R. 12089.

For example, 30 percent of the male addicts currently in the Federal programs at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky., are former servicemen, the bulk of whom became addicted or had their habits worsen during their tours in the military. Yet these facilities have not begun to receive GI's addicted during the surge of heroin use which began a year ago in Vietnam.

So I ask on this momentous occasion of House passage of H.R. 12089 that the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention give urgent and

special consideration to this Nation's addicted servicemen. The Congress and the mothers and fathers of our addicted GI's will expect no less.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 12089, to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

I have long been deeply concerned about the perilous drug problem which has engulfed this country. We are beyond doubt confronting a crisis situation, for narcotics addiction has reached epidemic proportions.

In fact, I wish to emphasize that in June of last year, in testimony in support of legislation I have introduced to provide a mandatory medical treatment program for narcotics addicts, I stated:

It has been a little over a year since I first testified before this Subcommittee with respect to the necessity for enacting extensive treatment legislation. During that year, the severity of the drug epidemic has drastically intensified. In view of the magnitude and scope of the drug abuse problem in this country, it is no longer accurate to describe it in terms of "an epidemic" or as a "problem which has reached serious proportions."

It is beyond that now; and unless we take immediate and decisive measures to attack this problem, the capacity of our Government to eventually control this problem will be greatly diminished. This disease is no longer restricted to the urban ghettos of our society. It has now spread to our suburban areas, and the scourge of heroin has infected many children in our elementary schools. Narcotics addiction is decimating our youth and damaging the basic fabric of American society. In describing this problem, it is not my intention to provoke alarm or arouse sensationalism, but instead to describe the situation as it actually exists.

Mr. Chairman, that was in June of 1971, and unfortunately the situation as it actually exists today is just as bleak and grim.

Therefore, I am pleased to strongly support the bill before us. It was the result of extremely thorough and intensive study by the House Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, and I want to commend the members of the subcommittee and of the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for their excellent accomplishment in bringing before the House this significant measure to deal with the "demand side" of the drug abuse problem.

Establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention as a component of the Executive Office of the President, as proposed by President Nixon on June 17, 1971, is in my judgment a vitally important action in what he rightfully termed our "crusade" against drug abuse.

This is a united, bipartisan effort, and I am heartened that Members of both parties in Congress and the executive branch can join in this effort to combat narcotics addiction.

Presently the Federal Government's activities in this area have been carried on by at least nine different agencies and departments, and have ranged from supporting programs which educate teenagers to those which train exaddicts for jobs. With establishment of the Special Action Office we will provide, I believe what the committee report envisages as

a "central comprehensive coordination of the Federal effort."

With approval of this legislation, there should be actual improvement in our governmental activities in fighting narcotics addiction. In addition, there would be a most significant impact because we will officially state that "it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this act to focus the resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on drug abuse to significantly reduce the incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse in the United States within the shortest practicable period of time, and to develop a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy to combat drug abuse."

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the approval of H.R. 12089.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 12089, a bill to create the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. I have supported bills in the past to prohibit foreign narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States, to amend the Narcotic Addiction Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to provide for involuntary civil commitment of narcotic addicts charged with a crime, and to provide increased penalties for distribution of heroin.

As a continuing step in our fight against drug abuse, I am pleased to give my support to this bill. I believe that this bill will help to meet the needs of our society in dealing with the problem of drug abuse. It would provide for centralized coordination, through one national agency, of all the various volunteer State and local programs attempting to deal with the problem of drug addiction. It would also provide these agencies with the tools they need through the pharmaceutical research grants contained in this bill.

The third aspect of this bill is its emphasis on community programs, strengthening, unifying, providing the tools to these community-based programs, in order to deal with the problem of drug abuse within their own local areas.

Fourth, the training program included in this bill would provide an educated and professional cadre, schooled in the latest techniques of combating the disease of drug addiction.

Fifth, Mr. Chairman, I feel that an essential part of this bill is the provision to provide a standard for the measurement of success. Not only would this allow us to identify the location and extent of the problem, but also to indicate the success or lack of success of specific programs. We will be able to determine how much crime is being committed now as the result of drug abuse, how many and what types of narcotics the offenders are addicted to, and, as this program gets underway, we will have a gage of just how effective this program is in reducing drug abuse and rehabilitating the addict.

The final aspect of this bill is that it will coordinate, on a large scale, all the forces of government from local agencies to the national administration: health, education, welfare, justice, mental health—all those segments of the government which deal in society, to weld

them together into an effective narcotic fighting force.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill before us today, coupled with the tough international crackdown on the illicit drug trade, represents a massive offensive in the war on drug abuse. When there are 200,000 to 250,000 addicts in the United States, when we realize that there are 10,400 estimated addicts on heroin alone in the District of Columbia, 15,000 drug addicts in Maryland and an estimated 5,000 addicts in Prince George's County, which I represent, when we have our law enforcement officials reporting constant increases in drug-related crime, when we have the sheer physical results of lung damage, brain damage, liver damage, anemia, mental deterioration, suicidal tendencies, unpredictable behavior, hallucinations, unconsciousness and death from suffocation and choking, then, Mr. Speaker, we are definitely dealing with a dreaded disease, a disease which we know is spreading in epidemic proportions. I believe that it takes a bill of this nature to deal adequately with this threat to our society. Our forces on the local level through volunteer organizations and public agencies have been trying to deal with the drug program for many years. In Prince Georges County, Md., we have had the Jaycees banding together with the board of education, the department of social services, the sheriff's office, health department, Lion's Club, county commissioners, as well as other organizations, all trying to deal with this problem of drug abuse. They have many worthwhile programs, they have learned a great deal, and are doing much good. This bill will give us the effective tools and the national coordination we need to weld together effectively volunteer, private, local, community, national forces in an all-out offensive against drug abuse.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly proud to have had a part in developing this legislation and would like to direct my remarks today to that man whom the President has selected to lead this most vital effort against this omnipresent enemy of our society.

Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and Special Consultant to the President for Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, arrived in Washington, D.C., just 8 short months ago with the monumental assignment to pull together all the ongoing drug abuse programs in more than 10 Federal agencies, to reevaluate their effectiveness and to make recommendations as to the need for redirection of certain ongoing programs, the abolishment of certain others which might be a duplication of effort, and the establishment of new programs where there had previously been none.

Dr. Jaffe is not a diplomat or a politician. He is one committed wholly to this cause of quelling the drug abuse problem. Asked if he could have the one thing in the world he wanted, he responded, "50 dedicated people to work 18 hours a day." And a better example of dedication would be hard to find. He lives to do all that is humanly possible to accomplish

the objective of reducing the human suffering and chaos that arises when drug users remain untreated, and he is willing to expend himself in the process.

His credentials speak for themselves. As former director of the drug abuse program at the Department of Mental Health of the State of Illinois as well as associate professor for the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Chicago, Dr. Jaffe was producing promising results under his multimodality addiction plan. If the patient was not making progress under one treatment, another was tried. He pioneered the use of new substances to reduce the use of heroin and comprehensive approaches in which methadone maintenance and therapeutic community approaches were combined. The success of this approach stands out in results, with two out of three of his patients being freed of illicit drugs.

In addition, Dr. Jaffe has been a consultant to numerous State and local governments and private organizations and has been a frequent contributor to many professional journals. His energy and innovativeness are without confinement. Dr. Jaffe is not just another bureaucrat either—he has, however, in a very short time, become very wise to bureaucratic techniques and will not be one to be dealt lightly with. He demands action—nothing more, nothing less. And he is fast putting together a team of action-oriented specialists to assist him in carrying out his mission. What better approach than this, to effectively deal with a problem which grows in geometrical leaps and bounds daily and will continue to do so unless immediate action is not only called for but taken?

Dr. Jaffe, well-known as "the most brilliant mind in drug abuse today," can and will do the job that he was called on to do. I insert in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the February 1972, issue of Signature, "Perle Mesta He's Not: Man on the Move—Jerome Jaffe." It exemplifies even further the individual toward whom our Nation looks for an effective solution to drug abuse:

#### CURRICULUM VITAE: JEROME HERBERT JAFFE

Formal education:  
Temple University: A.B., Psychology, 1954;  
M.A., Experimental Psychology, 1956.  
Temple University School of Medicine:  
M.D., 1958.

Awards and honors:  
Temple University, College of Liberal Arts: Magna cum laude; Distinction in Psychology; Alumni Prize; highest academic average; Psi Chi Award (scholarship and achievement in psychology); Psi Chi Honorary Society.

Temple University School of Medicine: Summer Research Fellowship in Pharmacology, 1957; Babcock Honorary Surgical Society; Alpha Omega Alpha; Merck Award: outstanding achievement in Medicine during senior year; Mosby Scholarship Award: highest four year average in medicine.

Fellowships:  
USPHS Post Doctoral Fellowship in Pharmacology, 1961-1964.  
USPHS Research Career Development Award, 1964 to 1966; 1967 to 1970.

Major interests: Psychopharmacology; use and abuse of psychoactive drugs—biological and sociological aspects.

Experience and Training:  
Rotating Internship: U.S. Public Health

Service Hospital, Staten Island, New York, 1958-1959.

Residency in Psychiatry: U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Kentucky, 1959-1960.

Psychiatric Staff: U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Kentucky, 1960-1961.

Post Doctoral Fellow, Interdisciplinary Program: Albert Einstein College of Medicine, 1961-1962.

Post Doctoral Fellow and resident in psychiatry: Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Bronx Municipal Hospital Center, 1962-1964.

Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology and Instructor, Department of Psychiatry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, 1964-1966.

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, 1966-1969.

Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, 1969-July 1971 (on leave of absence).

Director, Drug Abuse Program, Department of Mental Health, State of Illinois, 1967-July 1971.

Present position:  
Director, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, Executive Office of the President, The White House.

Special Consultant to the President for Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

Memberships in Organizations:  
Alpha Omega Alpha.

Sigma Xi.  
American Psychiatric Association.

American Society of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.

American College of Neuro-Psychopharmacology.

New York Academy of Science.  
American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Illinois Psychiatric Society.  
World Psychiatric Association.

Consultantships, Advisory Panels and Editorships:

Member, Editorial Board—*International Journal of the Addictions*, 1966-.

Member, Review Committee—Center for Studies of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, NIMH, 1966-1971.

Visiting Assistant Professor of Pharmacology and Psychiatry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, 1966-1971.

Visiting Lecturer, University of Texas, Medical Branch, 1966-1971.

Consultant—Illinois Narcotic Advisory Council, 1966-1968.

Consultant—New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1967-1970.

Member, Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Illinois State Medical Society, 1968-1971.

Member, Technical Advisory Board—National Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education & Information, 1969-1971.

Secretary, Section on Drug Dependence—World Psychiatric Association, 1969-1971.

Member—Advisory Board—*Psychopharmacologia*, 1970-.

Member, Committee of the Division of Clinical Pharmacology, American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 1970-.

Member, Advisory Committee—Drug Abuse Training Center, California State College, Hayward, California, 1970-1971.

Consultant, Bureau of Drugs Advisory Panel Systems, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1970-1971.

Special Consultant (Technical Advisor)—Expert Committee on Drug Dependence, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1970.

Member—American Psychiatric Association Task Force on Alcoholism, 1970-1971.

Consultant—Joint Information Service, American Psychiatric Association and the National Association for Mental Health (Project

on Current Methods for the Treatment of Addiction), 1970-1971.

In addition to these on going advisory and consulting activities, Dr. Jaffe has been, over the past three years, an invited participant in more than fifty national and international conferences and symposia. He has also served as special consultant to a number of state and local governments interested in developing drug abuse treatment or educational programs and to a number of temporary State and Federal advisory panels, school systems, not-for-profit corporations, and private industries. On assuming his current position, Dr. Jaffe resigned many of his responsibilities as consultant and board member.

#### PUBLICATIONS: JEROME HERBERT JAFFE, M.D.

With Sharpless, S.K. (1). The electrical activity of neuronally isolated cortex during barbiturate withdrawal (Abs.). *The Pharmacologist*. 5: 250, 1963.

With Sharpless, S.K. The rapid development of physical dependence on barbiturates and its relation to denervation (Abs.). *The Pharmacologist*. 5: 249, 1963.

Drug addiction and abuse. In *The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, 3rd edition, L. Goodman and A. Gilman, eds. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965.

Narcotic analgesics. In *The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, 3rd edition, L. Goodman and A. Gilman, eds. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965.

With Sharpless, S.K. The rapid development of physical dependence on barbiturates. *J. Pharmacol. and Exper. Ther.* 150: 140-145, 1965.

With Friedman, M.J. (1). Changes in CNS sensitivity to cholinergic (muscarinic) agonists following withdrawal of chronically administered scopolamine (Abs.). *The Pharmacologist*. 8: 199, 1966.

With Sharpless, S.K. (1). The electrical excitability of isolated cortex during barbiturate withdrawal. *J. Pharmacol. and Exper. Ther.* 151: 321-329, 1966.

Research on newer methods of treatment of drug dependent individuals in the U.S.A. *Excerpta Medica International Congress Series*. 129: 271-276, 1966. Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of the Collegium International Neuropsychopharmacologicum, Washington, D. C.

With Brill, L. Cyclazocine, a long acting narcotic antagonist: its voluntary acceptance as a treatment modality by ambulatory narcotics users. *Internat. J. Addictions*. 1: 9-123, 1966.

With Kirkpatrick, D. The use of ion-exchange resin impregnated paper in the detection of opiate alkaloids, amphetamines, phenothiazines and barbiturates in urine. *Psychopharm. Bull.* 3(4): 49-52, 1966.

With Brill, L. (1). The relevancy of some newer American treatment approaches for England. *Brit. J. Addict.* 62: 375-386, 1967.

Cyclazocine in the treatment of narcotics addiction. In *Current Psychiatric Therapies*, J. Masserman, ed. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1967.

Psychopharmacology and opiate dependence. In *Psychopharmacology: A Review of Progress, 1957-1967*, D.H. Efron, J.O. Cole, J. Levine, J.R. Wittenborn, eds. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology, San Juan, Puerto Rico, December, 1967.

With Sharpless, S.K. Pharmacological denervation supersensitivity in the CNS: A theory of physical dependence. In *The Addictive States*, A. Wikler, ed. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1968.

Narcotics in the treatment of pain. *Med. Clin. North Am.* 52: 33-45, 1968.

With Skom, J. and Hastings, J. Drug Addiction: New approaches to an old problem. *Postgrad. Med.* 45: 73-81, 1968.

Opiate dependence and the use of nar-

cotics for the relief of pain. In *Modern Treatment*. R. Wang, ed. 5: 1121-1135, 1968.

Cannabis (marihuana). In *Encyclopedia Americana*. New York: Grolier, 1969.

Drug addiction and drug abuse. In *Encyclopedia Americana*. New York: Grolier, 1969.

A review of the approaches to the problem of compulsive narcotics use. In *Drugs and Youth*, J.R. Wittenborn, H. Brill, J.P. Smith, S. Wittenborn, eds. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.

With Friedman, M.J. (1). A central hypothermic response to pilocarpine in the mouse. *J. Pharmacol. and Exper. Ther.* 167: 34-44, 1969.

With Friedman, M.J. (1) and Sharpless, S.K. Central nervous system supersensitivity to pilocarpine after withdrawal of chronically administered scopolamine. *J. Pharmacol. and Exper. Ther.* 167: 45-55, 1969.

With Sharpless, S.K. (1). Withdrawal phenomena as manifestations of disuse supersensitivity. In *The Scientific Basis of Drug Dependence* (A Biological Council Symposium), H. Steinberg, ed., pp. 67-76. London: J. and A. Churchill, Ltd., 1969.

Pharmacological approaches to the treatment of compulsive opiate use: their rationale and current status. In *Drugs and the Brain*, P. Black, ed. Baltimore: 1969.

With Zaks, M. and Washington, E. Experience with the use of methadone in a multimodality program for the treatment of narcotics users. *Internat. J. Addictions*. 4(3): 481-490, 1969.

With Deitch, D. (1). Problems in Drug Abuse Education: Two Hypotheses. In *Communication and Drug Abuse: Proceedings of the Second Rutgers Symposium on Drug Abuse*, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1969, J. R. Wittenborn, et. al., eds. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1970.

With Holtzman, D. (1), Lovell, R. A., and Freedom, D. X. 1-9-Tetra-hydrocannabinol: neurochemical and behavioral effects in the mouse. *Science*. 163: 1464-1467, 1969.

With Schuster, C. R., Smith, B., Blachly, P. Comparison of Di-alphaacetylmethadol and methadone in treatment of narcotics addicts (Abs.). *The Pharmacologist*. 11(2): Fall, 1969.

Drug maintenance and antagonists: limits and possibilities. Proceedings of the November 24, 1969 Conference of the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission.

The Treatment of Drug Abusers. In *Principles of Psychopharmacology*, W. Clark and J. del Guidice, eds. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Whatever Turns You Off. *Psychology Today*. 3(12): 42-44, 1970.

With Schuster, C. R., Smith, B., Blachly, P. A comparison of di-alphaacetylmethadol and methadone in the treatment of chronic heroin users: a pilot study. *JAMA*. 211(11): 1834-1836, 1970.

The implementation and evaluation of new treatments for compulsive drug users. In *Advances in Mental Science II—Drug Dependence*, R. T. Harris, W. M. McIsaac, C. R. Schuster, Jr., eds. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1970.

Narcotics Analgesics. In *The Pharmacological Basis for Therapeutics*, 4th edition, L. Goodman and A. Gilman, eds. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1970.

Drug Addiction and Drug Abuse. In *Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, 4th edition, L. Goodman and A. Gilman, eds. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1970.

Further experience with the use of methadone. *Internat. J. Addictions*. 5(3): 375-389, 1970.

Development of a successful treatment program for narcotics addicts in Illinois. In *Proceedings of the Second Western Institute on Problems of Drug Dependence*, P. Blachly, ed. Springfield: 1970.

The maintenance approach to the management of opiate dependence. To be included

in Proceedings International Symposium on Addiction, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Nov. 1970. C. J. D. Zarafonitis, ed.

With Schuster, C. R. (1) and Smith, B. Drug abuse in heroin users: an experimental study of self-administration of methadone, codeine, and pentazocine. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.* 24: 359-362, April, 1971.

With Hughes, P. (1). The heroin copping area: a location for epidemiological study and intervention activity. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.* 24(5): 394-400, May 1971.

With Senay, E. C. Methadone and 1-Methadyl Acetate, Use in Management of Narcotics Addicts. *JAMA.* 216(8): 1303-1305, 1971.

Drug Abuse Treatment Programs. *Hospitals, JAHA.* 45: Part I, 1971.

With Hughes, P. (1), Chappel, J., Senay, E. C. Developing in-patient services for community-based treatment of narcotic addictions. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.* 25: 278-283, 1971.

The Spectrum of Approaches to the Treatment of Narcotics Addiction. *Clinical Research.* 19: 612-617, 1971.

With Chappel, J. (1) and Senay, E. C. Cyclazocine in a multi-modality treatment program: comparative results. *Internat. J. Addictions.* 6(3): 509-523, Sept., 1971.

With Kalstha, K. K. (1). Extraction techniques for narcotics, barbiturates, and central nervous system stimulants in a drug abuse urine screening program. *Journal of Chromatography.* 60: 83-94, 1971.

With Fritz, K. and Kalstha, K. K. Methadone Disks: Injectable—Non-injectable tablets. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.* 25(6): 525-526, Dec., 1971.

#### IN PREPARATION, SUBMITTED OR ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

With diMenza, S. Effects of variation of methadone dose on the outcome of treatment of heroin users. Presented at NRC meeting, Feb., 1971. Report of 33rd Annual Scientific Meeting, Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence.

With Senay, E. C., Schuster, C. R., Renault, P. F., Smith, B. and diMenza, S. A double-blind study of D1-alpha-acetylmethadol and methadone in the treatment of chronic heroin users. *JAMA.* Oct., 1971 (accepted).

With Chappel, J. N. Role of hospitalization in the treatment of drug addiction.

With Chappel, J. N. and Senay, E. C. A double-blind controlled study of cyclazocine in the treatment of heroin users.

With Hughes, P. H., Barker, N. W., Crawford, G. A. The Natural History of a Heroin Epidemic. Presented to the 99th annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, October 11-15, 1971, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

#### PERLE MESTA HE IS NOT: MAN ON THE MOVE—JEROME JAFFE

(By John Peer Nugent)

In the briefing room of the White House last June 17th, President Richard Nixon announced that the "Public Enemy Number One in the United States is drug abuse" and declared a \$382 million war on an addiction that now afflicts the entire nation without regard for race, status or address.

To direct his unprecedented attack, the President picked no glamorous name, no political chum, no bureaucratic centurion. He reached all the way to Chicago's south side ghetto for Dr. Jerome Herbert Jaffe, a brilliant, brusque 37-year-old psychopharmacologist who has been battling abuse of drugs with science and medicine since 1954, the year before tranquilizers became a popular way out of problems for millions of citizens.

The selection of Jaffe to head the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention (SAODAP) was based on hard facts. The Illinois Drug Abuse Program he then directed was producing the most promising results coming out of the nation's 12,000 drug abuse

programs. Two out of three of Jaffe's patients were free of illicit drugs; the program's 1,700 patients were saving Illinois citizens about \$60 million annually—the amount they would normally be stealing from society to maintain their \$100-a-day heroin habits. (The nation loses an estimated \$6 to \$8 billion annually to addicts.)

The President quickly served notice to the public and his Administration that the chunky dynamo in the gold-rimmed glasses, who begins whirling at 6 a.m. and rarely stops before midnight, was going to be both relentless and demanding in the way he directed his campaign. "Dr. Jaffe is controversial," Mr. Nixon said. "He is blunt. He is abrasive. He is going to knock heads together. [And he is also] very compassionate."

It was for those very reasons that Mr. Nixon has given Dr. Jaffe unique powers to bring drug abuse under control. Accountable directly and only to the President, he has policy control over a major gamut of agencies: HEW's National Institute of Mental Health, Office of Education, Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health; HUD's Model Cities Administration; the Justice Department's Bureau of Prisons and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; the Veterans' Administration. He is, in effect, executive officer of what, when, and how the Federal Government handles drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training and research. He selects the priorities, evaluates the approaches, allocates the money.

From the start, Jaffe, who considers himself an empiricist not interested in simplistic responses, knew of the challenges ahead of him. On the one hand, there was getting the President's drug bill through a Democratic Congress that could certainly use drug abuse as a powerful domestic issue this year; on the other was the growing addiction to heroin as the number of known users passed the 250,000 count and the amount of heroin seized in the country jumped 2,000 percent in a year. And, as soon as he was appointed, instant cynics labeled him "the drug czar."

"To use an analogy from embryology," Jaffe says matter-of-factly, "it would be difficult even for the sophisticated observer to know if we shall develop into a lovely child of bipartisan goodwill or a deformed toad whose parentage might better be left unspecified."

A more committed man to bring forth the child would be hard to find. He took a \$20,000 cut in salary to go to Washington. At this writing, his close family life has been reduced to overnight visits to his Chicago home to be with his wife Faith and their three children Miriam, 11; Celia, 9; and Ari, 3½. His only diversion in Washington—between conferences—is house hunting out in the suburbs.

Jaffe is rather unique in Washington; he is a man with a single purpose who finds little need or place in its pursuit for socializing or hobbies. He is more frustrated than relaxed by leisure time. When he reads it is on the move, from a stapled bundle of Xeroxed newspaper and magazine articles on drug abuses he is handed by a press aide each morning. He also has little time to discuss matters not connected with his assignment and he appears to recharge his batteries with, not book or break, but a sharp, yeasty discussion on a new approach to abuse. He thrives on problems; he relaxes by working out their solutions.

The offices of SAODAP are found in a three-story red brick colonial building with electrified gas lamps on the front steps at 712 Jackson Place, about 200 paces from the west gate of the White House. With a hastily collected staff of 44 psychiatrists, pharmacologists and educators, it is here in unmarked, unplaqued, unheralded, close quarters that Jaffe plots not only how to

stem the tide of heroin addiction but also how to educate the nation about the dangers of and the cures for all illicit drug abuse.

Jaffe is a political independent who can't remember how he last registered so he doesn't see drugs in a political light. "We intend to develop a unified response to a national problem," he says in a voice that often shows impatience with wasting time on words. "We do not intend to be another layer of bureaucracy. We will have little sleep but were we to do less we might not sleep at all."

Such dedication to purpose has earned him the highest respect among colleagues on campuses and in hospitals and clinics around the nation. They refer to him as "the golden boy of the health profession." Peter Hammond, director of Washington's prestigious National Institute Coordinating Council on Drug Education (which is chaired by Art Linkletter) says of Jaffe: "He is the most brilliant mind in drug abuse today."

Because of his Herculean load, Jaffe's life is necessarily a spartan one. He doesn't smoke, is almost not aware of what he is eating and only drinks an occasional Bloody Mary "for the tomato juice." He's never certain of his weight because, as he says, "it fluctuates remarkably with the amount of time I have to eat." He's been known to walk out of Washington's much heralded "be seen" restaurant, Sans Souci, "because they didn't serve fast enough."

For a man known for being able to create a sense of urgency among his staff, his official biography is about as inspiring as a medical report. A Philadelphian, Jaffe studied psychiatry at Temple University and received his A.B. with *magna cum laude* honors in 1954. In 1956 he completed his M.A. in experimental psychiatry and also his M.D. at Temple's Medical School. He did his residency at the U.S. Public Health Hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, where he came in contact with drug addiction for the first time. In a rare moment of personal reflection, he recalls finding the thousands of addicts that he treated there were "people I could relate to. Even with all their problems they were very human people I thought I wanted to help. The professional relationships are not as cold as the textbooks would have you believe. In a time of crisis, one's response is almost as a friend."

From 1960 to 1966 he did research in drugs and behavior at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York. In 1966, he came to the University of Chicago in order to further develop his innovative multi-modality addiction plan which today is being applauded nationally. In 1968 the state of Illinois named him director of its program and Jaffe put his plan to work. In it, patients are assigned according to needs to therapeutic communities, psychotherapy, methadone maintenance, or treatment with one of the non-addictive narcotic antagonists such as cyclazocine. If the patient is not progressing under one treatment, he is shifted to another, because the objective is to cure, not to prove that any one system is the answer.

Jaffe more often than not arrives at work by taxi rather than government car. He bounds up the steps and into his first floor office which is devoid of any adornments except for the framed copy of the Executive Office order establishing his agency and a United Airlines 100,000 Mile Club paperweight which leans against a copy of Ralph Nader's report on *Vanishing Atr.*

His jacket comes off as he moves into the high-ceilinged chamber that was once an elegant 18th-century dining room but now serves as his operational nerve center.

His perpetual motion both physically and mentally creates a mood which is frantic, sometimes disorganized but never dull or slow. He has still to obtain a permanent sec-

retary. He finds it easier to place his own long-distance phone calls. The great sliding wooden doors that cut his office off from the front hall open and close with the frequency of a rodeo chute to let in herds of visitors—congressmen for briefings, international organization representatives seeking program directions and drug abuse professionals from across the nation offering their services.

On the phone to MIT's Jerome Wiesner, science advisor to Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, he says: "Come on down here and relieve me and I'll write a foreword for your next book." Jaffe wants him as a consultant but learns shortly after the conversation that he has lost him to the presidency of MIT.

To Professor Gordon Heistad, director of the University of Minnesota's drug information and education program and just off the plane he explains: "If you last until midnight, you're on. If you last past 9 p.m., I'll draft you." All day long it's that way as he tries to get an urgent slew of both short- and long-range drug abuse programs out of the paperwork stage and into practice.

During his first 90 days in office, master innovator Jaffe has put into action no less than 34 projects aimed at both the short-range problem of drugs in Vietnam and the long-range challenges such as spotting new drug abuses when they first break out—before they reach epidemic proportions. He is not only studying the behavior of drug users upon their return from Vietnam, but he is also monitoring returning non-users to see if the Vietnam experience alters their later, Stateside behavior.

Jaffe has already implemented a detoxification system for early detection of drug use. He quickly convinced the Army to send over a team of civilian ex-addicts, now working in drug abuse programs around the country, to brief military medical people on the various approaches to get users on the road to "cleaning up."

Though Jaffe has the highest respect for what professionals can accomplish in the drug abuse campaign, he is also a firm believer in the importance of ex-addicts. For all their scientific expertise, professionals are not as successful in getting hardcore addicts to turn off as are those who have been there and back. When one of their own "raps" with them, users respond much more positively. Also, it is much easier to fake a dedicated doctor out of position than a hard-nosed ex-addict who still has all the tricks fresh in his mind. That's why Jaffe recently (and successfully) recommended to the Pentagon they hire, "as civilian technical assistants," five ex-addicts to work in Vietnam as consultants with military professionals setting up on-scene programs. He is now compiling a data bank that will eventually be able to detect drug using trends across the country and sound a warning signal before they reach crisis proportions the way heroin has.

When red tape is mentioned, Jaffe pushes back in his black swivel chair, straightens out a paper clip into a tooth pick and says with an exacting, slightly high-pitched voice that "the strategy has to be that out of chaos, something good will happen. If you don't take risks nothing worthwhile will come out of it. It's like Guthrie's cat—if you retreat you'll never know cause and effect."

Jaffe learned quickly that some of the agencies put under his thumb give up "turf" power about as reluctantly as a street gang. "I'm sensitive to everyone else being sensitive of their territory," he says, while waiting for his educational team to arrive for a conference. Still, he demands the agencies be concise about their drug abuse goals. "The strategy has to be feasible," he says bluntly. "I have to know the resources and what the goals are. I'm really going to be an S.O.B. but I must know their goals."

Jaffe takes his Presidential assignment very personally, carrying his responsibility

mostly alone because, at this stage, there still aren't that many knowledgeable drug abuse specialists on his team.

"If you're a doctor, you're charged with a responsibility," he explains. "You can consult all you want but that does not divest you of the responsibility that you are charged with. We can't wait for everyone to be in agreement. We must move now. The President has charged us with that damned responsibility."

With no offer of coffee, the educational meeting starts. It deals with funding a program to set up courses on drug history in universities. As the idea is worked over, Jaffe asks for quiet and says: "What you want to discuss is: is this a relevant goal and why? Why not offer a course in dandruff in society instead of drugs in society?"

So charged, the group of educators adjourns to a third floor conference room to dig into the subject while Dr. Jaffe ushers into his office a group of Smithsonian Institute designers headed by deputy undersecretary Robert Brooks, who is involved with a major drug abuse exhibit planned for April. He listens to their plans, studies the displays and asks questions about goals. After 15 thoughtful minutes, one of the Smithsonian people asks if Jaffe could recommend a few drug abuse experts they might consult on certain aspects of the exhibit. Jaffe is thoughtful about it. He walks along his library pulling out books and tossing off names of men and women he would recommend.

He then launches into a discussion about educating citizens on the problem, removing myths and biases about drug abuse—i.e., that it is a secret attempt to enslave all blacks or that it is part of an international conspiracy. "We must try to deal with the thing on a rational basis," he says. "Without that, it is hard to convince skeptics. If someone says it's a Communist plot to destroy our youth, you might waste too much time just saying it isn't. And that's a waste of effort."

"The desire to consume drugs has nothing to do with one's state in life," Jaffe insists. "There is an argument to stop all pharmaceutical advertising dealing with drugs. You could say that was okay. But in other times when there were no advertisements, people were pushing drugs. In the Civil War there were no billboards but plenty of morphine addiction, and today we are grappling with much more than that. Individual responsibility is too easy a handle. If we were absolutely convinced that jogging three miles a day would add to our lives, how many of us would do it? Look at smoking. There's something strange about the human being's respect about health. Behavior is very resistant to it."

The man who has to be the most apolitical member of Mr. Nixon's first team is coldly critical of the rumors that whirl around Washington about drug abuse becoming a political football. "Any politicians who would use this crisis for votes will have to look into their own hearts to see if they are delaying issues for political reasons," he says. "I am committed to this cause. Politics come second to the cause. There are an awful lot of citizens who feel we have only one country. Obviously to some that is naive and anachronistic. Still, a lot of people are joining the cause. Damn little is being offered them except the chance to do something for their country. If that is passe, so be it."

When you're around Jerome Jaffe any length of time, you get the definite impression he's one man who has found that today's Washington can not only be challenging, but very productive for a mind that doesn't cry out for help but is dedicated to dispensing it instead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

TITLE I-----FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS  
SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

TITLE II-----OTHER AGENCIES

TITLE III-----FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS

Sec.

101. Congressional findings.
102. Declaration of national policy.
103. Definitions.

§ 101. Congressional findings.

The Congress makes the following findings:

- (1) Drug abuse is rapidly increasing in the United States and now afflicts urban, suburban, and rural areas of the Nation.
- (2) Drug abuse, especially heroin addiction, substantially contributes to crime.
- (3) The adverse impact of drug abuse inflicts increasing pain and hardship on individuals, families, and communities and undermines our institutions.
- (4) The success of Federal drug abuse programs and activities requires a recognition that education, treatment, rehabilitation, research, training, and law enforcement efforts are interrelated.
- (5) The effectiveness of efforts by State and local governments and by the Federal Government to control and treat drug abuse in the United States has been hampered by a lack of coordination among the States, between States and localities, among the Federal Government, States, and localities, and throughout the Federal Establishment.
- (6) Control of drug abuse requires the development of a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy that encompasses both effective law enforcement against illegal drug traffic and effective health programs to rehabilitate victims of drug abuse.
- (7) The increasing rate of drug abuse constitutes a serious and continuing threat to national health and welfare, requiring an immediate and effective response on the part of the Federal Government.

