

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW AND FOR UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of remarks by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) tomorrow there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the House amendment to S. 659, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and related acts, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has contacted me to ask that I submit the following unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on the pending committee substitute for the House amendment to S. 659 be limited to not to exceed 6 hours daily on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, and 6 hours daily on Monday and Tuesday of next week; and that such time be equally divided between and controlled by the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I think it might be said for the record that this is to assure that time which would ordinarily be available on the bill—but in this instance rather than the bill it is the committee substitute to the House bill—would be fairly apportioned and that those with opposing views would have an opportunity to get the floor in the event such time is available.

Is that the purpose of the agreement?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct. It would assure equal apportionment of, and control of, time on the committee substitute for the House amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to S. 659 at all times when no amendment to the committee substitute is pending before the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is understood, of course, that this is the kind of time which can be allotted to given Members, either in block or partially, because the majority and minority leaders are really custodians of the time. Is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, also, is it not correct that if there is time available and not being used, it can be ceded for other purposes of the Senate; it does not have to be used?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct; it can be yielded back, and each day it would not exceed 6 hours, which I think would be sufficient daily to carry the Senate at least to the hour of 5 p.m. or 5:30 p.m., or, in some instances perhaps 6 p.m., but it need not all be used.

Mr. JAVITS. May we also have an understanding—and I am perfectly willing to rely upon the majority and minority leaders to use their good judgment—about not unduly extending time on particular amendments? It would be possible under this proposal to yield hours on an amendment. I am not trying to provide for that in the unanimous consent request, but to utter a caveat that our leadership will exercise reasonable discretion in allotting extra time on an amendment. They can always yield time on the bill, but this can be taken care of if they exercise discretion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My request did not provide for yielding time on any amendment from the time allotted to the committee substitute.

Mr. JAVITS. So it could not be done?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It could not be done under my request.

Mr. JAVITS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, during the consideration of the message from the House on S. 659, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House amendment to S. 659 be treated as original text for the purpose of amendment and that debate on every amendment to the committee amendment be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled between the mover of the amendment and the manager of the bill, unless the manager of the bill favors the amendment in which case the time in opposition would be controlled by whomever the Majority Leader designates. *Provided further*, That time on any appeal, point of order or debatable motion shall be limited to ½ hour with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, unless the manager of the bill favors the proposition, in which case

the time in opposition shall be controlled by whomever the Majority Leader designates.

Ordered further, That, the vote on final disposition of the matter shall occur no later than 2 p.m. on Wednesday, March 1, 1972.

Ordered further, That debate on the pending motion to concur in the House amendment with the committee substitute be limited not to exceed 6 hours each day until Wednesday to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I assume this will be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate will proceed as follows on tomorrow:

The Senate will convene at 10 o'clock a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business. The unfinished business is the Senate committee substitute for the House amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 659, an act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965.

There is a time agreement on the committee substitute and on each amendment thereto, and also on each debatable motion, point of order, or appeal in respect thereto.

Roll call votes may occur on tomorrow. Senators may expect and anticipate—and should do so—roll call votes daily throughout the remainder of this week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:37 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1972, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 22, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul D. Moore, Woodland Heights Baptist Church, Chesapeake, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, source of life and giver of strength, we come to Thee in humility.

We give Thee thanks for the influence of our Nation in the past, its leadership in the present, its role yet to be observed in the future.

Praising Thee for the larger area of life's surroundings and history, we come with immediate intercession in behalf of

this government body—elected by man, may they be blessed by God.

Wisdom is promised from above. May this rest upon our Representatives during the period of trials and transition. Send the wisdom "liberally and without upbraiding"—James 1: 5.

In a special way, we unite our spirits in behalf of our President and other leaders as they now have worldwide attention. May common ground be found and the Prince of Peace reign in meetings and through the lands represented.

For Thy grace, strength, wisdom, we ask: in faith give Thee thanks.

In the name of God's Son, Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2714. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayo N. Carvell;

H.R. 2792. An act for the relief of Juanita Savedra Varela;

H.R. 3093. An act for the relief of Mrs. Crescenica Lyra Serna and her minor children, Maria Minde Fe Serna, Sally Garoza Serna, Gonzalo Garoza Serna, and James Garoza Serna;

H.R. 4319. An act for the relief of Josephine Dumpit;

H.R. 5179. An act for the relief of Soo Yong Kwak;

H.R. 6506. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hind Nicholas Chaber, Georgette Hanna Chaber, Jeanette Hanna Chaber, and Violette Hanna Chaber;

H.R. 6912. An act for the relief of William Lucas (also known as Vasilios Loukatis);

H.R. 7316. An act for the relief of Mrs. Norma McLeish;

H.R. 8540. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Mpolakis; and

H.R. 11738. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America, in connection with Boy Scout jamborees, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2275. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Kutter.

The message also announced that Mr. Fong be appointed as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12067) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes" in lieu of Mr. COTTON, excused.

RESIGNATION OF EDWARD O. CRAFT AS LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation of the Legislative Counsel, Edward O. Craft:

CXVIII—317—Part 4

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 21, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as Legislative Counsel of the United States House of Representatives effective at the close of business February 29, 1972.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD O. CRAFT,
Legislative Counsel.

THE SPEAKER'S ACCEPTANCE LETTER OF THE RESIGNATION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker's letter to Mr. Craft be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 21, 1972.

EDWARD O. CRAFT, Esq.,
Legislative Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 21. You state therein that you are retiring from your position as Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, effective at the close of business on February 29.

In accepting your resignation I am sure all Members join me in expressing deep appreciation for the excellent and devoted service you have so unstintingly given to the House and all its Members since 1941. The House will be losing a highly skilled legal craftsman and a dedicated official only because of ill health; no other reason, I am sure, would tempt you away from the career you have so dearly cherished.

Please accept my heart felt wishes for restoration of rugged health, many years of happiness for you, your wife Wilma, and your three children, and much success at any endeavor you undertake.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD O. CRAFT

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and one who has known Ed Craft since the time when he first began work in the legislative counsel's office, and as one who has known him probably as closely as anyone here today, let me say that it was with deep regret that I learned some time ago that Ed was planning to retire at the end of February. There is probably no committee of the Congress which has been more closely related to the work of the legislative counsel's office than the Committee on Ways and Means. That office was created by the Revenue Act of 1918 and continued its existence under that authority until last year when the last Legislative Reorganization Act was passed. The Committee on Ways and Means has drawn quite heavily on the services of

the legislative counsel and many of the specialists in his office over the years, because of the nature of the legislation which our committee processes.

Over all the years that I have known Ed, I can say that I do not know of anyone who has been more conscientious or sincere in the performance of his duties. He became legislative counsel in 1962 and has served as such for this period of 10 years—a very heavy responsibility. He has served with distinction, in my judgment, and I want to join with the other Members in extending to him best wishes on his retirement, along with our regret that he has made the decision. Ed is a very modest person, but one who is dedicated to his work and who brings to that work a keen intelligence and broad knowledge of the law.

We wish him well.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS). Ed Craft came to work for this body in 1941, the same year that I first came here, and I have known him very well since then. I know of no man who knows more about the actual mechanics of enacting legislation than Ed Craft. As a matter of fact, in the years that I served on the Committee on Ways and Means with the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) I was always amazed that after we had completed work on a complex bill, whether it dealt with taxes, social security, tariffs, or any of the myriad of other subjects considered by that committee, that it would be turned over to Ed Craft and he would say, in a very quiet manner, without being ruffled at all, that he would have it ready the next day, or the day after tomorrow, or some such thing. In any event, we always relied on Ed to do the work of actually drafting the legislation. At that time he was a legislative draftsman for the Ways and Means Committee.

Then when he became the legislative counsel of the House, he extended his work to include, not only to the great Committee on Ways and Means, but to all of the committees of the House, and to all of the Members, of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are indeed losing one of the great people who make this body possible, and I join with the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), in extending to Ed Craft and his family the very best wishes for a long retirement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for more than three decades this House has been endowed with rare good fortune. We have had the unparal-

leed assistance of Ed Craft in the legislative counsel's office.

Throughout his matchless career Ed has been a classic professional. He has worked for all of us—Democrats and Republicans—with an immense intensity of desire for objectivity, and without the slightest hint of partisanship. His work has been characterized by a true genius for precise drafting—a task which has become increasingly complex over the years.

For two of those decades Ed has worked closely with the Committee on Ways and Means on all of our major tax, social security, and trade legislation, and we are grateful to him for that service.

Speaking as one member of the committee, Mr. Speaker, I consider Ed Craft's efforts in our behalf to have been superb. I simply cannot envision a better sustained performance in that demanding capacity.

When I think back, Mr. Speaker, I can truly say that Ed Craft was not an 8-to-5 worker. Many nights he has worked long into the night so that we would have the legislation by the following morning in the correct legislative language—and that would follow day in and day out. He will leave a real legacy of excellence to those who follow.

Ed has devoted much of his life to us, and while we hate to see him go we fully recognize that after 31 years of this kind of service he certainly deserves some rest and relaxation, and our very best wishes for a truly rewarding retirement.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), for yielding to me at this time.

When the House of Representatives does a good job on complicated legislative matters the fact is not known to many that the real work and the expertise in the language that is produced comes from those who work behind the scenes, and Ed Craft for 30-plus years has performed that superb service for the House of Representatives.

He never sought any reward—he was getting his reward by the good job that was done in the writing of legislation for the benefit of the House, the Congress, and the country.

Although I did not have the privilege of working with him intimately on the legislative committees, I could see as we had legislation come to the floor of the House, his fine hand and expertise which was solely for the purpose of writing good legislation.

I join with the gentleman from Arkansas and our other colleagues in extending to him our best wishes for a long, healthy, and happy retirement. We will welcome him back as a friend in the years ahead.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have

been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years and have had an opportunity to see at close range the intricate and complex nature of the work which falls upon those specialists in the legislative counsel's office who work with our committee. The man who has worked with us longer than anyone else is, of course, Ed Craft, who is now the legislative counsel and whose retirement has today been announced.

I know of no individual with a higher integrity or finer mind or keener intelligence than Ed Craft, and I certainly know that other members of the Committee on Ways and Means feel as I do.

There is probably no committee of the Congress that has required more constant service of the legislative counsel's office than the Committee on Ways and Means. Indeed, the legislative counsel of the House was established by a Revenue Act many years ago and, until the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year, it was a revenue act which afforded the basis for the continuance of the office. We, therefore, have a close affinity to the nature of the work which is done by the legislative counsel and we have occasion to know the quality of the work which is performed.

We all wish Ed Craft Godspeed and a well deserved rest and relaxation upon his retirement, and hope we can take comfort from the fact that he will remain here in Washington and that we can have the opportunity to see him from time to time.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS).

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished chairman of our committee and others who have paid tribute to Ed Craft at this time.

I was terribly distressed to hear of Ed's retirement because I have always counted him among my longtime personal friends. He was completely dedicated to his duties and to every Member of the House. He has been a devoted public servant—one who has been so capable and yet so modest. His office is one that is entirely indispensable insofar as the operation of the House is concerned, and particularly the Committee on Ways and Means. Ed Craft was always more than adequate in the performance of his duties as head of this important service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my best wishes to Ed on his retirement.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a measure of regret that we note today the retirement of Edward O. Craft as the distinguished legislative counsel of this body. In my time here I have known no other person who has served this body and this Nation with greater dedication, expertise, and loyalty than Ed Craft.

For some 31 years, Ed Craft has labored in the Office of the Legislative Counsel, over a decade of that time as head of that Office. There would be few, if any, offices in this House which carry a greater burden in terms of workload and deadlines than the Office of the Leg-

islative Counsel. They often work around the clock in drafting the measures that come to this floor.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, let me say that Ed's surname is appropriately representative and descriptive of his calling and his career, as a craftsman par excellence, a legislative draftsman, whose products over the past 30 years have consistently reflected the complete objectivity and general excellence that have become hallmarks of the House Legislative Counsel's Office and for which that Office is known throughout the world.

We shall certainly miss Ed's great service to this Body, but we take gratification from the realization that his is such a singularly well-deserved retirement, and we hope a very long and happy one. We are sure that whatever his new endeavors may be he will pursue them with that same great spirit that has characterized his superb service to the House of Representatives, the Congress and the United States for these past three decades.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the chairman. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to these tributes to Ed Craft on the occasion of his retirement. He must have had great satisfaction in his demanding work, because his hand has now long been a major factor in the law of the land. He has worked under great pressure, but has never sacrificed excellence to the exigencies of time and the volume of legislation that has flowed from his drafting room. I admire a man who can bring Ed Craft's objectivity to such a central role in government, who can maintain his standards while serving so many legislators and who can sustain cheerfulness and equanimity in the face of constant pressure and change.

I salute Ed Craft, with all those who have admired his work, and wish him a most rewarding retirement.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

Mr. PETTIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I wish to join my colleagues in this tribute to Ed Craft.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I want to acknowledge personally the untiring and excellent efforts of Edward O. Craft, the legislative counsel of the House for the past 10 years and a valued employee of this body for 31 years.

Our committee's legislation, as all of us are very much aware, is usually anything but simple, and the drafting problems associated with it are great. In this connection, Ed Craft's work has been difficult, indeed, during the 20 years he has worked closely with Ways and Means, and all of us on the committee are thoroughly appreciative of his labors on our behalf.

He will be missed, but we wish him well in his richly deserved retirement.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL. Mr. Speaker, December of 1941 was a tragic month for the Nation, because of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. But for the House of Representatives, it was a month with

at least one happy event. For on December 5, Ed Craft came to work in the legislative counsel's office, and ushered in a new and better era in that sector of this body's work.

The legislative counsel's office will bear the stamp of his unsurpassed efforts for many Congresses to come. He has graced the office throughout his 31 years with a remarkable diligence and stamina and with a never-ending pursuit of accuracy and nonpartisanship. We on the Ways and Means Committee particularly are grateful for his service. He has worked with us since 1950 on major legislation, and we will sorely miss him.

He has earned, however, an unquestionably well-deserved rest, and our fondest hopes go with him. Ed has taken his vacation for a long time near my district in Pennsylvania, and on a personal note, I hope he will now be able to spend much more of his time in that area, where I am hopeful I may visit him to bring him up to date in what his former colleagues are doing.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Edward O. Craft is a rare man, indeed. He has a genuine gift for objectivity, a passion for accuracy, and an unerring eye for nonpartisanship. All of these characteristics have served him well in the legislative counsel's office for the past 31 years.

His quality of service has been exceptionally high and it is doubtful we shall see his like again. All of us on the Ways and Means Committee are grateful for his efforts in connection with our tax, trade, and social security legislation over the past 21 years, and our best wishes go with him as he embarks upon his amply merited retirement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Edward O. Craft has made his mark upon the work of the House in general, and upon the Ways and Means Committee in particular. As a member of that committee, I join my colleagues in expressing appreciation of his important contribution to our legislative efforts over two-score years, and in wishing him well in his retirement.

He came to work in the legislative counsel's office in December of 1941, and in the intervening years has established a standard of excellence toward which others strive. His personal record will be difficult to surpass.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praising the work of Ed Craft, our legislative counsel, and in wishing him the very best in his retirement years. Members of the Ways and Means Committee are particularly mindful of his superlative abilities as a draftsman of difficult and intricate legislation, and we will miss him greatly.

But, we are mindful also that Ed has served 31 years in the House and has worked with us in the committee for more than 21 of those years. In a broad sense, he has given a great deal of his life to the House, and in a narrower sense, he has given much of that to Ways and Means.

His absence will be marked, but we rejoice with him in his departure for the good life of retirement.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, men

such as Edward O. Craft come along all too infrequently, as the entire Ways and Means Committee has good reason to know. He has performed a truly monumental service for the committee for about two-thirds of his 31 years with the House, and every member of our committee has mixed feelings about his retirement. We are sorry to lose him, but glad to see him enter a new and more relaxing period of life.

Fortunately for all of us, the legislative counsel's office under his leadership has been, and will continue to be, an extremely capable arm of the House. He has set a uniquely fine example in his post.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the retirement of Mr. Craft at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF WARD M. HUSSEY, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces to the House that, pursuant to section 521 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C., sec. 282), he has appointed Ward M. Hussey Legislative Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives, effective March 1, 1972.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 671, DIVISION AND DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE BLACKFEET TRIBE AND THE GROS VENTRE TRIBE OF MONTANA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 671) to provide for division and for the disposition of the funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, HALEY, MELCHER, STEIGER of Arizona, and TERRY.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that this is Consent Calendar day, and the Chair cannot accept unanimous-consent requests until the Consent Calendar has been called.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar.

DISASTER LOANS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 893), to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to authorize disaster loans with respect to certain losses arising as the result of recent natural disasters, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that because the RECORD was misprinted or garbled on the last Consent Calendar day, this particular joint resolution does not meet the categorical requirements for the Consent Calendar in at least two different instances. First, it does not meet the category for consideration under unanimous consent as agreed to by the full House and recommended by the chairman of the majority of committee members during the organization of the House in the beginning of the 92d Congress in that it exceeds over \$1 million in not only 1972, but 1973 and 1974.

Second, Mr. Speaker, it does not have any departmental views given.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE "COOLY TRADE" LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 213), to repeal the "cooly trade" laws.

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

H.R. 213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 2158-2163, Revised Statutes, and sections 1, 2, and 4 of the Act of March 3, 1875 (ch. 141, 18 Stat. 477) (8 U.S.C. 331-339), are hereby repealed.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the author and introducer of H.R. 213, to urge its passage. This House, to its great credit, passed similar legislation in the 89th Congress and again in the 90th Congress, but in each instance the legislation was not acted upon by the Senate before final adjournment.

I wish at the outset to thank and commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, for the leading role which he assumed in reporting this measure to the floor. I wish also to ex-

press my appreciation to Chairman CELLER and members of his committee for the expeditious and unanimous support they gave the measure. It is with fervent hope and optimism that I look forward to favorable action by the other body on this long overdue legislation.

The so-called cooly trade laws were enacted by Congress in 1862 and 1875 to correct the then widespread practice of exploiting persons of oriental descent, particularly Chinese and Japanese, in connection with their procurement abroad for importation into the United States to be held in service as servants or apprentices. Criminal sanctions were imposed on those who were found guilty of such practice. These laws have remained in our statute books to this day.

However commendable they may have been at one time, these laws are obsolete and, for all practical purposes, are of no effect under today's enlightened social, economic and political conditions. Furthermore, the word "coolly" carries a demeaning connotation to persons of Chinese ancestry—Americans and foreigners alike—a fact which it would appear we are deliberately ignoring as we continue to perpetuate these laws in our statute books. All that my bill proposes to do is to repeal these obsolete and unnecessary, but irritant, laws.

The people of the State of Hawaii, because of its proximity to the Far East and its large population of Asian descent, are perhaps more sensitive than Americans in any other area of the country to the feelings and thoughts of Asians. We who live in Hawaii know that enactment of H.R. 213 would remove a source of racial misunderstanding and help to promote better relations between the United States and Asian countries.

In view of recent events, particularly the President's trip to Peking, which tend to focus world attention on our relations with the Far Eastern nations, there can be no better time than the present for the U.S. Congress to repeal these cooly trade laws. To dramatize his visit to the People's Republic of China, President Nixon might even sign the bill immediately upon his return to Washington from mainland China.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a unanimous vote today in favor of H.R. 213.

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

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6420) to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

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

H.R. 6420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 344(C) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (8 U.S.C. 1455(c)) is amended by striking out "\$6,000" in the two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 3, strike out the following language "section 344(C) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "section 344(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVIVOR ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT PROGRAM FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN ADOPTED BY SURVIVING SPOUSE AFTER DEATH OF EMPLOYEE OR MEMBER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2896) to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to adopted child.

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

S. 2896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8341(a)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", and (iii) a child who lived with and for whom a petition of adoption was filed by an employee or Member, and who is adopted by the surviving spouse of the employee or Member after his death".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act is effective upon enactment. Upon application to the Civil Service Commission, it also applies to a child of an employee or Member who died or retired before such date of enactment but no annuity shall be paid by reason of the amendment for any period prior to the date of enactment.

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 18, 1972.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The Clerk of the House of Representatives received on February 16, 1972 from the U.S. Marshal, a copy of the summons in a Civil Action together with the complaint filed by Ralph Nader and Public Citizen, Inc. v. several Government officials as defendants, including W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States House of Representatives, in Civil Action File No. 243-72 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The summons requires an answer to the complaint within sixty days after service, and both documents are attached herewith.

Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 118, I have written to the Acting Attorney General of the United States and to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia (copies of letters attached), requesting that they carry out their assigned statutory responsibilities in defending the Clerk of the House in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 18, 1972.

HON. HAROLD H. TITUS, JR.,
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,
U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TITUS: I am sending you a copy of a summons and complaint in a Civil Action No. 243-72, filed against several Government officials as defendants, including W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and served upon me in my official capacity as Clerk of the House of Representatives on February 16, 1972.

In accordance with 2 U.S.C. 118, I respectfully request that you take appropriate action, as deemed necessary, under the "supervision and direction of the Attorney General" of the United States in defense of this suit against The Congress of the United States.

I am also sending you a copy of the letter that I forwarded this date to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 18, 1972.

HON. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Acting Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEINDIENST: I am sending you a copy of a summons and complaint in a Civil Action No. 243-72, filed against several Government officials as defendants, including W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and served upon me on February 16, 1972.

In accordance with 2 U.S.C. 118, I have sent a copy of the summons and complaint in this action to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia requesting that he take appropriate action under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General. I am also sending you a copy of the letter I forwarded this date to the U.S. Attorney.

Sincerely yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action File No. 243-72]

Ralph Nader, Public Citizen, Inc., Plaintiffs v. John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States; Harold H. Titus, Jr., U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia; W. Pat Jennings, clerk of the House of Representatives; Francis R. Valeo, Secretary of the Senate, Defendants.

To the above named Defendant W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives.

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon William A. Dobrovir, plaintiff's attorney, whose address, 2005 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 60 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

JAMES F. DAVEY,
Clerk of court.
MARY B. DEEVERS,
Deputy Clerk.

Date: February 8, 1972.

DESIGNATING NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 189) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" and to designate Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for these Americans.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 189

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to demonstrate the support and concern of the people of the United States, for the more than one thousand five hundred Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and to forcefully protest the inhumane treatment these men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese in violation of the Geneva Convention, the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating the period beginning March 26, 1972, and ending April 1, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; (2) designating Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for the lives and safety of these men, and (3) calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my two colleagues from California (Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WIGGINS) in continuing the effort here in Congress to make sure that we, and the American people, not be allowed to forget the importance of the return of American prisoners who are now languishing in the deplorable conditions of enemy camps in Southeast Asia.

This resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 189—which authorized the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" and to designate Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for these Americans, will be passed today to make it clear that our Congress has not forgotten and will not forget our prisoners of war and missing in action. Again we renew our demand and request that the Hanoi government adhere to the Geneva Convention and cooperate with the International Red Cross to allow for the release of names of those held as prisoners and permit greater exchange of correspondence and communication with the families of these men.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 189, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NEW ECONOMIC POLICY RESULTS IN RISING CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that since President Nixon inaugurated his new economic policy last August 15, consumer confidence in the economy has been rising dramatically. Growth in consumer installment credit is one of our best indicators of what consumers are thinking. The months of September through December 1971 saw strong rises in consumer credit. During the month of September, installment debt outstanding, as seasonally adjusted, increased by almost \$1 billion. During October the rise was \$924 million, followed by rises in November and December of \$1¼ billion and \$900 million, respectively. Although the rise in December slowed somewhat from that of November, when installment credit had a record surge, the December credit growth was still brisk and generally reflects strong retail sales in December.

There is good evidence that this strong December performance was matched last month. Our major retail chain stores reported large sales gains during the month of January. For example, Sears, Roebuck & Co., the Nation's largest retailer, reported sales at a level last month which was 9.6 percent above sales in January 1971. The volume for J. C. Penney Co. rose even faster, having been reported at 15.7 percent over the sales rate a year ago. Two other important retailers, Montgomery Ward & Co. and F. W. Woolworth Co., reported sales gains last month over the comparable period a year earlier of 11 and 13 percent respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should be especially encouraged by the fact that these strong performances in consumer credit and in retail sales have not been merely one month results, but are showing a consistent pattern of growth over a period of several months, reflecting continuing consumer confidence in the economy.

RADIO FREE EUROPE

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on returning to Washington this morning, I found on my desk a telegram from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. In that telegram Mr. Meany expresses the concern of the executive council of the AFL-CIO with respect to

the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The text of Mr. Meany's telegram follows:

The future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is being decided in Congress. The closing of these vital communications with the captive peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will be a clear sign of U.S. capitulation in the war to bring truth and courage to countless millions behind the Iron Curtain.

The Soviet Union has spent more than \$300,000,000 annually to try to stop these effective broadcasts and the Soviet Union has until now failed.

The Executive Council urges the responsible leadership of both houses of Congress to demand the passage of a fully funded program which has the overwhelming support of the membership in both houses and the American people. George Meany, President, AFL-CIO.

As one of the conferees on this legislation, I regret very much we have been unable to reach a resolution of the differences between the House- and the Senate-passed bills. In my opinion, we have a clear obligation to reach an agreement, and reach it soon. Quite frankly, I was appalled by the statement made in the other body last week by one of the Senate conferees, saying that the whole program should be killed. That is not an issue between the House and the Senate. Both the House and the Senate have agreed to continue these vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, the present situation is clearly intolerable. The differences between the two bills are not great and agreement should not be difficult. In my opinion, it would reflect on Congress as an institution if a few individuals were to block any further legislative progress because they happen to hold strong views about the value of these radio programs. The fact is that both the House and the Senate have already decided that further funding should be forthcoming.

Let us hope we reach an early resolution of our differences.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHERLE. 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. 47]

Abourezk	Davis, S.C.	Kyl
Ashley	Dellums	Leggett
Badillo	Diggs	Link
Baring	Dow	Long, La.
Belcher	Dwyer	McCloskey
Bergland	Edmondson	McFall
Blanton	Edwards, La.	Macdonald,
Blatnik	Fisher	Mass.
Burleson, Tex.	Gallfianakis	Metcalfe
Caffery	Gallagher	Mikva
Celler	Gross	Moorhead
Chappell	Harsha	Morgan
Chisholm	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Heinz	Nelsen
Clawson, Del.	Holtfield	Nix
Clay	Jonas	Pike
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Pryor, Ark.
Conyers	Kee	Pucinski

Rees	Sisk	Udall
Roe	Smith, Calif.	Wampler
Rostenkowski	Steed	Wilson,
Roy	Talcott	Charles H.
Sandman	Teague, Calif.	Zablocki
Scheuer	Teague, Tex.	
Sikes	Tiernan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 748, U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 748, to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 9, 1972.)

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement on the part of the managers be dispensed with.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so for the purpose of asking a question. It is my understanding, and I wish to be corrected if I am wrong, that the conference committee could not uphold the position of the House and they yielded to the Senate and took out the deterrent provision for the seizure of fishing vessels by foreign nations. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. In part it is true, but the bill already contained sufficient language to protect the seizure of any vessels. It protects the owner of any seized vessel.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. But we put in a provision aimed basically at Ecuador, which has been harassing our fishing vessels and our people in international waters. Is it my understanding that the provision the House put in has been taken out?

Mr. PATMAN. We have a broadened provision that includes all the countries—not just Ecuador, but all countries—and there is no doubt that there is plenty of protection for American citizens. If the gentleman will read this report, I think he will be willing to admit himself that they are fully covered, and there is no use to put in a specific provision.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Since I have the gentleman's assurance that the language in the conference report is sufficient to protect America's fishing on the high seas, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving

the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman from Texas a question with respect to the language in the bill. I have read the conference report, and I see the language is left in the bill which indicates that any country which has seized ownership or control of the property owned by any U.S. citizen or corporation, and so forth; a fishing vessel which had been seized and taken into port and put under the control of that nation would still be covered and would therefore require our representative in the Bank to vote against any loan to that country. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. So fishing vessels, while they are stricken from the language of the bill are actually still included?

Mr. PATMAN. They are included and fully protected, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I do not want any State Department lawyer to put his own interpretation on the language of the bill. As it is, it is mandatory that the President of the United States shall instruct the U.S. Executive Director to vote against any loan for the benefit of any country which has imposed exaction or restrictive operational conditions which have the effect of seizing control of property owned by a U.S. citizen or corporation.

I am now assured by the chairman, (Mr. PATMAN) that such seizing control would include a U.S. fishing vessel taken into a foreign port and only subject to release on payment of a fine.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the conference report on S. 748 as an excellent action on the part of the Congress and as a great victory for the House of Representatives.

The bill as passed the House and agreed to by the conferees authorizes the payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. The committee of conference agreed to the expropriation amendment as passed the House, with very minor modifications, and, for that conference action, the House of Representatives can be justly proud. This amendment requires a negative vote on the part of the United States on the question of lending funds to any country which nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes ownership or control of property owned by U.S. citizens or which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen.