§ 102. Declaration of national policy.  
The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to focus the resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on drug abuse to significantly reduce the incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse in the United States within the shortest practicable period of time, and to develop a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy to combat drug abuse.

§ 103. Definitions.  
(a) The definitions set forth in this section apply for the purposes of this Act.

(b) The term "drug abuse prevention function" means any program or activity relating to drug abuse education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, or research, and includes any such function even when performed by an organization whose primary mission is in the field of drug traffic prevention functions, or is unrelated to drugs. The term does not include any function defined in subsection (c) as a "drug traffic prevention function".

(c) The term "drug traffic prevention function" means—  
(1) the conduct of formal or informal diplomatic or international negotiations at any level, whether with foreign governments, other foreign governmental or nongovernmental persons or organizations of any kind, or any international organization of any kind, relating to traffic (whether licit or illicit) in drugs subject to abuse, or any measures to control or curb such traffic; or

(2) any of the following law enforcement activities or proceedings:

(A) the investigation and prosecution of drug offenses;

(B) the impanelment of grand juries;

(C) programs or activities involving international narcotics control; and

(D) the detection and suppression of illicit drug supplies.

## TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

CHAPTER	SECTION
1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.....	201
2. FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR.....	221
3. ADVISORY COUNCIL.....	251

### Chapter 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### Sec.

201. Citation as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act.

202. Establishment of Office.

203. Appointment of Director.

204. Appointment of Deputy Director.

205. Appointment of Assistant Directors.

206. Delegation.

207. Officers and employees.

208. Employment of experts and consultants.

209. Acceptance of uncompensated services.

210. Grants and contracts.

211. Acting Director and Deputy Director.

212. Compensation of Director, Deputy Director, and Assistant Directors.

213. Statutory requirements unaffected.

214. Termination of authority.

215. Appropriations authorized.

§ 210. Citation as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act.

This title may be cited as the "Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act".

§ 202. Establishment of Office.

There is established in the Executive Office of the President an office to be known as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Office").

§ 203. Appointment of Director.

There shall be at the head of the Office a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

§ 204. Appointment of Deputy Director.

There shall be in the Office a Deputy Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director shall act as Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

§ 205. Appointment of Assistant Directors.

There shall be in the Office not to exceed six Assistant Directors appointed by the Director.

§ 206. Delegation.

Unless specifically prohibited by law, the Director may, without being relieved of his responsibility, perform any of his functions or duties, or exercise any of his powers through, or with the aid of, such persons in, or organizations of, the Office as he may designate.

§ 207. Officers and employees.

The Director may employ and prescribe the functions of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him. At the discretion of the Director, any officer or employee of the Office may be allowed and paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as is authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals employed intermittently.

§ 208. Employment of experts and consultants.

The Director may obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, at rates not to exceed the rate in effect for GS-18 of the General Schedule, and without regard to any limitation on the number of days or the period

of such service, except that, at any one time, not more than fifteen individuals may be employed without regard to such limitation.

§ 209. Acceptance of uncompensated services.

The Director is authorized to accept and employ in furtherance of the purpose of this Act or any Federal drug abuse prevention function, voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)).

§ 210. Grants and contracts.

(a) In carrying out any of his functions under this title, the Director is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and to enter into contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, or with any individual.

(b) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director may require the recipients of a grant or contract under this section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the program and activity for which such grant or contract was made.

(c) Payments under this section, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Director may determine.

(d) Any Federal department or agency may enter into grant or contractual arrangements with the Director and, pursuant to such a grant or contractual arrangement, may exercise any authority to use any personnel or facilities which would otherwise be available to such department or agency for the performance by it of its authorized functions.

§ 211. Acting Director and Deputy Director.

The President may authorize any person who immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act held a position in the executive branch of the Government to act as the Director or Deputy Director until the position in question is for the first time filled pursuant to the provisions of this title or by recess appointment, as the case may be, and the President may authorize any such person to receive the compensation attached to the office in respect of which he serves. Such compensation, if authorized, shall be in lieu of but not in addition to other compensation from the United States to which such person may be entitled.

§ 212. Compensation of Director, Deputy Director, and Assistant Directors.

(a) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(20) Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention."

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(94) Deputy Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention."

(c) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(131) Assistant Directors, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (6)."

§ 214. Statutory requirements unaffected

Except as authorized in section 226, nothing in this Act authorizes or permits the Director or any other Federal officer to waive or disregard any limitation or requirement, including standards, criteria, or cost-sharing formulas, prescribed by law with respect to any Federal program or activity. Except with respect to the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions, nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the operation of the armed forces or the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to furnishing health care to veterans.

§ 214. Termination of authority

The authority of the Director under chapter 2 and the authority of the Council under chapter 3 terminate on January 1, 1974.

§ 215. Appropriations authorized

(a) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, except for the provisions of sections 223, 224, and 225, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 223, there is authorized to be appropriated \$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974.

(c) For the purpose of making grants and contracts under section 224, there are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 225, there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

### Chapter 2.—FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR

#### Sec.

221. Concentration of Federal effort.

222. Funding authority.

223. Special Fund.

224. Encouragement of certain research and development.

225. National Drug Abuse Training Center.

226. Single Federal share requirement.

227. Recommendations regarding drug traffic prevention functions.

228. Resolution of certain conflicts.

229. Liaison with respect to drug traffic prevention.

230. Technical assistance to State and local agencies.

231. Reorganization authority.

232. Management oversight review.

233. Federal drug council authorized.

234. Consultation with respect to personnel policies.

235. International negotiations.

236. Annual report.

§ 221. Concentration of Federal effort.

(a) The Director shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions. In carrying out his functions under this subsection, the Director shall consult with the National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention.

(b) For the purpose of assuring the effectuation of the planning and policy and the achievement of the objectives and priorities provided or established pursuant to subsection (a), the Director shall

(1) review the regulations, guidelines, requirements, criteria, and procedures of operating agencies in terms of their consistency with the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes, and assist such agencies in making such additions thereto or changes therein as may be appropriate;

(2) recommend changes in organization, management, and personnel, which he deems advisable to implement the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes;

(3) review related Federal legislation in the areas of health, education, and welfare providing for medical treatment or assistance, vocational training, or other rehabilitative services and, consistent with the purposes of this Act, assure that the respective administering agencies construe drug abuse as a health problem;

(4) conduct or provide for the conduct of evaluations and studies of the performance and results achieved by Federal drug abuse prevention functions, and of the prospective

performance and results that might be achieved by alternative programs and activities supplementary to or in lieu of those currently being administered;

(5) require departments and agencies engaged in Federal drug abuse prevention functions to submit such information and reports with respect thereto as the Director determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such departments and agencies shall submit to the Director such information and reports as the Director may reasonably require; and

(6) develop improved methods for determining the extent of drug addiction and abuse in the United States.

#### § 222. Funding authority.

In implementation of his authority under section 221, and to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized

(1) to review and as he deems necessary modify insofar as they pertain to Federal drug abuse prevention functions,

(A) implementation plans for any Federal program, and

(B) the budget requests of any Federal department or agency; and

(2) to the extent not inconsistent with the applicable appropriation Acts, to make funds available from appropriations to Federal departments and agencies to conduct drug abuse prevention functions.

#### § 223. Special Fund.

(a) There is established a Special Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "fund") in order to provide additional incentives to Federal departments and agencies to develop more effective drug abuse prevention functions and to give the Director the flexibility to encourage, and respond quickly and effectively to, the development of promising programs and approaches.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, sums appropriated to the fund may be utilized only after their transfer, upon the order of the Director and at his discretion, to any Federal department or agency (other than the Office) and only for the purpose of

(1) developing or demonstrating promising new concepts or methods in respect of drug abuse prevention functions; or

(2) supplementing or expanding existing drug abuse prevention functions which the Director finds to be exceptionally effective or for which he finds there exists exceptional need.

(c) Not more than 10 per centum of such sums as are appropriated to the Fund may be expended by the Director through the Office to develop and demonstrate promising new concepts or methods in respect of drug abuse prevention functions.

#### § 224. Encouragement of certain research and development.

In carrying out his functions under section 221, the Director shall encourage and promote (by grants, contracts, or otherwise) expanded research programs to create, develop, and test

(1) nonaddictive synthetic analgesics to replace opium and its derivatives in medical use;

(2) long-lasting, nonaddictive blocking or antagonistic drugs or other pharmacological substances for treatment of heroin addiction; and

(3) detoxification agents which, when administered, will ease the physical effects of withdrawal from heroin addiction.

In carrying out this section the Director is authorized to establish, or provide for the establishment of, clinical research facilities.

#### § 225. National Drug Abuse Training Center.

(a) The Director shall establish a National Drug Abuse Training Center (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Center") to develop, conduct, and support a full range of training programs relating to drug abuse prevention functions. The Director shall consult with the National Advisory Council for

Drug Abuse Prevention regarding the general policies of the Center. The Director may operate the Center initially, but is authorized and directed to transfer the operation thereof to the National Institute of Mental Health not later than the date specified in section 214.

(b) The Center shall conduct or arrange for training programs, seminars, meetings, conferences, and other related activities, including the furnishing of training and educational materials for use by others.

(c) The services and facilities of the Center shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director, be available to (1) Federal, State, and local government officials, and their respective staffs, (2) medical and paramedical personnel, and educators, and (3) other persons, including drug dependent persons, requiring training or education in drug abuse prevention.

#### § 226. Single Federal share requirement.

Where funds are made available by more than one Federal department or agency to be used by an agency, organization, or individual to carry out a drug abuse prevention function, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Director, may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement as established in the regulations which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the other Federal agency or which the other Federal agency does not impose.

#### § 227. Recommendations regarding drug traffic prevention functions.

The Director may make recommendations to the President in connection with any Federal drug traffic prevention function, and shall consult with and be consulted by all responsible Federal departments and agencies regarding the policies, priorities, and objectives of such functions.

#### § 228. Resolution of certain conflicts.

If the Director determines in writing that the manner in which any Federal department or agency is conducting any drug abuse prevention function or drug traffic prevention function substantially impairs the effective conduct of any other such function, he shall submit in writing his findings and determinations to the President, who may direct the Federal department or agency in question to conduct the function thereafter under such policy guidelines as the President may specify to eliminate the impairment.

#### § 229. Liaison with respect to drug traffic prevention.

One of the Assistant Directors of the Office shall maintain communication and liaison with respect to all drug traffic prevention functions of the Federal Government.

#### § 230. Technical assistance to State and local agencies.

(a) The Director shall

(1) coordinate or assure coordination of Federal drug abuse prevention functions with such functions of State and local governments; and

(2) provide for a central clearinghouse for Federal, State, and local governments, public and private agencies, and individuals seeking drug abuse information and assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Director may

(1) provide technical assistance—including advice and consultation relating to local programs, technical and professional assistance, and, where deemed necessary, use of task forces of public officials or other persons assigned to work with State and local governments—to analyze and identify State and local drug abuse problems and assist in the development of plans and programs to meet the problems so identified;

(2) convene conferences of State, local, and Federal officials, and such other persons as the Director shall designate, to promote the

purposes of this Act, and the Director is authorized to pay reasonable expenses of individuals incurred in connection with their participation in such conferences;

(3) draft and make available to State and local governments model legislation with respect to State and local drug abuse programs and activities; and

(4) promote the promulgation of uniform criteria, procedures, and forms of grant or contract applications for drug abuse control and treatment proposals submitted by State and local governments and private organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) In implementation of his authority under subsection (b) (1), the Director may

(1) take such action as may be necessary to request the assignment, with or without reimbursement, of any individual employed by any Federal department or agency and engaged in any Federal drug abuse prevention function or drug traffic prevention function to serve as a member of any such task force; except that no such person shall be so assigned during any one fiscal year for more than an aggregate of ninety days without the express approval of the head of the Federal department or agency with respect to which he was so employed prior to such assignment;

(2) assign any person employed by the Office to serve as a member of any such task force or to coordinate management of such task forces; and

(3) enter into contracts or other agreements with any person or organization to serve on or work with such task forces.

#### § 231. Reorganization authority.

If the President finds, after investigation by the Director, that a reorganization in connection with the performance of any Federal drug abuse prevention function is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, the President shall prepare a reorganization plan in accord with the provisions of sections 902 to 913 of title 5, United States Code, for submission to the Congress pursuant to this subsection. Notwithstanding section 905(b) of title 5, United States Code, or the pendency of other reorganization plans, any plan submitted pursuant to this section may take effect as if it were the only plan pending before Congress in accord with sections 902 to 913 of title 5, United States Code, if the plan is transmitted to the Congress before the date specified in section 214.

#### § 232. Management oversight review.

The Director may, for a period not to exceed thirty days in any one calendar year, provide for the exercise or performance of a management oversight review with respect to the conduct of any Federal drug abuse prevention function. Such review may be conducted by an officer of any Federal department or agency other than the department or agency conducting such function. The officer shall submit a written report to the Director concerning his findings.

#### § 233. Federal drug council authorized.

To promote the purposes of this Act, the Director may convene, at his discretion, a council of officials representative of Federal departments and agencies, including intelligence agencies, responsible for Federal drug abuse prevention functions or Federal drug traffic prevention functions.

#### § 234. Consultation with respect to personnel policies.

The Director shall advise the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies with respect to appropriate policies and services for the control and treatment of drug abuse among Federal civilian employees, assuring optimal use of existing resources. The Director shall promote similar drug abuse control and treatment services in State and local governments and shall actively encourage labor and management to develop such services in private industry.

§ 235. International negotiations.

The President may designate the Director to represent the Government of the United States in discussions and negotiations relating to drug abuse prevention, drug traffic prevention, or both.

§ 236. Annual report.

The Director shall submit to the President and the Congress, prior to March 1 of each year which begins after the enactment of this title, a written report on the activities of the Office. The report shall specify the objectives, activities, and accomplishments of the Office, and shall contain an accounting of funds expended pursuant to this title.

Chapter 3.—ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec.

- 251. Establishment of Council.
- 252. Membership of the Council.
- 253. Chairman; meetings.
- 254. Compensation and expenses.
- 255. Functions of the Council.

§ 251. Establishment of Council.

There is established a National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Council") which shall consist of fifteen members.

§ 252. Membership of the Council.

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or their respective designees, shall be members of the Council ex officio.

(b) The remaining members of the Council shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at his pleasure. Appointments shall be made from persons who by virtue of their education, training, or experience are qualified to carry out the functions of members of the Council. Of the members so appointed, four shall be officials of State or local governments or governmental agencies who are actively engaged in drug abuse prevention functions.

§ 253. Chairman; meetings.

The President shall designate the Chairman of the Council. The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less often than four times a year.

§ 254. Compensation and expenses.

Members of the Council (other than members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States) shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive a per diem allowance at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule. Each member of the Council, while so serving away from his home or regular place of business, may be allowed actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

§ 255. Functions of the Council.

(a) The Council shall, from time to time, make recommendations to the Director with respect to overall planning and policy and the objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions.

(b) The Council may make recommendations to the Director with respect to the conduct of, or need for, any drug abuse prevention functions which are so in its judgment should be conducted by or with the support of the Federal Government.

TITLE III—OTHER AGENCIES

Sec.

- 301. Community mental health centers.
- 302. Public Health Service facilities.
- 303. State plan requirements.
- 304. Drug abuse prevention function appropriations.
- 305. Planning grants.
- 306. Authorization of appropriations for special projects.

§ 301. Community mental health centers.

Section 221 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If an application for a grant under this part for a community mental health center is made for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1972, and—

"(1) the Secretary determines that it is feasible for such center to provide a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems residing in the area served by the center and that the need for such a program in that area is of such a magnitude as to warrant the provision of such a program by the center, such application may not be approved unless it contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the center will provide such program in such fiscal year; or

"(2) the Secretary determines that it is feasible for the center to assist the Federal Government in treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems who are in the area served by the center, such application may not be approved unless it contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the center will enter into agreements with departments or agencies of the Government under which agreements the center may be used (to the maximum extent practicable) in treatment and rehabilitation programs (if any) provided by such departments or agencies.

For the purpose of making grants under this part to assist community mental health centers to meet the requirements of this subsection there are authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

§ 302. Public Health Service facilities.

(a) Section 341(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 257(a)) (relating to care and treatment of narcotic addicts and other drug abusers) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall establish in each hospital and other appropriate medical facility of the Service a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and drug dependence problems who are in the area served by such hospital or other facility; except that the requirement of this sentence shall not apply in the case of any such hospital or other facility with respect to which the Secretary determines that there is not sufficient need for such a program in such hospital or other facility."

(b) Section 341 of that Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary may enter into agreements with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the Government under which agreements hospitals and other appropriate medical facilities of the Service may be used in treatment and rehabilitation programs provided by such department or agency for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems who are in areas served by such hospitals or other facilities."

§ 303. State plan requirements.

(a) Section 314(d)(2)(K) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246(d)(2)(K)) is amended by inserting after "problem" the following: ", and include provisions for (i) licensing facilities in which treatment and rehabilitation programs are conducted for persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems, and (ii) expansion of State mental health programs in the field of drug abuse and drug dependence and of

other prevention and treatment programs in such field".

(b) Section 204 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2684) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) After June 30, 1973, the Secretary may not approve any State plan unless it provides for treatment and prevention programs in the field of drug abuse and drug dependence, commensurate with the extent of the problem, and it includes the provisions required by section 314(d)(2)(K) of the Public Health Service Act for State plans submitted under section 314(d) of such Act."

§ 304. Drug abuse prevention function appropriations.

Any request for appropriations by a department or agency of the Government submitted after the date of enactment of this Act shall specify, on a line item basis, that part of the appropriations which the department or agency is requesting to carry out its drug abuse prevention functions.

§ 305. Planning grants.

(a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants to States to assist them in (1) planning projects for the development of more effective drug abuse prevention functions, or (2) evaluating the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions within the States. For purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to the fifty States.

(b) For each fiscal year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, in accordance with regulations, allot the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for such year among the States on the basis of the relative population, financial need, and the need for more effective conduct of drug abuse prevention functions.

(c) Any amount so allotted to a State (other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State, for the purposes for which made, for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), and any such amount shall be in addition to the amounts allotted to such State for such purpose for such next fiscal year.

(d) As a condition to its receipt of any grant under subsection (b) for any planning project, a State shall, by provisions in the plan or otherwise.

(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the preparation or revision of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the preparation or revision of the plan;

(2) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernmental organizations or groups, and of public agencies concerned with the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, from different geographical areas of the State, to consult with the State agency in preparing or revising the plan;

(3) set forth, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, a detailed survey of the local and State needs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, including a survey of the health facilities needed to provide services for drug abuse and drug dependence, and a plan for the development and distribution of such facilities and programs throughout the State;

(4) provide for coordination of existing and planned treatment and rehabilitation

programs and activities, particularly in urban centers;

(5) provide that the Comptroller General of the United States or his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to records to substantiate the expenditures for which the grant is made;

(6) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan and submit to the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the prevention and treatment programs and activities carried out within the State, and any modifications in the plan which it considers necessary;

(7) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds for preparation or revision of a State plan made available under this section for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for such purposes, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

(8) furnish such additional information and assurance as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this section.

(e) As a condition to its receipt of any grant under subsection (b) for evaluation of drug abuse programs, a State shall.

(1) provide that the Comptroller General of the United States or his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to records to substantiate the expenditures for which the grant is made;

(2) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds for evaluation of drug abuse programs made available under this section for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for such purposes, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

(3) furnish such additional information and assurance as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this section.

§ 306. Authorization of appropriations for special projects.

Section 256(e) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended (1) by striking out "and \$35,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$60,000,000", and (2) by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof "; and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

Mr. STAGGERS (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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 10, immediately after the period, insert the following: "The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress, or committees of either House, (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of, or conducted by, the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 9, line 3, strike out "(20)" and insert "(21)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 9, line 7, strike out "(94)" and insert "(95)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 10, lines 3 and 4, strike out "January 1, 1974" and insert "June 30, 1974".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: On page 20, strike out line 5 and all that follows down through line 11 on page 20.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to eliminate a provision in the bill which indirectly amends the Reorganization Act.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) has expressed concern about this provision. I believe it should be deleted from the bill. I have cleared the amendment with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), and with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and recommend its adoption.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the action of the distinguished chairman, Mr. STAGGERS, in offering the amendment to H.R. 12089 to delete lines 5 through 11 on page 20 of the bill.

The words deleted by the chairman's amendment would have made a substantial change in the basic Reorganization Act of 1949. That act originated in the House Committee on Government Operations and has been periodically reenacted by the House as sponsored by that committee.

The House in the past always has acted diligently to extend the basic authority and, although there is an occasional delay in the other body that may cause a temporary lapse, the legislation almost continuously has been in effect.

As you know, we amended the basic act last year to provide that the President shall not transmit more than one such plan to Congress within any period of 30 consecutive days. This was a considered judgment on the part of our committee and the Congress to avoid the bunching of plans and to enable us to consider them in an orderly fashion. As you know, reorganization plans take effect within 60 days and, if there are resolutions of disapproval, they must be acted upon within that time period.

This amendment will not affect the substance of this legislation or the abil-

ity of the President to submit needed reorganization plans. However, it will leave intact our basic reorganization authority. Changes or exceptions to this basic authority ought not to be made unless these matters have been very carefully considered by the committee of jurisdiction.

The amendment also would serve to make clear that reorganization plans are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, which historically has had this responsibility.

Again, I want to commend the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its distinguished chairman for reporting this legislation, which has my strong support, with the passage of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: On page 13, line 7, insert "(a)" immediately before "In," and after line 20 on page 13, insert the following:

"(b) The authority of the Director contained in subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the Veterans Administration, or any of its appropriations, functions, or activities."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. This issue has been debated. All it does is to prevent Dr. Jaffe from being the dictator over the Veterans' Administration's drug program and leaves it in the hands of the Office of Management and Budget.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, in the field of drug abuse prevention, is designed to enable the Federal Government to speak with one voice on this subject. If the amendment carries, it will have two voices, and sometime in the future there will be three voices, then four, and we will be right back where we started. This problem is so serious that we need to stand together, all the people, the veterans, those who are in the field fighting today, and those who are in the ghettos of America, and all others, wherever they may be. We must speak with one voice to say, "We are going to eradicate drug abuse. We seek prevention, rehabilitation of users, and counseling." We must speak not only as a Congress but as parents. All the people in the land must get together to speak with one voice in one cause, and I do not think we can do it as effectively if we split the program apart.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would also like to congratulate the chairman of the

committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for the commendable job they have done in reporting out a bill of such great importance.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), who has offered the amendment, is also to be congratulated for his great concern for the veterans. It has been my observation that no Member of the House has done his job so zealously in connection with veterans as has Mr. TEAGUE.

While I laud the purpose of this bill, I feel that it is important to protect the integrity of the Veterans' Administration in the treatment of drug-addicted veterans.

Mr. Jaffee, who will head the Special Office, has not been noted for his concern for the treatment of veterans in VA hospitals. No one can doubt the gentleman from Texas' devotion to and concern for the veterans of this Nation. He has dedicated many, many more hours than is called for to assure that our returning soldiers receive the best treatment and care possible.

The question is whether the Veterans' Administration or veterans themselves will be best served by the adoption of the amendment. In my judgment, the criteria for the answer to that question is in the position taken by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Frankly, I have no faith in the integrity of the Executive to comply with the law and preserve its province. You and I as Congressmen have seen too often instances in which the Executive has encroached on the preserves of other concerns and has failed to execute its duties when required. Veterans coming home who are addicted require special attention, and it should be provided. A bill has already been passed by the Congress and now rests in the Senate providing a drug abuse program specifically targeted for veterans.

Nevertheless, the coordination of all drug abuse treatment and prevention efforts is long overdue. The drug abuse problem has clearly reached epidemic proportions and only an all out attack on the problem will stop the flow of poisonous drugs into the bloodstream of our society.

I hope that this office, however, does not just become another commission-type group that issues reports and laments the proportions of the problem. We must have action. Action to end the interagency quibbling over who has enforcement powers and who has education powers and who has classification powers. Action to convince our youth that drugs are not the answer. Action to properly treat all drug addicts in the country—not just the handful who can get into the few, limited clinics available.

For a long time now, I have been advocating the administration of methadone by doctors in private, office-based practices. These doctors can no longer sit back and decline to take an active role in the treatment of drug addicts.

If we had an epidemic of malaria sweeping the country no doctor would shirk his obligation to treat the sick.

Well, the drug abuse epidemic is as great as any epidemic this country has seen. Yet the vast majority of doctors in this country have abdicated their responsibilities to a few dedicated practitioners in the Nation's clinics.

I do not buy the argument that they cannot have addicts in their offices. The treatment of less than 10 addicts a week will not jeopardize any patient or any practice. And the treatment of 10 addicts a week by New York's 16,000 private, office-based doctors, for example, would put 160,000 addicts under treatment—the total estimated addict population in the city.

On a second front, I urge the special office to investigate the use of drug antagonists. The Federal Government has failed to support research into this area of drug abuse prevention. In addition to being a means of withdrawing and treating drug addicts, this family of drugs have the potential to provide an inoculation effect against drug abuse.

This would mean that we could inoculate, say, soldiers going into a combat area that has a high incidence of drug abuse. Or a parent could have his child inoculated against drug abuse during that period of his life when he is most susceptible to the ravages of this curse.

However, the most significant contribution such an office can make is to create a sense of national mobilization against drug abuse, a concentrated effort by all levels of Government and the people to eliminate once and for all this scourge of our youth, this deleterious destructor of society. Rome was destroyed not by an enemy from without, but the excesses of its own society within. A tree rotten at the core, will not withstand the onslaught of the storm.

At this point in our national history our core needs strengthening. By providing an all out attack on drug abuse over the next 5 years we can enter the next century of our existence a stronger Nation and a more resolute people.

This bill, with the adoption of this amendment, would provide the maximum protection and would answer the needs of the people of this country in connection with drug addiction and, by the same token, continue to provide for the maximum needs of the veterans concerned.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman has made an excellent argument. I am inclined to agree with him. If the gentleman would permit me, I should like to ask him to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), to respond to a question I should like to ask. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas, under his yielding to me, if it is his intention to safeguard the veterans' programs and the veterans' hospitals from any kind of Treasury raid while at the same time he would want any veteran who would want to take advantage of the facilities that are provided under this act to be perfectly free to do so?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows that this year we have held very comprehensive hearings on a drug bill. We debated whether drug abuse is a misbehavior or whether it is a disease. We passed a bill that said that any veteran, upon his discharge from the service, could go to a VA facility. I do not want to turn the drug abuse program of the Veterans' Administration over to a man I know is not friendly to the Veterans' Administration so far as drug abuse is concerned.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I think when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), our colleague, and a gentleman of great repute and great respect, makes a statement like that on the floor of the House, when he says that Dr. Jaffe who will implement this law will not be friendly to the Veterans' Administration, this, I believe, is a mandate for us to protect the Veterans' Administration and veterans and still preserve the full intent of the legislation presented to us today.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment offered. I endorse entirely what the chairman of our committee said a moment ago. If we are to fragment the effort to bring together all of the programs that are presently in operation and trying to do the very best job possible, if we fragment it at this moment when we are just trying to start the program, goodness knows what may happen looking into the future.

I believe it will be the intent of our committee and certainly our responsibility to see that every agency of the Government is properly treated. I know our chairman joins with me and our committee in trying to exert every effort to see that will be done.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentlemen who have spoken that I am a veteran of the Second World War and a disabled veteran and that I stand with the Veterans' Administration as much as anyone in this body. I want the best for it. But I do not want to fragment this program and say to the veterans that they are off the books. We want to treat them as deserving the best. I want the best for them.

If Dr. Jaffe is not the man for the job, he should be fired. The gentleman from Texas is talking about personalities. I think the job should be the focus, and we have limited the authority that goes with the job. We think this bill will give the best care possible to the veterans of America. I want the best for the veterans of America.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman

I challenge anyone in this House to read the hearings which were conducted by the gentleman and not come to the same conclusions that I came to.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, under this bill the Veterans' Administration hospitals will benefit rather than suffer. The Director of the Veterans' Administration is going to be on the National Advisory Council with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and they will advise with Dr. Jaffe as to the policies. Dr. Jaffe is not going to do anything without concurrence of this commission.

Further, these personal attacks on Dr. Jaffe, I think, are baseless. He is a distinguished physician from Illinois who headed a drug treatment group successfully there. He gained a national reputation. I feel he wants to hurt no one but to help all of us. I say this as a veteran myself.

Again I say I have always supported our veterans and have voted for every bit of helpful legislation in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think if we start on what should be really landmark legislation in this narcotics battle to fragment this bill, such as is now being suggested, we would be opening the door to exactly the same problems this bill was designed to correct, namely to get as many of these programs under one control as possible, so that everyone could be treated fairly and given the best possible treatment.

The chairman of the committee has certainly expressed the feeling so far as the veterans are concerned. We are deeply concerned about veterans. There is no Member of this House I know of who is not actively involved in work on legislation concerning veterans, to improve their lot.

To make a change at this time I believe will be to destroy the impact of this bill. It would not be doing a service to veterans. I believe it would be doing a grave disservice to veterans. They are a part of this problem. It is a part of the problem of the entire country. To break it apart I believe would be tragic.

I also believe it is a real mistake to get into this area of personalities. I am not arguing for or against Dr. Jaffe. I simply say that the Director is a man who has to be appointed and confirmed in his appointment. I do not believe we ought to worry about the man right now. We ought to worry about the job and the bill that will pull together this entire narcotics problem. Let us move ahead.

I certainly want to endorse the committee stand and the stand of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE). I certainly will not take 5 minutes.

I have here a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The letter was not asked for but voluntarily sent to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I should like to read only one paragraph from this letter. The letter is from the director of the national legislative program of the VFW, Mr. Stover, and is addressed to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This paragraph says:

The V.F.W. totally disagrees with the Administration's recommendation that the proposed Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention should take over and carry out the responsibility of caring for veterans. Such proposal collides head-on with the long-standing position of the V.F.W. that the Veterans Administration should be the Federal agency with the responsibility of administering veterans rights, benefits, and programs. The V.F.W. has always opposed and will continue to oppose any and all attempts and recommendations to transfer this responsibility to other Government agencies.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman after one more comment.

That is exactly what this bill does. If we do not adopt the Teague of Texas amendment we will be turning over the treatment as to drugs to a czar. This certainly will take away from the veterans' program.

This is a good amendment and should be supported.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Would the gentleman tell me the date of that letter?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. February 3, 1972.

Mr. STAGGERS. This is a new letter I did not know about. To whom is it addressed? It is not addressed to our committee?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It is addressed to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I believe I did mention that earlier.

Mr. STAGGERS. We knew that the VFW had opposed the earlier bill, which was H.R. 9264. I believe they are still referring to the same bill in this. This bill was introduced later, and objections were considered. Certainly it meets all of the objections we could find any veterans group had.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I believe they are talking about this bill.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) correctly, it would not deny the use of any of the new facilities which are to be constructed under this bill to any veteran in the United States. It would simply say that if a veteran wants to use Veterans' Administration facilities and use their program the money would not be pulled out of the VA program and its facilities to support some other facility. Is that correct?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is correct. Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN).

Mr. KAZEN. In further answer to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, about all people being treated alike, is it not a fact that the veterans group is the only identifiable group we will be dealing with under this program?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. The gentleman answered the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma. If there is any veteran who wants to take advantage of any other kind of program set up he is free to do so.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. But at the same time he can continue to take advantage of whatever programs the Veterans' Administration sets up exclusively for veterans, the only identifiable addicts that would be treated under this bill. The veterans deserve a measure of extra treatment in view of their contribution to our country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. STAGGERS. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. We specifically say in here every member of the armed services, and that takes in all of our boys in the field wherever they are all over the world. It specifically sets them out.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not know why you would not adopt this, then.

Mr. KAZEN. That is exactly what I am talking about. The members of the military forces, be they in active service or veterans, are the only identifiable segment of our population. From there on you have all types of people and citizens who can fall under this program proposed by you in this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason for that is we wanted to make sure we were not interfering with the Veterans' Administration in any way and with the armed services in any way, and we set them out. We wanted to make it crystal clear, so it was spelled out in the bill. We say that we will have a good drug abuse program and we want them to share in that and to have this knowledge shared everywhere.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you might say that this is a jurisdictional fight between one committee and another. I did not think it would get down to this, but obviously it has. Unfortunately, it developed even though the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment invited the chief counsel of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to come and sit with us and help to write the bill, and the ranking majority member on our subcommittee happens to be the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Hospitals. We added section 213 after meeting with the staff of the VA committee.

Now let us get down to it. What does this mean? Is somebody saying that we do not want veterans basically to have

the same benefits or as good drug abuse programs as the rest of the Nation?

Let me tell you this: The Veterans' Administration does not know right now how to cure a drug addict. We have two doctors on our committee who can vouch for that statement. They do not know how to cure an addict.

What we are trying to say is we want Dr. Jaffe, along with the rehabilitation people, along with the Veterans' Administration people, along with the armed services people, all of the experts in the country, to come together. If they can devise a good program that will have some results, well, it ought to be instituted and it ought to be instituted in the Veterans' Administration even though the veterans might not want it.

Did you know that the Veterans' Administration supports this bill? They testified in favor of it. What did the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs say? He said, "Oh, OMB stopped our program." He said that this afternoon. They have frozen it. Now, Dr. Jaffe does not have that authority yet, so you cannot accuse him. It is OMB. If you will pass this bill, I will guarantee that it will be unfrozen, because we are putting in some priorities. We will have a man who will see what they are doing. We will get additional findings here. If you want to help the veterans, then you vote against this amendment. If you want to help drug addicts—and that is all this goes to; it does not even touch any other program—then vote against it. The specific language in the bill provides that Dr. Jaffe's authority over the VA does not go to any other program except drug abuse. They do not have the answers yet, and they need them.

Here is another thing. Have you ever tried to get the Office of Management and Budget up before your committee and get them to tell you why they are holding up something? You try to do it and you will not get them.

But do you know what we have in this bill on Jaffe's office specifically?

The bill states that:

The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress, or committees of either House, (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of, or conducted by, the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office.

Now, the Congress itself can find out what is happening, who is making decisions to stop and hold up money or where it is spent. You leave this in OMB like this amendment would allow, and you will never find out.

If you want to uphold the authority of this Congress, if you want to do something for veterans who are addicts and begin to move forward with a program of cure you should vote strongly against this amendment. This is the most dangerous amendment in the fight against drug abuse I have yet seen presented.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman said that the gentleman from Texas said that the program would be stopped and I did not say that.

Mr. ROGERS. You said it had been frozen. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will tell you. This Congress approved the creation of 32 centers in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ROGERS. Not in this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not talking about this bill. We have already done that. However, there is a stop order on hiring people to go into drug abuse centers. That is what I said.

Mr. ROGERS. That is right. Who did it? OMB. And, so, we are going to change that if you will turn down this amendment.

I would urge that this amendment be strongly disapproved if you want to help the fight against drug abuse in this Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

With all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for whom I have so much love and affection and to the outstanding administration of the Veterans' Administration, I feel that a totally coordinated program to combat this horrendous drug scourge is essential.

Mr. Chairman, we should have one overall program, as the gentleman from Florida so clearly pointed out. We cannot have one program for veterans and other programs and standards for other segments of the American society. Drug addiction does not know classification between veterans and nonveterans. The addict on the street and the devastation he causes does not draw a line or distinction between the unfortunate ex-GI addict and the nonveteran addict.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration, as of November 1971, had treated in its 32 centers, an increase, incidentally, from five centers over the previous year, over 9,000 veterans. Of these, Mr. Chairman, 6,000—yes, over 6,000 addicts were ex-GI's who served in Vietnam.

This staggering figure represents only a percentage, obviously, of the veterans addict population. It represents only those veterans who have come forward for treatment. I believe it is safe to estimate that these thousands represent perhaps only 10 percent of the total veteran addict population. That is a staggering figure. And I think it is a conservative estimate.

The Veterans' Administration drug treatment and rehabilitation programs woefully need the benefit of better trained personnel and total research effort and all of the benefits that a coordinated program can bring about. So do all public and private hospitals and drug treatment facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me go back to the untreated veterans who are addicted. Their number would represent tens of thousands, perhaps 50,000, 60,000 or 70,000. I base this on the ratio of the number of patients who have been treated in VA facilities.

Unless total coordination can be achieved, this number of ex-GI addicts can very well turn on as many as 3 million Americans.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the only way we can effectively eradicate this scourge is a coordinated program for training personnel, for research, for education and rehabilitation, and this can only be done meaningfully as outlined in this bill.

I commend the subcommittee and I commend the full committee for the bill before us today, and I hope—and sincerely trust—that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the committee would not accept this amendment. I am not impressed by the argument advanced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS). In the first place, I doubt that the Veterans' Administration is really opposed to the amendment as offered, or does not favor the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE). There are enough of us within this Chamber today who have been around long enough to know that the Veterans' Administration does not really have the freedom to express its true position when the administration says to support a bill of this kind.

I am not impressed by the argument that we are fragmenting this particular problem and that we are fragmenting the efforts of this committee.

I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for what they have done, and thank their committee for what they have done in bringing out this bill.

All of us are seeking the same objective. We are trying to find solutions to one of the worst problems that America faces today.

The statement has been made on this floor that the Veterans' Administration has never cured an addict and does not know how to cure an addict. That may be true, but it may not only apply to the Veterans' Administration. It may apply to many other institutions in this field as well.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Let me say something about medical research in the Veterans' Administration. We have not fragmented medical research. The Congress appropriated \$68.7 million for medical research in the Veterans' Administration in 1972. Over the last 15 years it has developed a program in its hospitals that is essential to its mission of providing quality medical care.

I see the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who sits with me on the HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Appropriations Subcommittee. We have worked with Veterans' Administration programs for many years. The appropriation for medical research 14 years ago was \$10.3 million, and today it is up to \$68.7 million.

So, have we fragmented research? I say we have not. The Veterans' Administration has been a leader in the field.

Some of the best solutions to some of the worst problems facing veterans with

respect to medical and mental problems have come out of the Veterans' Administration. We can do the same thing here.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) objects to, and I think with very good reason, is that the head of the drug abuse program, which we have been debating, may have the power to deny funds to the Veterans' Administration. I understand that the power under one section of this bill may forbid the use of funds for particular programs. If that is so, then we ought not permit that kind of power.

If the Veterans' Administration can do in the drug problem what it has done in many other areas of medical research, then I think we should support them. If you want to obtain better medical research, where can you get better research results than from the veterans who are addicted to the drugs? We have these facilities and we know they can do a good job. Yes, the Veterans' Administration can probably do a better job than can be done in some of these institutions into which much of this money may go.

I do not know Dr. Jaffe. I am sure he must be a tremendously fine man, and extremely knowledgeable in this field. I do not quarrel with his position or the responsibilities he will have. But here we have an opportunity to move ahead with both Dr. Jaffe's activities, and with the ongoing program in the Veterans' Administration. Using this approach, I think we can help solve this tremendous problem. God knows this country needs to move ahead utilizing all of our resources in every way possible.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are several things that have been said that should be reiterated. No. 1 is that we do not know how to cure drug addiction. To find a cure will take a unified program, including perhaps the most important element and the most important facility that we have, the Veterans' Administration.

So there is no question the Veterans' Administration should be a part of our efforts. I know that doctors of the Veterans' Administration and doctors in many other places realize that they do not have the answers within the walls of their institutions, so we must have this research and we must have this exchange of information.

I think the only way we can move ahead is in that way. We are talking of several things. We are talking of a coordinated program. We are talking of research. We are talking of education. We are talking of treatment and we are talking of rehabilitation. We must move addicts from place to place as these processes for treatment and rehabilitation occur. I think we must, therefore, have somebody to coordinate this movement.

At the moment we have great difficulty. Our committee again and again has asked generals and admirals and the Veterans' Administration and others where the addicts are going that need service and why are they not being picked up by the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

About 2 months ago I looked in on

the VA treatment center at Topeka, Kans., and as I recall there were two heroin addicts and two speed addicts. I said:

Where are the veterans to be treated here?

They said:

They have not been identified. We know they are around but we have not been able to make the transfer.

Dr. Jaffe must have some authority—a limited authority granted—but he must have some authority with regard to the Veterans' Administration and with regard to the armed services and with regard to HEW and HUD and the Office of Economic Opportunity and all the other places where we have put money—where we have poured money in a sense when we consider the returns that we have received, in order to combat this scourge that is plaguing the American people.

It would be a mistake to leave out the Veterans' Administration. We have to have the Veterans' Administration coordinated with the rest of our efforts. I do not think I can emphasize too strongly to this House the anxiety on the part of our committee to be sure that these things do occur and that transfers occur whereby our veterans can receive the treatment they deserve.

The second point which I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) made so well, but which I will have the temerity to repeat—is that your money has been held up. It has been held up by the Office of Management and Budget, as he said and I am sure the distinguished chairman knows. This is a very, very difficult thing to fight. But we can fight it.

Dr. Jaffe is in the spotlight—not only of the people but of the President and of our committees of the Congress, and I feel it would be a grave error to go along with this amendment, which would chop off the veterans from having the best treatment that can be given to them. I am extremely disappointed to hear you come forth with this thing that sets aside, as something different, the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. What do you mean by that statement when you said we are chopping off the veterans from something.

Mr. ROY. We have to have a coordinated program. We will not have one in the Veterans' Administration as in other treatment programs, if we do not have the same authority and the same introduction of Dr. Jaffe and his staff into the Veterans' Administration. We very likely would not have the same coordination and the same exchange of research and the same education of personnel and other things we anticipate from this program.

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

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. I want to point out that the law requires the Veterans' Administration to treat drug addicts. If the director cuts off any of these funds and siphons off the funds to some other place, then you are restricting the quality of treatment that the veteran will get. That

is how you cut off the veteran and not the way the amendment provides but the way the bill provides.

Mr. ROY. Number one—the funds are provided by line item and there is no way that Dr. Jaffe can touch these funds to siphon them off and put them some place else.

Mr. WHITE. It says "at his discretion" in the bill—after the funds are appropriated.

Mr. ROY. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. I will read it to you. If you will look at page 14, it says:

Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, sums appropriated to the fund may be utilized only after their transfer, upon the order of the Director and at his discretion, to any Federal department or agency.

That is precisely how the money could be siphoned off.

Mr. ROY. No; the money we authorize to the special action of the director—not the veteran's money.

Mr. WHITE. Where does it say that?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee considering this legislation recognized we did have a problem in the programs being offered. It was for that reason they held consultation with the Veteran's Affairs Committee. We had thought that this matter had been resolved and we have come to the floor in good faith that an accord had been reached. It is very unfortunate that we find ourselves still in controversy at this point. I do hope, however this matter comes out, if this bill moves forward, if there is some way to resolve the question, we ought to do it, because it is not a vote for or against veterans. We are certainly agreed on that.

I would like to make this point. During the debate there has been constant reference to the fact that the Office of Management and Budget has been the agency which has frozen the funds that the VA hospitals have so desperately needed. This agency has done this in many other categories. There seems to be no relief. There seems to be no way to find out on what grounds or on what basis these funds are being withheld.

I submit to this body that in time we must address ourselves to the problem that is being caused by the Office of Management and Budget, because they seem to concentrate totally on the word "management" rather than on the word "budget." This matter should be looked into in some depth and in a broader manner.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like, first, to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) for his fight in what he believes is the best interests of the veterans. But I believe we are all in the same boat, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, is a great man, a distinguished Member of this House. Everybody loves him. I know that everyone has great affection for Mr. TEAGUE. We are all fight-

ing for the veterans of this land. I am sure we all are.

When I first came to Congress, I served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with Mr. TEAGUE, and I enjoyed the association we had in the years I was there, and have enjoyed them ever since. But that has nothing to do with this bill because we have taken every precaution we could. We have said that the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be on the advisory committee advising the Director and shall help to shape the policy.

We have two doctors on our committee, two eminent doctors of their communities, testify. They are perfectly satisfied and say emphatically that this provision should not be taken out. I believe thousands of veterans would say that this should not be taken out of the bill if we are going to give them the best treatment.

Then I would like to say that in the bill itself we have taken precautions. The gentleman from California had an amendment put into the bill, that we would have access at all times—and I will read the provision to the House so Members will know what we have inserted:

The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress, or committees of either House, (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of, or conducted by, the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office.

We knew that we might not otherwise get into the different things that the Executive Office has, so we said, "This is an exception." Any committee of the House can look at their documents and say, "What are you doing and why are you doing it?" We have assured that kind of investigation. We have taken that precaution. If they do something wrong, we can take a look at it. If we had left the office in the Executive Office without this amendment, we might not have had this authority. We have said that any Member of the House can say, "What are you doing and why are you doing it?"

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Could Dr. Jaffe spend one dime without the approval of the Office of Management and Budget? Whether he withholds funds or not, the Office of Management and Budget comes into it anyway. It makes no difference.

Mr. STAGGERS. It surely does. It makes all the difference in the world. We do not have to go through the Office of Management and Budget, because if we determine they need the money, they get the money.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CARTER. I have just one or two things to say on this subject. I should like to refer, first, to section 213, page 9, of the bill. Under the old bill I believe the term was "prevention and treatment." To assure the Veterans' Administration that Dr. Jaffe would not enter into the field of treatment, the word "treatment"

was deleted, taken out, and just "prevention" left there.

Another thing. The distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE), brought up the subject of the special fund, the so-called incentive fund, whereby the Director could send into a hospital or into a mental health center an agent who would check the method of treatment, and if he found it good, then he would give an incentive award to that group.

As far as that is concerned, that applies only to the incentive awards, and if the Veterans' Administration is conducting a good drug treatment program, they stand to gain incentive awards. We are here to help the Veterans' Administration in their treatment and not hurt them.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentlemen from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned section 213. Will the gentleman mention section 222 and tell the House what it means?

It means that Dr. Jaffe is the dictator over the Veterans' Administration, and it gives him power over all the money.

Mr. CARTER. I would say to the gentleman from Texas, let not your heart be troubled.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is.

Mr. CARTER. That is not the intention of this bill, and it will not be done. We are here to help the Veterans' Administration, to help them and not to hurt them. We are here to help the Veterans' Administration and drug addicts of this country, to help them and not to hurt them.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, under section 222, though, the Director can modify, I think the words are "as he deems necessary".

Mr. CARTER. Let me answer the gentleman as to why that was done. We have throughout this country program after program not all of which have actually been effective. In the District of Columbia, for instance, we have had one in which Ahmed Hassad, was in charge and one man died of an overdose of drugs. The purpose of this is to assure the Director the right to go into such an area and discontinue funding that when it is necessary—and many times it is necessary and must be done, so that we can coordinate the programs and treat the people who need treating.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, he can modify the budgets, and, therefore, he could put more in a special fund and less in other special requests.

Mr. CARTER. I think the fears of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, are groundless. Again I believe the gentleman is fighting a strawman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I have served with the gentleman on the committee for a good many years and know too well the continuing efforts by the Office of Management and Budget and its predecessor agency, the Bureau of the Budget, as well as other Federal agencies, to dismember the Veterans' Administration

and transfer one or another of its functions to other agencies.

I can remember efforts several years ago to transfer the veterans' home loan guarantee program to the Federal Housing Administration. I can also remember an ill-conceived effort to create a united hospital administration that would divest the Veterans' Administration of its vast hospital system which has always provided second-to-none medical care for the Nation's sick and wounded veterans. Then I recall repeated efforts to transfer the administrative control of the veterans' education program, the GI bill, to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

During the last administration there was an abortive effort to superimpose the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare over the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration as the President's Coordinator of Federal Health Activities.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it appears that we are creating a czar, this time under the guise of coordinating the Federal attack on drug abuse. The Veterans' Administration, Mr. Chairman, has been in the business of treating narcotic addiction for many years. They have demonstrated their qualifications in treating drug abuse and in spending wisely and economically the funds appropriated by the Congress for this important segment of medical rehabilitation. They do not require an overseer to determine how they shall treat veterans and servicemen or how much money will be devoted to this activity.

In addition to the ongoing medical and rehabilitative treatment of drug abuse practiced in all Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Administration will, by the end of the 1973 fiscal year, have 44 drug treatment centers in operation. Many of these units are already functioning actively.

The House of Representatives last year passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 9265 which greatly expanded the role of the Veterans' Administration in the overall attack upon drug abuse. The bill authorizes the Veterans' Administration to treat ex-servicemen for drug abuse irrespective of the nature of their discharge and to accept for treatment active duty servicemen and court-committed veterans. I am hopeful that the Senate will act upon this measure at the earliest possible date. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, that originated in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and passed the House, when it passes the Senate, will represent the will of Congress with respect to treatment of veterans and servicemen for drug abuse. I cannot support that portion of the legislation before the House today that will vest one person with the authority to thwart the will of Congress by withholding funds or otherwise changing the mission of the Veterans' Administration in the care and treatment of veterans suffering from narcotic addiction.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), as I do not believe it is appropriate as a part of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing my support of this legislation (H.R. 12089) for a Special Action Office in combating drug abuse, I realize that there are many of us in the Congress who are endeavoring to find rational and ready answers to this acute problem which faces our Nation.

It is highly commendable that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has produced this legislation which seeks to meet many of the most urgent needs in combating the drug problem.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation embodies the kind of Federal direction and impetus which can help local and State governments in meeting the challenges of drug abuse. In establishing a national drug abuse training center, many persons will be able to educate and train medical personnel, as well as educators and others, in providing care and treatment of drug dependent persons and to provide similar services in the area of drug abuse prevention.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which we are considering varies in several respects from the program outlined by the President in his message to the Congress on January 17, 1971. However, the broad objectives of a Special Action Office provided in this measure are consistent with the administration's proposals.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Director of the Special Action Office in the executive department, Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, has provided convincing testimony in support of the concepts embodied in this bill. Dr. Jaffe comes with a reputation of successful leadership in the area of drug abuse, having served as director of the drug abuse program in the Illinois Department of Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, there has already developed a substantial drug treatment facility in many of our Veterans' Administration hospitals. Hopefully, these facilities will be needed only on a temporary basis to treat the military personnel from Vietnam who have been subjected to drug use in that area. In carrying out the Veterans' Administration program and in developing the more comprehensive measures contemplated in this legislation, I find no basis for confusion or for criticism of Dr. Jaffe. Certainly, we are not planning to establish duplicate facilities for treatment or for training or for any other aspect of the drug abuse problem. Indeed, we have neither the physical resources nor the personnel to do more than is authorized in this measure—and in the interim any emergency programs which have already been undertaken by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration. In the record of hearings, part I, page 169, the Veterans' Administration drug treatment program is outlined—and there seems to be no basis for conflict. Instead, the Director indicates many ways in which the Veterans' Administration programs and the new Special Action Office may cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Jaffe has faced his new responsibilities forthrightly and courageously. When he has testified before committees of Congress, he has given clear evidence that he knows whereof he speaks as completely as any

person in the field of drug abuse. There is no basis for describing his forthright statements as arrogant or egotistical. Instead, they are, in my opinion, knowledgeable and frank. In reviewing his testimony before the committee, which covers approximately 90 pages of part I of the hearings—pages 171-260—it appears to me that Dr. Jaffe demonstrated professional talents consistent with his position as well as patience, respect, and sound reason in response to extensive questioning. I have noted the complimentary remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee on page 259 when Dr. Jaffe concluded his testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the substantial benefits of this legislation should not be diluted because of rivalries between the departments of Government, committees of the Congress, or other such differences. In my view, the legislation before us today is constructive—and should enable us to meet many of the challenges created by the prevalence of drug abuse. It is my fervent hope that in the administration of programs which are here authorized, we can meet many of the individual problems which drug dependent persons are experiencing, and that the program also will help reduce the trafficking in heroin and other dangerous drugs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 43, noes 64.

## TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. TEAGUE of Texas, STAGGERS, BRACCI, and NELSEN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 174, noes 196, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

## AYES—174

Abernethy	Cederberg	Goldwater
Anderson, Calif.	Chamberlain	Gonzalez
Anderson, Tenn.	Chappell	Grasso
Andrews	Clancy	Green, Oreg.
Archer	Cleveland	Green, Pa.
Arends	Collier	Griffin
Baker	Collins, Tex.	Gross
Baring	Colmer	Grover
Belcher	Cotter	Haley
Bennett	Crane	Hammer-
Bergland	Curlin	schmidt
Bevill	Daniel, Va.	Hanley
Blaggi	Daniels, N.J.	Heckler, Mass.
Blester	Danielson	Henderson
Boland	Davis, Ga.	Hicks, Mass.
Bray	Davis, S.C.	Hicks, Wash.
Brinkley	de la Garza	Hillis
Brooks	Delaney	Hosmer
Broomfield	Denholm	Hull
Brotzman	Derwinski	Hungate
Brown, Mich.	Dickinson	Hunt
Buchanan	Donohue	Ichord
Burke, Fla.	Dorn	Johnson, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Dowdy	Jones, N.C.
Burleson, Tex.	Dulski	Kazen
Cabell	Duncan	Kee
Caffery	Edmondson	King
Camp	Fisher	Landrum
Carney	Fountain	Leggett
Casey, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Lent
	Fuqua	Link
	Gaydos	Long, La.

Long, Md.	Pike	Sisk
Lujan	Poage	Snyder
McCloskey	Price, Tex.	Spence
McCormack	Pucinski	Steed
McCulloch	Purcell	Stevens
McDade	Quillen	Stratton
McEwen	Randall	Taylor
McMillan	Rarick	Teague, Calif.
Mahon	Riegler	Teague, Tex.
Mailliard	Roberts	Thone
Martin	Roe	Ullman
Mathias, Calif.	Roncalio	Vander Jagt
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	Vigorito
Melcher	Rostenkowski	Waggoner
Miller, Calif.	Rousselot	Walde
Miller, Ohio	Roybal	Wampler
Minshall	Runnels	Ware
Mizell	Ruth	White
Monagan	St Germain	Whitten
Montgomery	Sandman	Williams
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarbanes	Winn
Myers	Saylor	Wright
Natcher	Scherle	Wylder
Nichols	Schmitz	Young, Fla.
Patten	Scott	Young, Tex.
Perkins	Sebelius	Zion
Pettis	Shriver	Zwach

## NOES—196

Abbitt	Gallagher	Patman
Abourezk	Garmatz	Pelly
Abzug	Gialmo	Pepper
Adams	Goodling	Peyster
Addabbo	Gubser	Pickle
Anderson, Ill.	Gude	Pirnie
Annuozio	Hall	Podell
Ashbrook	Halpern	Poff
Ashley	Hamilton	Preyer, N.C.
Aspin	Hanna	Price, Ill.
Badillo	Harrington	Qule
Barrett	Hastings	Rallsback
Begich	Hathaway	Rangel
Betts	Hawkins	Reld
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Reuss
Blackburn	Heinz	Rhodes
Boggs	Helstoski	Robinson, Va.
Bolling	Hogan	Robison, N.Y.
Bow	Hollifield	Rodino
Brademas	Howard	Rogers
Brasco	Hutchinson	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Broyhill, N.C.	Jarman	Roush
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Burton	Karth	Satterfield
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Byron	Keating	Schneebell
Carey, N.Y.	Keith	Schwengel
Carter	Kluczynski	Seiberling
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Shipley
Clausen,	Kyl	Shoup
Don H.	Kyros	Sikes
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Collins, Ill.	Latta	Slack
Conable	Lloyd	Smith, Calif.
Conte	McClary	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	McClure	Staggers
Coughlin	McCollister	Stanton,
Culver	McFall	J. William
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Stanton,
Dellenback	McKevitt	James V.
Dellums	McKinney	Steele
Dennis	Mallary	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Mayne	Stokes
Dingell	Mazzoli	Stubblefield
Dow	Meeds	Sullivan
Downing	Metcalfe	Symington
Drinan	Michel	Talcott
du Pont	Mikva	Terry
Eckhardt	Mills, Md.	Thomson, Wis.
Edwards, Ala.	Minish	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Vanik
Eilberg	Mitchell	Veysey
Erlenborn	Moorhead	Whalen
Esch	Morgan	Whalley
Eshleman	Morse	Whitehurst
Fascell	Mosher	Widnall
Fish	Moss	Wiggins
Flood	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Foley	Nedzi	Wyatt
Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen	Wyman
Forsythe	Nix	Yates
Fraser	Obey	Yatron
Frenzel	O'Neill	Zablocki
Frey		

## NOT VOTING—61

Alexander	Clay	Flowers
Aspinall	Corman	Flynt
Bell	Dent	Ford,
Blanton	Dwyer	William D.
Blatnik	Edwards, La.	Fulton
Byrnes, Wis.	Evans, Colo.	Gaifianakis
Celler	Evins, Tenn.	Gettys
Clark	Findley	Gibbons

Gray	Lennon	Rees
Griffiths	McDonald,	Roy
Hagan	Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Hansen, Idaho	Macdonald,	Springer
Hansen, Wash.	Mass.	Stuckey
Harsha	Madden	Thompson, Ga.
Harvey	Mann	Thompson, N.J.
Hays	Mills, Ark.	Tiernan
Hébert	Mollohan	Udall
Horton	O'Hara	Wilson,
Johnson, Pa.	O'Konski	Charles H.
Jones, Ala.	Passman	Wolff
Kemp	Powell	Wylie
Koch	Pryor, Ark.	

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to express a view which I trust the chairman of this committee will carry to the conference on this bill. The Senate-passed legislation would grant considerable more new direct funding to States and localities for the actual operation of drug treatment and rehabilitation centers than the bill before us today. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the committee and the House conferees will reach a significantly larger figure than provided in H.R. 12089 so as to fulfill the critical need for treatment and rehabilitation programs on a local level. I trust that will be carried by the chairman and the conferees to the conference.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) that I am sympathetic toward his position but as the gentleman knows, as a member of the conference, I am dutybound to uphold what the House has done here. Of course in all conferences we have to have compromises. I do not know what is going to come out of that conference committee.

Mr. HALPERN. I hope that the compromise will be closer to the Senate bill on this point.

I have one other question to direct to the chairman of the committee, I would be interested in hearing the chairman's reason for the committee not including in H.R. 12089 the Senate-originated provision which would prohibit any public or private general hospitals presently receiving any Federal funding from refusing admission or treatment of drug-abusers who are suffering from an emergency medical condition.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe that is contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. HALPERN. It is contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. As I stated before, the chairman is sympathetic. I do not know what the conference will do, but as I said, we are dutybound to try to uphold what the House has done here.

Mr. HALPERN. Yes, but I trust the conference will accept this provision of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, because I had originally intended to propose an amendment to this bill and was

persuaded not to by the sponsor and other members of the committee. It has to do with a section which is contained in the Senate bill and which is not contained in the House bill. I would ask either the chairman of the committee or the distinguished sponsor of the bill to comment in connection with my concern. My concern is this:

The House bill is silent on the whole matter of confidentiality. The Senate bill contained an entire title on confidentiality that is not only important in terms of the rights of the addict, but in terms of the potential intake that the program will have. One of the defects in previous programs has been that persons who needed help have been reluctant to seek it, because they were afraid that the disclosures they made to the treatment agency would be turned over to law-enforcement agencies or to others to their detriment. I am hoping that when this bill is considered in conference the House conferees will not be unsympathetic to the Senate provision and will find agreement on some kind of provision which will protect confidentiality nationally in the interest of protecting civil liberties, but equally important in the interest of the success of the treatment programs.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. In response to that statement, I would say to the gentleman as I have to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) that I certainly would be sympathetic to this approach.

Confidentiality of research patients is in the basic law, but I would be sympathetic to this approach that the gentleman talked about in keeping these affairs confidential. But I would be sympathetic to having it written into the law, if we can provide safeguards to prevent abuse.

But we will uphold the House as we pass this bill and there will be compromises, but I do not know what they are going to be.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Crime Committee of the House has been so much concerned about heroin addiction to the rate of crime in this country—about 50 percent of the violent crime is attributable to heroin addiction where the crimes are committed by heroin addicts to get the money to buy the expensive heroin—that we have been doing what we could to develop a research and treatment and rehabilitation program that would effectively do something about this critical problem in the country.

We found out that only about \$2 million a year was being spent to try to find a drug that would be a blockage drug or an antagonistic drug to heroin. Consequently, on the 29th of November, all of our committee, both Democrats and Republicans, introduced a bill, H.R. 11927, proposing that we authorize a total expenditure of \$50 million a year, if needed, in order to expedite in every way possible an effective research program.

Methadone is the best drug that we have at the present time and it is the

most generally used drug in the treatment of heroin addicts. But it is addictive and it is fatal to some. It is appropriate to only about 35 percent of the addicts. Nobody knows what will be the effect of the continued use of methadone over a long period of time. Yet, the authorities say if you are going to use methadone, you have to use it for the rest of your life if you are not going to fall back into heroin addiction.

So we can see the importance of research in this field.

Now if I may have the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia, as I said, our bill, H.R. 11927, would authorize \$50 million, if needed by the authorities to try to carry out an effective research program to find such a drug.

As I understand it, in section 224 of your bill, you have an authorization of \$20 million for this purpose to try to find a blockage or antagonistic drug and if I am also correctly informed, in the budget submitted by the President recently there is a request before this session of the Congress for \$49 million for research in the narcotics area.

So that would make a total of \$69 million available if the authorities see fit to employ that much and can wisely use that amount for research in this critical field.

Am I right about that?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Our committee has also found that the drug industry in this country has been doing relatively little in this kind of research and one of the best sources of additional help our country could give would be to enter into contracts or arrangements including grants to drug companies to carry on particular research in respect to promising drugs in this field.

Am I correct in assuming that authority would exist on the part of the drug abuse prevention agency or the NIH or the appropriate Government authority to enter into contracts including the making of a grant in such amount as they would deem appropriate with the individual drug houses carrying on research that they want to carry on with the understanding that if a drug house makes a profit out of the drug that the first profit they will derive will go to reimburse the Government for any grants that might be made available to them under section 224?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PEPPER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we believe that the Director should go as far as he can under the law to stimulate and bring about research in this area.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman. I have one other question. A little bit ago the House passed two bills that came out of the Judiciary Committee and were presented to the House by the able gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS)

which spelled out a large number of things that could be done for prisoners who were heroin addicts in Federal and State prisons in an effort to get them off heroin and back to normal living. Am I correct in assuming that comparable authority, comparable assistance, such as job training, finding housing, if necessary, giving medical assistance, if needed—that comparable aid, comparable assistance could be given under this bill in the community health centers to heroin addicts under the treatment and rehabilitation program provided for in this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. In answer to the gentleman from Florida, I would say that existing law is broad enough in the authorities it contains to cover all the programs to which he refers, as well as many others. And the Director is given authority to fund further approaches, out of his incentive fund, if he finds merit in them.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able chairman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a couple of questions. Does this bill authorize the Director to enter into agreements to pay foreign farmers for the nonproduction of opium poppies?

Mr. STAGGERS. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. None of the funds authorized under this act can be used for that purpose; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. It is my understanding that that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I note in two or three places in the bill that there are provisions authorizing the Comptroller General to audit and/or examine books and records of expenditures, but in each instance that I have seen that authority is limited to grants. Can the Comptroller General audit and examine all expenditures authorized under this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, he can, as I am sure he can do so with all agencies.

Mr. GROSS. The authority goes beyond grants; it goes to anything?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I am sure of that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I take one moment to direct a question to either the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) or the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) in order to clarify the legislative history. I invite attention to page 7 of the bill, section 210, in which it is stated:

... the Director is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and to enter into contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, or with any individual.

I ask whether the Director would have the authority to enter into any kind of agreement with any agency such as some splinter group from a community ac-

tion organization, from poverty organizations, from the John Birch Society, the Ku Klux Klan, the Chicago Seven, the Black Panthers, or from any number of groups that could make application and declare themselves as a drug abuse center and get the grant. I think we should make this quite clear at this time before we pass the bill with section 210 included.

Mr. STAGGERS. All I can say, in answer to the gentleman, is what the language of the bill states:

In carrying out any of his functions under this title—

That goes back to what his functions are. There is no law that I know which would limit him as to whom he may make grants or contracts, unless the organization were unlawful, or one which the Justice Department would say was unlawful for him to enter into an agreement with.

Mr. DEVINE. I might say to the gentleman that this language is vastly broad, and if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation had authority such as this, a number of our Members would be hollering to high heaven. I think we should consider striking this section, but since it is so late in the debate perhaps it can be considered and limited or eliminated in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FRASER, 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. 12089) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse, pursuant to House Resolution 792, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 380, nays 0, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—380

Abernethy	Archer	Bergland	Brademas	Green, Pa.	Monagan
Abourezk	Arends	Betts	Brasco	Griffin	Montgomery
Abzug	Ashbrook	Bevill	Brinkley	Gross	Moorhead
Adams	Ashley	Biaggi	Brooks	Grover	Morgan
Addabbo	Aspin	Blester	Broomfield	Gubser	Morse
Anderson,	Badillo	Bingham	Brotzman	Gude	Mosher
Calif.	Baker	Blackburn	Brown, Mich.	Hagan	Moss
Anderson, Ill.	Baring	Blanton	Brown, Ohio	Haley	Murphy, Ill.
Anderson,	Barrett	Boggs	Broyhill, N.C.	Hall	Murphy, N.Y.
Tenn.	Begich	Boland	Broyhill, Va.	Halpern	Myers
Andrews	Belcher	Bolling	Buchanan	Hamilton	Natcher
Annunzio	Bennett	Bow	Burke, Fla.	Hammer-	Nedzi
			Burke, Mass.	schmidt	Nelsen
			Burleson, Tex.	Hanley	Nichols
			Burlison, Mo.	Hanna	Nix
			Burton	Harrington	Obey
			Byrne, Pa.	Hastings	O'Neill
			Byron	Hathaway	Patman
			Cabell	Hawkins	Patten
			Caffery	Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly
			Camp	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
			Carey, N.Y.	Heinz	Perkins
			Carney	Helstoski	Pettis
			Carter	Henderson	Peyster
			Casey, Tex.	Hicks, Mass.	Pickle
			Cederberg	Hicks, Wash.	Pike
			Chamberlain	Hillis	Pirnie
			Chappell	Hogan	Poage
			Chisholm	Holifield	Podell
			Clancy	Hosmer	Poff
			Clark	Howard	Preyer, N.C.
			Clawson, Del.	Hull	Price, Ill.
			Cleveland	Hungate	Price, Tex.
			Collier	Hunt	Pucinski
			Collins, Ill.	Hutchinson	Purcell
			Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Quie
			Colmer	Jacobs	Quillen
			Conable	Jarman	Railsback
			Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
			Conyers	Jonas	Rangel
			Cotter	Jones, N.C.	Barick
			Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Reid
			Crane	Karth	Reuss
			Culver	Kastenmeier	Rhodes
			Curlin	Kazen	Riegle
			Daniel, Va.	Keating	Roberts
			Daniels, N.J.	Kee	Robinson, Va.
			Danielson	Keith	Robison, N.Y.
			Davis, Ga.	Kemp	Rodino
			Davis, S.C.	King	Roe
			Davis, Wisc.	Kluczynski	Rogers
			de la Garza	Kuykendall	Roncallo
			Delaney	Kyl	Rooney, N.Y.
			Dellenback	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
			Dellums	Landgrebe	Rosenthal
			Denholm	Landrum	Rostenkowski
			Dennis	Latta	Roush
			Derwinski	Leggett	Rousselot
			Devine	Lent	Roy
			Dickinson	Link	Roybal
			Diggs	Lloyd	Runnels
			Dingell	Long, La.	Ruppe
			Donohue	Long, Md.	Ruth
			Dorn	Lujan	Ryan
			Dow	McClory	St Germain
			Dowdy	McCloskey	Sandman
			Downing	McClure	Sarbanes
			Drinan	McCollister	Satterfield
			Dulski	McCormack	Saylor
			Duncan	McCulloch	Scherle
			du Pont	McDade	Scheuer
			Eckhardt	McDonald,	Schmitz
			Edmondson	Mich.	Schneebeil
			Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Schwengel
			Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Scott
			Ellberg	McKay	Sebelius
			Erlenborn	McKevitt	Seiberling
			Esch	McKinney	Shipley
			Eshleman	McMillan	Shoup
			Fascell	Macdonald,	Shriver
			Fish	Mass.	Sikes
			Fisher	Mahon	Sisk
			Flood	Mailliard	Skubitz
			Foley	Mallary	Slack
			Ford, Gerald R.	Martin	Smith, Calif
			Ford,	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
			William D.	Mathis, Ga.	Snyder
			Forsythe	Matsumaga	Spence
			Fountain	Mayne	Springer
			Fraser	Mazzoli	Staggers
			Frelinghuysen	Meeds	Stanton,
			Frenzel	Melcher	James V.
			Frey	Metcalfe	Steed
			Fuqua	Michel	Steele
			Gallagher	Mikva	Steiger, Ariz.
			Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Steiger, Wis.
			Gaydos	Miller, Ohio	Stevens
			Gialmo	Mills, Md.	Stokes
			Gibbons	Minish	Stratton
			Goldwater	Mink	Stubblefield
			Goodling	Minshall	Sullivan
			Grasso	Mitchell	Symington
			Gonzalez	Mizell	Talcott
			Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Taylor

Teague, Calif.	Waldie	Winn
Teague, Tex.	Wampler	Wright
Terry	Ware	Wyatt
Thompson, N.J.	Whalen	Wydler
Thompson, Wis.	Whalley	Wyman
Thone	White	Yates
Tiernan	Whitehurst	Yatron
Ullman	Whitten	Young, Fla.
Van Deerlin	Widnall	Young, Tex.
Vander Jagt	Wiggins	Zablocki
Vanik	Williams	Zion
Veysey	Wilson, Bob	Zwach
Vigorito	Wilson,	
Waggonner	Charles H.	