In connection with the expropriation amendment, the House conferees agreed to two very inconsequential Senate amendments which failed to alter in any significant way the substance or effect of the amendment as passed the House.

The first modification simply requires the President instead of the Secretary of

the Treasury to take the responsibility for giving instructions as to when the United States should vote against the making of a loan because of an expropriation or seizure of control. The House conferees accepted this modification since it has no more effect than to identify as the real party in interest the President instead of the Secretary of the Treasury. Since the Secretary of the Treasury, as a Cabinet officer, is responsible to the President any way, the modification simply recognizes the facts as they are and addresses itself to the principal instead of his agent—that is, to the President instead of his Secretary of the Treasury.

In addition, the House conferees agreed to a Senate amendment to strike out the so-called tuna boat amendment. This amendment required an adverse vote on the part of the United States in connection with any loan to any country which wrongfully seizes a vessel of the United States in territorial waters or the high seas.

At the outset, it should be made unmistakably clear that the conferees of both Houses are of the view that the bill is not being weakened one bit by this action. The conferees are mindful of the seriousness of the wrongful taking of a vessel of the United States on the basis of rights or claims in territorial waters of the high seas. However, it is the view of the committee of conference that this kind of taking is clearly and manifestly covered by the existing provisions of the so-called expropriation amendment. To repeat, the expropriation amendment is designed to require the United States to vote against a loan in any case where any country has, and I quote, "nationalized, or expropriated, or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen * * *", and I emphasize the words "seized ownership or control of property." Clearly, when a foreign nation boards and seizes a vessel of the United States and takes it to port, then that nation has, at the very least, seized control of the U.S. vessel within the terms of the expropriation amendment.

The Senate conferees agreed to the House-passed amendment relating to the control of narcotic drugs. Your conferees felt that the acceptance of this amendment reflects a significant victory for the Congress and an important step in the battle against the illegal importation and distribution of narcotic drugs in the United States. The amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury to require a vote against any loan to any country with respect to which the President makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent illegal trafficking in narcotic drugs. The amendment is strong and since it is brief it is worthy of recital at this point, and I quote:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take

adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances . . . produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances.

In the past, the United States has perhaps unthinkingly participated in international lending programs to foreign countries without attempting to exact as a condition to such loans that borrowing nations to take steps to stem the flow of illegal drug traffic into the United States. Many such foreign nations have permitted the unhindered growth of opium crops and the processing of the seeds and morphine within their borders. To the extent that those illegal crops are directed to the United States, this amendment is designed to help bring about a dramatic halt.

The adoption of this amendment represents an intelligent and vigorous effort on the part of the United States to use its extensive international power to help stem the flow of narcotic drugs to the United States. The amendment represents a new initiative on the part of this country to make foreign nations more effectively control traffic in narcotic drugs as a condition to our agreement to permit international bank loans.

Since a sizable amount of the illegal narcotic drugs sold in this country are grown or manufactured abroad, it is through our economic and other influence in areas of international interaction that we might best hope to attack our national problem of drug abuse. This amendment represents a bold and energetic step in that direction.

The House conferees vigorously recommend the passage of this conference report. The approval of this report, together with the approval of the other two reports scheduled for today relating to U.S. contributions to international lending institutions, will continue this Nation's record as a moving force in providing international lending assistance to better help less privileged nations to help themselves. It is interesting and important to note at this point that our participation in these international lending programs benefits business in the United States at the same time that it helps to meet the needs of our foreign friends. Review of these programs has revealed that the direct benefit to the U.S. exports from financing these international institutions comes to about \$3.3 billion. A reasonable, and probably conservative estimate of the spare parts, replacements, and followup business not financed by the institutions but generated by the initial loans would add about \$500 million. The administrative expenditures of the institutions located in Washington have probably averaged \$20 million annually, and over the past decade, the United States economically has, therefore, benefited from such expendi-

tures by an amount of \$200 million. The total of the direct benefits to U.S. suppliers from financing by these international institutions thus, has been \$4.1 billion. Since our part in contributions to these banks is \$3.8 billion, the direct U.S. business generated has exceeded our imports by \$287 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the conference report on S. 748.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment and congratulate the House conferees for coming back with what I think is good legislation.

The House conferees did well in their negotiations with their counterparts in the other body.

The legislation passed by the House several weeks ago I supported and I more strongly support this conference report on this occasion.

This legislation over the years has helped to implement and execute our Nation's foreign policy under all administrations. I am convinced the extension of this legislation with modifications will equally help in the execution of our Nation's foreign policy. At a time when the President is in China on a rather historic mission on behalf of all of us it seems to me we would be acting properly and effectively to pass this legislation to help him in the overall task of seeking a better world for us as well as for others.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I am very much impressed with what is going on in China myself. I feel as though a big step is being taken in the direction of real peace in the world. I do not believe we should think about voting against any bill that is aimed directly in a direction that the President of the United States wants it aimed at. The President has especially asked for the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While agreeing with some of the things that he has said, not being indicative of total concurrence in either the background of this expenditure or the authorization thereof, let me simply ask if the expenditure is increased over the amount that passed the House and if the Senate added any nongermane amendments in the conference.

Mr. PATMAN. It is not increased over it.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman answer my second question as to whether or not there are any nongermane amendments?

Mr. PATMAN. There are no nongermane amendments, under the rules of the House.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

As a member of the committee of conference, I want to say to the House that I thought we had a very successful conference with the Senate. They yielded to the House on all of our amendments except the one previously mentioned on fishing vessels.

I think we have a set of very fine bills before us, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of both the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. PATMAN, and also those of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, our minority leader.

I ask the House to agree to the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to S. 748 which would instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank to vote against any loan to a country, such as Ecuador, which seizes and fines a U.S. vessel for fishing in international waters.

I felt that this amendment was necessary in order to deter pirate nations from seizing our vessels on the high seas. Last year, Ecuador seized 51 U.S. fishing vessels and exacted fines totaling over \$2 million. Thus far, in 1972, Ecuador has seized seven U.S. vessels and levied fines totaling \$469,180.

At the same time Ecuador was pirating our vessels, the Inter-American Development Bank was making loans to Ecuador through a Fund for Special Operations. United States contributions represent approximately 73 percent of the amount of money in the Fund for Special Operations.

In fiscal year 1971, which concluded June 30, 1971, the Inter-American Development Bank loaned \$30 million to Ecuador.

Thus far in fiscal year 1972, which concludes June 30, 1972, the IADB has loaned Ecuador an additional \$30.3 million. Three prospective loans requested by Ecuador, totaling between \$18 million to \$23 million, are presently pending before the IADB awaiting action by the Board of Directors.

The amendment adopted by the House of Representatives on February 1, 1972, would have had the effect of vetoing these pending loans to Ecuador, since a negative vote by the U.S. member of the IADB would cancel any loan from the Fund for Special Operations.

While the language of the amendment I authored to S. 748 was not adopted by the conference committee, I have received Chairman PATMAN's assurance that the conference report contains sufficient language to protect the owner of any seized vessel.

Since I have the gentleman's assurance that the language in the conference report will direct the President to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Board to vote against a loan to a country which illegally seizes a U.S. vessel in international waters, I will support the conference report to accompany S. 748.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I will continue to watch the activities of the

State Department to insure their compliance with the intent of Congress that loans should not be granted to countries which violate international law by seizing U.S. vessels which are fishing on the high seas.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 749, U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 749) to authorize U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 9, 1972.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the conference report on S. 749 as an excellent action on the part of the Congress and as a great victory for the House of Representatives.

The bill as passed the House and agreed to by the conferees authorizes the U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank. The committee of conference agreed to the so-called expropriation amendment as passed the House, with very minor modifications, and, for that conference action, the House of Representatives can be justly proud. This amendment requires a negative vote on the part of the United States on the question of lending funds to any country which nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes ownership or control of property owned by U.S. citizens or which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen.

In connection with the expropriation amendment, the House conferees agreed to one very inconsequential Senate amendment which failed to alter in any significant way the substance or effect of the amendment as passed the House.

The modification simply requires the President instead of the Secretary of the Treasury to take the responsibility for giving instructions as to when the United States should vote against the making of a loan because of an expropriation or seizure of control. The House conferees accepted this modification since it has no more effect than to identify as the real party in interest the President instead of the Secretary of the Treasury. Since the Secretary of the Treasury, as a Cabinet officer, is responsible to the President anyway, the modification

simply recognizes the facts as they are and addresses itself to the principal instead of his agent; that is, to the President instead of his Secretary of the Treasury.

The Senate conferees agreed to the House-passed amendment relating to the control of narcotic drugs. Your conferees felt that the acceptance of this amendment reflects a significant victory for the Congress and an important step in the battle against the illegal importation and distribution of narcotic drugs in the United States. The amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury to require a vote against any loan to any country with respect to which the President makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent illegal trafficking in narcotic drugs. The amendment is strong and since it is brief it is worthy of recital at this point, and I quote:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances . . . produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances.

In the past, the United States has perhaps unthinkingly participated in international lending programs to foreign countries without attempting to exact as a condition to such loans that borrowing nations take steps to stem the flow of illegal drug traffic into the United States. Many such foreign nations have permitted the unhindered growth of opium crops and the processing of the seeds and morphine within their borders. To the extent that these illegal crops are directed to the United States, this amendment is designed to help bring about a dramatic halt.

The adoption of this amendment represents an intelligent and vigorous effort on the part of the United States to use its extensive international power to help stem the flow of narcotic drugs to the United States. The amendment represents a new initiative on the part of this country to make foreign nations more effectively control traffic in narcotic drugs as a condition to our agreement to permit international bank loans.

Since a sizable amount of the illegal narcotic drugs sold in this country are grown or manufactured abroad, it is through our economic and other influence in areas of international interaction that we might best hope to attack our national problem of drug abuse. This

amendment represents a bold and energetic step in that direction.

The House conferees vigorously recommend the passage of this conference report. The approval of this report, together with the approval of the other two reports scheduled for today relating to U.S. contributions to international lending institutions, will continue this Nation's record as a moving force in providing international lending assistance to better help less privileged nations to help themselves. It is interesting and important to note at this point that our participation in these international lending programs benefits business in the United States at the same time that it helps to meet the needs of our foreign friends. Review of these programs has revealed that the direct benefit to the U.S. exports from financing these international institutions comes to about \$3.3 billion. A reasonable, and probably conservative estimate of the spare parts, replacements, and followup business not financed by the institutions but generated by the initial loans would add about \$500 million. The administrative expenditures of the institutions located in Washington have probably averaged \$20 million annually, and over the past decade, the United States economically has, therefore, benefited from such expenditures by an amount of \$200 million. The total of the direct benefits to U.S. suppliers from financing by these international institutions thus, has been \$4.1 billion. Since our part in contributions to these banks is \$3.8 billion, the direct U.S. business generated has exceeded our imports by \$287 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the conference report on S. 749.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I heard with interest the statement of the gentleman from Texas that this conference report is similar to the Inter-American Development Bank conference report, but I think, maybe, some of us think there is considerable difference between the Asian Development Bank which was born later than the other one, if for no other reason; and, second, I would like for the chairman to at least assure the Members before we put this conference report through that there is no money in this conference report for any giveaway to those north of the DMZ that might now be under consideration and that there was no increase in funds over the House-passed bill; and, third, that all Senate amendments are germane to the House bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I can assure the gentleman from Missouri in both instances and also the third one that there is no Senate nongermane amendment.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2010,
INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY
THE UNITED STATES IN THE
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 9, 1972.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the conference report on S. 2010 as an excellent action on the part of the Congress and as a great victory for the House of Representatives.

The bill as passed the House and agreed to by the conferees provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association. The committee of conference agreed to the so-called expropriation amendment as passed the House, with very minor modifications, and, for that conference action, the House of Representatives can be justly proud. This amendment requires a negative vote on the part of the United States on the question of lending funds to any country which nationalizes, expropriates, or seizes ownership or control of property owned by U.S. citizens or which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen.

In connection with the expropriation amendment, the House conferees agreed to one very inconsequential Senate amendment which failed to alter in any significant way the substance or effect of the amendment as passed the House.

The modification simply requires the President instead of the Secretary of the Treasury to take the responsibility for giving instructions as to when the United States should vote against the making of a loan because of an expropriation or seizure of control. The House conferees accepted this modification since it has no more effect than to identify as the real party in interest the President instead of the Secretary of the Treasury. Since the Secretary of the Treasury, as a Cabinet officer, is responsible to the President anyway, the modification simply recognizes the facts as they are and addresses itself to the principal instead of his agent—that is, to the President instead of his Secretary of the Treasury.

The Senate conferees agreed to the House-passed amendment relating to the control of narcotic drugs. Your conferees felt that the acceptance of this amendment reflects a significant victory for the Congress and an important step in the battle against the illegal importation and distribution of narcotic drugs in the United States. The amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury to

require a vote against any loan to any country with respect to which the President makes a determination that such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent illegal trafficking in narcotic drugs. The amendment is strong and since it is brief it is worthy of recital at this point, and I quote:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances . . . produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances.

In the past, the United States has perhaps unthinkingly participated in international lending programs to foreign countries without attempting to exact as a condition to such loans that borrowing nations take steps to stem the flow of illegal drug traffic into the United States. Many such foreign nations have permitted the unhindered growth of opium crops and the processing of the seeds and morphine within their borders. To the extent that those illegal crops are directed to the United States, this amendment is designed to help bring about a dramatic halt.

The adoption of this amendment represents an intelligent and vigorous effort on the part of the United States to use its extensive international power to help stem the flow of narcotic drugs to the United States. The amendment represents a new initiative on the part of this country to make foreign nations more effectively control traffic in narcotic drugs as a condition to our agreement to permit international bank loans.

Since a sizable amount of the illegal narcotic drugs sold in this country are grown or manufactured abroad, it is through our economic and other influence in areas of international interaction that we might best hope to attack our national problem of drug abuse. This amendment represents a bold and energetic step in that direction.

The House conferees vigorously recommend the passage of this conference report. The approval of this report, together with the approval of the other two reports scheduled for today relating to United States contributions to international lending institutions, will continue this Nation's record as a moving force in providing international lending assistance to better help less privileged nations to help themselves. It is interesting and important to note at this point that our participation in these international lending programs benefits business in the United States at the same

time that it helps to meet the needs of our foreign friends.