**NAYS—0**

**NOT VOTING—51**

Abbutt	Flowers	Madden
Alexander	Flynt	Mann
Aspinall	Fulton	Mills, Ark.
Bell	Galifianakis	O'Hara
Blatnik	Gettys	O'Konski
Bray	Gray	Passman
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Powell
Celler	Hansen, Idaho	Fryor, Ark.
Clausen,	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Don H.	Harsha	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Harvey	Stanton,
Corman	Hays	J. William
Dent	Hébert	Stuckey
Dwyer	Horton	Thompson, Ga.
Edwards, La.	Johnson, Pa.	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Jones, Ala.	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	Koch	Wylie
Findley	Lennon	

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

- Mr. Mann with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
- Mr. Koch with Mr. Clay.
- Mr. Dent with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
- Mr. Hays with Mr. Powell.
- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bray.
- Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
- Mr. Celler with Mr. Horton.
- Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
- Mr. Passman with Mr. O'Konski.
- Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harsha.
- Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Harvey.
- Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.
- Mr. Rees with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
- Mr. O'Hara with J. William Stanton.
- Mr. Gray with Mr. Findley.
- Mr. Fulton with Mr. Wylie.
- Mr. Abbutt with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
- Mr. Corman with Mr. Wolff.
- Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Fryor of Arkansas.
- Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Flow-ers.
- Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
- Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Lennon.
- Mr. Madden with Mr. Gettys.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 792, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2097) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

**MOTION BY MR. STAGGERS**

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2097 and insert in

lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12089, as passed, as follows:

Title I, Findings and Declaration of Policy; Definitions

Title II, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention

Title III, Other Agencies.

**TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS**

Sec.

- 101. Congressional findings.
- 102. Declaration of national policy.
- 103. Definitions.

**§ 101. Congressional findings.**

The Congress makes the following finding:

(1) Drug abuse is rapidly increasing in the United States and now afflicts urban, suburban, and rural areas of the Nation.

(2) Drug abuse, especially heroin addiction, substantially contributes to crime.

(3) The adverse impact of drug abuse inflicts increasing pain and hardship on individuals, families, and communities and undermines our institutions.

(4) The success of Federal drug abuse programs and activities requires a recognition that education, treatment, rehabilitation, research, training, and law enforcement efforts are interrelated.

(5) The effectiveness of efforts by State and local governments and by the Federal Government to control and treat drug abuse in the United States has been hampered by a lack of coordination among the States, between States and localities, among the Federal Government, States, and localities, and throughout the Federal establishment.

(6) Control of drug abuse requires the development of a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy that encompasses both effective law enforcement against illegal drug traffic and effective health programs to rehabilitate victims of drug abuse.

(7) The increasing rate of drug abuse constitutes a serious and continuing threat to national health and welfare, requiring an immediate and effective response on the part of the Federal Government.

**§ 102. Declaration of national policy.**

The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to focus the resources of the Federal Government and bring them to bear on drug abuse to significantly reduce the incidence of drug addiction and drug abuse in the United States within the shortest practicable period of time, and to develop a comprehensive coordinated long-term Federal strategy to combat drug abuse.

**§ 103. Definitions.**

(a) The definitions set forth in this section apply for the purposes of this Act.

(b) The term "drug abuse prevention function" means any program or activity relating to drug abuse education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, or research, and includes any such function even when performed by an organization whose primary mission is in the field of drug traffic prevention functions, or is unrelated to drugs. The term does not include any function defined in subsection (c) as a "drug traffic prevention function".

(c) The term "drug traffic prevention function" means—

(1) the conduct of formal or informal diplomatic or international negotiations at any level, whether with foreign governments, other foreign governmental or non-governmental persons or organizations of any kind, or any international organization of any kind, relating to traffic (whether licit or illicit) in drugs subject to abuse, or any measures to control or curb such traffic; or

(2) any of the following law enforcement activities or proceedings:

(A) the investigation and prosecution of drug offenses;

- (B) the impanelment of grand juries;
- (C) programs or activities involving international narcotics control; and
- (D) the detection and suppression of illicit drug supplies.

**TITLE II—SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION**

CHAPTER	SECTION
1. General Provisions.....	201
2. Functions of the Director.....	221
3. Advisory Council.....	251

**Chapter 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Sec.

- 201. Citation as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act.
- 202. Establishment of Office.
- 203. Appointment of Director.
- 204. Appointment of Deputy Director.
- 205. Appointment of Assistant Directors.
- 206. Delegation.
- 207. Officers and employees.
- 208. Employment of experts and consultants.
- 209. Acceptance of uncompensated services.
- 210. Grants and contracts.
- 211. Acting Director and Deputy Director.
- 212. Compensation of Director, Deputy Director and Assistant Directors.
- 213. Statutory requirements unaffected.
- 214. Termination of authority.
- 215. Appropriations authorized.

**§ 201. Citation as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act.**

This title may be cited as the "Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention Act".

**§ 202. Establishment of Office.**

There is established in the Executive Office of the President an office to be known as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Office"). The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress or committees of either House, (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of, or conducted by, the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office.

**§ 203. Appointment of Director.**

There shall be at the head of the Office a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

**§ 204. Appointment of Deputy Director.**

There shall be in the Office a Deputy Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director shall act as Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

**§ 205. Appointment of Assistant Directors.**

There shall be in the Office not to exceed six Assistant Directors appointed by the Director.

**§ 206. Delegation.**

Unless specifically prohibited by law, the Director may, without being relieved of his responsibility, perform any of his functions or duties, or exercise any of his powers through, or with the aid of, such persons in, or organizations of, the Office as he may designate.

**§ 207. Officers and employees.**

The Director may employ and prescribe the functions of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him. At the discretion of the Director, any officer or employee of the Office may be allowed and paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as it authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals employed intermittently.

**§ 208. Employment of experts and consultants.**

The Director may obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, at rates not to exceed

the rate in effect for GS-18 of the General Schedule, and without regard to any limitation on the number of days or the period of such service, except that, at any one time, not more than fifteen individuals may be employed without regard to such limitation.

§ 209. Acceptance of uncompensated services. The Director is authorized to accept and employ in furtherance of the purpose of this Act or any Federal drug abuse prevention function, voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)).

§ 210. Grants and contracts.

(a) In carrying out any of his functions under this title, the Director is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and to enter into contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, or with any individual.

(b) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director may require the recipients of a grant or contract under this section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the program and activity for which such grant or contract was made.

(c) Payments under this section, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, and in such installments and on such conditions as the Director may determine.

(d) Any Federal department or agency may enter into grant or contractual arrangements with the Director and, pursuant to such a grant or contractual arrangement, may exercise any authority to use any personnel or facilities which would otherwise be available to such department or agency for the performance by it of its authorized functions.

§ 211. Acting Director and Deputy Director.

The President may authorize any person who immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act held a position in the executive branch of the Government to act as the Director or Deputy Director until the position in question is for the first time filled pursuant to the provisions of this title or by recess appointment, as the case may be, and the President may authorize any such person to receive the compensation attached to the office in respect of which he serves. Such compensation, if authorized, shall be in lieu of but not in addition to other compensation from the United States to which such person may be entitled.

§ 212. Compensation of Director, Deputy Director, and Assistant Directors.

(a) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(21) Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention."

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(95) Deputy Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention."

(c) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(131) Assistant Directors, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (6)."

§ 213. Statutory requirements unaffected.

Except as authorized in section 226, nothing in this Act authorizes or permits the Director or any other Federal officer to waive or disregard any limitation or requirement, including standards, criteria, or cost-sharing formulas, prescribed by law with respect to any Federal program or activity. Except with respect to the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions, nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the operation of the armed forces or the authority of

the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to furnishing health care to veterans. § 214. Termination of authority.

The authority of the Director under chapter 2 and the authority of the Council under chapter 3 terminate on June 30, 1974.

§ 215. Appropriations authorized.

(a) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, except for the provisions of sections 223, 224, and 225, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 223, there is authorized to be appropriated \$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974.

(c) For the purpose of making grants and contracts under section 224, there are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 225, there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

#### Chapter 2.—FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR

Sec.

- 221. Concentration of Federal effort.
- 222. Funding authority.
- 223. Special Fund.
- 224. Encouragement of certain research and development.
- 225. National Drug Abuse Training Center.
- 226. Single Federal share requirement.
- 227. Recommendations regarding drug traffic prevention functions.
- 228. Resolution of certain conflicts.
- 229. Liaison with respect to drug traffic prevention.
- 230. Technical assistance to State and local agencies.
- 231. Reorganization authority.
- 232. Management oversight review.
- 233. Federal drug council authorized.
- 234. Consultation with respect to personnel policies.
- 235. International negotiations.
- 236. Annual report.

§ 221. Concentration of Federal effort.

(a) The Director shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions. In carrying out his functions under this subsection, the Director shall consult with the National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention.

(b) For the purpose of assuring the effectuation of the planning and policy and the achievement of the objectives and priorities provided or established pursuant to subsection (a), the Director shall

(1) review the regulations, guidelines, requirements, criteria, and procedures of operating agencies in terms of their consistency with the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes, and assist such agencies in making such additions thereto or changes therein as may be appropriate;

(2) recommend changes in organization, management, and personnel, which he deems advisable to implement the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes;

(3) review related Federal legislation in the areas of health, education, and welfare providing for medical treatment or assistance, vocational training, or other rehabilitative services and, consistent with the purposes of this Act, assure that the respective administering agencies construe drug abuse as a health problem;

(4) conduct or provide for the conduct of evaluations and studies of the performance and results achieved by Federal drug abuse

prevention functions, and of the prospective performance and results that might be achieved by alternative programs and activities supplementary to or in lieu of those currently being administered;

(5) require departments and agencies engaged in Federal drug abuse prevention functions to submit such information and reports with respect thereto as the Director determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such departments and agencies shall submit to the Director such information and reports as the Director may reasonably require; and

(6) develop improved methods for determining the extent of drug addiction and abuse in the United States.

§ 222. Funding authority.

In implementation of this authority under section 221, and to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized

(1) to review and as he deems necessary modify insofar as they pertain to Federal drug abuse prevention functions,

(A) implementation plans for any Federal program, and

(B) the budget requests of any Federal department or agency; and

(2) to the extent not inconsistent with the applicable appropriation Acts, to make funds available from appropriations to Federal departments and agencies to conduct drug abuse prevention functions.

§ 223. Special Fund.

(a) There is established a Special Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "fund") in order to provide additional incentives to Federal departments and agencies to develop more effective drug abuse prevention functions and to give the Director the flexibility to encourage, and respond quickly and effectively to, the development of promising programs and approaches.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, sums appropriated to the fund may be utilized only after their transfer, upon the order of the Director and at his discretion, to any Federal department or agency (other than the Office) and only for the purpose of

(1) developing or demonstrating promising new concepts or methods in respect of drug abuse prevention functions; or

(2) supplementing or expanding existing drug abuse prevention functions which the Director finds to be exceptionally effective or for which he finds there exists exceptional need.

(c) Not more than 10 per centum of such sums as are appropriated to the Fund may be expended by the Director through the Office to develop and demonstrate promising new concepts or methods in respect of drug abuse prevention functions.

§ 224. Encouragement of certain research and development.

In carrying out his functions under section 221, the Director shall encourage and promote (by grants, contracts, or otherwise) expanded research programs to create, develop, and test

(1) nonaddictive synthetic analgesics to replace opium and its derivatives in medical use;

(2) long-lasting, nonaddictive blocking or antagonistic drugs or other pharmacological substances for treatment of heroin addiction; and

(3) detoxification agents which, when administered, will ease the physical effects of withdrawal from heroin addiction.

In carrying out this section the Director is authorized to establish, or provide for the establishment of, clinical research facilities.

§ 225. National Drug Abuse Training Center

(a) The Director shall establish a National Drug Abuse Training Center (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Center") to develop, conduct, and support a full range of training programs relating to

drug abuse prevention functions. The Director shall consult with the National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention regarding the general policies of the Center. The Director may operate the Center initially, but is authorized and directed to transfer the operation thereof to the National Institute of Mental Health not later than the date specified in section 214.

(b) The Center shall conduct or arrange for training programs, seminars, meetings, conferences, and other related activities, including the furnishing of training and educational materials for use by others.

(c) The services and facilities of the Center shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director, be available to (1) Federal, State, and local government officials and their respective staffs, (2) medical and paramedical personnel, and educators, and (3) other persons, including drug dependent persons, requiring training or education in drug abuse prevention.

§ 226. Single Federal share requirement.

Where funds are made available by more than one Federal department or agency to be used by an agency, organization, or individual to carry out a drug abuse prevention function, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Director may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement as established in the regulations which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the other Federal agency or which the other Federal agency does not impose.

§ 227. Recommendations regarding drug traffic prevention functions.

The Director may make recommendations to the President in connection with any Federal drug traffic prevention function, and shall consult with and be consulted by all responsible Federal departments and agencies regarding the policies, priorities, and objectives of such functions.

§ 228. Resolution of certain conflicts.

If the Director determines in writing that the manner in which any Federal department or agency is conducting any drug abuse prevention function or drug traffic prevention function substantially impairs the effective conduct of any other such function, he shall submit in writing his findings and determinations to the President, who may direct the Federal department or agency in question to conduct the function thereafter under such policy guidelines as the President may specify to eliminate the impairment.

§ 229. Liaison with respect to drug traffic prevention.

One of the Assistant Directors of the Office shall maintain communication and liaison with respect to all drug traffic prevention functions of the Federal Government.

§ 230. Technical assistance to State and local agencies.

(a) The Director shall

(1) coordinate or assure coordination of Federal drug abuse prevention functions with such functions of State and local governments; and

(2) provide for a central clearinghouse for Federal, State, and local governments, public and private agencies, and individuals seeking drug abuse information and assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Director may

(1) provide technical assistance—including advice and consultation relating to local programs, technical and professional assistance, and, where deemed necessary, use of task forces of public officials or other persons assigned to work with State and local governments—to analyze and identify State and local drug abuse problems and assist in the development of plans and programs to meet the problems so identified;

(2) convene conferences of State, local, and Federal officials, and such other persons as the Director shall designate, to promote the purposes of this Act, and the Director is authorized to pay reasonable expenses of individuals incurred in connection with their participation in such conferences;

(3) draft and make available to State and local governments model legislation with respect to State and local drug abuse programs and activities; and

(4) promote the promulgation of uniform criteria, procedures, and forms of grant or contract applications for drug abuse control and treatment proposals submitted by State and local governments and private organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) In implementation of his authority under subsection (b) (1), the Director may

(1) take such action as may be necessary to request the assignment, with or without reimbursement, of any individual employed by any Federal department or agency and engaged in any Federal drug abuse prevention function or drug traffic prevention function to serve as a member of any such task force; except that no such person shall be so assigned during any one fiscal year for more than an aggregate of ninety days without the express approval of the head of the Federal department or agency with respect to which he was so employed prior to such assignment;

(2) assign any person employed by the Office to serve as a member of any such task force or to coordinate management of such task forces; and

(3) enter into contracts or other agreements with any person or organization to serve on or work with such task forces.

§ 231. Reorganization authority.

If the President finds, after investigation by the Director, that a reorganization in connection with the performance of any Federal drug abuse prevention function is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, the President shall prepare a reorganization plan in accord with the provisions of sections 902 to 913 of title 5, United States Code, for submission to the Congress pursuant to this subsection.

§ 232. Management oversight review.

The Director may, for a period not to exceed thirty days in any one calendar year, provide for the exercise or performance of a management oversight review with respect to the conduct of any Federal drug abuse prevention function. Such review may be conducted by an officer of any Federal department or agency other than the department or agency conducting such function. The officer shall submit a written report to the Director concerning his findings.

§ 233. Federal drug council authorized.

To promote the purposes of this Act, the Director may convene, at his discretion, a council of officials representative of Federal departments and agencies, including intelligence agencies, responsible for Federal drug abuse prevention functions or Federal drug traffic prevention functions.

§ 234. Consultation with respect to personnel policies.

The Director shall advise the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies with respect to appropriate policies and services for the control and treatment of drug abuse among Federal civilian employees, assuring optimal use of existing resources. The Director shall promote similar drug abuse control and treatment services in State and local governments and shall actively encourage labor and management to develop such services in private industry.

§ 235. International negotiations.

The President may designate the Director to represent the Government of the United States in discussions and negotiations relating to drug abuse prevention, drug traffic prevention, or both.

§ 236. Annual report.

The Director shall submit to the President and the Congress, prior to March 1 of each year which begins after the enactment of this title, a written report on the activities of the Office. The report shall specify the objectives, activities, and accomplishments of the Office, and shall contain an accounting of funds expended pursuant to this title.

Chapter 3.—ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec.

251. Establishment of Council.

252. Membership of the Council.

253. Chairman; meetings.

254. Compensation and expenses.

255. Functions of the Council.

§ 251. Establishment of Council.

There is established a National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Council") which shall consist of fifteen members.

§ 252. Membership of the Council.

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or their respective designees, shall be members of the Council ex officio.

(b) The remaining members of the Council shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at his pleasure. Appointments shall be made from persons who by virtue of their education, training, or experience are qualified to carry out the functions of members of the Council. Of the members so appointed, four shall be officials of State or local governments or governmental agencies who are actively engaged in drug abuse prevention functions.

§ 253. Chairman; meetings.

The President shall designate the Chairman of the Council. The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less often than four times a year.

§ 254. Compensation and expenses.

Members of the Council (other than members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States) shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive a per diem allowance at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule. Each member of the Council, while so serving away from his home or regular place of business, may be allowed actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

§ 255. Functions of the Council.

(a) The Council shall, from time to time, make recommendations to the Director with respect to overall planning and policy and the objectives and priorities for all Federal drug abuse prevention functions.

(b) The Council may make recommendations to the Director with respect to the conduct of, or need for, any drug abuse prevention functions which are or in its judgment should be conducted by or with the support of the Federal Government.

TITLE III—OTHER AGENCIES

Sec.

301. Community mental health centers.

302. Public Health Service facilities.

303. State plan requirements.

304. Drug abuse prevention function appropriations.

305. Planning grants.

306. Authorization of appropriations for special projects.

§ 301. Community mental health centers.

Section 221 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If an application for a grant under this part for a community mental health

center is made for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1972, and—

"(1) the Secretary determines that it is feasible for such center to provide a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems residing in the area served by the center and that the need for such a program in that area is of such a magnitude as to warrant the provision of such a program by the center, such application may not be approved unless it contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the center will provide such program in such fiscal year; or

"(2) the Secretary determines that it is feasible for the center to assist the Federal Government in treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems who are in the area served by the center, such application may not be approved unless it contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the center will enter into agreements with departments or agencies of the Government under which agreements the center may be used (to the maximum extent practicable) in treatment and rehabilitation programs (if any) provided by such departments or agencies.

For the purpose of making grants under this part to assist community mental health centers to meet the requirements of this subsection there are authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

#### § 302. Public Health Service facilities.

(a) Section 341(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 257(a)) (relating to care and treatment of narcotic addicts and other drug abusers) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall establish in each hospital and other appropriate medical facility of the Service a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and drug dependence problems who are in the area served by such hospital or other facility; except that the requirement of this sentence shall not apply in the case of any such hospital or other facility with respect to which the Secretary determines that there is not sufficient need for such a program in such hospital or other facility."

(b) Section 341 of that Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary may enter into agreements with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the Government under which agreements hospitals and other appropriate medical facilities of the Service may be used in treatment and rehabilitation programs provided by such department or agency for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems who are in areas served by such hospitals or other facilities."

#### § 303. State plan requirements.

(a) Section 314(d) (2) (K) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246(d) (2) (K)) is amended by inserting after "problem" the following: ", and include provisions for (1) licensing facilities in which treatment and rehabilitation programs are conducted for persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems, and (ii) expansion of State mental health programs in the field of drug abuse and drug dependence and of other prevention and treatment programs in such field."

(b) Section 204 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2684) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) After June 30, 1973, the Secretary may not approve any State plan unless it provides for treatment and prevention programs in the field of drug abuse and drug dependence, commensurate with the extent of the problem, and it includes the provisions required by section 314(d) (2) (K) of the Public Health Service Act for State plans submitted under section 314(d) of such Act."

#### § 304. Drug abuse prevention function appropriations.

Any request for appropriations by a department or agency of the Government submitted after the date of enactment of this Act shall specify, on a line item basis, that part of the appropriations which the department or agency is requesting to carry out its drug abuse prevention functions.

#### § 305. Planning grants.

(a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants to States to assist them in (1) planning projects for the development of more effective drug abuse prevention functions, or (2) evaluating the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions within the States. For purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to the fifty States.

(b) For each fiscal year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, in accordance with regulations, allot the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for such year among the States on the basis of the relative population, financial need, and the need for more effective conduct of drug abuse prevention functions.

(c) Any amount so allotted to a State (other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State, for the purposes for which made, for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), and any such amount shall be in addition to the amounts allotted to such State for such purpose for such next fiscal year.

(d) As a condition to its receipt of any grant under subsection (b) for any planning project, a State shall, by provisions in the plan or otherwise,

(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the preparation or revision of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the preparation or revision of the plan;

(2) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernmental organizations or groups, and of public agencies concerned with the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, from different geographical areas of the State, to consult with the State agency in preparing or revising the plan;

(3) set forth, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, a detailed survey of the local and State needs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, including a survey of the health facilities needed to provided services for drug abuse and drug dependence, and a plan for the development and distribution of such facilities and programs throughout the State;

(4) provide for coordination of existing and planned treatment and rehabilitation programs and activities, particularly in urban centers.

(5) provide that the Comptroller General of the United States or his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to records to substantiate the expenditures for which the grant is made;

(6) provided that the State agency will

from time to time, but not less often than annually review its State plan and submit to the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the prevention and treatment programs and activities carried out within the State, and any modifications in the plan which it considers necessary;

(7) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds for preparation or revision of a State plan made available under this section for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for such purposes, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

(8) furnish such additional information and assurance as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this section.

(e) As a condition to its receipt of any grant under subsection (b) for evaluation of drug abuse programs, a State shall

(1) provide that the Comptroller General of the United States or his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to records to substantiate the expenditures for which the grant is made;

(2) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds for evaluation of drug abuse programs made available under this section for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for such purposes, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

(3) furnish such additional information and assurances as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this section.

#### § 306. Authorization of appropriations for special projects.

Section 256(e) of the Community Mental Health Center Act is amended (1) by striking out "and \$35,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$60,000,000", and (2) by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof "; and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 12089) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader, this concludes the program for this week. It is my intention to ask to go over to Monday.

The schedule for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called.

There are 12 suspensions as follows: S. 1857, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission;

H.R. 6730, land and water conservation fund amendment;

H.R. 8382, Buffalo National River, Ark.;

House Joint Resolution 958, Sugar Act clarification;

S. 2672, exempting potatoes for processing from marketing orders;

H.R. 9756, Merchant Marine Act amendment;

S. 1163, Older Americans Act amendment;

H.R. 7088, Tinicum National Environmental Center, Pennsylvania;

H.R. 12143, San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 12186, Bald Eagle Protection Act;

H.R. 12207, program for development of tuna fisheries; and

H.R. 12741, Water Pollution Control Act extension to June 30, 1972.

On Tuesday, House Resolution 164, the Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions.

H.R. 10243, Office of Technology Assessment. This is an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Wednesday, H.R. 12910, the bill on the temporary debt ceiling increase to June 30, 1972, is scheduled, subject to a rule being granted.

The Lincoln's Birthday recess will begin after the conclusion of the business on Wednesday next, February 9, and will continue until noon the following Wednesday, February 16.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced late.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT ISSUES GUIDELINES FOR ASYLUM IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, following the attempted defection of Lithuanian sailor Simas Kudirka last November, I and other Members of Congress decried the manner in which this incident was handled by Coast Guard and State Department officials. While confusion reigned at several levels of authority, Kudirka was beaten and forcibly removed from an American ship by Soviet sailors in full sight of the American crewmen who had allowed the Russians to board the U.S. vessel.

At hearings before the House Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, of which I am a member, I noted that this case displayed not only a serious lack of flexibility on the part of U.S. officials but a lack of humanity. I also pointed out that the implications of the case could go far beyond one isolated incident. They could affect the entire historical tradition of the United States for granting political asylum. To avoid the repetition of this humiliating episode, I urged that the United States reaffirm its belief in asylum and take steps to prevent the circumstances which led to the Kudirka problem.

I was therefore pleased to see that the U.S. Department of State has issued guidelines concerning requests by foreign nationals for asylum in the United States. The basic objective of these new guidelines is "to promote institutional and individual freedom and humanitarian concern for the treatment of the individual." Specifically, they call for the consideration of each asylum request on its merits, set forth procedures for dealing with asylum requests at any kind of U.S. territory abroad, and provide a precise chain of command for reporting and seeking advice on potential defections. These guidelines will be distributed to all U.S. personnel who might become involved in asylum cases. All in all, they should go a long way toward eliminating the confusion and indecision which pervaded the Kudirka case.

During hearings on this subject, members of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations reaffirmed America's belief in the right to asylum. The new State Department guidelines provide specific channels through which that right will continue to be exercised. Unfortunately, these rules will not help Simas Kudirka, who is suffering now in his homeland. However, they will help those to follow him, and will provide some assurance that there will be no more Simas Kudirkas. As Secretary of State William P. Rogers stated upon issuing these guidelines:

The right of asylum is rooted in American history and tradition. The new guidance is intended to reinforce our continuing dedication to the principle.

#### ASSAULTING AN OFFICER SHOULD BE MADE A FEDERAL CRIME

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the people of New York were shocked by the senseless killing of two police officers who were shot in the back while investigating a complaint. During the last calendar year, 125 police officers in various parts of the United States were killed by criminal action.

The funerals of the two officers murdered last week in New York City, Patrolmen Gregory P. Foster and Rocco W. Laurie, were held on February 1, attended by thousands of policemen and other mourners. Msgr. Joseph A. Dunne, Roman Catholic chaplain of the New York Police Department, asked on that day:

If a police officer can be cut down, what will happen to the rest of us?

Mayor John V. Lindsay, attending one of the two funerals, said:

This is the 10th service of this kind that I have been to in a year.

Too often those of our citizens who serve in the capacity of policemen, firemen, judicial officers, and prison guards are regarded simply as components of our system of criminal justice. The fact is that they are human beings just like the rest of us, with families, friends, mortgages, automobile payments, and other features of life in American society. They are just like the rest of us except for one thing. In their case, unlike ours, every day is a day when their lives are in danger because they are performing the job assigned to them.

The sharp rise in the number of attacks on policemen and firemen in the past year has aroused serious concern on the part of all responsible Americans. This grievous situation, which is nationwide, calls for action on a national, and not just a local basis.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill which would make it a Federal offense to assault with the intent to kill any officer—whether local or State—engaged in law enforcement or firefighting. The bill is limited to local and State officers because an attack on a Federal officer is already a Federal crime.

In 1968, Congress enacted legislation which extended to certain non-Federal law enforcement officers, or their survivors, benefits which were available to Federal employees in case of injury or death. To be eligible, however, the non-Federal officer would have to be killed or injured while engaged in action involving a Federal offense. That legislation, which appears as section 8191 of title 5 in the United States Code, would not have applied to the two New York patrolmen. The new bill I am introducing would apply to such cases.

It is true that a policeman's life entails an inescapable element of danger, since his job is to enforce the law against predatory persons of many kinds. Firefighters also necessarily confront danger on every call to duty. Nevertheless, the un-

precedented toll of lives of firemen and law enforcement officers in recent months has raised the level of the problem to a new height, requiring Federal attention.

The International Association of Firefighters, in testimony before a Senate subcommittee, cited the new character of the peril of attacks on firemen, outdistancing any known past experience. In the riots of Watts, Detroit, Newark, and Cleveland in recent years, firefighters actually suffered more casualties than police officers. From 1967 to 1970, over 800 firefighters were injured during civil disorders. Over 100 in 1970 alone sustained injuries from acts of individual violence.

The dangers faced by correctional officers and judicial employees were highlighted by events which occurred at the correctional facility in Attica, N.Y., and at the Marin County Courthouse in California. As a consequence of those events, all persons involved in law enforcement, public safety work, and administration of criminal justice, along with their families, have become victims of fear.

Enactment of the legislation which I am proposing would permit the FBI to assist State and local authorities in investigating assaults on these public servants and in tracking down criminal suspects. Swift action of this kind is called for in protecting our public servants. They deserve no less. I urge prompt consideration of this measure, which would deal severely with those who flaunt our law and our society by murdering or assaulting law enforcement personnel.

When we lose a dedicated law enforcement officer, a portion of the law that we respect dies with him. We cannot afford the loss of either the officer or the rule of law.

#### IMPACT OF WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE ON MONTANA

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

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in the last several days about the extensive damage on the American economy caused by the west coast dock strike. While much of the rhetoric has centered on damage to our agriculture, there are similar drastic effects on many other aspects of the economy. Our farmers and other businessmen, such as retail stores and even large corporations, have been deeply hurt by restrictions on both exporting and importing marketing efforts.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a dramatic, though brief, news statement which was developed and aired by Mr. Orin Bleken, news director of KOPI in Kalispell, Mont., on January 26, 1972. It paints a very clear picture of the dock strike's effects on just one county—Flathead County—in the upper part of my district.

Therefore, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point his news-story:

The West Coast Dock Strike has cut off the shipment of wheat from the Flathead Valley, served a blow to area foreign car dealers, par-

tially cutting off new shipments of Japanese vehicles and parts, and may cause the Anaconda Aluminum Company at Columbia Falls, to re-route ships carrying raw material or look elsewhere for aluminum to keep the plant open.

Stan Halvorson, Manager of the Equity Supply Company in Kalispell, said, wheat shipments to the west coast have been cut off because west coast terminals are filled and foreign buyers are not buying the wheat. The strike is also causing the wheat market in the Flathead to enter a depressed state, dropping wheat prices about five cents per bushel and with the loss in total sales, much of the 1971 wheat crop may still be in the grain bin when harvest season 1972 rolls around.

Jack Canavan, Administrative Officer at the Anaconda Company's aluminum reduction plant in Columbia Falls said, they are facing a serious situation with only a 30 day supply of raw material on hand unless the strike is settled. He said, since the raw material used at the plant comes from Jamaica via boat to the Port of Everett, if the strike continues much longer other steps will have to be taken. The plant will either have to re-route its ships to ports in the Gulf or on the eastern seaboard, or buy the raw material elsewhere at a prohibitive cost.

Several auto dealers in the Flathead and business selling Japanese made goods, say both goods and vehicles cannot be obtained due to the strike, and in some instances parts for the goods and vehicles they sell are hard to get.

#### W. MARVIN WATSON—MAN OF INTEGRITY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Texas is always proud of the success of its native sons, both in public service and in industry.

Today, I would like to register my own plaudits for a Texan who has truly distinguished himself in service to God and country—W. Marvin Watson of Daingerfield.

Mr. Watson's name is well known to those of us who serve in Washington. In the period 1964 to 1968, he was Chief Special Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson, distinguishing himself to a degree which all considered exceptional. Indeed, at one point in his career, President Johnson said:

It would be a long story if I told you everything Marvin Watson had done for me. Marvin is as wise as my father, as gentle as my mother, as loyal and dedicated and as close to my side as another East Texan I know—Lady Bird . . . In this hour of our nation we need constructive men, men of faith who do not have time to hate. Such a man is Marvin.

On April 26, 1968, President Johnson elevated Mr. Watson to his well-deserved Cabinet rank as Postmaster General of the United States. Once again, Mr. Watson showed his unique ability totally to dedicate himself to service, reorganizing the postal mechanization and building programs into a new concept that is being used today with enormous effect, while, at the same time, winning the thanks of the postal unions as well as management echelons and private business for the manner in which he plunged in and saved what many thought was a sinking ship.

Perhaps overlooked in that period was the fact that Mr. Watson also saved the American taxpayer a great deal of money—for at the end of his 9 months of service, Mr. Watson returned a saving of \$148 million, not to mention the program that would save many millions more in years to come.

Since leaving public life, Mr. Watson has made for himself a new successful career in the business world, notably as president of Occidental International, a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum Corp.

This week, Dr. Armand Hammer, chairman of the board and president of Occidental Petroleum, announced that Mr. Watson has been appointed executive vice president for corporate affairs, executive assistant to the chairman of the board, and a member of the executive committee of the board of directors of Occidental Petroleum Corp., as well as continuing as president of Occidental International Corp.

Those of us who have known Marvin have always admired his ability to accomplish much and to give much.

We watched him when he served as a marine in the Pacific during World War II; when he achieved a master's degree in economics at Baylor University, subsequently serving on the faculty; when he served the city of Daingerfield as chamber of commerce manager and city judge; when he helped to build a new steel industry in Texas—the Lone Star Steel Co.—into one of the most important independent steel operations in America, a company which has done much to benefit the economic growth of east Texas.

Always we have seen a truly dedicated man, patriotic and deeply religious, a man who has given much and who has always strived for the ultimate in constructive achievement, and it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate him on his new appointment, although I note that his new duties will give him a new base of operations, Los Angeles, Calif.—in addition, of course, to his home which will always be maintained on West Marvin Watson Boulevard in Daingerfield.

It is not surprising to find that Marvin Watson has an outstanding and wonderful wife and family—as is almost always the case with a man of tremendous accomplishments—certainly Marvin is fortunate to have a beautiful and talented wife, Marion, always by his side, together with their children, Lee, Kimberly and Bill.

Perhaps Marvin Watson can best be summed up by the words another great American, Dr. Billy Graham, used to describe him:

(The Postmaster General is a man of) faith and dedication . . . I wish everybody in Washington was like Marvin Watson; we'd have a better country . . . When I think of Marvin Watson, I think of a man of integrity.

And that he surely is.

#### THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr.

Speaker, with further regard to the west coast dock strike situation, I would like to inform the House that on tomorrow Mr. Bridges of the Longshoremen's Union, Mr. Flynn, of the Pacific Maritime Association, and the west coast counsel for the Teamsters' Union will be appearing in room 2175, the Education and Labor Committee room, at 10 a.m. to inform us of the situation as it exists at the end of today's bargaining. They have been in virtually constant session.

Again today I have talked with both Mr. Flynn and Mr. Bridges. They inform me that their differences are ever narrowing. I have summoned them to Washington in order that we may have full knowledge of the seriousness of this situation, of the facts as they exist, and I want to express my determination to bring this impasse to an early conclusion, either by legislation or by other means so that the situation can be resolved.

The invitations to the gentlemen who will testify were sent out earlier in the week before the message of President Nixon was received yesterday. We appreciate the interest and support for a settlement by the President, but emphasize that we were proceeding in this manner independently even before the legislation was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and therefore unable to be present for a vote on H.R. 12089, Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. I would simply like to have the RECORD show that had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### FLOWSHARE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today other House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and I have introduced a bill to provide the statutory framework under which the Atomic Energy Commission would be authorized to provide commercial nuclear explosive services to private industry. This is an updated version of H.R. 477 which we introduced on January 3, 1969. The Joint Committee held extensive hearings on that measure in May and July of 1969 and it became apparent that some revisions were in order. Moreover, the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted on January 1, 1970, so that new law had to be considered. We now have a considerable amount of experience with that law both as to the benefits being realized through more thorough evaluation and as to some administrative problems which naturally developed in implementing such a sweeping change.

This new bill recognizes these developments. It authorizes the AEC to provide nuclear detonation services on a contractual basis with the Commission remaining at all times in full custody and control of the nuclear device. It, in effect, is authorization for the sale of energy to be employed, at least in the near term,

in underground engineering projects such as stimulating natural gas flow in deep, low-permeability rock formations. Other applications are under study, but gas stimulation has been shown to be effective in two experiments—Gasbuggy and Rulison. Two more experiments are planned for the near future—Rio Blanco and Wagon Wheel.

We are rapidly approaching demonstration of the commercial viability of this technology. The purpose of this bill is to assure that when that point is reached, the legislative and administrative framework to move ahead with its application is ready and has been carefully and thoroughly considered. The bill will require criteria to be established by the AEC, with Joint Committee oversight, to provide for the review of projects by all appropriate agencies. Obviously, regulations must be formulated by the AEC and standards for use of the products must be developed by the Environmental Protection Agency. These will take time—this bill is intended to provide the statutory authority and stimulation to accomplish these tasks.

I need not belabor our energy problems in this country. Let it suffice to say that natural gas is recognized as the cleanest of all fossil fuels. Flowshare technology holds the very high promise of doubling the amount of recoverable natural gas in the lower 48 States. We must take the steps necessary to assure ourselves of the option of employing it when it is ready.

#### HAITI: JOBLESS, POOR LINE UP TO SELL BLOOD

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

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the least savory aspects of the scandal in United States blood banking is the unsupervised importation and use of blood plasma from such medically underdeveloped countries as Haiti, India and the Dominican Republic. The conditions under which such plasma is collected are well described in the following article from the January 27, 1972, edition of the Los Angeles Times, which was summarized in the Washington Post of January 28.

One of the striking things about the "blood bank" described in this article is the reluctance of those involved to say who in the United States is purchasing the plasma and what it is used for. Neither the U.S. State Department nor the Haitian Government approves of this operation but it continues to rattle its cash register.

The article again documents the glaring lack of supervision of this trade which I reported to the House on November 17. The NIH Division of Biologics Standards—DBS—charged with responsibility for the "purity, potency, and safety" of biologic products like plasma, seems to think it is fine to shift its duty to inspect blood products collected in places like Haiti to the financially interested companies importing the plasma.

Such delegation would be questionable even if the product involved were rela-

tively harmless. But blood plasma from paid donors carries a high risk of deadly serum hepatitis. DBS claims that no imported plasma is being transfused directly into human beings, but they admit they do not check this themselves. They only accept the assurances they receive from companies selling the product.

DBS claims there is no danger since this plasma is intended to be broken down into its component fractions. But they have to concede the risk of hepatitis is not completely eliminated by this procedure. Although some plasma fractions are sterilized and cannot transmit hepatitis, other important fractions like fibrinogen and the antihemophilia factor continue to carry a hepatitis that was in the original plasma. The division has no way of knowing that infected plasma fractions from Haiti are not being sold in the United States today; in fact, they tell me they do not even know how much plasma is imported annually.

While DBS's procedures seem unbelievably lax to me, a call to the Food and Drug Administration confirms it. The FDA tells me they inspect, sample and test all the drugs imported into this country under their jurisdiction. In addition, they inspect all foreign plants producing drugs for the U.S. market. I can think of no excuse for not inspecting potentially infectious blood products as well.

Mr. Speaker, The National Blood Bank Act, H.R. 11828, which I recently introduced would correct this shocking abdication of duty. It would establish adequate inspection and licensing of all blood banks and importers, and it would vest this program in some part of HEW other than the Division of Biologics Standards. Yesterday, 17 of my colleagues joined me in cosponsoring my bill, bringing the total number of cosponsors to 53. I urge my colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to hear this important bill, and to end the intolerable risk from imported plasma.

The article follows:

RIISING CRITICISM—HAITI: JOBLESS, POOR LINE UP TO SELL BLOOD

(By Francis B. Kent)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—Just up from the waterfront, on a squalid street called Rue des Remparts, a ragged mob clusters patiently outside a shabby two-story building.

There is little conversation among the 30 or so who wait, but elsewhere in the Haitian capital the business conducted in this malodorous quarter has become the subject of considerable if guarded criticism.

Here the poor and out of work, more than 300 of them a day, sell their blood for export to U.S. pharmaceutical houses. Each time they come—and they come often—they are given the equivalent of \$3.

Werner A. Thill, an Austrian biochemist and technical director for the American-owned firm known as Hemo Caribbean of Haiti, told The Times that his staff works two shifts a day, six days a week. Twice a month, he added, he ships 2,500 liters of blood plasma to the United States.

PROFIT MARGINS NOT HIGH

"The profit margin," Thill said in response to a reporter's question, "is not extremely high, perhaps \$4 or \$5 per liter."

The plasma is frozen and shipped in styrofoam containers to the United States, where it is usually broken down into gamma globulin, albumin and other elements marketed by drug firms.

(In Washington, a doctor at the National

Institutes of Health's division of biological standards said that no whole blood is imported into the United States and that no imported blood plasma is infused directly into humans.)

At the U.S. Embassy, a spokesman said that Hemo Caribbean "definitely does not have the blessing" of U.S. officials. Although most Americans doing business in Haiti have consulted the embassy in advance, the spokesman added, "we were never consulted on this."

#### HEALTH MINISTRY NOT CONSULTED

Haiti's minister of public health reportedly was not consulted, either. This official is described as refusing to speak to or have anything to do with Hemo Caribbean's owner, who was identified by the Austrian, Thill, as Joseph B. Gorinstein, a Miami businessman and former stock broker.

At the moment, Thill said, Gorinstein is in a Miami hospital recovering from surgery for a stomach ulcer.

According to Thill, Gorinstein entered into his contract with the Haitian government last year while Francois (Papa Doc) Duvalier, was still alive. It is to run for 10 years.

Several sources, all reliable, said that the liaison agent between Duvalier and Gorinstein was Luckner Cambronne, now minister of the interior and defense, whose business interests extend into much of Haiti's fragile economy.

In addition to the blood business, of which he is said to own a substantial part, Cambronne owns an airline, a travel agency, a number of taxicabs and either exports or imports fruits, dried fish and used clothing.

It is Hemo Caribbean, however, that has attracted a storm of criticism to Cambronne's door, both from American residents here and those Haitians willing to speak out from the protective shadow of anonymity.

An American housewife, asked for her view of the blood business, said she could "not condone taking blood from sick, undernourished people."

A young secretary called it "a terrible thing in a country where so many are dying for lack of blood."

A cab driver screwed up his face and said, "No good."

An official who cannot be identified said he thought the Haitian government, in its efforts to improve the national image since Duvalier's death last April, would cancel the contract with Gorinstein if it could do so without damaging its prospects for other foreign investment.

Thill, however, looks at the situation differently.

"I don't think you can criticize what we are doing on ethical grounds," he said. "We are saving lives. We are providing a source of income in a country where the per capita income is no more than \$75 a year."

He said Hemo Caribbean has a pool of 6,000 donors, most of them unemployed, and added that "we bleed the donors" every seven days.

At that rate, he said, a donor can receive up to \$12 a month or \$144 a year, far above the average in this poverty-stricken country. He said the firm pays about \$1,000 a week to the donors and more than twice that in salaries for the staff, which consists of four physicians, 12 registered nurses, 16 laboratory technicians and about 80 others.

Thill said that each donor is given a general physical examination, including a blood test, each time he appears at the plasma center. The donor also receives, free of charge, an anti-tetanus inoculation.

Although whole blood is withdrawn from the donor, only the amber-colored plasma is retained, Thill said, the red cells being returned to the donor's veins after it has been separated from the plasma in a centrifuge. Diligent care is taken to avoid the red cells taken from one donor being returned to another since it could be severely harmful.

Thill would not say what firms were purchasing the plasma from Haiti but con-

ceded that shipments were going to California, Illinois and Indiana.

There is no danger, he said, of transmitting disease from the donor to the recipient of one of the end products. Even if the donor were infected with syphilis, he said, "this would not bother me," since the freezing process destroys the bacteria.

Thill conceded, however, that there is the possibility that anyone handling the blood might contract hepatitis. To date, he said, there has been only one case at the plasma center.

Periodically, he said, the center is inspected by agents of the firms that buy the plasma, as required by U.S. law. The entire operation must meet the U.S. National Institutes of Health standards, he said.

(The NIH's Washington spokesman said that although there is some government inspection of blood suppliers abroad, the burden for purity rests on the U.S. firms licensed to import blood products.)

(He also said that he knows of no problem with Hemo Caribbean and that exporting blood products to the United States is not unusual.)

Under the contract with Haiti's government, the firm must supply plasma to any local hospital without charge in emergencies, Thill said, but added that there has been no local call for his product to date.

"Let's face it," he said, "the Haitians wouldn't know what to do with it."

Thill estimated that the center represents an investment of about \$250,000. Based on its success, he said, Gorinstein is putting up a second center here with facilities to handle 500 donors a day.

Moreover, he said, expansion into other islands of the Caribbean is under active consideration.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. 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.

The first cash register was devised by an American, James Ritty, in 1879.

#### HEALTH CARE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

The SPEAKER. 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 past year I have spent a considerable amount of time studying the arguments for and against national health insurance, as well as the various proposals which would create a national health insurance system. This has been a complicated task during an exacting period of analysis and lively discussion of the status of this country's health-care system, and I have waded through countless articles, reports, bills, and books with the feeling that my decision to support any of the existing proposals would be an important one—perhaps one of the most important I will make during my presence in this body.

What I find after this study and questioning, is that we have a health system in this country which is providing the best health care available in the world. It encompasses a highly complex and sophisticated delivery system—so much

so that much of the discussion relating to health insurance proposals is largely an attempt to define the boundaries and capabilities of the existing system. And it is a system which, by virtue of its size and complexities, is subject to a variety of stresses. The discussion which still continues over the availability and distribution of medical professionals is indicative of the difficulties which accompany the analysis of any segment of so large a delivery system. Are there too few medical doctors, or are there sufficient doctors who must, however, be encouraged to increase their emphasis on primary care? Will the new Health Manpower Training Act create a doctor surplus by 1980, or is an increased reliance on paramedics the only answer to an apparent physician shortage? This is a productive line of questioning, but also a confusing one. And it certainly illustrates my point that we now have a huge and many-faceted system in operation.

To attempt the total replacement of this health-care system with a new federally administered and financed system seems not only a gigantic and costly operation, but also one whose success is highly uncertain. For that reason, I still wait to be convinced of the practicality of the approach taken by the Health Security Act which the Congresswoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) has introduced in the House.

Rather, it seems more sensible that we build on the existing health-care system—one which has many notable shortcomings, to be sure, but one, nevertheless, which has demonstrated its capability to produce the highest quality health care. And it is my further conclusion that President Nixon's National Health Partnership Act, together with its accompanying proposals for the encouragement of health maintenance organizations and the regulation of the health insurance industry, provide the most reliable and most promising framework for meeting the goal of comprehensive health services for every American.

Today, I will join the many advocates of this "health care package" by introducing the National Health Partnership Act and the Health Maintenance Assistance Act. These two bills comprise the second and third steps in a health-care program which addresses itself to the full range of problems to be encountered in providing health services at a reasonable cost to every American. We have already debated and approved the first part of that program, the Health Manpower Training Act, which attacks the present shortages and maldistribution of medical professionals. The second step, the National Health Insurance Partnership Act, which I am introducing today, will provide a public-private system of health financing for all Americans, whatever their financial circumstances. I am also introducing the Health Maintenance Assistance Act, which will enhance the organization and delivery of health services by stimulating the development of health maintenance organizations.

These comprehensive health treatment centers offer an innovative form of health-care delivery which stresses preventive treatment rather than after-the-fact hospitalization. Federally sup-

ported "HMO's," as they are referred to, would also be encouraged to utilize a capitation fee system, a fixed annual fee covering most regular and emergency health-care needs.

I know of the controversy which surrounds this concept of organization and delivery, yet I think that the notable success of the "Kaiser plan" on the west coast and our own Government Health Association here in Washington recommends a greater emphasis on this kind of health-care system.

Finally, I would like to mention legislation which I am not introducing today—but which I hope to sponsor in the future. My conviction that the administration health-care proposals embody the right approach rests to a considerable extent on Secretary Elliot Richardson's suggestion to the House Ways and Means Committee that further amendments be added to the administration health-care package to regulate health-care insurers and providers. These proposed amendments will be extremely important to assure that the consumer receives reasonably priced health care, backed by reputable, financially sound companies.

It is expected that the administration will suggest such amendments during the coming weeks, and I would hope to join as a sponsor of this final element of a comprehensive health-care package. I will, of course, study these new amendments closely—and even cut and paste, if I see fit—because they will be so important to the acceptability and success of the administration health-care program.

Mr. Speaker, my sponsorship of these bills today is the culmination of long hours of study and evaluation. The question of a national health insurance system demands such study, and I believe we in the House are nearing the end of that study, and that we must prepare to act, so that the 92d Congress can be remembered as the Congress which gave the best health care in the world to every one of its constituents.

#### TESTIMONIAL RECEPTION FOR HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening February 1, 1972, a testimonial reception was held for Chairman RICHARD H. ICHORD at the Quality Motel, Capitol Hill. This was a most unusual occasion for a number of reasons. In the first place our colleague DICK ICHORD is now serving his 12th year in the U.S. Congress and this is the first time such a Washington testimonial has been held to commemorate his many accomplishments as a Member of this body. In the second place, Dick is held in such high esteem by his colleagues that the busy and highly distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. WILLIAM COLMER of Mississippi, served as honorary chairman of the affair and personally invited the leadership of both parties and a number of other Members who have known Dick well over the years.

As a genuine testimony to the respect and esteem afforded the Member from

Missouri's Eighth Congressional District, 51 Members of this House including 16 from the minority party, attended the testimonial to pay their respects. Those attending from the House of Representatives, in addition to Chairman COLMER, included Speaker ALBERT; the Honorable ED HÉBERT, chairman of the Armed Services Committee; the Honorable BOB POAGE, chairman of the Agriculture Committee; the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, Chairman of Appropriations Committee; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of Banking and Currency; the Honorable CARL PERKINS, chairman of Education and Labor; the Honorable WAYNE HAYS, chairman of House Administration; the Honorable MEL PRICE, chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The respected senior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, speaking for the Missouri delegation expressed their appreciation of Mr. ICHORD.

The overwhelming success of the testimonial attended by more than 300 people, many of whom traveled from Missouri to Washington for the affair, is in keeping with the record of our friend from Missouri. As chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, DICK ICHORD is the youngest chairman of a standing committee since congressional reorganization. This national accomplishment is paralleled by the fact that DICK ICHORD was the youngest man ever elected speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives back in 1959 at the age of 32. He is now also the seventh ranking majority member of the important Armed Services Committee where he has chaired a number of investigative subcommittees, the most important of which were the investigation of the M-16 rifle program of the defense services and the investigation of commercial air travel accommodations for servicemen on authorized leave. He received nationwide acclaim in both instances for the effective results and the success of the investigations.

Congressman ICHORD has served his country well in time of peace and war. In 1944 after graduating as valedictorian of his high school class in Licking, Mo., he enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served 2 years in the Pacific theater of World War II in the Naval Transport Service of the Naval Air Corps as an aerial gunner and radioman. After his honorable discharge from the Navy in 1946 he enrolled at the University of Missouri where he received a B.S. degree in accounting and an LL.B. degree and was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1952. In that same year he made his first political race and was elected State representative from his home area in Texas County, Mo.

DICK ICHORD's continuing interest in citizenship responsibilities was adequately recognized in 1971 when he was named "Outstanding Citizen of the Year" by the prestigious American Security Council. This important award had been presented in past years to such national figures as former President Dwight Eisenhower and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to add my voice to those of my col-

leagues in commending this great American and outstanding Member of Congress for his many years of service to his country and his State.

#### RECREATION: A REDEFINITION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. Speaker, if there is one problem, more than any other, that continually seems to plague our present National Recreation and Parks System, it would have to be the lack of communication and the resulting misunderstanding that exists among the various concerned government agencies with regard to the purpose of recreation. The problem is one of substance, not of semantics.

As I have been quick to point out, there are, at this time, entirely too many different government agencies, all with their own vested interests, presently controlling the funds and operations of our national summer recreation programs. The confusion that has resulted from this bureaucratic potpourri, as to what the role of everyday recreation is, or should be, is truly mind-boggling with even the most superficial of examinations.

We have used recreation to educate our poor, to supply jobs for our jobless, and, to keep the proverbial lid on our "long hot summers." While the solutions to these problems would be directly served by a well developed, intricate recreation network, it is not the foremost purpose of recreation to supply a panacea for urban and rural social ailments.

Recreation is the creative use of leisure time. It is the use of leisure time for diversion, self-expression and cultural enrichment, and the promotion of physical, mental, and spiritual well-being.

In the absence of a conceptual framework that does justice to the complex character of recreation, it is, nevertheless, possible—and necessary—to establish criteria for dealing with the future of recreation. These criteria are: the physical, the social, and the psychological environment, as well as wealth and time.

First. The physical environment. The state of the physical world in which we live, work, and play will either support or stifle our enjoyment of it. The environmental movement is real. It is the job of government to actively sustain this movement. We must insure that our city parks continue to be developed and renewed, thereby safeguarding against the propagation of a hostile physical environment that would suffocate its inhabitants.

Second. The social environment. Seventy percent of our population currently resides in metropolitan areas. The city is the center stage for social interaction in the United States. If the places where most of us live, work, and play are designed for automobiles and not for people, then recreation will be more reaction than re-creation. It is imperative that the Congress reorganize our recreation system to accommodate the growing need for leisure time facilities in our

cities. If the purpose of recreation is to serve the leisure time of our Nation's people, then we must insure that adequate facilities are within reach of all of those people.

Third. The psychological environment. Recreation thrives with self-confidence and learned skills. Ignorance keeps us from reaching our potential. Children have an instinctive capacity for imagination and learning that can be nurtured throughout their adult life, including the years following retirement. A well structured Recreation and Parks System can, and should, provide this nourishment. It should be a system that is geared toward the needs of the people it serves.

Fourth. Wealth. Recreation is dependent on wealth. The United States has both the resources and the ability to utilize its natural wealth to satisfy the increasing demand for better and more constructive recreation programs and facilities. It is paramount that we move now, to develop a system that makes the best use of our resources.

Fifth. Time. Only man can grasp the notion of measurable time. When he measures it, he makes it precious. As more of man's time is structured, so is his leisure. Acceptance of the 4-day work-week will revolutionize, not only recreation, but the whole structure of family and social life. We must have a recreation system that can best help man to properly utilize the growing amount of leisure time he will have at his disposal.

Mr. Speaker, "things fall apart—when—the center cannot hold." The future of summer recreation in the United States is in acute danger of collapse. There is not, nor has there ever been, a strong core organization from which our recreation programs could evolve. Most of our summer programs are floundering from their lack of permanence. They are forced to rely on annual crash funding and sporadic planning support from controlling agencies. Our cities have reached the point where they can no longer afford to match Government grants. Without extensive change in the recreation system—without total revision by the Congress of that system—"the center" surely will not hold.

Recreation programs, Mr. Speaker, must be both positive and progressive if we are to have a healthy urban environment. These programs and their restructuring demand our immediate attention. It is the nucleus of recreation that must be fortified, so that the rest does not fall apart.

#### USING IRS TO ENFORCE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM A MISTAKE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, when we considered the Economic Stabilization Act last year, I warned both in committee and on the floor that it was a mistake to use the Internal Revenue Service as the economic cop of the Nation. It is beginning to appear now that I was correct.

You will recall that I said it would be inevitable that the public would feel intimidated, and unduly so, if it should happen that the same IRS agent who handled their tax account should also be called on to police their wage or price matters. Now it is beginning to happen: the same man who does tax audits is all too often the same man who comes around checking on compliance with the stabilization program. It is enough to intimidate any honest man.

Beyond that, however, is the fact that the IRS is simply not equipped to do both jobs simultaneously. Either the stabilization program will suffer or the tax administration effort will suffer. The IRS has to make a choice between doing a good tax job or a good stabilization job, or to try to do a halfhearted job of each. The situation presents the IRS with an impossible task, one it should have never been saddled with.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point an item from the current Business Week of January 22, 1972, on this subject:

#### THE IRS STRAINS UNDER A TWIN LOAD

Internal Revenue Service officials in Washington and at regional offices swear to it: There is no chance that IRS's new job as watchdog for wage and price controls will interfere with its enforcement of the tax code.

At least, many of them add, not much of a chance. But not everyone believes IRS can do both jobs efficiently. "I'm sure it will affect their work eventually," says Mark Larkin, Price, Waterhouse & Co.'s West Coast partner. Counters an IRS official in Washington: "If anybody thinks, this is a year to get even with Uncle Sam, they'd better think twice."

Such heated responses are typical, for the IRS does not want to let word get around that enforcement of wage and price controls—and of tax enforcement—is going to be spotty. "People assume that because the IRS is handling stabilization, they must neglect tax work," says a spokesman for the agency in Boston. "But this just isn't so."

There are several reasons for this insistence. One is that President Nixon exempted the agency from his 5% cutback in government personnel. The IRS had expected to trim 3,600 jobs, but it has been able to retain them. Its total force numbers 72,000 persons, up 4,000 from a year ago, and the agency still is filling vacant positions. Still, about 3,000 IRS employees are working on wage and price matters, and reports from local offices suggest that the proportion of staff devoted to stabilization is higher in the field than in Washington.

#### COMPUTERS

The IRS claims that it can fill the gap—mostly with its computers. Last year the agency fed formulas into its computers to evaluate which of the 77-million tax returns it gets from individuals would yield the most if audited. The idea was to produce the largest payoff. The agency currently audits about two-thirds of the returns that the computers say it should. It figures that this is productive because the proportion of returns on which there is no change following audits is down more than 10% from a year ago.

So even though the tax collectors acknowledge that there may be fewer field audits this year, returns will be examined more closely. The agency expects to look at 2.2% of total individual returns in the current fiscal year, up from 1.9% in fiscal 1971.

There has been a downward trend in the number of field audits over the past few years, however. In 1969 there were 2.5-million

field audits, but by 1971 the total dropped to 1.6-million. But those which the IRS did conduct were more productive. The total take from field audits in 1969 was \$3-billion, but 1971 income was \$3.4 billion.

IRS does not look for this decline in field audits to continue, however, and companies can expect them at about the same rate this year as in 1971. The agency is trying to work out computer formulas so that it can also sift business returns automatically for the most likely audit candidates. It hopes to begin putting these on the computers next January. Even then about 300,000 businesses will continue to be treated individually.

#### CONTROLS ROLE

The IRS is taking a different tack to fill its responsibility as Nixon's intelligence and information network on Phase II. It is relying heavily on press coverage to spread the word that it will insist on compliance with price regulations. And it has opened telephone lines around the country to answer basic questions.

#### THERE PROBABLY WILL BE FEWER FIELD AUDITS UNTIL THE IRS GETS ITS FEET ON THE GROUND

Other signs of a businesslike approach are emerging. The most important up to now is that the expert tax accountants who make regular corporate tax audits are also beginning to inquire about the figures companies are using to justify wage and price changes. In San Francisco, an IRS official notes that agents making regular field audits have added spot checks of price lists to "their official duties."

And John Flynn, controller of Warner Co. in Philadelphia, says the IRS agent who makes Warner's routine tax audit this time handled wage-price matters, too. "I know of two specific cases where an agent who came in for a regular tax audit also came in with wage and price questions," says New York tax attorney Joseph E. Bachelder.

The IRS has its problems, however. It has had to shift experienced people from tax work to stabilization matters, as it did in Los Angeles where the 150 people assigned to the stabilization program include 110 fairly senior staffers. In San Francisco, Joseph T. Davis, assistant regional commissioner for stabilization, says field audits have not generally been affected, but adds, "As far as workloads go, we're diverting from audit and collection into the program, though the percentage is very small—about 3% overall."

#### LINGERING DOUBTS

But the opinion held outside the agency that the IRS cannot effectively do both jobs persists. A Los Angeles tax consultant, who was an IRS agent, says that the double duty "can't help but cost the IRS money. They'll just have to back up on audits of the smaller companies."

Raymond W. Ehrman, president of the Pittsburgh chapter of the Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants, believes it is too early to tell if there will be any impairment of the IRS's performance. But he adds, "There probably will be fewer field audits until IRS gets its feet on the Pittsburgh accounting firm of Hinds, Lind & ground." And Wayne Lind, partner in the Miller, claims that he noticed a 50% decline in office and field audits through 1971, plus a "significant delay" in receiving completed audit reports.

#### DAVID BARRUS REPRESENTS THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCKAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, today I

would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the recognition given to a young man from my district, 18-year-old David Barrus, who this week will represent the Boy Scouts of America in a special visit to the President as a part of the 62d anniversary of the Scout organization.

David, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George Barrus of Provo, Utah, is an active Explorer Scout who has been named as one of three national youth representatives to represent the 6½ million members of the Boy Scouts of America in making a report to the President. David Barrus was selected by a special committee for his outstanding record in conservation, community affairs, religious activities, and scouting.

As one of three national youth representatives, he will be made a member of the national executive board of the Boy Scouts of America, the group of volunteer national leaders who establish the policies and program of the organization. This will include working with a new drug abuse prevention program designed to create an environment that will discourage drug experimentation among Scouts, Explorers, and their friends.

David Barrus became an Eagle Scout in 1967. He is now a member of post 2192, sponsored by the Provo 21st ward of the Mormon Church. He has served in a variety of leadership positions, including that of post president. He is an active member of his church and has also held church leadership positions. David is now a student at Brigham Young University and plans to study for a career in law.

The Boy Scout organization, in observing its 62d anniversary during this month of February, will be focusing attention on several ongoing nationwide activities that reflect scouting's new look. There will be special emphasis during the anniversary celebration to deeply involve the boys of our Nation in their school, their church and their community. I would like to encourage strong support for the BSA movement. My own church, and that of David Barrus, long ago made scouting an integral part of its youth program saying:

The Scout oath and law are compatible with Christ's teachings, so it helps the Church build in young men, character, citizenship training, physical and mental fitness and "duty to God."

The Mormon Church first investigated scouting in 1911 and officially proposed adoption of the program in March of 1913. A charter was issued later that year by the Boy Scouts of America making the Mormon Church the first institution in the Nation to sponsor the scouting program. Presently, the Mormon church is the fourth largest sponsor of the BSA program in the United States.

In 1928, the church developed the Vanguard program for its older boys which led to the adoption of the BSA Explorer program in 1932. The Cub Scout program was officially added to the LDS youth program in 1953. Since that time, the entire scouting family has been a part of the Mormon youth program.

The church's emphasis on scouting has placed it at the forefront of the Nation's scouting movement. In population,

the Mormon Church has only 1 percent of the country's population, but 6 percent of the membership in the Boy Scouts of America. Sixteen percent of the Nation's Explorers—boys 14 to 18—belong to the Mormon Church. Approximately 85 percent of the available boys in the Mormon Church—ages 8 to 18—are registered in scouting while only 25 percent of the available boys in the United States are Scouts. It is also interesting to note that of the total BSA membership, 1½ percent of the boys become Eagle Scouts while 3 percent of the Mormon boys achieve the eagle rank. Annually, there are some 30,000 Eagle Scouts in America and 3,500 of them are Mormons.

I am sure the emphasis the Mormon Church places on the scouting program is of great value to the young men who are members of that church and that this leads to the development of such outstanding young leaders as David Barrus. I commend the Mormon Church for its scouting program and all other churches and organizations who sponsor a Scout program. You provide a great service to our country. I would like to pay tribute to the 6½ million Scouts in America and to the program's leaders. We would have a stronger nation if we could assist the Boy Scouts of America in surpassing the goal of involvement in scouting for one-third of the Nation's boys.

In the words of the founder of the Scout movement, Lord Baden-Powell:

Let us therefore, in training our Scouts, keep the higher aims in the forefront, not let ourselves get too absorbed in the steps. Don't let the technical outweigh the moral. Field efficiency, back-woodsman'ship, camping, hiking, good turns, jamboree comradeship are all means, not the end. The end is character—with a purpose. And that purpose is that the next generation may be sane in an insane world, and develop the higher realization of service, active service of love and duty to God and neighbor.

#### FINANCIAL AID TO FIRE DEPARTMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with regret to point out that Congress and the administration have been derelict in one very important area involving public safety. Everyone knows that the average citizen looks to his fire department, no less than to his police department, for protection of his family and his property. This has always been the case, but in recent years firemen have been thrust forward more and more into our frontline of defense against certain criminal elements. I quote from a letter I have received from Chief William E. Barry, the highly competent firefighter who heads the fire department in Cleveland, Ohio:

Arson has been commonly used as a form of protest in Cleveland and in connection with riots and is associated with the use of "booby traps" for firemen in burning buildings and gunfire directed against firemen.

Despite facts such as this, the needs of fire departments were overlooked when Congress enacted legislation in 1968 establishing the Law Enforcement

Assistance Administration in the Justice Department. Police departments are among those agencies that do of course qualify for Federal assistance from LEAA, but fire departments have been finding it extremely difficult to obtain funding for important projects associated directly with the police mission but capable of being carried out only by fire departments.

Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1971—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 32, page 41573—I introduced legislation which among other things, would go a long way toward erasing this deficiency in the law and regulations under which LEAA operates. My Emergency Crime Control Act (H.R. 11813) would assure city and county officials in our 56 largest metropolitan areas that all the funds they receive from LEAA would come to them in the form of block grants, with few strings attached. The amount of money reaching each of these areas also would be increased greatly, and the funds would arrive sooner and be available for spending more quickly because much of the redtape currently would be dispensed with.

The key to this legislation so far as fire departments are concerned is the revenue-sharing block grant concept. Since local officials would have virtually full control over the lump sums of cash they receive through LEAA, with funds being spent according to needs as perceived at the local level, fire departments for the first time would have a fighting chance to qualify for grants from this agency of the Justice Department. The fire departments would find themselves on the same footing as police departments and other applicants for assistance. A meritorious proposal submitted by a fire department would be reviewed by local authorities, who are in a better position than Federal or State officials to judge the needs of their home communities. Once convinced of a fire department's need for financial assistance, the local authorities would be under no restraints, and money from the block grant could be earmarked for fire purposes. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that under a new arrangement such as this, firefighters would at least be given a realistic opportunity to find financial means for discharging the new responsibilities that have become part of their burden in recent years.

I am happy to report that my proposed bill has prompted responses from national and local fire-fighting organizations. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD some examples of letters I have received.

#### INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS,

Washington, D.C., December 17, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: This is in reference to your recent proposal on loosening the guidelines for administration of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Safe Streets Act.

The Board of Directors of this Association, meeting in Cleveland, Ohio on December 13-14, 1971, voted to commend you for this endeavor and to support your efforts in this direction.

Our members will be apprised of this ac-

tion and if this office can assist in any other manner, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. O'BRIEN,  
General Manager.

INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL  
SIGNAL ASSOCIATION,  
Houston, Tex., December 15, 1971.

JAMES V. STANTON,  
U.S. Representative,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: In reading your remarks in the Nov. 19, 1971 issue of "Industrial Communications", we as an association wish to express our opinion regarding the more than 3000 members among whom serve in the important fire services.

We have long felt that the LEAA funds should include the fire services. Every day, men in the fire services devote their life to public safety. What is more important than protecting the public through fighting fire to keep the "streets safe"?

Money is urgently needed for better communications and other equipment. Money is needed for education and training in the fire services. By better trained and better equipped personnel, the municipalities are assured of safer streets and a safer community. To date, LEAA funds have been allocated to the police departments, which is good. However, we believe that it is time that the fire services receive federal funding through the LEAA program.

The International Municipal Signal Association was founded in 1896 as a non-profit, tax exempt organization dedicated to education and the betterment of public safety. Among our earlier members were Thomas Edison and Charles Steinmetz. Our members are governmental employees who devote their lives to public safety. It is time that funds be made available to help these men help the public in keeping our streets safe.

Yours in public safety,

RICHARD J. BEAM,  
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION,  
Providence, R.I., December 13, 1971.

Hon. Congressman JAMES V. STANTON,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: While in Washington I had the pleasure of attending your Press Conference in regard to an amendment to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. Here in the City of Providence, I am in charge of all Public Safety Communications and it is rather discouraging that monies are available to Police and not to Fire Service. I for one agree whole-heartedly with your effort to take much of the red tape out of the act, and allow the Cities to use the grants for both services.

It has always been my contention that the Fire Service plays an important part in the safe streets of many of our major cities, and yet no Federal Grants are forthcoming.

Many of our major cities in this country are plagued with ghetto areas that have numerous fires, many others have Urban Renewal projects underway with vacant buildings constantly being burned by vandals thus causing millions of dollars in expenses to Cities in addition to personal injury to the firefighters involved.

I strongly feel that if Federal monies were available to the Fire Service through your amendment, our Fire Departments could be better equipped and organized.

Many of our Police Departments have equipped each of their personnel with hand walkie-talkies in order to maintain constant contact with the men, this would be very advantageous for firefighters both from efficiency and safety standpoints while in the performance of their duties, this in turn would contribute immeasurably to the safety of our neighborhoods and streets.

I know that there are many innovations

that the fire service could use to make fire-fighting more efficient if the fire service is given the monies and the tools to work with.

I hope that you are successful in getting your amendment passed.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED J. MELLO.

NORTH-EASTERN OHIO  
FIRE CHIEFS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Bedford Heights, Ohio, January 10, 1972.

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANTON: There are many urban and rural areas in the United States which are badly in need of federal assistance to provide a minimum of fire protection.

Almost every one is lulled into a false sense of security that our fire service can handle its problems with its present equipment and manpower. Many fire departments are using pieces of fire equipment, which private industry would have scrapped many years ago as being obsolete and too costly to operate.

This is why the fire service feels it is necessary to rewrite the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to include aid to our counties fire defense.

Sincerely,

EUGENE E. ROGERS,  
Secretary, North-Eastern Ohio Fire  
Chiefs' Association, Inc.

PERRYSBURG FIRE DEPARTMENT,  
Perryburg, Ohio, January 11, 1972.

Rep. JAMES V. STANTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: I feel very strongly that the 1968 Law Enforcement Assistance Act should be rewritten so as to include the fire departments of the United States.

Many departments are undermanned and equipment certainly could be updated.

For some reason it seems as though when an austerity program comes along the fire departments are the first to suffer, and federal aid would certainly help to alleviate this condition.

The Police and Fire departments are both of the division of safety, and I do not understand why one should be federally funded and not the other.

It is a known fact that the fireman's job is the most hazardous of any occupation today.

Sincerely,

LEONARD ROBERTS, Chief,  
Perryburg Fire Department.

Mr. Speaker, the needs of the Nation's fire departments have found expression also recently in two of the leading newspapers of the United States. The Plain Dealer, the distinguished morning newspaper in Cleveland, Ohio, has been crusading for some time on this issue. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point two lead editorials from the Plain Dealer, and, in addition, an article appearing recently on the page opposite the editorial page of the New York Times:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,  
Sept. 1, 1971]

#### ARSON, CRIME AGAINST COMMUNITY

Arsonists who set the costly fire at Woodland Elementary School somehow may think their action expressed civil disobedience. Against whom? Who knows? Such criminals need no more rationale than an imaginary enemy such as the vague "establishment" or merely the status quo.

But that fire, and other destructive moves against Cleveland Board of Education property, primarily hurt most the decent parents and hopeful, knowledge-hungry children of the community.

The Board of Education, already beset by

gnawing financial problems, suffers a severe setback every time it has to buy new books for old, charred ones, or arrange new classrooms for those which have been gutted.

At the same time, pupils and their parents suffer inconvenience. But this is minor compared to the board's dilemma:

Already it is spending some \$750,000 for daytime school guards to protect schools and pupils against the violence of the streets. This is outside of the expense for watchmen in the night hours as property protectors.

The board cannot buy insurance against losses by depredation such as arson. It is self-insured against vandalism losses but the losses far outweigh the reserves.

Superintendent Paul W. Briggs and other education experts are forced to spend much of their time dealing with preservation of the system, and seeking financial help in Columbus, instead of plotting new and progressive learning techniques and curricula.

While Briggs asserts that relations between the school system and parents in most neighborhoods are good, there is reason to believe many residents are frightened into silence when they may have knowledge of the torch welders. The pattern of arson in this community, not only as far as school buildings are concerned but also including factories and telephone cables, indicates the criminals are well-informed, well-organized. They are not pranksters.

Neighborhood parents fearing recrimination if they call police (who have been cooperative in these cases) should call the Board of Education or individual board members if they suspect dirty work in a neighborhood school. This is the recommendation of school officials who realize that some inner-city residents are caught up in terror.

These residents suffer most when fire burns out the city's public education resources. For although the city's population decreases, public school enrollment has been rising. Burning books and destroying classrooms is not revenge but only a shameful crime against that stratum of society which needs most the tools of knowledge.

Civil disobedience? Call it what it is— anarchy.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,  
Jan 17, 1972]

#### CRISIS IN THE FIRE DEPARTMENT

A high-ranking Cleveland Fire Department officer sometimes goes to fires just to make sure someone will be there to call in help for proud but exhausted men.

The department's situation is near desperation, but neither the city nor the federal government has shown an adequate response. The department is answering three times as many alarms as 10 years ago—with 100 fewer men. Next summer fire stations may have to be closed temporarily, four or five at a time.

In the not-too-distant future, industry here could face sharp increases in fire insurance rates because of the manpower shortage and other problems.

"I'm not as much concerned about insurance as I am about keeping our men alive," said the fire officer. "We're killing them. They're getting hurt, and they're working themselves to death.

"Our equipment is taking a beating, too. Pumpers that ought to last 20 years, we're burning out in five or six. It's true that the percentage of false alarms doubled last year over seven or eight years ago, but we also had a great many more actual fires."

Among other problems, he said, is upgrading water lines that sometimes can't carry anywhere near the volume they are supposed to.

As the Plain Dealer reported, Cleveland has hired no new firemen since adding 50 in May 1970. In 10 years department strength has dropped from 1,340 to 1,238 (by the end of this month). Alarms have soared from 10,849 a year to 30,084.

A dismaying insight is provided by the 1-

multaneous swearing in and laying off of 22 new firemen. They're in to protect their civil service standing; they're out because the city cannot afford their salaries.

The federal grants awarded Cleveland last week will not help the fire department, unless the city is able to stretch their terms.

That might be worth trying. The Emergency Employment Act grant, \$3.4 million, is for rehiring city employes, not for new hires. All right: What about rehiring the 22 men who were just laid off?

The other grant, from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, is for law enforcement. But arson and the looting of torched properties are crimes, and the quicker firemen can respond, the less likely such crimes are to flourish. If you close stations, response time is obviously endangered.

This may seem to be clutching at straws, but the city must take every measure possible to stop the department's deterioration.

But something more substantial must be done in Washington. Cleveland and cities like it need help in fighting fires just as much as fighting crime. In the absence of revenue sharing Congress should provide specific funds for this purpose before summer comes.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1972]

NOW LISTEN TO A FIREFIGHTER'S 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 twenty 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 twenty 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 twenty 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 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 thirty pounds and can be used up in less than ten 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?

Additionally, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between the Cleveland Fire Department and LEAA. These letters are self-explanatory:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
September 8, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Member of Congress,  
Cleveland, Ohio

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: The Cleveland Fire Department has submitted an "Application for a Grant For Discretionary Funds" to the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (L.E.A.A.) in the amount of \$392,000.00.

The reason for this request is:

The Cleveland Fire Division has faced severe problems in responding to riot and

civil unrest situations and a command control system for coordinated efforts aimed to cut losses due to crimes of arson and civil disturbance is essential. The effectiveness of such a project could be measured in terms of the prospects for saving lives of citizens, firemen and police, and in saving property losses that have in the past been measured in terms of millions of dollars. The Cleveland Fire Division is required to respond to civil disturbances and other situations with communication resources that are satisfactory for normal fire protection purposes but entirely inadequate for these newer problems. Due to specific needs of Cleveland and the nationwide implication of the problem and its relationship to responsiveness in incendiary and arson situations, it is appropriate to apply for relief of the situation under the L.E.A.A. discretionary grant program.

The project's goal is the creation of a thoroughly modern alerting, dispatching and command control system for more optimum use of the city's fire fighting resources with particular emphasis on coordination of all public safety elements (police, fire fighting and rescue) to meet needs due to major multiple alarm and multiple simultaneous fires as well as during natural catastrophes (storm and tornado) and/or hostile action. Arson has been commonly used as a form of protest in Cleveland and in connection with riots and is associated with the use of "booby traps" for firemen in burning buildings and gunfire directed against firemen.

The proposed command control system should speed the fire division's ability to allocate its resources in situations where, in the past, it has had to deal with up to fifteen (15) fires simultaneously. Further, it will increase effectiveness of fire fighting personnel by enhancing and coordinating their activities with police and other agencies of the municipal government.

Though admitting that our needs are "very great", the grant request was turned down. (Please see attached letter) We feel that the City of Cleveland desperately needs relief in this area and L.E.A.A. funds are our only hope of assistance.

Therefore, your help in this matter is urgently requested.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. BARRY,  
Chief, Division of Fire.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1971.  
Battalion Chief STEPHEN ELLER,  
Department of Public Safety, Division of  
Fire, Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR CHIEF ELLER: The application for discretionary funds submitted by the City of Cleveland entitled "Improved Protection from Fires of Riots and Disorders" has been carefully reviewed by this office.

There is no question that your needs in this area are very great, but at the present time we have no way by which we can support you. Our guidelines do not include fire departments as eligible grantees for discretionary funds, nor does your proposal meet the specifications for any of our programs.

We sincerely hope you will be successful in obtaining support elsewhere. Unfortunately we know of no federal source to which you could turn with the possible exception of Civil Defense.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. ESTAYER,  
Civil Disorders,  
Technical Assistance Division.

#### RESOLUTION FOR A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am today

reintroducing a three-part resolution for a comprehensive test ban treaty which I originally introduced on December 9 of last year. Sixteen of my fellow Congressmen have now agreed to cosponsor this resolution. It urges the President to: First, open active negotiations with the Soviet Union for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty; second, undertake at the Disarmament Conference which will reconvene this month in Geneva to extend such a total ban on nuclear testing to the other nuclear powers, including France and China, which should be seated at that conference; and third, declare an immediate, unqualified ban on U.S. nuclear weapons testing.

I am pleased that the senior Senator from Massachusetts has introduced a similar resolution in the other body, although I regret that it omits mention of the need to stop nuclear testing by all nuclear powers, not only the United States and the Soviet Union. The world cries out for an end to the contamination of the atmosphere by radioactive fallout from continuing French and Chinese tests.

The Atomic Energy Commission spent \$218,352,000 on nuclear weapons testing in 1971. Unless Congress and the President act, AEC will spend another \$200 million on underground testing in 1972; furthermore, its recently announced budget seeks a similar authorization for fiscal year 1973. This does not include over \$250 million spent, authorized, and requested for each of the years 1971, 1972, and 1973 for research and development in the field of nuclear weapons, nor does it include all the hidden items which go into AEC, defense and other budgets for support of this dangerous and unnecessary program.

Need I detail for my colleagues the constructive uses to which this half billion dollars a year can be put? A half billion dollars is almost exactly the total operating budget for this year of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Office of Education will ask in the next few months for a supplemental appropriation of a half billion dollars for emergency school assistance. The total Federal appropriation for vocational and adult education for this year is just over half a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a halt to this wasteful and redundant program of nuclear weapons development and testing. I insert a number of articles and letters of support for this resolution at the conclusion of my remarks.

The following Congressmen have agreed to cosponsor it: Mrs. CHISHOLM, Messrs. COLLINS of Illinois, CONYERS, DELLUMS, EDWARDS of California, FRASER, HALPERN, HARRINGTON, HELSTOSKI, MIKVA, RANGEL, ROSENTHAL, RYAN, SCHEUER, and STOKES.

The aforementioned articles follow:

H. CON. RES. 522

Whereas the United States solemnly pledged itself in both the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the Nonproliferation Treaty to work toward "discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time" and to continue negotiations to this end; and

Whereas the security of our Nation and of all mankind is diminished by the continuing upward spiral of the nuclear arms race; and

Whereas, due to progress in methods of detection, the risks of "cheating" on underground nuclear tests are now virtually nil; and

Whereas such "cheating," if it occurred, could in no way affect the military strategic balance; and

Whereas a comprehensive ban on nuclear test explosions would stabilize and retard the arms race and make early agreement among the nuclear powers on a mutual limitation on strategic nuclear weapons much more likely; and

Whereas each nuclear explosion poses a new set of unresolvable questions about its possible effects on the environment (release of radioactive materials, triggering of earthquakes, permanent damage to the ecology of an area); and

Whereas the requirements of national security include the health, prosperity, and well-being of our citizens, the soundness of our economy and the reduction of tensions at home and abroad:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that the President should immediately take the necessary steps to initiate active negotiations seeking agreements with the Soviet Union on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions; and

*Resolved further,* That it is the sense of Congress that the President should take the necessary steps to work toward extension of a prohibition against nuclear testing to the other nuclear powers, including France and China; and

*Resolved further,* That it is the sense of Congress that the President should immediately declare an indefinite moratorium on all nuclear test explosions.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 30, 1971]  
HALTING NUCLEAR TESTS

Adjournment of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in Vienna, without the year-end agreement to which the White House and Kremlin committed themselves last May, demonstrates again the slow pace of progress in curbing the atomic arms race. It brings into question the wisdom of delaying other nuclear negotiations that could contribute to this goal and, particularly, exploration of a comprehensive treaty banning all nuclear tests, including those underground.

The American case against a comprehensive test-ban has been based on the difficulty in verifying compliance without on-site inspection, something that is anathema to Moscow. To overcome this obstacle, the United States in the past decade has spent \$274 million in research on means of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions, mostly by seismic methods. It is increasingly evident that a genuine breakthrough has been achieved.

The extent of this breakthrough has just been underlined in a report by a prestigious committee of the Federation of American Scientists, including former Presidential science advisers George Kistiakowsky and Franklin Long, former Pentagon research chief Herbert York and the former science chief of the C.I.A., Herbert Scoville. They state that recent improvements in long-range seismology and other unilateral means of detection—presumably satellite photography and communications monitoring—provide high confidence that violations of a comprehensive test-ban would be detected.

Specifically, the report states, the United States could be sure of detecting violations long before illicit underground tests could develop new weapons threatening the stability of the nuclear balance. Even unrestricted Soviet testing below the level easily spotted by seismic and other national means would achieve nothing more than wasteful further refinements in very small tactical nuclear weapons. In fact, the difficulties in carrying out on-site inspections

appear so considerable and the benefits so small that the United States would have no need to go through with them even if Moscow agreed to permit them.

Much of the American opposition to a comprehensive test-ban does not stem from fear of Soviet cheating any more, the report argues, but from a Pentagon desire to continue American testing. New weapons, however, are not needed to maintain the American deterrent, which already is much greater than required. After a SALT agreement, particularly, there will be no need to test new warheads for antiballistic missiles (ABM's) and MIRV multiple warhead missiles.

A comprehensive test-ban, on the other hand, would bulwark American and world security by slowing the arms race, reinforcing the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and reducing the likelihood of other countries joining the nuclear club. Soviet officials informally have indicated a willingness to open new test-ban talks. The United Nations General Assembly, by vote of 112 to 0 with only one abstention, has urged the Geneva Conference to pursue a test-ban. An early move by the Nixon Administration to initiate test-ban negotiations is clearly warranted.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,  
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE,  
Sacramento, Calif., January 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: Thank you for sending me a copy of the resolution that you introduced into the 92nd Congress calling for a comprehensive test ban treaty, and efforts to extend a prohibition on nuclear testing to all nuclear powers, including France and China. I read the copy of H. Con. Res. 480 and your supporting statement on the House floor. I was very impressed with the content of your resolution and of your statement concerning the resolution. I can assure you that your resolution does command the support of the members of the National Student Leaders Task Force on Disarmament, and I am writing all of the members to urge them to write their individual congressmen and senators in support of your resolution.

We have a long hard fight ahead of us to motivate the citizens of the United States to take unilateral leadership in securing peace in the world. I personally feel that your resolution is a step in this direction. I will do what I can to make your resolution known to students at large.

Thank you for your efforts in pushing negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

Yours sincerely,  
MICHAEL A. HACHARD,  
Student Body President.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,  
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1972.  
Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: I wish to express my firm support for HR 480. It is indeed long past the time for a "discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons . . ."

The United States' superiority in nuclear science should now be applied to a superiority in the arts of humanitarian efforts.

Yours truly,  
EARL CALLEN,  
Professor of Physics.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,  
Washington, D.C. January 25, 1972.  
Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: This is to express my unconditional support for HR 480 toward a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban which you introduced recently.

The three points which you make in this Resolution are well balanced and at the essentials of this international problem.

From the technical point of view it is clear that even with a conservative view of the progress made in detecting small thermonuclear explosives, the risks of further testing decidedly outweighs the risks of cheating by any nation. Evidence in support of this conclusion is presented in the Federation of American Scientists Newsletter, Vol. 24, No. 10, January 1972.

Bravo to you representing your District and the Women of this country for exerting leadership in this crucial issue of a ban of "all test explosives of nuclear weapons for all time."

Sincerely yours,

BENSON T. CHERTOK,  
Associate Professor of Physics.

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL SERVICE,  
THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,  
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1972.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: I would like to express my deep appreciation for your introduction of H. Con. Res. 480. It is a very timely move considering: (a) progress in multilateral negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (i.e., (a) agreements on Seabed, NPT and Bacteriological War); (b) the probability of some SALT agreement this Spring; (c) recent technological progress re detection; (d) a growing sense of progressive momentum in the arms control field; and (e) this is an election year.

I am a specialist in U.S. foreign and national security policy with a particular interest in arms control. There is a virtually unanimous sentiment today in ACDA for a comprehensive test ban. ACDA, of course, does not have the powerful outside constituents which support DoD and the JCS.

Your voice, I pray, will be joined by others who feel "security" in its truest sense is not necessarily synonymous with massive armaments.

Sincerely,

DR. DUNCAN L. CLARKE,  
Assistant Professor.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,  
New York, N.Y., November 19, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG: Please accept the enclosed copy of my recent paper entitled, "Limits of Military Power for National Security".

I wrote this paper a few weeks ago following an invitation to a discussion on disarmament problems that was sponsored by the Soviet Pugwash Committee and the Soviet Peace Committee. While the Soviet official policy is contrary to the conclusions of this paper, the reaction of serious Russians was that this paper set forth novel ideas that deserved examination. The report in *The New York Times* of Sunday, October 31st seemed to justify the interest that I thought would attach to this subject.

The arms race since the Second World War has involved the assumption that military power is effectively unlimited; that there is always some new level of power that is attainable, if only one is willing to try hard enough. I have tried to take a fresh look at this assumption and find that it is probably in error. The superpowers, while trying for military superiority, have both gone past the point of meaningful difference in military power. At the same time the economic cost of arms to the United States and to the Soviet Union has been massive.

There appear to be new reasons of self-interest, both military and economic, for moving toward a more rational military policy, for American reasons, and regardless of Russian-American agreement or disagreement.

I am sure that this brief paper does not dispose of the large issues that are raised.

But I hope you will agree that these matters are worth fresh discussion.

Sincerely,

SEYMOUR MELMAN.

PAPER TO SYMPOSIUM ON DISARMAMENT PROBLEMS, MOSCOW, OCTOBER 30-31, 1971

LIMITS OF MILITARY POWER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY, AND THE PATH TO DISARMAMENT  
(By Seymour Melman\*)

After 25 years of a nuclear-military arms race, it is possible to define significant limits of military power for national security. These limits apply with special force to the nuclear superpowers. These same limits of military power also define new requirements for a disarmament process.

Underlying the long discussion of disarmament among nations has been the understanding that lowered levels of armaments produce mutual advantages: the prospect of physical destruction is reduced; and the cost of armaments can be applied to constructive uses. Thus, the arms race from 1946 to 1971 between the United States and the Soviet Union has not improved the military security of either nation. The economic cost to these two countries has exceeded \$1,500 billion.

In 1961 I calculated that a rapid process of economic development for the unindustrialized people of the world could be executed with an annual capital outlay of about \$22 billion.<sup>1</sup> Hence, the arms race outlays by the United States and the Soviet Union during the last quarter century would have financed 50 years of world economic development, while still leaving one-third of the actual budgets to be used for military security purposes.

#### DEFINING LEVELS OF ARMAMENTS

Classically, attempts to negotiate international reduction and limitation on armaments levels could proceed with the confident assumption that it was technically feasible to define armaments quantitatively and qualitatively. Owing to the evolution of military technology, these previously assumed conditions have altered. What is the unit weapon? One medium-sized military aircraft, or a naval vessel like a destroyer, take on altered military meaning when their weapons change from conventional to nuclear explosives. A missile with conventional warhead is transformed by replacement with a nuclear warhead, or by 5 separately-directed nuclear warheads.

Similar conditions have affected the qualitative assessment of weapons. A battleship was once more powerful than a destroyer. But a motor torpedo boat, equipped to launch a nuclear-tipped missile, can destroy not only a single large naval vessel, but—conceivably—even an entire flotilla.

What is a "strategic" weapon? Is it to be measured by the explosive power of a warhead? If five "tactical" warheads are jointly applied, do they then become "strategic"? Does strategic mean the speed of delivery or the distance over which nonstop delivery can be affected? Is it reasonable to assume that great destructive force can be delivered only over great distances and at high speed? I formulate these questions not only to suggest the new problems of defining terms of military "equality" or "parity" under conditions of nuclear weapons abundance, but more importantly because these questions, and the array of possible answers, reflect a true transformation in military power.

#### NEW CONSTRAINTS ON MILITARY POWER

Since the end of the second World War there have been a great number of armed conflicts between the military forces of national states. It is a unique feature of this long period, that in no case was a conflict permitted to operate to a military conclusion.

Footnotes at end of article.

In each instance other nations intervened, singly or through concerted action—as through the United Nations, to bring military operations to a halt well before one national power was able to overwhelm the other side militarily and use that fact to dictate political terms. The large number of lives lost in the procession of smaller wars from 1946 to 1971 rules out the possibility that a new concern for human life was the operating factor. Rather this new development was a result of the well-founded and pervasive fear of the consequences from extension and escalation of what began, in each case, as limited national conflict. Extension means involving other countries. Escalation means greater intensity of violence. The feared end result of military extension and escalation has been confrontation between superpowers leading to nuclear war. It is widely appreciated that this outcome cannot be excluded since the generals of each side are instructed to win and that each major nuclear state wields nuclear weapons in abundance.

In 1971 the London Institute for Strategic Studies estimated that the U.S. possesses 6,000 nuclear warheads fitted to delivery vehicles that could reach the U.S.S.R. and that 2,000 Soviet warheads could strike at the continental United States.<sup>2</sup>

In the United States, there are 150 populated places with more than a hundred thousand persons each. In the U.S.S.R., there are about 175 such places.<sup>3</sup> It is relevant to compare the number of deliverable warheads with the number of sizable population-industrial centers of each society.

By this form of reckoning, the United States could conceivably overkill the population-industrial centers of the U.S.S.R. 34 times, and the Soviets could destroy the United States' counterpart 13 times over. The military, scientific and human absurdity of the overkill development is revealed in the following. Who is ahead, the Soviet Union or the United States, with respect to nuclear military power? If the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were to exchange their strategic forces, would it make any military difference?

An overwhelming advantage has been given to the offensive in military operations, for nuclear warheads can be delivered in diverse size and by varied delivery systems. Against the number, diversity and destructive power contained in nuclear warheads, the defense function is made essentially unfeasible. Varied allowances for weapons reliability do not alter the condition.

These characteristics of nuclear weapons affect the potential relationship between large and small military powers. As the knowledge for making nuclear weapons is elaborated and alternative technologies become available at lowered costs, it is not inconceivable that smaller nations should undertake the manufacture of their own nuclear weapons. However "small" such weapons and their numbers, the nature of nuclear weapons and the possibility of delivering them by alternative means opens up the nightmarish possibility of military-political confrontations in which major powers find themselves threatened by small nations wielding nuclear "equalizers." What science or body of human wisdom could be drawn upon to advise a government on how much value to place on any of its cities?

#### CONVENTIONAL FORCES

In the relations of the nuclear superpowers the consequences from use of conventional forces is not separable from nuclear forces. For each state trains and operates armed forces to apply successive intensities of force as required to prevail militarily. Recourse to nuclear weapons can, accordingly, not be ruled out, especially in the absence even of doctrine to that effect.

A second major aspect of modern military operations that deserves a discussion of limits involves conventional warfare in its guerrilla form. Guerrilla warfare involves a ma-

for military-technical innovation. The innovation is of an organizational sort and does not consist primarily of particular weapons. Nevertheless, this organizational innovation is significant for it has had the result of setting limits to military power and hence to the meaning of various military-technological developments.

The essence of guerrilla warfare involves military operations under the following conditions: (a) a group of men sufficiently committed to a common purpose to risk their lives for the end in view; (b) support from the surrounding population for the guerrilla fighting group; (c) capability by the guerrillas for taking on appearances similar to that of the surrounding population.

The importance of these three conditions is that when they are fulfilled, it has been unfeasible to overcome the group of men so operating. During the last decades, major armed forces have been repeatedly frustrated by guerrilla-type operations that fulfill the three conditions noted above. This was starkly revealed in the frustration of the German army during the Second World War against the Yugoslav guerrillas, and is further demonstrated by the frustration of American armed forces in their relation to the guerrilla organization of the National Liberation Front in Vietnam.

There is no question that in every department of weapons technology, American armed forces in Vietnam, and those supported by them, enjoy overwhelming superiority. The guerrilla opponent in Vietnam has demonstrated military staying power despite the fact that he possesses no heavy weapons, no navy, no air force, and nothing like the technically elaborate military and industrial infrastructure that supports American and allied armed forces. During the last decade, American armed forces have not stinted on research and development for counter-guerrilla operations.<sup>4</sup> The array of new weapons development to facilitate the counter-guerrilla operations in Vietnam is impressively elaborate. The range extends from new light-weight weapons, new types of footgear and protective clothing, devices to "smell" a possible opponent concealed in a jungle, and antipersonnel bombs of diverse sorts and highly destructive effect. The inability of the most elaborately-equipped armed force in the world, backed by the world's largest military technology research and development network, to overcome the guerrilla forces of a small, poor country defines a major limit in military technology.

This is not to say that guerrilla operations cannot be overcome. They can, if one or more of the three conditions listed above are altered. Thus, the second requirement for successful operation can be altered: if the surrounding population is destroyed, then there is no "sea" in which the guerrillas can "swim." The United States has the capability for destroying the population in areas under guerrilla control. But such methods, until now, are unacceptable politically. Also, the destruction of a population goes counter to at least one traditional requirement of military operations: that the winner take control, not only of territory, but of the population therein.

#### MILITARY ASSUMPTIONS

The governments of the superpowers have each underwritten massive efforts to achieve superior military power. The advice they have followed in this respect has been based on assumptions which deserve review.

It has been assumed that military supremacy is both definable and achievable. In the case of nuclear warfare this is clearly not the case. Neither is there any prospect, based on knowledge of nature or its application to technology, for supposing that this may be the case in some predictable future.

Once nuclear weaponry is understood as not being usable for military superiority, then it is also difficult to suppose that conventional warfare, in the presence of nuclear options, can be turned to account for this purpose. For if conventional weapons and forces are interlinked with nuclear weapons and forces, and the same men command the two, and are indoctrinated to prevail, then it is plausible to expect that these men will move—given the need—from conventional to nuclear forces.

Second: perhaps the key technical assumption underlying confidence in the achievement of military advantage is the idea of "suboptimization".

Suboptimization is the strategy for improving a system as a whole through improvement of the parts. In military-technical form, this has meant an improved rifle, improved bullets, an improved airplane, an improved tire, an improved bandage, an improved uniform, an improved guidance system, an improved missile fuel—each one being pursued on the assumption that from the sum of such unit technical improvements, there will emerge, necessarily, an improvement in a military system as a whole.

A military officer's view of unit improvements desirable during the 1970's was given by Brigadier (RET) Kenneth Hunt in his paper "The Requirements of Military Technology in the 1970's."<sup>5</sup> Hunt wrote, in 1967:

"The soldier is interested in infra-red or laser sighting devices to enable him to see and aim at night or in fog; light-weight radar or sensory aids to detect enemy approach; weapon-locating radars to pinpoint enemy guns or mortars by calculating the path taken by the shells they fire; the location of enemy concentrations and particularly nuclear artillery, with sufficient accuracy and speed to enable them to be hit before they move or fire; the engagement of high-speed attacking aircraft, preferably before they release their weapons."

"The sailor must find the enemy submarine, surface ship or aircraft, which is no doubt moving, and engage these fleeting targets before they engage him. The airman has his target to strike, fixed, moving, predetermined or opportunity; the enemy interceptor, bomber or missile to engage; the enemy defences to counter."

Characteristically, military technologists have each specialized in a particular military-technical device or problem. Each has proceeded on the assumption that some improvement in a particular device or system will contribute towards improvement of military power as a whole.

This conventional strategy of military-technological development is checkmated by two limits of military power discussed above: nuclear overkill and guerrilla warfare. "Improvement" in overkill is nonoperational and hence militarily, humanly and scientifically meaningless. Ever-greater firepower for destroying an opponent under conditions of guerrilla warfare is meaningless insofar as the opponent cannot be identified.

In weapons development, technological improvement has typically taken the form of attempts at superiority in destructive power, accuracy, speed, range, and reliability. Consider Brigadier Hunt's shopping list of technological improvements in terms of these factors. Each of these developments might very well produce some particular military gain under conditions of Second World War military operations. Once nuclear weapons are introduced in quantity, the military worth of these gains is vitiated.

This military-technical shopping list has its counterpart in the agendas of particular technical problems being tackled by the military research and development institutions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Taken together, the interest in these developments rests on the assumption that military operations in some foreseeable future will be like the knightly jousts of

medieval warriors: wars that are fought between opposing armed forces such that the relative technological superiority of one as against the other might make some significant difference. Under present conditions, that prospect is unrealistic. In the era of nuclear overkill, knightly jousting between elite military forces is replaced by the prospect of nuclear confrontation, in terms of which (as in the Cuban Missile Crisis of October, 1962) particular technical "advantages" are overwhelmed by the prospective destructiveness of the nuclear weapons to be used.