Review of these programs has revealed that the direct benefit to the U.S. exports from financing these international institutions comes to about \$3.3 billion. A reasonable, and probably conservative estimate of the spare parts, replacements, and followup business not financed by the institutions but generated by the initial loans would add about \$500 million. The administrative expenditures of the institutions located in Washington have probably averaged \$20 million annually, and over the past decade, the United States economically has, therefore, benefited from such expenditures by an amount of \$200 million. The total of the direct benefits to U.S. suppliers from financing by these international institutions thus, has been \$4.1 billion. Since our part in contributions to these banks is \$3.8 billion, the direct U.S. business generated has exceeded our imports by \$287 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the conference report on S. 2010.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the same three questions that I have asked on the two previous conference reports in view of the fact that the chairman did not see fit to include them in his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri for being so alert. They are relevant questions, and they should be answered. The answers are the same as on the preceding two conference reports.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the three conference reports that have just been agreed to on S. 748, S. 749, and S. 2010 and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

OFFSHORE MINERAL REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have taken the floor to discuss the need to devise some formula by which Coastal States could share the revenues from mineral production on Federal lands adjacent to their shores.

At the present time, the Department of Interior has before it my bill which would apply to Coastal States the same formula which is presently applied to inland States with mineral-producing Federal lands within their borders.

Simply stated, the proposal would allow Coastal States 37.5 percent of the revenues arising from mineral production on submerged lands, belonging to the Federal Government, off their shores.

Mr. Speaker, Coastal States make great and expensive contributions in the form of public services to offshore mineral production. Among other things, they build the roads, educate the children, and provide the health care for the men and their families who make offshore mineral production possible. It is only just that the Coastal States be compensated for these expenditures as is presently done in the case of inland States.

This topic has been thoroughly researched and studied by the distinguished executive editor of the New Orleans Times Picayune, George W. Healy, Jr.

The Times Picayune has recently published a report to Members of the Congress, entitled, "Revenue Sharing, Earned and Deserved." I am inserting this document in the RECORD, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

A REPORT TO MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

For a quarter of a century oil and gas have been produced from beneath waters off the coast of Louisiana.

Development of oil fields in the Outer Continental Shelf has produced revenues for the federal government in the past eighteen years exceeding \$6 billion.

Royalties from offshore federal lands are continuing to rise, and there is real prospect that federal lands off coastal states which now have no minerals production soon will

be adding bonus, rental and royalty money to the United States Treasury.

As of Jan. 1, 1972, federal oil and gas income had been realized principally from lands off the coasts of Louisiana, Texas, California, Oregon, Washington and Florida.

By far the greatest contributor of funds to the central government are federal lands off Louisiana's coast.

Because it makes great and expensive contributions toward productivity of these federal lands off its coast but receives no share of the revenues from these lands, Louisiana has been and is a victim of what seems to us serious injustice. That inequity will affect adversely other coastal states unless the law is amended to provide for sharing with coastal states of revenues from offshore lands in a way comparable to that by which revenues from inshore federal lands are shared with inland states.

Facts in this booklet have been compiled with the hope that they will assist members of the Congress to better understand what offshore minerals production means to the United States, where offshore production is being obtained and is expected to be obtained and why the federal government should share its growing offshore revenues with states which provide services for the men who make possible production of those revenues and for their families.

GEORGE W. HEALY, Jr.,

Editor, The Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La.

VOLUME OF PRODUCTION OFF LOUISIANA'S SHORES, CRUDE PRODUCTION, DAILY AVERAGE, JUNE 1970

	Barrels	Value of production
Oil:		
Zone 0.....	3,188	\$9,564
Zone 1.....	143,618	430,854
Zone 2.....	345,480	1,036,440
Zone 3.....	177,219	531,657
Zone 4 (bisected leases).....	24,655	73,965
Zone 4 (uncontested).....	41,452	124,356

Notes: Zone 1, to 3 miles from shore. Zone 2, from 3 miles to 3 leagues from shore. Zone 3, 3 leagues to coastline established 1812.

	Cubic feet	Value of production
Gas (not counting casinghead):		
Zone 0.....	48,824,000	\$7,811,840.00
Zone 1.....	1,359,952,000	217,592,320.00
Zone 2.....	1,634,711,000	310,595,090.00
Zone 3.....	609,133,000	115,735,270.00
Zone 4 (bisected leases).....	102,314,000	19,439,660.00
Zone 4 (outer).....	134,398,250	25,534,667.50

Notes: Zone 1, to 3 miles from shore. Zone 2, from 3 miles to 3 leagues from shore. Zone 3, 3 leagues to coastline established 1812.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF RECEIPTS, FISCAL YEAR, 1955 THROUGH 1970

Year	Royalties	Total (includes bonuses and rentals)
1955.....	0	\$154,621,764.85
1956.....	\$52,814.63	137,742,374.94
1957.....	232,342.31	13,178,593.89
1958.....	830,760.69	15,669,347.58
1959.....	2,266,484.40	23,830,325.75
1960.....	2,839,980.97	401,722,186.69
1961.....	5,588,525.60	51,067,561.98
1962.....	5,605,230.15	510,198,439.12
1963.....	7,443,921.55	137,273,381.41
1964.....	10,620,439.52	152,395,954.32
1965.....	11,246,201.92	142,502,002.40
1966.....	86,424,061.11	208,764,843.82
1967.....	41,107,770.26	785,440,705.67
1968.....	57,935,108.40	1,082,763,202.32
1969.....	78,083,889.47	713,912,091.57
1970.....	113,580,953.89	333,809,071.36
1971.....	159,914,891.13	1,272,257,326.56
Total.....	583,771,719.06	6,137,149,774.21

Federal revenues produced by bonuses and rentals from minerals' rights sales for operations off coastal States up to Dec. 15, 1970

Louisiana.....	\$3,021,740,545.86
Texas.....	699,022,081.96
California.....	638,754,209.28
Oregon.....	29,045,074.24
Washington.....	8,231,188.40
Florida.....	2,109,312.00

BONUSES AND RENTALS RECEIVED BY FEDERAL TREASURY—FEDERAL REVENUES FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF, MINERAL LEASE SALES—INCLUDING BONUSES AND RENTALS

Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	First year rental
1954				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	90	394,721.16	\$116,378,476.00	\$1,184,175
Louisiana—Sulphur.....	5	25,000.00	1,233,500.00	50,000
Texas—Oil and gas.....	19	67,148.70	23,357,029.48	201,450
Total.....	114	486,869.86	140,969,005.48	1,435,625
1955				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	94	252,806.92	100,091,262.93	758,442
Texas—Oil and gas.....	27	149,760.00	8,437,461.60	449,280
Total.....	121	402,566.92	108,528,724.53	1,207,722
1959				
Florida—Oil and gas.....	23	132,480.00	1,711,872.00	397,440
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	19	38,819.90	88,035,121.27	388,200
Total.....	42	171,299.90	89,746,993.27	786,640
1960				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	99	464,046.23	246,909,783.59	1,392,159
Texas—Oil and gas.....	48	240,480.00	35,732,031.20	721,440
Louisiana—Salt.....	1	2,500.00	75,250.00	7,500
Total.....	148	707,926.23	282,717,064.79	2,121,099
1962				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	401	1,879,526.71	445,036,031.81	5,638,671
Texas—Oil and gas.....	10	28,800.00	557,719.50	86,400
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	9	16,177.95	43,887,358.75	161,780
Total.....	420	1,924,504.66	489,481,110.06	5,886,851

Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	First year rental
1963				
California—Oil and gas.....	57	312,944.85	\$12,807,586.68	\$938,838
1964				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	23	32,673.34	60,340,626.00	326,780
Oregon—Oil and gas.....	74	425,433.05	27,768,772.24	1,276,302
Washington—Oil and gas.....	27	155,420.00	7,764,728.40	466,260
Total.....	124	613,526.39	95,874,326.64	2,069,342
1965				
Texas—Sulphur.....	50	72,000.00	33,740,308.80	216,000
1966				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	17	35,056.00	88,845,963.00	350,570
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	24	104,717.19	99,164,930.42	523,600
California—Oil and gas.....	1	1,995.48	21,189,000.00	9,980
Total.....	42	141,768.67	209,199,893.42	884,150
1967				
Louisiana—Oil and gas.....	158	744,456.12	510,079,177.76	2,233,458
Louisiana—Salt.....	1	2,495.00	30,563.75	7,485
Total.....	159	746,951.13	510,109,741.51	2,240,943
1968				
California—Oil and Gas.....	71	363,181.00	602,719,261.60	1,089,543
Texas—Oil and Gas.....	110	541,304.41	593,899,046.38	1,623,915
Louisiana—Oil and Gas.....	169	934,167.41	149,868,789.27	296,820
Total.....	197	934,167.41	1,346,487,097.25	3,010,278

Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	First year rental	Adjacent State and products	Number	Acreage	Bonus	First year rental
1969					1970				
Louisiana—Oil and gas	20	48,505.00	\$44,037,338.65	\$485,050	Louisiana—Oil and gas	19	44,642.00	\$97,769,013.00	\$446,420
Louisiana—Sulphur	4	5,625.00	715,150.00	16,875	Louisiana—Oil and gas	116	543,897.70	845,832,785.06	1,631,694
Louisiana—Oil and gas	16	60,153.06	66,908,195.60	601,550	Total	135	588,539.70	943,601,198.06	2,078,114
Total	40	114,283.06	111,660,684.25	1,103,475	Grand total to Dec 15, 1970	1,649	7,216,448.78	4,374,324,334.74	23,978,077

Source: U.S. Bureau of Land Management.

NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED OFF LOUISIANA'S SHORES (ESTIMATES AND ASPECTS FOR ESTIMATION)

30,000 employed in exploration and production, some from satellites are employed offshore.

6,400 or 40% of 16,000 persons in one parish covered by the Employment Security Law who drew their livelihood directly from the oil and gas industry.

5,000 were either unemployed or underemployed (on part-time basis) in Morgan City area alone during the offshore curtailment.

30,144 persons are engaged in some form of water transportation with movement of petroleum, its products and personnel, by far the largest operation.

7,500 is not an unreasonable estimate for

number of persons who gain a livelihood from boats, barges, tankers and other vessels engaged in oil industry movements in Louisiana's waterways each day. (From testimony presented before the Senate Committee by the Offshore Operations Committee in 1970.)

WHAT ARE OFFSHORE OPERATIONS COSTING LOUISIANA AND ITS POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS?

Providing education, health, police, recreation and other essential government services to 67,644 persons employed to make offshore fields productive and to members of their families cost the state and local government, conservatively, in 1970: \$79,718,702.

This estimate is based on employment figures obtained from the oil and gas industry and suppliers and on government cost figures compiled by the Louisiana Public Affairs Re-

search Council. The data used by PAR as foundation for its figures was obtained from the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Capital expenditures by the state and local governments to provide roads, marinas and other facilities needed to service the offshore operations run to many millions of dollars.

As an example

Heavy traffic of trucks carrying supplies and equipment to the offshore platforms and barges, of buses carrying workers and of heavy drilling machinery overtaxed the highway between Belle Chasse and Venice, at the head of the Mississippi river passes.

Creating a four-lane highway to accommodate this increased load cost Plaquemines parish alone: \$48,024,008.00

LOUISIANA'S OIL-POPULATION GROWTH

	Growth						Growth				
	1950	1960	Percent	1970	Percent		1950	1960	Percent	1970	Percent
Louisiana (total)	2,683,516	3,257,022	21.4	3,564,310	9.4	Coastal parishes—Continued					
Coastal parishes:						St. Bernard	11,087	32,186	190.3	50,729	57.6
Cameron	6,244	6,909	10.7	7,685	11.2	St. Mary	35,848	48,833	36.2	59,559	21.9
Jefferson	103,873	208,769	100.9	688,774	229.9	Terrebonne	43,328	60,771	40.3	73,343	20.7
Lafourche	42,209	55,381	31.2	67,652	22.2	Vermilion	36,929	38,855	5.2	21,930	7.9
Plaquemines	14,239	22,545	58.3	24,700	9.6	8-parish total	293,757	425,416	44.8	1,014,372	138.4

If collectible, Louisiana's severance tax rates on natural resources extracted from the soil, would have provided \$397,356,668.42 (1955-1968):

Oil	\$250,233,711.75
Condensate	26,933,276.65
Casinghead gas	23,503,190.66
Natural gas	96,686,489.36
Total	397,356,668.42

Louisiana collects no sales tax on materials used in offshore operations.

WHAT HAS GULF OIL PRODUCTION DONE TO THE LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENT?

Fish catch in pounds

1945:	
Louisiana	163,902,000
Total gulf	341,080,000
1968:	
Louisiana	763,969,000
Total gulf	1,298,295,000
1969:	
Louisiana	1,003,137,000
Total gulf	1,614,628,000
1970:	
Louisiana	1,107,251,000
Total gulf	1,698,104,000
Source—National Marine Fisheries Bureau	

of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

WHERE HAS LITIGATION BROUGHT US?

First offshore lawsuit filed by the U.S. against California in 1945. It was decided—to a point—in 1977. It is still hanging fire on some issues.

U.S. vs Louisiana was filed in 1950. It is still in the courts!

Costs are not available.

Plaquemines parish, alone, appropriated and spent more than \$250,000 in two years.

IN QUEST OF SPEEDY JUSTICE

John N. Mitchell, quoted in *Judicature*, November, 1971:

In the novel, *Bleak House*, Charles Dickens built his story and his message around a civil case before the High Court of Chancery that had dragged on for generations. Two or three of the solicitors in the cause, he wrote, . . . have inherited it from their fathers, who made a fortune by it . . . Innumerable children have been born into the cause; innumerable young people have been married into it; innumerable old people have died out of it.

Receipts by Coastal states from Federal Offshore Lands in 1970—Zero.