Consider the meaning of suboptimization with respect to classes of military technology that have been given considerable attention. Suppose one armed force, having been given elaborate equipment and training in the use of tactical nuclear weapons, is able to score a major advantage in the field. Of what use or meaning is that advantage if the population-industrial centers of the society have been destroyed in the course of escalated military operations.

What science can be called upon to judge that such levels of violence would not be attained?

A third assumption that is characteristically made with respect to military power is that the size of money expenditure can make the difference. Here it is worth recalling the possibility that small countries may, in a near future, acquire nuclear weapons at relatively low cost.

In sum: military technology can deliver great destructive power for operating a threat system. But military technology cannot, now or in a foreseeable future, deliver a physical shield, that is defense, in nuclear war. Neither can present or foreseeable military technology insure victory against determined guerrilla opponents.

#### WEIGHT OF MILITARY INSTITUTIONS

An important feature of the arms race has been the development of major military-industrial and military-technical institutions in the major countries of the world. The long operation of such institutions and their large cadres of educated men gives institutional weight to the ideologies of the arms race. For many able men working in these institutions has been their prime career experience.

Insofar as military technologists, however able they are individually, participate in what is scientifically absurd—like the multiplication of overkill, or the improvement of targeting accuracy by hundreds of yards in warheads with miles of destructive effect—then their technical work is in the tradition of science-fiction rather than science, regardless of its technical intricacy or elegance in detail.

Our countries have been asking military technologists to produce something which, on the evidence, can no longer be delivered: a workable shield against nuclear destruction from without, and military superiority in both nuclear and conventional warfare. Despite the known technological limits in these spheres, military specialists recommend the expenditure of large public funds for their activities, each of which is presumed to contribute to a plausible military defense or to superiority of armed forces.

When research organizations reach limits of the potential contribution to given technology, as in the case of most military research institutions, how can one account for the perpetuation of such organizations? The answer to such questions must be sought in the realm of social laws of perpetuation of organizations: the social inertia that stems from the well-esteemed operation of a large organization that has high status, large budgets, a technically qualified staff, and a network of interrelations with important institutions in society. In the case of military research establishments, these factors are a base upon which these organizations build for sustained operations through the prom-

Footnotes at end of article.

ise of military-technological "improvement" always in prospect. Indeed, improvement in detail can generally be delivered even though the larger purposes of military advantage that must presumably be served by military technology get lost from view.

#### SELF-PENALIZING EFFECTS OF THE ARMS RACE

No nation, however large and wealthy, can escape the negative economic effects that are caused by sustained military spending on a large scale. Economists, as a profession, have tended to neglect the functional difference between productive and parasitic aspects of economic growth. Productive growth refers to goods and services that are money-valued and which form a part of the level of living, or can be used for further production. Parasitic economic output refers to goods and services that are, primarily, neither part of the level of living nor useful for further production. Military output is overwhelmingly of the latter sort. Thus, in the United States, from 1946 to 1971, more than \$1,200 billion has been expended in the budgets of the Department of Defense. (This quantity of resources exceeds the money value of all the residential and commercial buildings on the surface of the United States.) The comparable data for the U.S.S.R. are not available to me.

The value of productive economic growth foregone is the true indicator of the social cost of large and sustained military expenditures. Thus, the 8-10% of Gross National Product annually devoted to military purposes in the United States has seemed to be a small part of the national product. This portion, however, includes a preponderance of the research and development, scientific and engineering manpower of the country. The effect of their concentration on military and related work is the relative technical depletion of many civilian industries and activities.<sup>6</sup> This effect is operative apart from variation in economic systems.

In the United States a series of important industries have become technically and economically incompetent to serve even the domestic market, let alone compete successfully in the world market. The effect of inadequate productive investment is widespread. In New York City, for example, central power supply, the telephone system, and rail services have become unreliable. Since these services are the underpinnings of an industrial system, the inefficiencies in these activities have ramified effects throughout the economy and society.

In the Soviet Union there is evidence too of constraint on economic development that is surely traceable to the long priority given to military-industry and military-technology. For example, I read in dispatches from Moscow that citizens of that city are mobilized to help bring in the yearly harvest of truck produce around the Soviet capital and that the mechanization and organization of agriculture has not proceeded to the point where newspapers need not exhort Moscovites with headlines proclaiming "Decisive Days," "Every Hour Counts," and "The Capital Awaits its Potatoes."<sup>7</sup>

In an official summary of the "Draft Directives of the 24th CPSU Congress for the New Five-Year Plan" I find that "It is planned to raise labor productivity in industry by 38-40% over the five-year period, securing thereby 87-90% of the total increment in output." This is, of course, a centrally important economic matter for the Soviet Union. From the standpoint of industrial productivity attaining this goal depends on intensive mechanization of existing plants and construction of new, highly productive, industrial facilities. This result is unlikely of achievement without a substantial transfer of Soviet technical talent from military and space activities to productive economic work.

I find it significant that despite considerable differences in political-economic conditions, there are problems of economic depletion or limited economic growth in the United States and the Soviet Union that involve a common factor: long concentration of technical talent and capital on parasitic economic growth. That is the automatic penalty of priority to the arms race. Substantially improved economic conditions are the automatic reward for reversing the arms race.

#### NEW CONDITIONS OF DISARMAMENT

The development of nuclear overkill systems among the superpowers has led to qualitative and quantitative constraints on defining military "parity" or "equality". If such categories are not definable, then it is difficult to see how they can be used as a basis for a negotiated, parallel reversal of the arms race. At the same time it is incontestable that the further development of the arms race is militarily irrational, leads to heightened military insecurity and unacceptable economic penalties. Under these conditions a new approach is required to a disarmament process. I propose the following as a workable set of actions for disarmament under present conditions.

A. *Limited agreements.* This includes agreement among the superpowers, and hopefully others, for a complete test ban on nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles, agreement on no ABM systems, and agreements to terminate chemical and biological weapons.

B. *Disengagement and demilitarization agreements.* These include agreements for demilitarized zones as in Europe or the Middle East, and arrangements for disengagement of aerial and naval forces of the superpowers (agreed rules of navigation, minimum distances, etc.).

Agreements of the two sorts noted above do not touch centrally on the main course of the arms race. They are important, however, both in the substance that they deal with and for the political confidence that such agreements generate, within and among nations.

C. *Unilateral reduction of overkill and extra-defense forces.* By reduction of overkill forces I mean reduction to a level defined as follows: In the United States there are 150 cities with populations of 100,000 and over. A nuclear force for the U.S.S.R. is one that is capable of delivering 150 warheads to these places. Leaders of the United States who would not be constrained from nuclear military initiatives by the prospect of destruction of these 150 cities would be too insane to be constrained by anything.

In the U.S.S.R. there are 175 cities of population 100,000 or more. A strategic force level for the United States is one that is capable of directing nuclear warheads to those cities. Soviet leaders who would not be constrained from nuclear military initiatives by the prospect of destruction of these cities would be too insane to be constrained by anything.

The statistics for cities given above in the United States and the Soviet Union define, reciprocally, the size of nuclear forces in each case. The merit of this reasoning for defining a nuclear force is not altered by qualifications concerning weapons reliability, etc.

Once it is appreciated that military advantage in a nuclear arms race can no longer be defined and that "parity" at multiples of overkill cannot be defined, then it is indicated that initiative toward sharp reduction of nuclear overkill forces is deservedly done by unilateral action of each government and society. In each case the action is taken on grounds of improving the military and the economic security of the society in question.

Similar reasoning applies to the reduction of extra-defense conventional forces. Once it

is appreciated that such forces, alone or with nuclear adjuncts, cannot provide a true shield for any society, then their residual function is that of plausibly guarding the boundaries of superpower states and contiguous allied territories. This assumes agreement to the proposition that the use of their own conventional military forces as instruments of political power extension by the superpowers involves them in the unacceptable risk of nuclear confrontation.

D. *Negotiated disarmament and peacekeeping.* As armed forces of the superpowers come down to the nuclear force levels and limited conventional forces as defined above, the technical and political conditions for negotiating disarmament and peacekeeping institutions will be transformed. On the technical side the number of nuclear weapons and delivery systems will have defined meaning, thereby rendering their further reduction negotiable. Politically, the visible effort to put aside attempts to overwhelm the other nation militarily will create the necessary atmosphere for further reduction of both nuclear and conventional armed forces, and for the implementation of agreed peacekeeping arrangements.

It is worth stressing here that one of the important areas of unattended problems concerns the design and operation of international peacekeeping arrangements, and the formulation of a workable strategy for phasing these into operation.

#### SOME BARRIERS TO DISARMAMENT

The experience of the last decade has made me cautious about understating the political weight of military institutions and military-supporting ideology. I do have the judgment, however, that the self-imposed economic and other penalties of the arms race have become vividly evident in both the United States and the U.S.S.R. and that thoughtful men in both societies are prepared to reassess the conventional wisdom that has led our countries to seek security in the arms race. There is no alternative in my view to trying, deliberately, to overcome myths like the one that tells us that a military advantage is still obtainable if one tries hard enough. Thoughtful men in each society have the obligation to address the primitive fears and suspicions that have grown up over the last decades. It is necessary to show that, on the one hand, there is no way to succeed with the arms race for "success" means failure. On the other hand, it is necessary to persuade that the security of a society could be substantially improved by policies that reverse the arms race and apply vast resources to productive tasks.

The process of "demystifying" the arms race might be assisted by continuing demonstration of the process of "antagonistic cooperation" that has proceeded during the last decade. Military policymakers of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. have each reacted to actions by the other, making them into justifications for further steps in the arms race on their part.

In the United States, I can say with some confidence that one of the problems Americans face is overcoming the fears that many feel if we are not outdoing the Russians weapon-by-weapon and technology-by-technology. At a recent informal discussion that included a number of military men, I presented some of my ideas. Finally, one Air Force man rose to his feet and cried out: "We've gotten so accustomed to just reacting to the Russians that we have allowed ourselves to become too reactive. Why, if the Russians announced they were going to hell, in no time the Bureau of Mines would come up with a program . . ."—at which point the entire discussion dissolved in laughter.

Most likely the same story is appropriate the other way around as well. If the Americans announced they were going to hell, in no time the Soviet equivalent of the Bu-

Footnotes at end of article.

reau of Mines would also "come up with a program."

In sum, I judge that the main order of new action for reducing the military confrontation system between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is the unilateral reduction of military establishments by each government down to the level of sufficiency for effecting nuclear constraint and guarding the country.<sup>3</sup>

In the coming period the mark of courage of national leaders in the United States and the Soviet Union will be the readiness to tell the people the truth about the limits of military power and to recommend and implement the reversal of the arms race.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> S. Melman, *The Peace Race*, Ballantine Books and Braziller, New York, 1961, Chapter 8.

<sup>2</sup> Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 1970-71*, London, 1971, p. 89.

<sup>3</sup> *The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1971*, Doubleday, New York, 1971, p. 406; *The Statesmen's Yearbook, Statistical and Historical Annual of the States of the World for the Year 1970-71*, edited by John Paxton, Macmillan, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1971, p. 1387.

<sup>4</sup> S. Melman, *Pentagon Capitalism*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970, Chapter 6.

<sup>5</sup> K. Hunt, *The Requirements of Military Technology in the 1970's*, Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1967.

<sup>6</sup> S. Melman, *Our Depleted Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Dell Books, New York, 1965.

<sup>7</sup> Dispatch from Moscow by Theodore Shabad, *The New York Times*, October 3, 1971.

<sup>8</sup> S. Melman, "All the Muscle at One-Third the Cost," *Saturday Review*, New York, October 9, 1971.

#### OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, this is a special interest legislation and I am proud to admit it.

Enactment of this bill will provide an immediate, effective, precise response to the specialized housing and related needs of the low-moderate income elderly.

We would be naive to deny that even in our so-called classless society we do, in fact, have economic stratas—different income groups. This is as true of the elderly as it is of the general population.

Some of the more than 20 million older Americans can be characterized as "comfortable," affluent or just plain rich. Unfortunately, a much larger segment of our elderly population have very low incomes; at or below the poverty level. Then, we have all the older people in between.

The well-to-do elderly generally enjoy balanced investment portfolios and are thus insulated from inflation or deflation. This group, happily, needs no government help at all.

The very low-income elderly are eligible for low-rent public housing and various other forms of government assistance. We are very mindful of this group.

It is the in-between group, the low-moderate income elderly, who seem to have been almost forgotten. These are the people who have constituted the stable middle class element of our society; the backbone of America, the people who during their productive years paid into pension funds, educated their children

and sent their sons to our wars. It is these middle class fixed income older citizens who have been most cruelly punished by inflation. Now when they are old and have no way to improve their economic situation, they find themselves, through no fault of their own, deprived of the decent housing, security, independence and dignity that they have rightfully earned.

The situation is particularly tragic for those who live alone because for many they are not living at all—merely existing. Some are virtually prisoners in their own deteriorating homes; fearful, insecure, starved for companionship and meaningful activity. Not infrequently, this loneliness and financial insecurity spawns malnutrition, premature aging, sickness, and death.

These fine, proud older Americans simply cannot compete in the private market for the housing and supportive services that their age and economic circumstances require. Worse yet, our primary vehicle for delivery of subsidized housing, section 236 of the housing statute, simply does not and cannot do the job.

Our bill will do the job; swiftly, efficiently and at minimal cost.

Mr. BLACKBURN of Georgia and I have for sometime found ourselves working on parallel paths, studying existing programs, evaluating new ideas and proposals, seeking a workable solution to the problem. We have concluded that new legislation, this legislation, is the answer.

I will be surprised if those responsible for administration of the section 236 program do not challenge my statement that the 236 program or its refurbished counterpart section 502 of the administration housing bill cannot adequately respond to the specialized needs of the elderly.

Fortunately, we have some impressively authoritative support for our contention that this kind of new legislation is essential.

For example, the President's Task Force on Aging, in its report published April 1970, made the following recommendation:

Recommendation 16.  
Establishment of a Separate Identity for Federal Housing Programs for the Elderly.

We recommend that the Department of Housing and Urban Development in administering Federal housing programs recognize the needs of the elderly for specialized housing arrangements by developing and using separate guidelines for the provision of such arrangements concerning design, funding, and operation.

Technical staff work which preceded the 1971 White House Conference on Aging included an in-depth detailed study and analysis of existing legislation and programs related to housing and supportive services for the elderly. This 120-page study-report, published in March 1971, included this forthright, unequivocal finding and recommendation:

Certain obvious gaps in housing adequacy emerge . . . Among the major concerns is the broad question of commitment of resources at the Federal level to the needs of the elderly population, many of whom cannot be competitive in the general housing market for rental or sales housing.

The above fact would lead to the con-

clusion that housing programs specifically identified and funded for the elderly population should be reestablished and the number of units increased. In addition, staff sensitive to the needs of the elderly are required to provide guidance on the special nature of these programs in HUD central, regional, and area offices."

Then, just this past December, the White House Conference on Aging, in clear terms recommended and urged new legislation in this area. Their findings and recommendations were the product of the collective wisdom, intelligence, experience, and goodwill of more than 3,000 delegates from across the Nation.

Enactment of this bill, the Older Americans Act of 1972, will effectively implement the most significant recommendations of the President's Task Force on Aging and the 1971 White House Conference on Aging concerning elderly housing and related programs.

The bill contains four major elements: First, it will allow the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make direct 3-percent loans to organizations designed to construct specialized housing facilities for the elderly. When the housing projects so funded become operational and 90-percent occupied, they will be eligible for refinancing by conversion to the interest assistance program, thereby immediately repaying Federal loan moneys to a revolving fund. A revolving fund of approximately \$500 million would be initially created by refinancing of Federal housing loans already outstanding using interest assistance funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1972 and new appropriations of less than \$20 million for fiscal year 1973. This housing program would provide approximately 35,000 units of specialized elderly housing during its first 2 years of operation.

The second part of the bill provides for direct 100-percent grants to nonprofit organizations and public bodies to build senior citizen centers, including senior centers built in conjunction with housing projects so as to provide outreach and supportive services to residents and non-residents in the neighborhood and community.

The third program embodied in the bill provides that HUD may make either grants or loans to elderly persons living in their own homes to rehabilitate their homes to keep them in a decent, safe and sanitary condition. Qualifications for the grant or loan would be based upon inability to receive similar funding through private lending organizations. For those able to repay the money, they would be expected to do so and the interest rate would be 3 percent. However, for those whose incomes were insufficient to be able to repay the money, a direct grant would be made for the rehabilitation of their home, and the Secretary of HUD would have the first lien against the property when it was transferred due to death or sale.

Finally, the bill provides for a specialized organizational component within the Department of Housing and Urban Development led by an Administrator for Housing and Related programs for Older Americans. The Administrator would have responsibility for operating the elderly housing program, the senior

citizen center program, and the loan and grant program for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing. Additionally, the Administrator would have authority and responsibility for initiation and conduct of research programs concerning the health, physical, emotional and social aspects of all housing and related programs for the elderly; and the development and implementation of programs for training professional and semiprofessional staff personnel to improve the competency, efficiency, and sensitivity of the management of federally assisted housing projects and programs for the elderly would be within his jurisdiction. In short, he will synthesize all elements essential to a comprehensive and effective program.

We have heard from our constituents, the personal tragedies of individual cases, the mounting frustration and despair of churchmen and others who have attempted unsuccessfully to employ existing, nonspecialized HUD programs, to help older people. We have studied the work product of the researcher, the scholar, the experts. It is extraordinarily rare when every view, every informed opinion, all recommendations merge, agree and coalesce into one. I genuinely believe that this bill does in fact represent the remarkable opportunity for the Congress to make law which will have the support and endorsement of every right-thinking person.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK T. BOW OF OHIO

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we learned with deep regret a few days ago that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), has decided to retire at the end of his current term of office.

As his friend, a fellow Ohioan and a member of the Appropriations Committee to which he has rendered such outstanding service in the role of ranking minority member, I feel a great sense of loss.

It is not surprising that the same sentiments are shared by the people of his congressional district and have been expressed in the news media of that area. I would like to include with my remarks editorials on the subject of Mr. Bow's retirement from the Canton, Ohio, Repository and the Massillon, Ohio, Evening Independent. I should also like to include a copy of Mr. Bow's statement announcing his retirement, one of the most thoughtful and considerate statements I have ever read.

#### STATEMENT

It has been my honor and privilege to represent the 16th District of Ohio in the Congress for 22 years, longer than any other incumbent. I am thankful to those who have supported me in the past and have indicated they will do so in the future. A recent poll taken in the new district indicates I can be re-elected without serious opposition. The hour has arrived when I must decide whether to continue the difficult task involved in being the leader of my party's membership on the appropriations committee, or see some-

one else from our district start up the ladder of seniority.

We have many capable men, particularly in the Republican party, already schooled in the art of government, who would serve the district with competence and distinction.

I will be 71 years of age at the next election. It is well known I have suffered several heart attacks. Although my doctors tell me I am physically sound for my age, it is also true that two more years of the pressures of this office would not be without risk.

Mrs. Bow, who has been so loyal to me and to the district, deserves respite from the responsibility a Congressional wife must assume, usually without acknowledgment or thanks.

Therefore, after careful and prayerful consideration, I have made the decision that I will not be a candidate for re-election to the 93rd Congress.

I have had a loyal and competent staff. I would hope my successor would see fit to continue those who know the district and have served it well.

The President, my longtime friend, has asked me to continue. I regret I will not be with him to complete the program he has instituted, and which has been in the best interests of the nation. However, I shall be happy to serve where I can in a limited capacity.

I am deeply grateful for the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and for the support and warm friendship of the people of this district. I have endeavored to justify in every way the faith they have expressed in me, and shall continue to serve in the same manner during the year ahead.

#### MR. REPUBLICAN TO RETIRE

The 16th Congressional District will have a new congressman, Frank T. Bow, of Canton, who has served the district faithfully for 22 years, announced Friday that he will not be a candidate for re-election. He will retire upon completion of his present term. And this opens the door for a new representative to the district.

Already standing in the doorway are State Sen. Ralph Regula of Navarre, who today announced that he would seek the nomination of the Republican party, and Virgil L. Musser, Massillon city solicitor, who will seek the Democratic nomination.

We have mixed feelings on Congressman's Bow's decision to retire. He has been a good congressman, otherwise he never could have been elected to 11 terms in office. He has represented the district well in Washington and through his efforts millions of dollars in federal funds have been secured and invested in projects and other programs in the district.

He has served with distinction and at the present time holds the all-important post of ranking minority member of the powerful house appropriations committee.

We have every reason to believe that Congressman Bow could have been elected to a 12th term in office had he chose to seek it, for he is just as attentive today to matters brought to his attention with requests for help from residents of the district as he was when he first took office. And because of his high position in congress, he is likely to get action quicker than perhaps some lesser known legislator.

But Congressman Bow is 71 years old, and though his health is good, he has been the victim of several heart attacks in recent years. There comes a time when reason and good judgment dictate a slowing down from the daily rigors of hard work and the congressman believes that this is the time for him. "While the doctors tell me I am physically strong for my age, it is also true that two more years of the pressures of this office would not be without risk," he said in announcing his decision.

So this is the other emotion of our mixed feelings: Congressman Bow is deserving of the less vigorous hours retirement will bring.

He might have taken the step two years ago had not Republicans in high places begged him to stay on the job. It would be unkind and selfish not to accede to his wishes at this time and we hope that he and Mrs. Bow will have many happy hours in the less strenuous years ahead. She, too, deserves respite from the responsibilities a congressional wife must assume, "usually without thanks," as the congressman puts it.

It is significant that the first two men to announce themselves as candidates for Bow's seat are from western Stark county.

The Republican party is fortunate that it has a man of the stature of Ralph Regula ready and willing to make a bid for the office.

He is the first Republican to enter the race and will be a hard running candidate. He is respected by Republicans throughout the district and state because of his sincere and arduous work in the Ohio Statehouse. After five years on the Ohio Board of Education, he ran for state representative and was elected, then moved up to the state senate and is now serving his fifth year. He is one of Ohio's best known and most respected legislators. It is a good year for him to run since it is an off-election year for him, which means his seat in the Ohio senate is not in jeopardy.

Musser's bid for congress will be his third. He has twice carried the flag for the Democratic party in unsuccessful attempts to unseat Bow. While his experience in public office has been limited to that of city solicitor, he has been prominent in Democratic circles, having formerly served as president of the Ohio League of Young Democrats and two years as president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

We don't look for a flock of candidates entering the race in either party, though others have been mentioned in political circles—among them Stanley Cmich, Canton mayor, a Republican and Joseph Sommer, a Democrat, former county commissioner and now administrator of the Ohio Bureau of Workmen's Compensation in Columbus.

And so the political pot is now simmering. Future announcements may bring it to a boil.

#### REPRESENTATIVE BOW: FRIEND OF THE PEOPLE

Canton's Mr. Invincible on Capitol Hill has decided to clean off his desk at the end of the year and devote full attention to his most loyal supporter and wife, Caroline.

From a purely selfish standpoint, we regret the decision of Frank T. Bow to bypass another 16th District campaign but we understand and respect the wisdom of such a move made largely for reasons of health.

Mr. Bow has been a Republican watchdog in the U.S. House of Representatives for more than two decades. He has kept an eye on federal matters as well as always being sensitive to the best interest of his constituents.

When Canton officials have journeyed to Washington—whether to promote funds for housing, crime fighting or other important local projects—Rep. Bow always could be counted on to follow through. More times than not, he was successful.

As ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, the Cantonian was operating from a position of strength on Capitol Hill which paid off time and again for his constituents.

Because of his leadership role made possible by seniority but achieved mainly through dedication and ability, he has been one of the most powerful congressmen ever to represent this district—certainly the most effective representative from this area in modern times. In the last three years his position has been further enhanced by the fact he has been a personal friend and trusted confidante of President Nixon.

Mr. Bow has been an outspoken legislator, knowledgeable in domestic affairs and for-

aign policy. He has been a vocal critic of waste.

But his constituents know him best, perhaps, in the area of one-to-one service. They may not know that he helped get the money for a hospital in India or rescued projects vital to Ohio, but they do know that he provided them assistance on individual problems when help was badly needed.

His staff operated under the rule that it was to give as much aid as possible on individual requests and Mr. Bow made himself available in numerous cases.

In return for this type of concerned service, his constituents returned Rep. Bow to office every time he asked them to do so.

That fact, in itself, says more about Rep. Frank T. Bow than could a mountain of words.

To the richly deserved titles of Mr. Republican, Mr. Invincible, and friend of the people, we must add Mr. Sincerity, Mr. Integrity and, as the President refers to him, Mr. Responsibility.

For 22 years, FRANK T. BOW has served the 16th District of Ohio with a selfless dedication unparalleled in modern times. His vast knowledge of human sentiment and an inherent sense of fairplay coupled with the determined exercise of authority, have paid off time and again for his constituents. FRANK BOW would best be described as a perfect statesman, eloquent in debate, immovable when he has made the right decision, and equally judicious when dealing with his subordinates as when conferring with the great powers of the world.

Whether it is when making decisions affecting millions of Americans or when thrilling a small boy, visiting Washington, by taking time to chat with him, FRANK BOW always displays the same sincerity and modesty that has endeared him to so many.

He has been referred to as the watchdog of the Treasury and the holder of the Nation's purse strings. The responsibility with which he has fulfilled his duties as leader of the minority on the Appropriations Committee must be respected by all.

For the past 22 years, FRANK BOW has been "the man you know" to the people of the 16th District of Ohio. The mutual respect and loyalty they hold has been unsurpassed in that area. And now that he is retiring, his constituents as well as the entire country will realize what a great man and true American FRANK BOW is. It is true that a mountain of words could be said about FRANK T. BOW, but then he is a mountain of a man.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was absent on Judiciary Committee business when the House voted on H.R. 10086, a bill to increase the ceiling on appropriations and to make boundary changes for various national parks. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on roll 12.

Unfortunately the bill did not apply to the Indiana Dunes National Park, which is seriously threatened by erosion

and is desperately in need of immediate development if the natural beauty of the sand dunes is to be preserved.

I am hopeful that the necessary acquisitions can be made and the necessary funds provided for the development of the Indiana Dunes Park before it is too late.

#### SET A DATE

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President on television revealed to the American people his peace proposals made in secret talks in Paris, to try to show that reasonable offers to end the war have been made by his administration.

Apparently, the President seeks to convince us that he can do nothing more and thereby prepare us for new enemy offensives, new American offensives and possibly new reintroduction of additional U.S. forces to "save the lives of our remaining men."

Under analysis, it should be obvious that at the core of his plan, Mr. Nixon still insists that the existing Thieu regime be protected as a condition for our withdrawal. He thus chooses the welfare of Thieu's government over the release of American prisoners of war.

Our only remaining purpose in Vietnam should be to secure the release of our prisoners, and then get out. We can do this by setting a fixed withdrawal date as Congress has urged the President to do.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting editorials and articles which support this analysis.

Our people have endured years of repeated promises and a rehash of old peace proposals, while the fighting in Vietnam continues and our prisoners are still held captive. This fact is inescapable and will remain so, further Presidential declarations notwithstanding.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1972]

Vietnam: A Limited War For Limited Aims—  
II

We are not going to work our way out of the war in Vietnam—or out of the agony it has brought to the homefront—until we learn to talk about it in something less than absolute and, in an important sense, old-fashioned and irrelevant terms. This is the lesson once again underscored by the response to President Nixon's latest plan for peace—the response which says that to question the President's terms as too rigid amounts to a recommendation for "abject surrender," in the words of Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott.

"Surrender"? To whom? With whom, when you get down to it, are we at war? Is "war" even the word for a struggle in which we have been engaged in various times, and at so many different levels of intensity—financial backer; military adviser; principal combatant; and now, running the reel backward, once again no more than a marginal participant? Wars, as this country has known them, are to be won or lost (in our case, won). But we have not declared war on North Vietnam and the most we ever could have hoped to "win" was prevention of South Vietnam's losing political control of its territory at the hands of a guerrilla insurgency. If the

government in Saigon should lose control to the North Vietnamese some other way—by a failure of its own will even after a political settlement, by sheer fatigue on the part of the people, or by greed or corruption or sheer incompetence—would President Nixon nonetheless "become the first President in history to lose a war," as he was putting it to visitors not so very long ago.

The answer, it seems plain to us, is No: at this point, having expended over 50,000 lives and several billion dollars and ten years (or twenty if you wish to go back to our beginning efforts in Indochina), it is fair to say that we have done all that we could reasonably do for the South Vietnamese; that we have given them the time and the weapons and the money; and that the rest is up to their own will which nobody else can supply. To go on seeking to furnish what only they can furnish for themselves is to invite with certainty that specter—so abhorrent to the President—of a great nation reduced to the position of a "pitiful, helpless giant" unable to have its way, or make good its word, or bring its power to bear. We could have had our way with North Vietnam—but only at what was long ago judged to be an unacceptable risk of a confrontation with China or the Russians, and a far wider war. So we rejected the means of conventional war—invasion, occupation, subjugation, all the absolutes that have been common to past wars, including even Korea, where you could draw a line and call it a front, and work out a truce along it and agree on a cease-fire which was more or less enforceable. Anybody who thinks you can do that with any assurance of success in Vietnam has not been there.

And yet, having renounced conventional means, we continue to talk and to think in terms of conventional ends, and about "losing" a war that was never ours to lose. We continue to forget that we began with a gesture of economic support for South Vietnam under President Eisenhower, when we thought economic aid would do the trick. When it didn't, we moved to military aid (also under Mr. Eisenhower), and when that wasn't enough we brought in military advisers (in the Kennedy administration) and then authorized them to go out on military operations and to shoot, and that didn't turn the tide either. So it was that under President Johnson we moved combat units into battle and began the bombing and vastly expanded our efforts on the theory that a "graduated response," like a thumbscrew, would soon become unbearable to Hanoi. Only it didn't; instead it became unbearable at home and that was when we "surrendered" in the sense that we abandoned the thumbscrew in March, 1968, by holding back the next increment of American troops and, in the name of Vietnamization, began a steady withdrawal from the war. This withdrawal had only something to do with the course of the war on the ground in Vietnam and a lot more to do with the state of mind at home; the former could be rationalized while the latter was an inescapable fact.

In short, we abandoned even the strictly limited and unconventional means we had been employing—and still continued to hold out the hope of conventional and comfortable ends. So it is that in 1972 we continue to talk about honoring our "commitments" without bothering to define them in realistic terms; to cry "shame" at the thought of an inconclusive or even adverse outcome; to shout "surrender" at those who suggest that there are limits upon what you can do when you are progressively limiting the means you are prepared to employ in order to do it. As Mr. Charles W. Yost writes elsewhere on this page today, "It is far too late for the United States to play a decisive role either in propping up the Saigon government or in changing it," and we would agree. "Decisive," however, is the critical word. For once we have ac-

cepted the principle of the limits upon us, there are still things this country can do—and still things in the way of disengagement that it cannot do abruptly or irresponsibly—in the interest of trying to influence the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam as best it can, and these will be the subject of another editorial.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1972]

**UNITED STATES IS LATE AGAIN WITH VIETNAM CONCESSIONS, BUT IT'S NOT TOO LATE TO MAKE A DEAL FOR THE POW'S**

(By Charles W. Yost)

Among the many tragic aspects of United States involvement in Vietnam, two particularly stand out at this moment when the administration has revealed its latest "peace proposal." The first is that seven years after the massive involvement which most Americans now believe was an appalling mistake, the administration is still determined to win the war, even while leaving it. The second is that concessions on our part necessary for a negotiated settlement have always come much too late.

There was a time, some years ago, when a plan similar to the one now offered by the administration might have succeeded in ending the war. In 1968 I prepared for a private organization a plan for a Vietnam settlement which contained most of the elements of the latest United States proposal. This plan was submitted to the incoming administration in December, 1968. It is most gratifying to find that it has been in large part adopted nearly four years later.

There are, however, two significant differences between the two plans. The first is in timing. At the beginning of 1969, the United States had more than half a million troops in Vietnam, and Hanoi might possibly have been willing to pay a high price to get them out quickly. By the summer of 1972, the United States forces will presumably be down to about 30,000; our leverage is already vastly less; and the price we could now exact for what we have to offer would be a small one.

The second significant difference—this one substantive—between my plan of 1968 and the administration's of 1971 was that I suggested that new elections be conducted, not by "an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam," but by a neutral interim government having that representative character.

Such an interim arrangement might possibly have been saleable to both sides in 1969 if the United States had pressed hard enough. It is not now, because we have long since passed decision-making from ourselves to Thieu.

The administration proposal leaves Thieu's authority essentially intact, and from Hanoi's point of view, this is a fatal defect. While the plan provides for the resignation of President Thieu and his vice president one month before the election takes place, and for the "independent" election supervision, it otherwise leaves the entire apparatus of government, executive and legislative, national and local, police and military, in the hands of the present regime.

This is the apparatus that would in fact, whatever else might be stipulated, "run" the elections. Under those circumstances the result would be a foregoing conclusion. The fact that President Thieu has cheerfully accepted this program suggests that he is not worried about its outcome.

Naturally every American would be delighted if Hanoi would accept the administration's latest "peace proposal." We would however, be deluding ourselves enormously—for about the hundredth time in the Vietnam war—if we really expected that they would.

So far Hanoi's rejection seems unequivocal. The official Chinese press agency has characterized it as a "plan for persisting in the war of aggression against Vietnam and Indochina." That does not sound hopeful.

To be quite frank, there never was any sound reason for believing that Hanoi would accept at this late date a cease-fire and political "settlement" which would be almost certain to confirm the Thieu regime in office.