Division of Receipts from Federal Lands in 1970

Alabama	\$15,814.42
Alaska	8,652,976.12
Arizona	193,803.90
Arkansas	19,533.29
California	3,376,685.63
Colorado	2,806,968.65
Florida	41,664.97
Idaho	297,359.75
Indiana	2.00
Kansas	183,311.61
Louisiana	312,411.51
Michigan	16,860.44
Mississippi	15,544.95
Missouri	4.00
Montana	2,742,397.73
Nebraska	1,530.86
Nevada	456,706.55
New Mexico	12,964,835.88
North Dakota	201,501.57
Oklahoma	170,136.50
Oregon	163,523.62
South Dakota	166,647.84
Utah	3,409,833.03
Washington	10,173.14
Wisconsin	15.70
Wyoming	18,792,266.71
Total	55,011,910.37

REVENUE FROM OIL AND GAS MINERAL LEASES ON STATE LANDS

Year	Inland			Submerged lands			Total
	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	
1945	\$2,574,762.51	\$591,831.21	\$834,092.28	0	0	\$634,997.65	\$4,635,683.60
1946	3,298,980.40	421,136.06	981,088.10	0	\$229,381.07	4,854,612.66	9,785,198.29
1947	5,141,146.63	680,843.39	1,823,995.51	0	2,275,598.96	8,676,522.50	18,598,106.99
1948	8,066,882.20	572,495.27	6,242,296.39	\$32,524.05	5,573,630.90	11,866,374.91	32,354,203.72
1949	8,837,096.92	941,068.94	2,456,750.42	273,813.89	7,663,728.14	0	19,372,458.31
1950	9,218,156.91	1,090,123.85	4,220,646.76	941,800.10	3,941,764.07	1,340,590.04	20,753,081.73
1951	11,508,659.90	1,122,356.59	3,947,828.61	319,958.62	867,455.32	4,087,286.41	21,853,545.45

REVENUE FROM OIL AND GAS MINERAL LEASES ON STATE LANDS—Continued

Year	Inland			Submerged lands			Total
	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	Royalty	Rentals	Bonuses	
1952	\$12,708,412.88	\$862,593.87	\$5,046,357.29	\$136,889.94	\$1,026,868.99	\$8,933,573.02	\$29,714,695.99
1953	13,638,787.90	1,063,870.63	7,028,049.18	3,576,812.09	1,300,175.70	3,766,110.49	30,373,805.99
1954	17,103,753.91	1,254,127.24	9,650,516.90	3,983,146.41	2,091,481.25	36,302,875.08	70,385,900.79
1955	18,652,338.11	1,440,242.50	44,564,388.17	5,839,622.82	1,553,068.66	44,212,534.53	116,262,194.79
1956	20,794,053.39	1,654,620.99	46,784,657.04	6,342,201.65	1,260,144.11	15,951,511.75	92,787,189.93
1957	35,083,879.29	2,677,982.47	24,988,764.23	13,167,241.45	941,054.47	1,522,310.47	78,381,232.38
1958	30,022,757.15	1,643,532.21	13,243,909.22	10,160,215.10	348,777.47	0	55,419,191.15
1959	40,657,718.13	668,979.73	24,106,967.16	13,129,934.42	168,952.93	47,459,266.67	126,191,819.04
1960	39,400,679.41	1,189,417.93	11,267,698.77	13,094,552.06	302,987.60	850,000.00	66,105,335.77
1961	44,494,831.45	1,253,895.68	6,787,951.96	13,299,765.12	72,112.66	10,265,223.61	76,173,780.48
1962	51,487,656.87	479,355.07	10,436,750.62	18,599,278.71	205,819.08	6,641,701.95	87,850,562.30
1963	56,672,037.78	1,043,191.68	34,477,333.71	15,901,028.50	449,098.52	832,360.00	109,375,050.19
1964	58,799,759.36	982,220.16	21,838,107.81	17,445,071.41	468,635.50	13,142,149.44	112,675,943.68
1965	63,039,409.25	2,079,919.00	22,732,440.88	21,787,067.72	628,656.31	7,768,949.00	118,036,442.16
1966	71,267,105.86	1,166,962.66	14,243,497.51	44,610,478.52	857,674.43	21,996,887.30	154,142,606.10
1967	86,341,690.05	1,041,282.64	8,555,217.57	32,945,913.61	630,282.76	6,450,679.94	135,965,066.57
1968	95,098,223.79	1,055,460.23	14,145,477.97	34,992,621.35	575,557.31	4,241,395.13	150,108,735.78
1969	102,013,241.15	1,294,697.44	12,886,377.69	37,516,328.02	717,061.51	1,840,471.16	156,268,176.97
1970	99,632,735.92	1,044,301.61	6,426,423.02	38,270,035.03	367,510.76	1,581,778.07	147,323,684.41
Total	1,004,754,756.94	29,316,509.05	360,717,584.72	346,367,200.59	34,517,479.48	265,220,161.78	2,040,893,692.56

Note: State's bonuses from submerged lands decreased from \$44,212,534.53 to \$1,581,778.07 in 15 years; Federal bonuses from lands off Louisiana increased from \$100,091,262.93 to \$948,601,798.06 in same period.

Source: Table by register of State land office for Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

BOLD NEW PLAN TO EXPAND AMERICAN EXPORTS

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some remarks on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) and myself concerning the cosponsorship of our bill (H.R. 11508) which will greatly benefit America and the world, especially the developing countries.

Thirty Members of Congress today joined us in cosponsoring a bold new plan to expand American exports abroad without costing the U.S. taxpayers a penny in new appropriations. In fact, this plan can make money for the Treasury as well as U.S. labor and industry.

The major bipartisan bill—plainly labeled as an experiment—would use U.S.-owned foreign currencies and debt repayments to pay foreign import duties on American-manufactured goods and agricultural products. The move would make U.S. exports more competitive with European and Japanese goods right in the foreign marketplace. Foreign import duties average about 10 percent. In order to qualify, the foreign importer would have to agree to pass this saving along to the ultimate consumer.

Our investment would be repaid in the form of increased U.S. tax revenues and at the same time result in a tremendous boost to the U.S. economy creating new jobs and raising corporate profits.

The United States currently owns and is owed vast amounts of foreign currencies which have rapidly deteriorated in value because of devaluations, inflation, and exchange rate adjustments. America now holds more than \$2 billion in such currencies. Another \$6 billion in foreign currencies are owed to the United States and in the process of regular payment. In addition, almost \$22 billion in our own currency is owed the United States. The total of all these categories is approximately \$30 billion and considering an average 10-percent foreign import

duty would finance \$300 billion worth of American exports over the coming years if used entirely for that purpose.

Because of the multiplier tax effects when our exports increase, for every dollar or its equivalent in foreign currency we spend, we would virtually double our tax income. Corporation taxes would rise, taxes on dividends would go up, and, of course, income taxes from the thousands of new jobs created would flow into the Treasury. These multiple new tax revenues will be reflected as fast as U.S. exports expand.

And as our exports rise, we also will need increased raw materials from many of the developing nations, thus providing them with additional foreign exchange to buy machinery, tools, transport equipment, and other goods from the United States which will assist and speed their development.

A classic economic cycle is thus set in motion that will benefit not only America but other countries everywhere.

The other cosponsors are: Representatives WILLIAM R. COTTER, Democrat, of Connecticut; JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California; OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York; ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Democrat, of California; CHARLES B. RANGEL, Democrat, of New York; JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan; FRANK HORTON, Republican, of New York; CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; CHARLES W. WHELEN, Jr., Republican, of Ohio; WILLIAM R. ROY, Democrat, of Kansas; JOSHUA EILBERG, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JAMES W. SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; PHILLIP BURTON, Democrat, of California; GUS YATRON, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire; JOHN H. TERRY, Republican, of New York; CHARLES THONE, Republican, of Nebraska; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida; FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island; WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Republican, of Virginia; LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Pennsylvania; PHILIP E. RUPPE, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES A. McCURE, Repub-

lican, of Idaho; GUY VANDER JAGT, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES J. HOWARD, Democrat, of New Jersey; MANUEL LUJAN, Republican, of New Mexico; BILL ALEXANDER, Democrat, of Arkansas; and JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBLESSNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, I just noticed something in today's paper and yesterday's paper that changed the whole course of the remarks I was going to make.

It is related to the subject matter that I took up with the House 10 days ago when I read a report from the chairman of the board of the Committee of 100 headed by the Corn Products Corp., Inc., International. This Committee of 100 went over to Russia to talk to Chairman Kosygin and Russian officials about a trade deal with the United States.

As we know, we are living in an era of commercialization and merchantism and trade that supersedes all other considerations of the human actions and behavior of our times.

I read the complete report that was given by this committee, and to say the least about it, it scared me since it deals with the subject matter that I believe to be the most important subject matter before the American people today—unemployment and joblessness, caused by our illogical and outmoded international trade posture.

Mr. Kosygin laid down two specific terms before he would discuss any trade agreements.

First, He said that the Soviet Union must be considered as a favored nation under our trade agreements.

This means that all concessions that we have given over the some 30 years of the reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and friendly nations

would have to be given to the Soviet Union in one fell swoop.

The second provision that he would expect is that all avenues of credit now open to all our trading partners would be open to the Soviet Union, including the Import-Export Bank financing.

He went on further to say that since the United States was so far ahead of Russia in its production of sophisticated computers, and that he was having difficulty buying computers from the United States because, he said, they would not be used for military purposes.

At least he was honest enough to qualify that particular statement by saying that at least these computers we would buy now would not be used for military purposes.

Then he went on to say, to put the clincher on what I think would be a most devastating blow to U.S. industrial productivity and employment capacities—he said that he would want and expects American enterprise concerns to build plants and to send the equipped and trained persons to teach them the know-how to produce many industrial goods that they do not have proficiency in today.

Further, he would expect and demand that the plants would be paid for by selling to the United States the production of those plants.

Further, he said that this meant also prearrangement arrangements for the plants would include an agreement to buy the same amount of goods from those plants annually for the next 20 years.

He further went on to say that any products that the United States would sell to Russia would have to be part of a *quid pro quo* in which the Russian products would have to be bought by America, and that all products bought from America would have to be paid for in a barter type trade arrangement on products from Russia because "We will not pay for products from any hard currency country other than in products from our country to take their place in a barter deal."

Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, the article I refer to was just disclosed not more than 10 minutes before I advised this Congress of the kind of secret arrangement which happens to be the diplomatic policy of this administration—secret arrangements and secret deals that are brought out in the open after they have been accomplished and leaving Congress in a bind where it can do nothing else but ratify the arrangements that were made.

Arrangements were made, and we are now providing \$3,100,000,000 worth of equipment, machinery, know-how, technical staffs, and all of the background knowledge that we have paid for with billions of dollars and the sweat of many thousands of American workmen, to build a plant for the construction of trucks.

However, in that agreement—and he has already petitioned for the financing of the total amount from the Export-Import Bank and other agencies of credit that are within control of the United States—but he also goes further and says that they would produce under the first group of vehicles that they

make 150,000 trucks plus 100,000 motors which will be sold to the United States in payment yearly for the plant until the \$3 billion is paid off.

I defy anybody to go broke under that kind of an arrangement. I would be glad to start a group tomorrow to construct a plant in my district and make motor trucks if the U.S. Government would give me the money and buy back enough of the product to pay for the plant.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this is the kind of agreement we have made all over the world, and that is why we cannot do anything about the import invasion of the United States. We cannot, because secret agreements have been made whereby we have spent billions of dollars of American money constructing production facilities all over the world and have agreed to buy back the products in order to pay the debts for the construction of those plants.

This country grew big because it had a brain to create productivity. It grew big because it had a dedicated labor force and a business enterprise system which allowed the smallest man within it to become the largest man within the whole country. It was built big because we designed and knew how to make things, and we kept that design to ourselves and sold the product of that design.

Now we give the design away and buy the product from those to whom we have given it.

To those of you who have not yet felt the seriousness of the unemployment in the United States, I pray that you do not wake up, because you are sleeping in a dream world of unreality. We are on a very dangerous precipice, and one little shove can push us down into oblivion. I do not want to comment on the President's visit to China. Anything that is done in the interest of humanity I applaud and support. But I say that the prompting factor in the decision to go to China is the commercialism and the mercantilism of international trade.

You will see just as surely as you are alive that within a very short time we will be importing from the Chinese mainland products that just a few years ago would subject you to jail sentences and fines if you were caught bringing them into the country.

This ban has been lifted already, because the Hecht Co. just announced this morning that all of the District stores will, in 2 weeks, open up with China shops called "The Oriental Express," in which they will have available for sale soups, glass, and certain articles that are already made in Red China.

We cannot be the marketplace for the whole world, but they think we are. At this point, 32.7 percent of all the shoes purchased in America come from foreign countries. It so happens that in last week's issue of Toronto's Financial Post, an article stated that the Canadians are very seriously disturbed because of the imports of shoes into Canada.

But what do Members think their solution is? Do the Members think their solution is to do something about protectionism and to do something to guarantee that the workers in their areas are

not put out of work by workers making shoes for one-quarter or one-fifth or one-tenth of our wages? No. They are holding a meeting this week, and the tone of the meeting is this: that now, because of the pressure of shoes coming in from France and Italy and Brazil and Japan and Taiwan, they think the thing they have to do is expand their sales into the United States.

We have become the biggest boobs on the face of the earth. We have failed to realize that without jobs there is no economy. Without men working there is no market here for our goods nor will there be a market for foreign goods.

There will be no foreign goods market simply because the income of the American is being taken from him now. The income which would be used to feed and clothe and house and medically care for a great portion of our American people is being taken now.

There are approximately 200 million people living in this country. Yet, there are 52 million of that number who do not work at any productive or service type of work. We have 26 million who draw social security; they do not produce goods. The money that pays for social security comes out of the marketplace. Some of that money goes back in, but mostly it is for food and rent and a few necessities, no luxuries.

We have something like 13½ million Americans who are drawing welfare. This money comes out of the earnings of those who work, and that does not buy in the marketplace the kind of products that create employment in this country. Then we have about 13 million in the service of the different governments in the United States. This money comes out of the wages of those who are employed in productive and service industries. All of this money comes in and then goes back out to take care of Americans who are out of productive work.

Right now, every automobile company in America is buying foreign steel. Let us take a look at automobile production. This year, a nation that 10 years ago was not producing 100,000 automobiles—Japan—is producing by their own calculations 6,700,000 automobiles, over 2 million of which they expect to sell in the United States. For every 200,000 automobiles that are sold in the United States, 25,000 workers are required, starting from the digging of the coal, the mining of the ore, and on through the blast furnaces and steelmaking processes, the making of springs and seats, tires and tubes, and the glass and the electronic equipment that goes into the automobile.

So, if we take 2 million imported cars—and we must not forget that we do not sell 2,500 automobiles to Japan in the whole year, most of which are bought by American expatriates or the Diplomatic Corps in Japan—when we couple that with the above facts and multiply 10 times 200,000, or 250,000, we will find there are 2 million Americans in some walk of life, in some form of production, in some type of service industry, who will lose their jobs this year because of imports of cars alone.

In the steel industry this past year we

imported 18 million tons of steel, and we exported less than 2 million tons, a difference of 16 million tons of exports. Every million tons of steel that is made requires 6,000 workers per year in all of the types of jobs required from the digging of the coal and the drilling of the oil on through all the parts that go into the production of steel.

So we find ourselves with 16 million tons and 6,000 workers, or 96,000 workers no longer employed in steel.

Come to Pittsburgh. Go to Birmingham, Ala. Go out to Detroit. Go anywhere in this country where men make their living making steel, where men make their living making automobiles, where men make their living making tires. Do you know that last year we imported 21 million automobile tires, not counting the five tires that come in on every imported car into the United States?