The idea of a cease-fire is particularly chimerical. For many years the previous administration and this one have been pursuing this particular will-o-the-wisp. It was always entirely clear that the North Vietnamese would never agree to a cease-fire of any significant duration as long as United States or South Vietnamese forces held the populated centers in the south. To do so would have been to admit that they had lost the war, which they have not been and are not willing to do.

One cannot help but wonder, therefore, whether this latest proposal, like all the similar ploys of the Johnson administration, was not put forward, and spiced by the exciting, bustling back and forth to secret meetings, chiefly in order to persuade the American electorate that its government has "gone the last mile for peace"—while it continues to wage the war.

As cynics have noted, the rejection of this "peace proposal" and the anticipated launching of new offensives by Hanoi could easily be used as pretexts for more United States bombing and hence more, not less, United States involvement.

The only way quickly to end United States participation in the war is the one repeatedly proposed by majorities in the Congress—to offer a firm and early date for total United States withdrawal in exchange only for the simultaneous release of our prisoners.

The future of Vietnam will eventually be settled between the two Vietnamese governments, either by negotiating or by continued fighting. It is far too late for the United States to play a decisive role either in proping up the Saigon government or in changing it. Vietnamese politics is no longer our business. That should be the ultimate meaning of "Vietnamization."

It is not too late, however, for us to make a deal for the release of our prisoners. After all, they are of no use to Hanoi except as leverage for bargaining the United States out.

Once Hanoi is convinced the United States is going out completely, out of Vietnamese politics as well as out of the war, a deal on prisoners should still be possible. But the longer we wait, the more we pretend to pursue phantom "peace proposals," the less and less our leverage for the release of our prisoners will become.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1972]

**AFTER A LONG, INCONCLUSIVE WAR—A NON-COMMUNIST SOUTH VIETNAM CANNOT BE GUARANTEED**

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In 1962 in Hanoi, Pham Van Dong remarked to French journalist Bernard Fall that "Americans do not like long, inconclusive wars and this is going to be a long, inconclusive war. Thus we are sure to win in the end." A decade and three Presidents later it is still an inconclusive war. And Pham Van Dong is still the North Vietnamese Premier.

During that same visit to Hanoi Ho Chi Minh told Fall that "it took us eight years of bitter fighting to defeat you French in Indochina. . . The Americans are much stronger than the French, though they know us less well. It may perhaps take 10 years to do it. . ." Ho is dead but clearly his spirit, and his aim, live on.

It seems to me that Americans today must keep such remarks as these in mind as they assess the disclosures by President Nixon of Henry Kissinger's secret negotiations with the North Vietnamese and the peace proposals put to Hanoi. We suffer from a baseball syndrome; we want to see the final score and then go home to dinner. The North Viet-

namese don't think that way; to them there is no final out until their side has won.

There is an aphorism from the American side that can be applied to the current situation in Indochina. In 1954 when he returned to Washington from the Geneva Conference that decreed the "temporary" division of Vietnam, Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith remarked that "it will be well to remember that diplomacy has rarely been able to gain at the conference table what cannot be gained or held on the battlefield."

In truth, neither side has prevailed on the battlefield. And there is stalemate at the conference table. The American eight-point peace plan, in sum, must seem to Hanoi to be a proposal for surrendering their victory aim. The North Vietnamese nine-point plan, judging from Kissinger's description of it since it has yet to be published, in sum, seems to Washington to be a proposal for surrendering South Vietnam to the control of the Communists.

There are, as the Nixon administration contends, some new elements in the American proposals. But the sum of it is that Hanoi must take its chances on an election in the South in which the Vietcong or National Liberation Front would compete. It is probable that the Communists would end up as a minority; they know that and so do Messrs. Nixon and Kissinger. I have never thought the Communists would participate in an election except as a mechanism to confirm a deal already set that would give them key Cabinet and other posts in a Saigon regime. Wide-open, nation-wide elections as the West knows them are both abhorrent to Communist regimes and foreign to the Vietnamese, North and South, as a technique for distributing power. Past elections in the South have been more of a charade than a reality—the result of Americanization of that part of Vietnam—despite all the trumpeting in Washington about them.

Kissinger said that the North Vietnamese told him that there could be no solution that did not include a political element and that they asked the United States for "an indirect overthrow" of the Saigon government; in short, that the United States cooperate in turning over South Vietnam to the Communists. A perusal of Hanoi's public statements supports that reading; presumably the nine-point program, once we see the text, will too.

President Nixon is not prepared to do so, any more than was President Johnson of whom the same thing was asked. It is illuminating that, according to Hanoi's spokesman in Paris, Kissinger remarked at the secret talks that "you must not nourish the illusion that we can settle the problem of the war only because of the question of the prisoners of war." Secretary of State Rogers some months ago publicly said substantially the same thing. In effect, both were saying that Mr. Nixon will not make a deal to turn the South over to the Communists simply to get back the POWs.

Now it is being said that Mr. Nixon has made a "generous" offer. But Hanoi does not want just a chance to win in the South; it wants a certainty. Mr. Nixon is willing to give Hanoi at least some chance but not anything like a certainty. And from what has been reported from Saigon one can imagine that President Thieu's agreement to resign before a new election is based either on his belief that the procedure offers him a near certainty or his estimate that Hanoi will not accept anything less than near certainty for its side and therefore that there is not going to be any such election.

Where does this leave us? With the likelihood of a continuing inconclusive war, with a continuation of the withdrawal of American forces but with the probability of a residual force remaining in the South at election time next November plus the certainty that American planes will stay in adjacent

areas outside Indochina. This is not, of course, absolutely certain for Mr. Nixon before election day could dramatically pull out the last man. But how would he square that with past declarations that some forces will remain until the prisoners are released?

The POWs are hostages and hostages not just for complete American withdrawal but for a political settlement favorable to Hanoi. There are conceivable ways to reach that kind of a settlement such as a deal, confirmed by a sham election, to replace the Thieu regime with some form of coalition giving the Communists real power in Saigon and the strong expectation of eventual total power. But that deal is not likely one to be made by Mr. Nixon. If it is made it will be made by anti-Thieu South Vietnamese who manage by coup or otherwise to displace him and probably only when they are sure Washington is powerless to prevent such a deal.

The truth of the matter is that the United States, despite the vast expenditure of blood and treasure, has failed to guarantee the survival of a non-Communist South Vietnam. If the Nixon administration, or its successor, is determined, as Kissinger put it, to end the division at home over the war it can only pull out completely, hope Hanoi then will release the POWs and leave it to Saigon and Hanoi to settle the political issue.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1972]

TEXT OF SECRET PROPOSALS RELEASED BY NORTH VIETNAM

PARIS.—Following is the text of the nine-point "peace initiative" which North Vietnamese officials presented to Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, President Nixon's adviser for national security affairs, at a secret meeting in Paris last June 26:

1. The withdrawal of the totality of U.S. forces and those of other foreign countries in the U.S. camp from South Vietnam and other Indochinese countries should be completed within 1971.

2. The release of all military men and civilians captured in the war should be carried out parallelly and completely at the same time with the troop withdrawal mentioned in Point 1.

3. In South Vietnam, the United States should stop supporting Thieu-Ky-Khiem so that there may be set up in Saigon a new administration standing for peace, independence, neutrality and democracy. The provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam will enter into talks with that administration to settle all internal affairs of South Vietnam and to achieve national concord.

4. The U.S. government must bear full responsibility for the damages caused by the United States to the people of the whole of Vietnam. The government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam demand that the U.S. government reparations for the damages caused by the United States in the two zones of Vietnam.

5. The United States should respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina and those of 1962 on Laos. It should stop its aggression and intervention in the Indochina countries and let their peoples settle by themselves their own affairs.

6. The problems existing among the Indochinese countries should be settled by the Indochinese parties on the basis of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. As far as it is concerned, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is prepared to join in resolving such problems.

7. All the parties should achieve a cease-fire after the signing of the agreements on the above-mentioned problems.

8. There should be an international supervision.

9. There should be an international guarantee for the fundamental national rights of the Indochinese peoples, the neutrality of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and lasting peace in this region.

The above points form an integrated whole.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1972]

COMPARISON OF POINTS

American 1. Total withdrawal from South Vietnam of all U.S. forces and other foreign forces allied with the government of South Vietnam within six month of an agreement.

North Vietnamese 1. Withdrawal of totality of U.S. forces and those of other foreign countries in U.S. camp from South Vietnam and other Indochinese countries should be completed within 1971.

American 2. Release of all military men and innocent civilians captured throughout Indochina carried out parallel with troop withdrawals. Both sides present complete list of those held throughout Indochina on day agreement is signed.

North Vietnamese 2. Release of all military men and civilians captured in the war carried out parallel with troop withdrawal.

(The North Vietnamese points 3 and 4 cover basically the same ground as American point 3 and are combined for comparison.)

American 3. Political future of South Vietnam will be left for South Vietnamese people to decide, free from outside interference, in a free and democratic presidential election within six months of an agreement. The election will be run by an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam, will be under international supervision and will be open to all political forces in South Vietnam. The incumbent president and vice president of South Vietnam resign one month before the election, with the chairman of the Senate assuming administrative caretaker responsibilities except those pertaining to election. The United States will remain completely neutral, abide by the election's outcome and define its military and economic assistance relationship with any government that emerges.

Both sides agree that South Vietnam and other Indochina countries adopt a foreign policy consistent with the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva accords and that North and South Vietnam should discuss and decide reunification of Vietnam without constraint and annexation from either party and without foreign interference.

North Vietnamese 3 and 4. In South Vietnam, the United States should stop supporting Thieu-Ky-Khiem so that there may be set up in Saigon a new administration standing for peace, independence, neutrality and democracy. The provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam will enter into talks with that administration to settle all internal affairs of South Vietnam and to achieve national concord.

The U.S. government must bear full responsibility for damages it causes to people of the whole Vietnam. U.S. payment of reparations is demanded.

American 4. Both sides will respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina and those of 1962 on Laos. There will be no foreign intervention in the Indochinese countries and the Indochinese people will be left to settle their own affairs by themselves.

North Vietnamese 5. The United States should respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina and those of 1962 on Laos. It should stop its aggression and intervention in the Indochina countries and let their peoples settle by themselves their own affairs.

American 5. Problems existing among Indochinese countries will be settled by the Indochinese parties on the basis of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and noninterference in each other's

affairs. Among the problems that will be settled is the implementation of the principle that all armed forces of the countries of Indochina must remain within their national frontiers.

North Vietnamese 6. Problems existing among the Indochinese countries should be settled by the Indochinese parties on the basis of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. As far as it is concerned, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is prepared to join in resolving such problems.

American 6. There will be a general cease-fire throughout Indochina, to begin when the agreement is signed. As part of the cease-fire, there will be no further infiltration of outside forces into any of the countries of Indochina.

North Vietnamese 7. All the parties should achieve a cease-fire after the signing of the agreements on the above-mentioned problems.

American 7. There will be international supervision of the military aspects of this agreement, including the cease-fire and its provisions, the release of prisoners of war and innocent civilians, the withdrawal of outside forces from Indochina, and the implementation of the principle that all armed forces of the countries of Indochina must remain within their national frontiers.

North Vietnamese 8. There should be an international supervision.

American 8. There will be an international guarantee for the fundamental national rights of the Indochinese peoples, the status of all the countries in Indochina, and lasting peace in this region.

Both sides express their willingness to participate in an international conference for this and their appropriate purposes.

North Vietnamese 9. There should be an international guarantee for the fundamental national rights of the Indochinese peoples, the neutrality of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and lasting peace in the region.

The above points form an integrated whole.

CALLING FOR THE RECOGNITION OF BANGLADESH BY THE UNITED STATES

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill calling upon our Government to recognize the Government of Bangladesh.

Bangladesh is a reality. The people of Bangladesh displayed the inimitable will of humanity to seek freedom regardless of the cost or the overwhelming odds against achieving that goal. No force on earth has been able to dissuade these people that they must any longer submit to the cruel, unfeeling rule of others. They have attained their freedom. Bangladesh is a reality. It is a political, spiritual entity unto itself—and it will remain so. This undaunted spirit of freedom is reason enough for the speedy diplomatic recognition of Bangladesh by the United States.

Even exclusive of our admiration for their remarkable demonstration of the indestructible free human spirit, there are any number of reasons for early diplomatic recognition. We have never had any disagreement with the people or political leaders of Bangladesh. They have never been our foes in battle or in international diplomacy. They have not been unfriendly in thought or deed to-

ward the United States. If we have official disagreements with any country on the subcontinent, and we should not, we have no basis for unfriendliness or refusal to recognize Bangladesh.

Neither can we take issue with the political structure under which Bangladesh intends to rule itself. In fact, the free and overwhelming election of its leaders by the people precipitated the horrors visited on that country. The newly formed government intends to continue to choose its leaders according to the will of the people. If we desire to see more democracies in the world, let us recognize and support those who seek to govern by democracy.

We have been told the present administration seeks to revise our foreign policy posture, that we cannot respond ably in today's world with yesterday's antiquated ideology, and that we intend to view the world as it exists. We are on the verge of recognizing the People's Republic of China, which we have been prone to see as an enemy, after more than 20 years of officially blinding ourselves to the reality of its political existence. If the administration does indeed intend to recognize the realities of the world, it might well begin by speedy recognition of Bangladesh.

And we need not fear that we will be the first country to accord Bangladesh the diplomatic dignity it has earned at such a dear cost. Twenty countries have already recognized it, including Australia, New Zealand, Yugoslavia, Russia, and Great Britain. Several other countries are also on the verge of extending formal recognition. Let us not be one of the last.

We have already suffered great losses of prestige on the subcontinent and throughout the world by our incomprehensible official posture throughout this tormenting situation. We erred in siding with West Pakistan; we erred in continuing to supply arms to the oppressors; we erred in castigating India for difficulties not of their making; we erred in siding with oppression over humanity. We have been proven wrong every step of the way, and the world knows it. I hope the administration will not further compound its errors.

Our goal on the subcontinent should be to help restore some semblance of normalcy as quickly as possible. We must take whatever steps are necessary to relieve the enormous amount of human suffering—the starvation, the wrecked villages and homes, the displaced millions who were forced to flee to India. These are humanitarian goals which can be aided immensely by speedy diplomatic recognition of Bangladesh. Politics should not be allowed to impede our response to these cries of human anguish. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to give early and favorable consideration to my bill to demonstrate to the administration and the world that we in Congress are vitally concerned about the plight of Bangladesh and wish to see it formally recognized by the U.S. Government.

#### OH, TO BE A STAGEHAND AT KENNEDY CENTER

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure by the New York Times this past Monday that stagehands at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts make as much as \$1,500 per week illuminates why Center officials want Congress to appropriate \$1,500,000 for an annual maintenance fund.

The Center was originally "sold" to the Congress as an edifice that would be largely built by public contributions with a relatively small share to come out of the taxpayers' pockets. Subsequently, the Congress was asked and consented to two huge construction appropriations. An additional \$6 million remains in dispute and I have little doubt that we will be asked also to make that good from the Treasury.

The original premise was that operationally the Center might be self-sufficient. Of course, we were told as a backward nation culturally we owed something to the arts and humanities and maybe, just maybe, the Center might run an operating deficit. Well, as one who appreciates music and the theater, and even opera on occasion, I felt sympathetic. I even understand and agree with special rates for students and some subsidy for patrons who cannot afford \$10 seats.

Now, perhaps in an effort to partially disguise obvious operating deficits, the Center has come up with the proposition that its budgets should be considered on two levels: One for the operation of the three theaters; and the second as a tourist attraction for visitors. It is for this latter purpose, says the Center, that it requires \$1,500,000 for annual maintenance costs. The effort is to place it in the same category with the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial as a tourist attraction and to patronize its privately operated restaurants.

If that is the true objective, let us turn the Center over to the National Park Service to operate. I am sure they can do it for less money and far more efficiently.

Of course, I think this double budget proposal is a sham, a clever device designed to bamboozle Members of Congress. Mr. Roger Stevens and his staff must realize that the sanity must be questioned of whoever signed a labor contract that permit stagehands to earn \$78,000 a year, even if they work 15 hours a day. I know Members of this body who work 16 hours a day and also work Saturdays and Sundays who do not get time and a half or double time and who do not make that kind of money. Moreover, they take abuse and frustration from all sides; just let Mr. Stevens tell one of his stagehands what he should do and Mr. Stevens will be told what he can do with his instructions and where he can go.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, a contract that permits this kind of fleecing of the public is unconscionable. It ought to be canceled and revised before any official of the Center has the temerity to appear before Congress again.

I include in the RECORD the New York Times article of February 1, 1972, as part of my remarks:

#### STAGEHANDS AT KENNEDY CENTER SAID TO EARN UP TO \$1,500 A WEEK

(By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Stagehands at the Kennedy Center are making as much as \$1,500 a week under a union contract—apparently the richest in the American theater—that has become the management's biggest embarrassment and headache.

For 125 members of the International Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees, there are at last four factors that make for a bonanza:

1. Hourly rates that are the highest, on average, in the country: \$7.70 for the head electrician, carpenter and property man in each of three theaters, down to a minimum \$6.60 for their subordinates. The comparable hourly wages in Los Angeles are \$6.25 and \$4.35. On Broadway department heads get \$8.65 an hour, but their more numerous assistants get \$5.85, or 75 cents less than their counterparts here.

2. A rule requiring four hours of pay for each assignment or "call." At the Kennedy Center—particularly in the frantically busy, multipurpose concert Hall—there may easily be four or five calls a day. Stagehands get a full four hours of pay for each of the first two calls and time and a half, or six hours of pay, for each one thereafter.

3. A minimum complement of three department heads during each use of each theater and a "fly man" to handle scenery in the Opera House and Eisenhower Theater.

4. An apparent shortage of stagehands to work Washington's booming schedule of performing arts, so that by midweek the available help has clocked its 40 hours and continues at time and a half or double time.

#### UNION AGENT SILENT

William Bennett, the stagehands' business agent here for more than 30 years, does not discuss his contracts with outsiders.

As a reporter introduced himself last week, Mr. Bennett proffered his calling card and alerted the German shepherd that guards his office on New York Avenue.

"I hope I can do you a favor some day," said Mr. Barrett, smiling cordially. "I know why you're here, but I have nothing to tell you."

Kennedy Center officials, who say paychecks in the neighborhood of \$1,000 a week are commonplace, offer this example of how paychecks get fattened up:

The day's first assignment in the Concert Hall, a four-hour call to set up the platforms and chairs on stage for the National Symphony Orchestra, might start at 9 A.M. and be completed by 10:30 A.M. Another four-hour call for heads of the three stagehands departments might be for a one-hour Children's concert at midmorning. At noon there could be a third call for a two-hour National Symphony rehearsal, and at 2:30 P.M. there could be a fourth to rehearse the next day's jazz show for an hour and a half. In the evening, of course, there is a separate call for the National Symphony's concert, which lasts perhaps two hours.

At the end of a day that had spanned 13 hours and included eight hours work, each department head would have had five calls—three at overtime—and would have been paid over \$200, and more if he had already worked 40 hours that week before the day began.

All Sunday work is paid at time and a half unless, as is usually the case, stagehands are already on overtime by Sunday. The Sunday rate then goes to double time.

#### SHIFTS ARE OVERLAPPING

The fact that three theaters are clustered together in the single Kennedy Center works to the stagehands' advantage in the overlapping calculation of overtime.

A man who puts in 40 hours during the week in the Concert Hall starts any weekend work in the Opera House at time and a half, even though he is working in a different

theater for a different producer on a different show.

Thus the local sponsors of the Ballet Folklórico of Mexico last weekend had to pay 18 stagehands time and a half and double time for moving the show in and out of the center for an unprofitable two performances.

The stagehands negotiated their contract only weeks before the Kennedy Center's September opening, when tickets to performances had already been sold. They were in a strong bargaining position at the start and appear to have pressed their advantage.

One afternoon during the American Ballet Theater's first visit in September, for example, as stagehands worked on the lighting, dancers came onstage for a workout. The union insisted on being paid for a rehearsal, charging the Kennedy Center for eight hours lighting and a four-hour rehearsal call, at overtime.

In New York, the American Ballet theater dancers are allowed to use the City Center stage while stagehands are out to lunch. But at the Kennedy Center, stagehands returning from lunch found dancers on stage and billed the center for another four-hour call.

There have been other fights about what constitutes a rehearsal, but the union always seems to win. Last October, when Garay Graffman, the piano soloist, walked onstage before a concert with the National Symphony, ran his fingers up and down the piano, the union promptly billed for the services of three department heads at a full four-hour rehearsal call. The Kennedy Center protested but paid.

Patrick Hayes, managing director of the Washington Performing Arts Society, speaks hopefully of a new contract in which rehearsals would be redefined to exclude warm-ups and the calculation of overtime hours could not overlap from one show to another.

But Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the center, says, he is probably stuck with the contract, though he wishes he never signed it. The stagehands contract has clearly cut the occasional profits and increased the typical losses on Kennedy Center shows, but there is no evidence that it has driven attractions away.

#### SPACE SHUTTLE

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief and are designed to express my complete support for the newly announced program for the space shuttle. While I cannot say that I have found a complete and persuasive logic in some of the programs that we have been called upon to consider in the Congress, I find here, in the space shuttle program, a step that is simplicity itself as far as where we go next in the important work of space study and exploration.

For something like 2 years a task force has been studying to discover what is the next thing we should do in the space program. The people engaged in this study are experts, and I am not an expert. But from what I know of our past Saturn-Apollo program and from what I have learned about the new plans for a space shuttle I will say that the task force had done an outstanding job. This year, 1972, will see the end of our series of manned flights to the moon. The flights already taken and the two that yet remain will have accomplished what this country set out to do some 10 years ago, and accomplished it in the most dramatic and satisfying fashion. These

flights were the beginning and from them we have learned, as the task force has now enunciated for us, what our next step should be. The step that they have chosen and the plans that they have outlined add up, to my mind, to both scientific and commonsense.

There will be controversy; controversy here in the Congress and controversy among the people of the country over this program. There will be those who state that all that man needs to know about space can be discovered with instrumented vehicles, that there is no need for man himself to travel in space. I have not the slightest doubt that very much of what we need to know can indeed be found out in very effective fashion with instrumented vehicles. Indeed this has already been well established by our programs so far. I do feel, however, that until optics are developed that embrace and are coupled with the ability to make judgments, until computers are devised that approximate the thinking processes of the human brain, it will be necessary that man himself observe, ponder, and make human judgments about what he is seeing and experiencing.

I draw an analogy, perhaps it is too simple a one, between a space program involving only encapsulated instruments speeding around the earth and a military program of defense that would contemplate only missiles. It may be a measure of the conservatism of my thoughts on such matters that leads me to say that there is a certain sterility, a certain implicit limitation, to a defense program that did not contemplate a mix of missiles and of manned aircraft. I have a fundamental belief in the need for man as a direct participant in our defense and in our space efforts. Much of the work in space will be done through pure instrumentation; undoubtedly some of it can be done very much better this way. But, as in the case of our defensive and offensive systems, I personally will continue to hold the view and, to the extent that I am able, to insist that man, whether in a bomber or in a space vehicle, be a part of the program.

This program of the space shuttle will go forward. The questions that will be raised will also be answered. It is my sincere hope that I will find throughout the membership of Congress a substantial reflection of the kind of approach that I have enunciated toward the space shuttle program. I feel quite certain that this will be so.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VEYSEY, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEPHENS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 60 minutes, on February 23.

Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, on February 17.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, to revise and extend his remarks immediately preceding the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas today.

Mr. McCLORY to extend his remarks prior to vote on Teague of Texas amendment.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. HEINZ in 10 instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. McCLURE in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in six instances.

Mr. CORDOVA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY of New York.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in four instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. OBEY in four instances.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. CABELL in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. METCALFE in two instances.

Mr. MORGAN in two instances.

Mr. ROY in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. RONCALIO in five instances.  
Mr. SIKES.  
Mr. ST GERMAIN.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1545. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Annual Report of the Veterans' Administration for Fiscal Year 1971, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 92-208); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1546. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and detailed to the Army General Staff on December 31, 1971, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1547. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1971 on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1548. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1971 on the progress of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2110(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1549. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Air Force on experimental, development, test, and research procurement action, covering the period ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1550. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1551. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting an errata sheet for inclusion in the report of the 1971 quadrennial review of military compensation required by 37 U.S.C. 1008(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1552. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice of the intention of the Department of the Navy to donate a surplus 45-ton Porter model BB-04 diesel locomotive to the Charleston, S.C., chapter of the National Railway Historical Society, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7545; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1553. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the annual reports and financial statements for fiscal year 1971 of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium, pursuant to Public Laws 80-605 and 85-300; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1554. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report for 1970 on the administration of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1555. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to discharge obligations under the Convention on Psychotropic Substances relating to regulatory controls on the manufacture, distribution, importation, and exportation of psychotropic substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1556. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the first annual report on the activities of the Department of Transportation under the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970, together with an elevation of the financial condition of the railroads which have outstanding certificates guaranteed under the act, pursuant to section 10 of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1557. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in the Khmer Republic (Cambodia) concerning war victims, civilian health, and war-related casualties; to the Commission on Government Operations.

1558. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the economies available by better selection of office copiers by Federal agencies, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2896. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to adopted child (Rept. No. 92-811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12741. A bill to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972 (Rept. No. 92-812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12143. A bill to provide for the establishment of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. No. 92-813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12910. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit (Rept. 92-814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12905. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1833, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable; to define when articles, materials, and supplies have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States; to make clear the right of any State to give preference to domestically produced goods in purchasing for pub-

lic use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12906. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 12907. A bill to assist in combating crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism, providing improved Federal, State, and local correctional facilities and services, strengthening administration of Federal corrections, strengthening control over probationers, parolees, and persons found not guilty by reason of insanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12908. A bill to amend certain provisions of chapter 311 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12909. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. BETTS):

H.R. 12910. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12911. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 12912. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide that full credit be given for all active military service by retired Armed Forces members for determining retention and annual leave in the civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 12913. A bill to provide for Federal collection of State individual income taxes, to provide funds to localities for Federal high-priority purposes, and to provide funds to States to encourage more efficient use of revenue sources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12914. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease; to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 12915. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLYNT (for himself and Mr. LANDRUM):

H.R. 12916. 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. FLYNT:

H.R. 12917. A bill to amend section 4492 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the tax on the use of civil aircraft antique aircraft which received their type certificates before 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12918. A bill to provide financial and other aid to enable the United States to assist Jewish refugees to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel or the country of their choice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. HOLFIELD, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 12919. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 12920. A bill to amend section 1979 of the Revised Statutes to provide that certain civil actions for the deprivation of rights may not be brought by certain persons convicted of crime and to provide a time limitation with respect to such civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 12921. 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. KING:

H.R. 12922. A bill to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 12923. A bill to provide for monthly furloughs for Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ERLÉNBERN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 12924. 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. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 12925. 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. NEDZI:

H.R. 12926. A bill to provide that, in the case of the death of a petitioner on any approved petition for preference status under paragraph (1), (2), (4), or (5) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien beneficiary will be allowed a period of sixty days from the date of such death to become the beneficiary of another petition without losing his preference status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12927. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 12928. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. QUÉ, Mr. ERLÉNBERN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROE, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 12929. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LINK, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 12930. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POAGE (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KYL, Mr. LINK, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. SISK, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 12931. A bill to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12932. A bill to designate as a Federal crime murder, or an attempt to commit murder, of certain non-Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12933. A bill to amend section 1905 of title 44 of the United States Code relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 12934. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that progressive muscular atrophy developing a 10 per centum or more degree of disability within seven years after separation from active service during a period of war shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 12935. A bill to regulate the interstate trafficking and sale of hypodermic needles and syringes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 12936. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12937. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require employers to make an approved basic health care plan available to their employees, to provide a family health insurance plan for low-income families not covered by an employer's basic health care plan, to facilitate provision of health services to beneficiaries of the family health insurance plan by health maintenance organizations, by prohibiting State law interference with such organizations providing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 12938. A bill to provide for comprehensive management of the Nation's forest lands through the application of sound forest practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12939. A bill to amend chapter 81 of

subpart G of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12940. A bill to establish a national land use policy; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to encourage and assist the States to prepare and implement land use programs for the protection of areas of critical environmental concern and the control and direction of growth and development of more than local significance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12941. A bill to require the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to provide free or reduced-rate railroad transportation to retired railroad employees and their dependents on the same basis that such transportation was available to such employees and dependents on the date of enactment of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12942. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12943. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, or the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12944. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12945. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the regulation of the possession or receipt of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THONE (for himself and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 12946. 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.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 12947. 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. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 1050. A resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 19, 1972 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 1051. A resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth Wednesday in January as National School Nurse Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 1052. A resolution to provide a

procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should take the necessary steps to initiate active negotiations seeking agreement with the Soviet Union on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions, to work toward extension of a prohibition against nuclear

testing to the other nuclear powers, including France and China, and to declare and observe an indefinite moratorium on all nuclear test explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. STRATTON):

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the current situation in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. FAUNTRON, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOW, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LINK, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. MYERS):

H. Res. 799. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 800. Resolution to provide funds for the second session, 92d Congress, for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 217; to the Committee on House Administration.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### FORESTRY INCENTIVES ACT OF 1972

#### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 92d Congress faces an unusually complex and broad challenge. The range of issues and problems demanding action by the Members of this body is immense. A sense of urgency is evident throughout—including real concern over the great need to enhance and protect our priceless natural environment.

In comparison, my purpose today is a simple one but it does deserve priority attention. It does provide an important opportunity to strengthen the Nation's forestry programs and this, of course, can be of immense value in the years ahead.

A few short months ago the House of Representatives unanimously voted in favor of H.R. 8817—a bill that I am very proud to have introduced. This prompt action and strong support by the Members of the House did not surprise me. All of us have a deep awareness of the vital importance of the renewable forest resources on which our Nation relies. It was obvious that the highly successful cooperative wildfire protection program under the Clarke-McNary Law of 1924 should not be allowed to be constrained by dollar ceilings on Federal participation that was set many years ago. Similarly, we saw that it was time to remove the constraints set more than 20 years ago on Federal participation under the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. In the latter case we also recognized and met the need to broaden the scope of the law to include technical assistance in protecting and establishing trees and shrubs which are needed to enhance the environmental quality of urban areas and communities. Your unanimous support last year paved the way for urgently needed, intensified and broadened Federal participation in funding forest resource protection and technical assistance in forestry and related activities.

Additional legislation is urgently needed to complement and roundout coop-

erative forestry efforts. This is the bill I am introducing today. I am speaking of a forestry incentive program. This bill is built upon the foundation of time-tested procedures and arrangements between the U.S. Forest Service, and other Federal agencies, State forestry organizations, private landowners, and others. The bill provides renewed emphasis, a broadened scope of activities, and a positive-effort toward motivating nonindustrial forest landowners to increase the flow of public benefits from the management and use of the resources they control.

The Members of this distinguished body need no reminder of the fact that the public spotlight is on the Nation's forest lands. Never, have I seen more intense interest in what is taking place in the woods. Battle lines are drawn between those who would lock up and preserve the forest landscape intact and those who see the need to increase the flow of timber, water, wildlife, and outdoor recreation opportunities to meet the urgent needs of the American citizen of today and tomorrow. To date the debate has centered on the public lands—particularly the National Forests. Difficult problems exist and hard decisions must yet be made by the Congress in this regard.

But, happily, there is another side to the coin—another string to our forestry bow, if you will—the 300 million acres of timberland owned by some four million Americans. These smaller tracts constitute 59 percent of the Nation's productive forest land base—more than three times the comparable acreage in the great National Forest System. These lands already—in the aggregate—produce huge amounts of the pulpwood, sawlogs and other timber products needed by America's growing economy. However, these small properties are producing at only a fraction of their potential—half or less in terms of wood products. In terms of wildlife production; use for hunting, hiking, and other outdoor recreation activities, the fraction is probably even smaller. Natural beauty and watershed protection are examples of additional public benefits that can be substantially increased from these lands.

When protection from wildfires and adequate technical assistance to guide their efforts are assured—the last re-

maining obstacle preventing owners of small forest properties from managing and developing their resources is the motivation and the funds needed to make the necessary investments. Planting trees, cultural work in established stands, seeding to prevent soil erosion, creating improved wildlife habitat, providing public access for recreational use—these all cost money. Prospective dollar returns on investments to produce benefits to the public frequently are insufficient to encourage the landowner to make the necessary additional expenditures. Now it should be noted that landowners already are making a sizeable investment. The purchase price of the land, or income foregone that could come from sale of the land, the annual taxes, and other expenses are borne by the landowner. A program of financial incentives is needed to trigger the forestry investments that can result in major increases in public benefits from these lands. That is what my new bill is all about. I consider such incentives justified because the public benefits that accrue from well tended forest land are significant.

Without going into detail regarding these public benefits, let me cite just three examples. Expanding demands for lumber, pulp and other products needed to meet housing and other needs are clearly evident. For example—housing starts in 1971 set an all-time high. These pressures will increase the relative prices to be paid by future consumers unless well-planned investments on these lands are made now. To dampen future price rises, we need to assure an abundant supply of timber of the species and sizes needed in the future. Clearly it is better to provide Federal incentive funds now rather than permit wood to price itself out of much of its present and potential market. Significantly higher prices will add to consumer costs, and worse, will encourage use of substitutes which must come from the Nation's store of non-renewable resources rather than its renewable forest resource. These 300 million acres can indeed hold the key to the adequacy of future supplies.

As another example, if we are successful in meeting an increased portion of the total timber demand through harvests on these lands, the extreme pressures falling on public forest lands will be eased. As landowners are motivated