Then they say that labor has caused inflation. They are against my little minimum wage bill that is going to pay \$1.80 to some workers and \$2 an hour to some other workers. It is too much money, they have said, and it causes inflation. I do not know anybody who is working 40 hours a week, making even \$2 an hour, the minimum we have in our bill, who can buy anything with that that would cause inflation. In my book, I believe he will be hard put just to buy the barest necessities for himself and his family. But that is going to cause inflation.

Do you know what causes inflation? When there are goods on the shelves of the marketplaces and money in the pockets of Americans, and those people are buying goods on the market shelves that were not put there by American workers. When the goods on the market shelves are made elsewhere, every time Americans buy those products the money goes elsewhere to pay the worker who made it in a foreign country. He pays his shoemaker, and he pays his electric bills and he pay his grocery bills. You and I and the rest of us who are fortunate enough to be working pay for all the costs for the boys thrown out of work because that foreign workers has his job.

There is absolutely no living person, in spite of his philosophy, in spite of whatever ideology he may have, who can stand up in open debate and defend a system that destroys the capability of this country in peace and makes us an open target in case of war.

We have difficulty and have had difficulty in prosecuting the so-called brush fire in Vietnam. Why? It is because we had let our merchant marine go down, and we did not have the bottoms to send over the seas to ship not only the men required but also the equipment and materiel for them. And, we had to pay exorbitant prices to foreign flagships, owned by Americans. It cost you and every other American who bought or built a home since that war began thousands of dollars extra, because we had used these ships to bring our lumber to the east coast, to the central United States and to the South from the northwestern part of our country. We had to pay three or four times as much per board foot because we did not have ships to bring it around to the coastal ports so that you and I could get it at reasonable rates.

We are living in a day and age today where to be sound and sane, according to some people, one must be unreal in his philosophy and unreal in your love for this country and in regard for your fellow worker.

There is not anything any country can give the United States that can give back to a working man who has lost his job the dignity of working for himself and his family or can give them an opportunity to live on an equal basis with anybody who happens to have a job.

That is the ideal my father came to when he was an immigrant from little Italy. He came over with the idea that this was the place which recognized the need for dignity for human beings. He worked—and he worked for 80 cents a day—and he did not cry or complain. It was a lot more than he could make over there, and he had an opportunity to educate his children. That opportunity is now going to be taken from their grandchildren because the Government of the United States cannot pay for all of the education or for all of the needs of human beings who are not working.

I do not care what anybody tells you about figures. To me every able-bodied person who is not working today is unemployed. I do not believe now and I never will believe that the American citizen would rather be on relief than work. I do not believe that argument, because every time I have had an opportunity to find a job for anyone I have never had any trouble finding somebody to fill it. To those critics who moan and groan and say that we have to cut back on welfare I say there is only one way to do it, which is give them an opportunity to work. Give them a job, the job that we are transporting across the oceans without regard to what it means to the welfare and well-being of our American people and to our country itself.

Mr. GAYDOS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAYDOS. We all know in our district and in this House that the gentleman in the well has been fighting against unreasonable imports for the last 15 years or more.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he would explain and clarify the situation regarding specialty steels as it affects his district, my district, and the Nation, particularly since the voluntary quota arrangement with Japan and the European steel producers has expired.

Mr. DENT. When you stand on the floor of the House and say to the House, as I have on about 11 occasions in the last few years, that they have just closed down the Graybar Steel Co.—and this is a plant that has been there for over 300 years—does not cause a ripple. When I tell them that the Latrobe Steel Co. is down 30 percent, that does not cause a ripple. When I tell them the American Pane Glass Co. shut down permanently, it having been the largest in the world, and that its last employment was down from 11,000 a few years ago to about 5,500, it does not make any difference to the House Members and the Secretary of State who negotiated the trade deals that

we are in. It does not make any difference when I come here and cry and plead with the Members to try to do something about the Aluminum Co. of America which is closing down its plant. When I was a little younger man they had 15,000 employees. They will all be thrown out of work. It does not seem to mean anything to anyone any more than it did in the 1920's when we lost the production of coal in our area because of the importation of oil. It does not seem to matter to any of you that today there is not an American who is working and earning \$7,500 a year or more who is not paying 50 cents out of every dollar that he earns into Federal, State, local, and county taxes in the form of hidden taxes as well as public and open taxes. That is the distribution that the gentleman talks about.

You must understand that the mere loss of a job in a steel plant is not the extent of the injury; it is not the extent of the damage that is being done to the economy, because before that steel man can make steel someone has to provide a ton and a half of coal in order to make three-quarters of a ton of coke that goes into that steel mill in order to make the steel. Somebody has to provide the coal for the energy needed to drive the powerplants which make the necessary electricity. Somebody else has to mine the ore and somebody else has to transport it and someone has to be working to unload and then to load and unload it again. Someone has to do these jobs all along the line, making tools and the necessary equipment and machines in order to make a ton of steel. That is where you get this work distribution.

It means that when they shut down plants and mills 100,000 workers are put out onto the street when the distribution is stopped at that particular plant. Maybe some of those who distribute the goods, the truckdrivers and railroad workers, will still work, but they will be distributing foreign steel.

At the same time so many Americans think that there is no damage whatsoever done to the economy of this country in going in and buying a Volkswagen or a Datsun or a Honda or a Yamaha or a Suzuki. They think nothing of it. But every time they do it these young people are cutting down their own chances of having a job. It is cutting down the opportunity for the parents to support them if not old enough to get a job; it is cutting down the opportunity for their future for work. This is proven by the fact that in June of this year we will have 65,000 of all the college graduates in America out of work. Unless the men working in the mills, unless the men working in the mines have jobs in the production field, there are no jobs for the parasites. They will have no opportunity to go into the production work.

I am one of the parasitic group. I do not produce anything any more. However, at one time I worked in the mills, in the actual production field, and thereby I was providing the salaries for government officials and for others in service industries, but the minute the production job dies, all of the other jobs die. If you do not believe me, take a walk with me out into Pennsylvania and Ap-

palachia and you will see whole towns abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, I was born on the banks of the Allegheny River. It was a big town at that time for a coal town. It was a town of 700 families and that is a big town in a coal community. I lived there and worked there and everyone dealt with the two stores located there. We had a squire or a justice of the peace, we had a constable, we had two churches, we had two barbers, we had a shoe repairman to repair our shoes, but what happened? When the coal mines shut down, within 9 months there was not a living soul in that community. It is still there on the banks of the Allegheny. Some of the coal is still there. But, why could not the shoemaker stay? He was earning a living. Why could not the doctor stay? Why did they have to move? Because there was not that same amount of money that came from production.

For every production worker producing a product to sell in the marketplace, three more were earning a living. The production worker took the money and paid a part of it to this person, he paid a part of it to that person, he paid a part of it to this person and they, in turn, paid a part of their wages back to the person that supplies the services they need and thereby we have what made this economy—the free movement within our own States, the free movement within the territory, that made this Nation great, the free movement of people, the free movement of goods, the same price for money, the same banking loans and the same rules of behavior, and minimum wage laws. But, when we go out into the jungle of foreign trade, do we have any kind of law that guarantees that my coworker in Italy or Japan is going to have as much to spend from his wages to buy the production he makes, as I will have to buy the production I make? We do not have any equality in the value of our money. They juggle their money up and down. They do anything they want to do with it. Most of their unions are company operated and in most instances they are nationally operated. They get subsidies to see to it that they can dump their goods on the American market.

I am not saying that only the Nixon administration is at fault, because it goes back to the Johnson administration, to the Kennedy administration, to the Eisenhower administration, to the Truman administration, and all the way back to the most inconceivable conception of 1933 that this had to be a free trade world.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as free trade. We do not have it in the United States. We were great when we had free trade. No man had to pay a bounty to go across the State line from Pennsylvania over into Ohio, but now if you go across a State line up in New Jersey or New York and many other States and take a little bottle of whiskey, you will be stopped and they will confiscate your car.

Oh, no, you will be stopped, and they will confiscate your car. In some States you cannot bring in a carton of cigarettes from another State. If you happen to be traveling in one State you cannot bring cigarettes into Pennsylvania. Also if you buy a car somewhere else because

it is cheaper, if you go into a State like Pennsylvania where they have a 6 percent sales tax, then you cannot run that car in Pennsylvania unless you pay another tax in Pennsylvania, no matter where you buy the car.

This is not true with foreign goods. When foreign products come into this country, no one says they have to pay an equalizing tax on it by the residents of the United States, and that is true of any product that comes into the United States; it comes in without taxation. But we have to pay an equalizing tax when you travel from one State to another.

What we are doing is removing all the barriers against trade with foreign countries, and at the same time we are erecting barriers on trade within the United States.

Oh, I know that it will not be too long until people like myself will not be heard on this floor because I believe we are all becoming mesmerized into the belief that if we get world trade it means peace. Well, within about 2 weeks I will be 64 years of age, and, do you know, I just cannot remember peace during all these years—and my uncle GEORGE MILLER from California just said that I am just a kid—but I just want to say that even in his memory at no period in our entire history of the 200 years, come 1976, at no period of time has there been more war and devastation, unrest and unfriendliness in the world than in the last 40 years. We have never been without war. I have never seen a war that has been settled yet. Every time we end one we work out a solution that starts another.

And trade is nothing but a commercial venture, its whole purpose in being is profit. We have compounded it to the real injury of this economy by creating multinational corporations that are no more interested in the integrity of any land within which they operate, including our own, than the man in the moon. They are interested in only one thing, and that is profit; they are profiteering beyond any amount, beyond any measure in our economy before. I have seen things sold to importers for as low as \$3, and sold to Americans for as high as \$50.

As an example, I visited in my investigation of Export-Import, a shoe plant in Florence, in fact three or four of them, and the highest priced shoe being sold to the United States from the highest priced shoe plant in Italy was \$6.75 to the American importer—and you ask any American woman if she can buy a pair of Italian shoes for that—and I remember the name of the shoe, I just cannot think of it right now, but it is the highest-priced shoe in America, and it sells for \$67.

Do you think that we are being honest and true to the concept and principle that we adhere to, or believe that we adhere to in this country when we allow them to pay their workers over there 63 cents an hour, and the same American workers get \$5.40 or \$4.50 an hour? That is slavery in a certain way. The slaves worked for nothing, they got their food and they got their board, but now we are paying them, but they still have to come to the government and get food

and board, because they are not paid enough. As I say, in the old days we had physical slavery all over the world, but you know what you have now? You have political-economic slavery. And just as Chile, Cuba, and Peru, and just as Brazil and the rest of them, you will see the day when the workers in this country make our luxuries for us and they will not be able to buy these same luxuries themselves. That is the form of slavery that will destroy this economy unless we wake up. Unless the people wake up, it will happen. And the way to wake up is to just go into the stores and not buy foreign-made products.

I went into the biggest store in our area. I wanted to buy a couple of white shirts. I know that today everybody is wearing colored shirts, but I wanted to go back to white again just to see what I would look like. And I went into the store and out of all the shirts—and they must have at least 12 or 14 counters of men's shirts and this is one of the largest chains in this country.

Only one counter had American-made shirts on it. All the rest were from Malaya, and they do not even wear shirts in Malaya. Malaya, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, and pretty soon I guess they will go to the Congo because I understand they only pay 4 cents an hour in the Congo. They do not care where they make a product—they bring it to the market that has the highest buying power. There is not a single worker—now get this straight—there is not a single worker outside of the sophisticated workers in West Germany, France and certain common market countries and Japan—the ordinary worker and tradesman in all those countries does not get paid as much as we pay for the welfare of our families who are on public assistance.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman and I will yield him 30 minutes if he wishes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Will the gentleman be good enough to explain how a shirt manufactured in Rumania, behind the Iron Curtain, passes through Germany or Scandinavia and comes to this country labeled as an American-made product?

Mr. DENT. We are investigating welfare pension systems to try to improve the pension systems in the United States for those Americans who have to depend solely on social security. We were trying to work out a system whereby a collateral program would allow them to live without going on welfare once they were provided with social security and a private pension.

So, of course, we know that Denmark is way ahead of many countries. Sweden is way ahead of many countries. So we decided to go up to the Nordic countries that have had pension systems in existence for a long time.

One evening a Member of Congress, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), was with us on the committee and we went out to have some dinner. There was an American sitting at the next table, and surprising to say—he was drinking and he was talking a little loud. We caught on that he was some kind of

a textile man. So later he came over and he said:

I heard you boys talking—you are Americans. Won't you have a drink?

And we said:

Sure.

Then this man told us that he is operating out of Finland, behind the Red Curtain, and they were making textiles, Finnish products—dresses, shirts, and things like that for men, and women, boys, and girls.

I said to him:

How do you get them into the United States?

He said:

Well, we have a corporation in two or three countries that have trade agreements with the United States. So we ship them to our corporations in those free nations and then they pack them and label them with their country label and send them to the United States.

All these years, if you want to know where they got the money for sputnik and you want to know where they got the money for many of the things—some of it came out of your pockets and my pockets when we go in and buy foreign-made products.

Mr. GAYDOS. Before the gentleman concludes, I wonder if he would give us the benefit of his expert knowledge with respect to the effect foreign imports have on our domestic specialty steel and tool steel industries.

Would the gentleman tell us what we can expect if this insidious encroachment in these areas continues as far as the national defense of this country is concerned.

Mr. DENT. Over 3 years ago we made a so-called voluntary agreement with Japan. At the time special steel in the United States was producing 99 percent of most of the specialty steels and 97 percent of the special steel coming into—I mean being sold in the United States.

After this voluntary agreement was signed, the Japanese changed their product mix from high carbon steel and low carbon steel and ordinary steel, structural steel and so on and went into the special steel business, which is the high cost, high employment steel.

To make a million tons of ordinary steel, it takes 6,000 workers a year. To make a million tons of special steel, it takes 15,000 workers a year.

So now up as high as 72 percent of all the special steel sold in the United States is being imported and so our special steel industry is flat on its back. Unless we in the Congress have the courage to do something about it, the specialty steel industry will not survive another 3 years.

Let me say something to you about what specialty steel is. Everything that you see, everything that you touch, everything processed by man has to have the use of specialty steel to be able to make it or to produce it. Specialty steel is the steel that cuts the molds. It is the steel that makes it possible to build production machinery. Without it you cannot do anything. You would never have gotten off the ground in trying to go to the moon without specialty steel. You would not get from here out the door of the Capitol of the United States without specialty steel having been used.

Everything you see that has been created by modern man, since he first learned how to make steel in its crudest form, has been formed into something useful for the human hand to use through specialty steel.

You cannot survive in peace without specialty steel and without the productivity to meet the demands of peacetime, and in war you have no more hope of surviving than a man in the moon. Germany ran out of pep because her specialty steels were not sufficient to meet the demands for the production of the war machine that had been devastated by the allies. Japan went down the drain for the same reason. If it were not for North Vietnam getting its requirements and needs from Soviet Russia and Red China, they would have been down a long time ago.

The whole basis of human endeavor as we know it in our country and as the world knows it stems from the use of specialty steel.

We, my dear friend from Allegheny County, are in a very dangerous position, and apparently the Congress has lost either its knowledge of the subject, its respect for this Nation's needs, or its regard for the human beings that make up this great country of ours.

I yield whatever time is remaining to the gentleman from Allegheny County.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my good friend for yielding to me at this time. JOHN DENT has been fighting the unfair and unreasonable foreign import problem for the last 15 years. As he carries on the almost single-handed battle, he has never hesitated to appear anywhere inside or outside this country to save American jobs and American industry. If someone were to say to me that I could do half as good a job as he, I would consider it an extreme personal compliment. I hope the gentleman is with us for a long time. Regardless of how young he is, we expect him to be here for the next three or four terms, because we do not have many people here who have the knowledge that he has on this very complicated subject.

I can stand here and tell you about the voluntary trade arrangements, the agreements we have had in effect for the last 3 years and how they have been violated, and I can tell you what we are trying to do and what has not been done by the State Department. Many things can be said but only men like JOHN DENT have the expertise and intimate knowledge of our foreign-trade problems and the ability to present them so clearly.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the expression "as American as apple pie" carried a most significant meaning. Whether applied to man or machine, it was a declaration to the world that that person or product was American and, therefore, something solid, dependable, something to be trusted.

Regrettably, that no longer applies today. At least not in the business world. Products once made in America by Americans and sold under names that were "as American as apple pie" now are made practically anywhere on the face of the earth. However, because their name still is "American" the product is sold in the United States under the label our people have come to respect and trust.

For instance, Ford Motor Co., a firm whose name occupies a special spot in American history, has parts of its cars made in Canada and England but sold here under the Ford name. Plymouth has a model made in England with parts supplied by Germany. It is not sold as an English Plymouth or a German Plymouth. It is sold simply as a Plymouth, a good solid American name. Dodge, another well-known American auto manufacturer, has a model built in Japan by the Mitsubishi Corp.

Please do not get the idea I am singling out the automakers of America as the only practitioners of this type of sales pitch. The list of "American" products made overseas is a long one. It includes, television models—Monroe, for example; typewriters—Royal; movie cameras—Bell & Howell; radios—RCA; washing machines—General Electric; calculators—NCR, Burroughs and Dictaphone. Even baseball, the all-American game, has gone abroad, Spalding Co., a firm synonymous with baseball, has its "mitts" made overseas.

Some people will say you should not criticize a company for going international, for expanding and increasing its sales. After all, they point out, a firm which is beholden to its stockholders has an obligation to return as high a dividend as possible. The cheap labor markets overseas gives them that opportunity.

I do not stand here to criticize the marketing policy of any company. It is not my intention to tell them how to run their business. But I firmly believe that the American consumer is entitled to know whether the product which carries an "American" name is in fact American made.

Of course, it can be said that many companies do stamp their product with the point of manufacture, telling the consumer the article was made here or there. But too often, far too often, that stamp is not prominently displayed. Granted, the fact the stamp is there at all might meet legal requirements but there is a question whether moral ones are met.

Is it really right to expect a potential auto buyer to crawl under the hood of a new car, search his way through the twisted mass of wiring, dig in through all the nuts and bolts just to find out what parts are made where? Must a customer take apart his radio, TV, or washing machine to find out whether the component parts were made in America or somewhere else?

I will insert into the RECORD at the close of my remarks a copy of a news article which deals with the subject of "American" products manufactured abroad. It was researched by a reporter for United Press International in New York and points out that each year American consumers spend billions of dollars for Japanese-made products which carry American names. The writer notes, too, that many people are not aware of this because labels and plates denoting the point of manufacture often are placed in obscure areas of the product.

That same article, which appeared in the February 14 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, attributes the loss of 275,000 jobs to the flight of American companies overseas where labor is a cheap commodity.

That combination of cheap labor, good technology, and a well-known name product is part of the reason that last year 90 percent of the home radios in America were imported, 51 percent of the black and white TV sets came in from other countries, so did 42 percent of our shoes, 96 percent of our motorcycles, and 68 percent of our sweaters.

You can add to that list the more than 18 million tons of our steel. This is the area which particularly concerns me and the more than 50,000 men and women in the Mon-Yough Valley of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, who depend on steel and steel products for a living.

These are the people who are still waiting to see what will come from our State Department's attempt to gain a new, and I certainly hope, a meaningful voluntary restraint arrangement with the major foreign steelmakers. I say "meaningful" arrangement because the 1968 one was disastrous. Less than 2 weeks ago, I stood on the floor of this House and told you I was assured of a preliminary report on the negotiations with a more detailed one to follow when the talks were completed. I did not have that report then; I do not have it now.

What I do have is a report from Stewart S. Cort, chairman of Bethlehem Steel Corp. The report is not a cheerful one. Mr. Cort frankly admits the American steel industry is not snapping back from last year's import deluge. Furthermore, the reason he is quoted as giving for the slow recovery is due to continued heavy imports.

Despite the west coast dock strike, imports of steel last month probably equaled the 1.3 million tons shipped into the country during December of 1971. In addition, Bethlehem Steel, despite a pickup in orders from the automotive and construction industries, does not expect to see much of a business increase until next month, according to Mr. Cort.

Mr. Cort's comments are contained in a news article in the Pittsburgh Press of February 16, and I will include a copy of that article in the RECORD today. In the same issue, in fact on the same page, is another story which I think will interest you. Written by Robert Dietsch, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, it is primarily concerned with our country's \$30 billion deficit in the balance of payments last year. However, it does touch on our lopsided trade balance, which was a factor in the overall deficit. Mr. Dietsch points out that in 1 year this Nation did a complete flip-flop in the import-export area. In 1970, he reports our exports topped our imports by \$2.1 billion. But last year the situation was reversed with imports topping our exports by almost \$3 billion. He adds a rather gloomy footnote, noting that our exports still are not booming and that we cannot soon expect to see a return to the trade surpluses of a decade ago.

Industry Week magazine did nothing to brighten the outlook in a report it carried in its February 14 issue. The "Valentine" it sent to the steel industry was an announcement that General Motors Corp. planned to double its purchase of Japanese steel this year. According to Industry Week, GM will buy 154,322 net tons from Japan in 1972.

The magazine further warned that:

Coming on top of an absence of new quota agreements with European and Japanese steel producers, renewed interest in overseas sources raises the threat of another big year for steel import.

Nineteen seventy-one, you recall, was the year of the big love affair between U.S. manufacturers and foreign steelmakers. The result was a record 18.3 million tons of steel, valued at \$2.6 billion, another record, shipped into the country.

Industry Week, as does Mr. Cort, sees little to cheer about in the immediate future as far as steel is concerned. The magazine says foreign mills are expected to ship us about 8 million tons in the first half of this year. That is not too far behind last year when imports totaled 9.1 million tons in the same 6-month period.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am frightened. The situation grows ever more critical. America, once the greatest exporter in the world, has become the greatest importer in the world. The trade deficit last year, the country's first since 1888, shocked a great many people and, I hope, brought the issue into sharp focus.

It did produce a reaction to "Buy American." I am glad to see that. But, if the present trend continues, that may be all that we produce.

The articles follow:

"MADE IN JAPAN" LABEL WIDESPREAD

NEW YORK.—You may think that the Dodge Colt compact car, Royal's "Apollo" typewriter and Bell & Howell's Super-8 movie camera have little in common.

But they do.

They're all made in Japan.

To the long list of "American" products made overseas can be added many models of television sets, some General Electric washing machines, RCA radios and even Spalding baseball gloves.

Each year Americans spend billions for Japanese products bearing American brand names. Many people aren't even aware of it because labels and plates denoting point of manufacture often are under or on the backs of the machines.

Hitachi makes some models of the RCA radio and G.E. washing machines. Mitsubishi Corp. makes the Colt compact.

NCR, Burroughs and Dictaphone place their names on calculators produced in Japan by Sharp, Sanyo and Nippon, respectively. Most Monroe television sets also are produced abroad.

This flight to cheaper labor markets has cost Americans about 275,000 jobs just in the radio-television and electronics area and the fields of leather footwear, steel, apparel and textiles, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics. Imports in these areas in 1970 contributed nearly \$4 billion to the balance of payments deficit.

It's been estimated that Americans in 1971 imported 90 percent of their home radios, 51 per cent of their black and white television sets, 42 per cent of their shoes, 16 per cent of their new cars, 96 per cent of their motorcycles and 68 per cent of their sweaters.

Besides products made overseas and bearing American brand names, a vast quantity of goods are assembled here from components manufactured abroad.

IBM, the leading maker of computers, has a component manufacturing plant in Taiwan. That island also turns out television components and other electronic parts for Philco-Ford, Admiral and General Instruments Co.

Little by little, the drive toward cheaper labor, a major factor in productivity which ultimately determines profit margins, is chipping away at American industries.

Take the portable typewriter industry, for example. Major producers like Royal, Remington and Underwood, acquired by Olivetti, an Italian company, make their products overseas.

Allen business machines (formerly R. C. Allen), an American manufacturer of office typewriters, was forced out of business entirely.

Smith-Corona portables, made by SCM Corp., are the only portables still produced in this country. SCM manages this through automated manufacturing methods at its production complex in the Cortland, N.Y., area.

Despite the automation, Smith-Corona still hires 3,500 workers at these plants. But you can bet that these workers worry some as they feel the pressures of foreign labor closing in on them.

Corporations also feel that pressure. They're caught between the desire to make more profits through higher productivity and public resentment when they phase out plants * * * foreign labor.

IMPORTS STILL HURTING STEEL

Imports are taking the snap out of steel's comeback, according to Stewart S. Cort, chairman of Bethlehem Steel Corp.

Cort said that shipments, which remain well below expected levels, are "inching up" but the reason they aren't more robust "quite frankly, is due to continued heavy imports."

The steel executive said that despite the dock strike on the West Coast, imports last month probably equalled the 1.3 million tons shipped into the U.S. in December.

Despite a pickup in orders from the automotive and construction industries, he said it would be March before Bethlehem would expect to see much of a hike in business.

He reiterated estimates made in the past that industry shipments in the first quarter will be only 21.5 million tons to 22 million tons and lag behind the 24.4 million tons shipped a year ago.

It is still possible, according to Cort, that total shipments this year will reach the 94-million-ton level he had been forecasting two months ago.

Cort added that this figure, which represents an 8 per cent hike from the 87 million tons shipped in 1971, is based on an expected drop in imports from last year's record 18.3 million to around 16 million tons.

Cort said as part of an intensive cost-cutting program last year, Bethlehem weeded out unprofitable sales and partially, as a result, saw its shipments fall to 12.6 million tons from 13.8 million in 1970 and its share of the market slip to 14.5 per cent from 15.2.

He said Bethlehem is "going to try with every effort" to regain its market share this year, and he forecasts the company's shipments in 1972 at 14 million tons.

He declined to project earnings and laughed at estimates by some analysts that the company will earn \$4 or more a share this year. "I like those figures," he said, adding that "We'll have to work hard to meet that."

Some analysts had increased their projections for Bethlehem from around \$3.50 a share earlier this year when the company astounded the industry by reporting a 54.6 per cent surge in earnings to \$139,239,000 or \$3.14 a share on a 1 per cent gain in sales to \$2.96 billion.

Cort said it's too early to tell if Bethlehem can match last year's first quarter net of \$33,125,000 or 75 cents a share on sales of \$768.4 million.

"We had a chance in a few early months last year—when customers were building inventory as a hedge against a strike that didn't materialize—to turn the motor on and really let things roll at optimum levels." But sluggish demand has kept operations below these levels so far this year.

PAYMENTS DEFICIT RECORD IN 1971

(By Robert Dietsch)

WASHINGTON.—The \$29.6 billion deficit in the U.S. balance of payments last year set a record.

Administration officials and private bankers said today they foresee some improvement, but not much, for 1972.

The Commerce Department reported yesterday that the 1971 payments deficit was \$19.8 billion more than the previous record set only a year earlier.

The figures reflect what economists call the "official reserve transactions balance" meaning that foreign central banks accumulated \$29.6 billion more than they sent to the United States.

By another method of measurement—one which reflects dollars accumulated by both foreign central banks and foreign private sources (individuals, private banks and corporations)—the 1971 balance of payments deficit was \$21.2 billion.

This also was a record by far. The previous record deficit by this accounting was \$3.8 billion set in 1970.

The deterioration of the payments account is reflected in the fact that in 1969 the official reserve payments account had a \$2.7 billion surplus.

Main reason for the massive dollar exodus last year was the loss of faith in the dollar last spring and summer.

Foreigners had piled up so many dollars they became apprehensive about the U.S. government's ability or intent to swap them for gold. They became convinced the dollar was overvalued in relation to other major world currencies.

As a result, not only foreigners but U.S. businessmen and banks doing business overseas sold dollars to buy other currencies, especially the West German mark and the Japanese yen.

It was to stem such dollar hemorrhaging that President Nixon last Aug. 15 ended the policy of swapping dollars for gold and thus, in effect, devalued the dollar.

The official devaluation did not come until shortly before Christmas, when the dollar was cheapened in price in relation to other currencies and many other currencies were raised in price in relation to the dollar.

Another factor in the swelling of the 1971 payments deficit was a deteriorating U.S. trade balance. In 1970, U.S. exports topped imports by about \$2.1 billion; but in 1971, imports topped exports by almost \$3 billion. It was the country's first trade deficit since 1888.

The new alignment of currencies, which gives the dollar an edge in world merchandise and financial transactions, was designed to help the U.S. payments account. But most economists think it will be several years before any sizeable improvement can be made.

U.S. exports still are not booming and the country cannot soon expect the hefty trade surpluses it enjoyed in the early 1960s.

And, despite the new currency alignment, there has been no massive flow of dollars back into the United States.

[From the Daily News, McKeesport, Pa., Feb. 14, 1972]

STEEL IMPORTS SET RECORD IN 1971

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—More foreign steel entered the United States last year than ever before, and U.S. manufacturers are looking to overseas steel mills again this year for price breaks, Industry Week magazine reports.

Steel users last year built up a strike hedge with foreign steel at a cost of \$2.6 billion. This year, customers are looking to the lower cost of imported steel in the face of hikes by U.S. steelmakers, the business weekly said.

General Motors Corp. said it will buy 154,322 net tons of Japanese steel this year—double the amount GM purchased last year, Industry Week said.

"Coming on top of an absence of new quota agreements with European and Japanese steel producers, renewed interest in overseas sources raises the threat of another big year for steel imports," the magazine said.

It noted a record 18.3 million net tons of foreign steel entered the U.S. last year.

Domestic steelmakers forecast imports for the first half of the year will be about 3.5 million net tons the first quarter and 4.5 million net tons the second quarter. Last year, 3.8 million net tons were imported the first period and 5.3 million net tons the second.

The magazine said, however, that "there is some indication . . . that overseas steel producers are eyeing price hikes of their own."

Imports may "hit a snag in the form of a strike of dock workers at the Great Lakes ports April 1," Industry Week said.

"Contracts with the International Longshoremen's Association expire on the Great Lakes March 31, and unless the federal Pay Board approves a 40 per cent increase like that won on the East, West and Gulf coasts, lake port stevedores will probably be asked to strike."

Industry Week estimated 2,378,000 net tons of raw steel were poured in the week ended Feb. 12, compared with 2,345,000 net tons for the week ended Feb. 5.

The price composite on No. 1 heavy melting steelmaking scrap held at \$34.83 per gross ton for the second week the magazine said.

[From Industry Week, Feb. 14, 1972]
MORE STEEL CUSTOMERS GO SHOPPING
OVERSEAS

U.S. manufacturers are again flirting with foreign steelmakers—and this could further hurt the domestic mills they jilted last year.

In 1971, steel users in this country had a record \$2.6 billion affair with overseas suppliers as they built huge strikehedge stockpiles. This year, customers are looking for price breaks in the face of hikes by U.S. steelmakers.

Evidence of current interest in import steel is mounting:

The recent price increase on cold rolled steel sheet and strip apparently hasn't cost U.S. mills any business yet—but it is causing some customers to grumble and check foreign price lists.

Price shading on some other steel product lines is necessary to keep orders in this country, notes a Chicago area mill.

General Motors Corp. says it will buy 154,322 net tons of Japanese steel this year—double the amount it purchased last year.

A Southern pig iron facility has been closed because its customers were able to buy more cheaply overseas.

Import fears.—Coming on top of an absence of new quota agreements with European and Japanese steel producers, renewed interest in overseas sources raises the threat of another big year for steel imports. Last year, more foreign steel than ever before—18.3 million net tons—entered the U.S.

Indeed, domestic steelmakers are forecasting imports for the first two quarters at a relatively high level, although down from record 1971. Foreign mills are expected to ship about 3.5 million net tons of steel to this country in the first quarter and 4.5 million tons in the second. A year ago, they shipped 3.8 million and 5.3 million tons, respectively.

There is, however, some indication that overseas steel producers are eyeing price hikes of their own. Most are reported to be signing contracts of only three months.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Congressman JOHN DENT has long been an advocate of a truer and freer and

better life for Americans, and also his colleague Congressman GAYDOS.

This is my first full term here. I came down here as a theoretical free trader. All I had read and studied advocated the policies of free trade. However, after being here for just 1 short year I have found that America is in desperate straits.

My district, formerly a great steel district in the Mahoning Valley area—the Cumberland and Mahoning Valley area—in the State of Ohio has had small plant after small plant closing their doors for good. The great United States Steel Co. shut down the Ohio works at Youngstown early in July of last year idling about 3,400 workers. They have opened up that plant to 700 people in the last 3 weeks. There are over 2,000 workers still unemployed at that plant. The Highland Co. in my district shut its doors forever a few weeks ago and sold all its equipment. It employed as many as 400 people and at the time of its closing 300 people.

In each and every one of these instances they gave the same reason for closing. United States Steel gave as the reason for shutting down its Ohio works, which made some of the best alloy steels in the world, the fact that they could not compete with cheap foreign imports. The Highland Co., which is one of the oldest companies, going back to Civil War days in the steel valley, shut down because of foreign imports.

Congressman DENT in his very fine speech started off by saying that it seemed to him that the people just do not care. They do not care. He gave instance after instance of that. I am saying to this Congress and to the people of the United States we had better start caring or it will be woe for America.

So, I appeal to you here for assistance in this matter. I cannot do too much on my own, but I want to say that I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and those who want the America of old, and I will do my best to help them.

IMPORTS AND FREE TRADE HURTING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEE). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am only going to take approximately 2 or 3 minutes.

However, I would like to make a point which I think is very important, particularly for my colleagues, if I may have their attention. A great many people, in fact most people throughout the country, for many years have had the misunderstanding of what we mean by fair foreign trade under international law.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between protectionism and liberalism is clear and regardless of the difference, it must be understood that those who advocate reasonable restraints and a fair quota system are not those who are saying we should not be trading with anyone.

It is fundamental, but a lot of people have a misunderstanding and a misconception, particularly those businessmen

who make their living in the import business, because they believe when we talk about a voluntary arrangement to restrict imports, they think we are cutting off their life line. They misinterpret it and they immediately begin accusing us of being antifree trade.

Mr. Speaker, there cannot be any more erroneous conclusion than that. We must understand fair trade as distinguished from free trade.

Under fair international agreements—and I hope they will be binding—a country would be allowed to produce within its capabilities and send that product to this country under reasonable regulations and we, in turn, would manufacture and deliver to the world—in those areas where we can sell our product to those who do not have it without creating a great imbalance between the economic situation as we see it. These are very broad concepts. It is fundamental that if we sell, we would of necessity be expected to buy. However, the point to remember when you do buy is that you must have a fair atmosphere in which to buy, and that a foreign country should not have the opportunity, a legal right based upon international agreements, to come into this country, pick out one particular segment of an industry and flood that area by dumping their products and thereby do irreparable harm to that industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is an insidious type of operation and a designed approach to capture a product market.

The Japanese are past masters at this and pick out certain segments of our industry, doing just what I explained, and then doing *carte blanche* what they want to do. The consumer, of course, does not see the inherent danger in this type of operation. We have many people who are critical of the so-called fair traders when they say we are taking away the opportunity to buy a product at a lower price than an American-made product, particularly in view of inflation and high taxes. They say we are hurting the American consumer. They say you are not allowing them to have a free choice, that they should have a right to a competitive product price. The example is cited many times to the effect that a mother or father is pressured by a child to buy a bicycle or tricycle of a foreign make. Because of the high cost of living and taxes being what they are, that housewife when she walks into that store should have a right to buy that Japanese-made bicycle. She should have the right to spend \$30 for that Japanese bicycle which today is as good and sometimes better than the American bicycle.

She should have the right, because of her economic condition, to have available a \$30 tricycle for purchase, and save the difference between the \$50 cost of the American product and the one she is buying. I say this is right. From my research I do not believe you can convince anyone in this country that one can go to the workmen or to the so-called middle-class income group and expect them to solve our international trade problem by buying American. We would like to see people buy American. But as I see it, and as I analyze it—and I think I am on solid ground—it is impractical; we cannot buy American because of the economic situa-

tion. I think it is illustrative of what occurs with so many different products. You cannot put this obligation upon the backs of the consumers and expect them to buy American because it is, costwise, too impractical. So what is the alternative?

As I see it, as a fair trader, distinguished from a free trader, I would advocate a reasonable amount of bicycles be imported into this country. I say a reasonable amount, yes, so as to keep our manufacturers in a competitive situation so that that American product remains a good American product compared with those imported into this country.

Yes, imports are important. We cannot expect to sell and not to buy. Yes, that housewife, because of her particular economic situation, should have the choice of a cheaper product so as to be able to buy that \$30 tricycle. As I say, this is a general observation considering the entire problem. I do not think that that position could be criticized that it is not a reasonable position; that it is not well thought out. It is good for the American manufacturer and the American consumer. But what bothers me, and what bothers every American and every Member of this House, is the fact that the Japanese and the European Common Market countries are able to pick out a specific product such as, you might say, the Honda motorcycles they are selling in this country. They will dump their product in the first instance on the American market at far below what it costs them to manufacture. And then once they corner that market, and once the American manufacturer folds because he cannot compete, then the sky is the limit. They charge what they want and the product eventually changes in price, quality, and durability.

Once they have captured the market, the quality of that product slowly, but surely, diminishes. Before you know it, the product becomes inferior to the American product and it becomes more expensive.

Just to give you a good example of that situation, we had cameras that were manufactured in Germany, and those German cameras were competitive with the other cameras then being sold. They were available after World War II for a price of \$300 to \$350. The Nikon camera from Japan was a competitive product brought into this country, to compete with the German cameras. Of course, the American camera manufacturers were out of the business a long time ago, so we are not even talking about the American end of it. But the Nikon and other Japanese cameras competed with the German cameras, and undersold the German cameras. The end result was that the German producers were forced to withdraw from the market. And now that same camera costs \$150 over the original price because they captured the market and now there are no other competitors.

That is how this insidious movement goes, day after day, month after month, and year after year.

In fact, the Japanese Government has today in the city of New York 14,000 to 16,000 highly trained representatives. They live in a community in New York, all together. They have one interest in

common, and that is to sell Japanese products.

They knew years back that if they wanted to match the economy of this country and wanted to increase their standard of living to be at least comparable to what the American standard of living is, they would have to outsell and outproduce us. I would do the same thing. If I wanted to help my people and my country as an elected official I would look at the most successful country in the world, which happens to be us—and I would use them as an example and study it and see what they did that was right and how they did it. That is what I would do and that is what they did.

They found out that we sold a lot of things to a lot of people and in a lot of places and they found out that we had the technology and the patents, the copyrights and the research and development.

They knew what to do some 25 years ago with our money—they put together an industrial complex second to none and with our money. They picked up the result of our Government investments like *Acu* color in the TV industry, where this Government had spent millions of dollars. The Japanese representatives being well schooled and skilled in the special school of international diplomacy came into this country and saw what was going on in California and bought the patent rights on which we spent so much of the taxpayers' money. Now they have the only exclusive copyrighted *Acu* color in the world. That is what is selling their color TV sets. That is what they have been doing and will continue to do.

We have antitrust laws in this country that say you must be very careful or you will be violating the law—you cannot get together in concert nor can you put together a cartel.

But the Japanese analyzing our economy and our free enterprise system have done just the opposite. They have allowed and encouraged their companies, their entire steelmaking industries, to work together and have given them special money credit—they have allowed them to sit in one room and fix prices. They have encouraged that.

The Japanese made a decision a long time ago—we are not going to allow to exist nor are we going to permit a drain upon our productive wealth any company that is incapable of producing efficiently. They have methodically and coldly put poorly run industries out of business.

We are going to have to take a second look in this country as to how we run our free enterprise business.

I am a firm advocate of the *laissez faire* doctrine of carrying on business—hands off and private industry will do it. They will do it better, cheaper and more efficiently if you allow them to do it. If we are going to sustain this doctrine and this philosophy, if we want to better it, we have to make some changes to remain competitive with the Japanese.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time. I would hope our colleagues would join us in a special order of business to discuss all the aspects of this

matter and make sure that our discussions are carried back to our districts.

I think the time has come when we must all get together behind the same wheel and push in the same direction.

KEMP FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BILL

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House forceful legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

It states unequivocally that no one has the right to pollute.

With the full realization that our concern for the environment must transcend politics, even in an election year, I am introducing, with some refinements, the Water Pollution Control Act which our Senate colleagues have approved, the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

I also have the greatest respect for the work done by the House Committee on Public Works under the leadership of the very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK). I therefore have used those provisions of the Blatnik bill which I feel contribute most effectively in the fight to control water pollution.

With this in mind, I respectfully bring to the attention of my colleagues and the distinguished members of Mr. BLATNIK's committee, through the introduction of this legislation today, several points which I feel are critical to a strong and effective water pollution control bill.

This bill is the most practical and most available legislation to curb pollution in Lake Erie and all the waters in the United States at the earliest possible date.

It is a tough and challenging proposal which establishes a timetable to achieve an ambitious goal: The total elimination of all effluent discharges into the Nation's waterways by a 1985 deadline.

I believe that this 1985 goal of "zero discharge" is more reasonable than its critics may think. The bill sets zero discharge as a goal, not a legal requirement. And every step toward achieving that goal is clearly circumscribed by cost considerations.

The legislation has two stages. During its first phase ending in 1976, all companies must apply the "best practicable" technology to control water pollution. In its second phase, companies must achieve zero discharge by 1981 unless they can show it cannot be done at "reasonable cost." In that case, they must employ the "best available" technology. The aim: To achieve water clean enough for swimming and fish propagation by 1981 and to eliminate all effluents by 1985. The legislation which I am urging you to approve is widely misunderstood by industrial critics and others, despite the fact it contains effective safeguards to protect economic interests and existing jobs and, at the same time, holds the promise of helping to create additional jobs in a new and expanding antipollution industry.

The language of my bill which I will introduce tomorrow is careful not to

eliminate affluence along with effluents. The phrases "best practicable" and "best available" are defined to consider the ages of the plants, their sizes, their processes, and the cost of controls—thereby ruling out ruinously expensive techniques. Furthermore, the bill requires the Environmental Protection Agency to study the cost and feasibility of zero discharge. If the costs outweigh the benefits, Congress is charged with making a "mid-course correction" by 1976, eliminating zero discharge as a national goal altogether.

While no one knows precisely what zero discharge would eventually cost, there are many signs that the price tag will not be as high as critics fear. Several companies, including Dow Chemical and Hercules, are already operating plants that have achieved zero discharge through recycling. And General Motors plans to convert a Chevrolet assembly plant on the Hudson River to complete recycling of waste water. Since no one has compelled these companies to eliminate pollution, the costs are obviously not prohibitive. Indeed, as Dow has found, it is often cheaper to recycle wastes than to build expensive treatment facilities.

This legislation encourages the recycling of waste water used by industry.

In many cases of industrial use of recycled water, the water does not have to be completely purged of pollutants.

In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency has stated that the technology for closed loop recycling seems within reach of many industries.

My bill as does Senator MUSKIE's makes unlawful the dumping or disposal of any radiological, chemical, or biological warfare agent, or high-level radioactive waste into the oceans or the waters of the contiguous zone—3 to 12 miles—and the territorial seas—0 to 3 miles.

Discharges into the territorial seas or discharges from ocean outfalls are subject to the regulations applicable to discharge into the domestic, navigable waters.

For new, point sources of pollutants, the bill requires the Administrator to set uniform standards of performance. These standards must reflect the maximum reduction of pollutants possible through use of the best available control technology.

Twenty-eight types of industry listed by the bill are to be covered by the performance standards. Each State may develop and submit to the Administrator a procedure for enforcing the performance standards for new, point sources located within the State.

This bill contains a sensible, philosophical shift from the 1965 water pollution control law which currently allows each state to determine how it wants to use its waters, either for industry or recreation.

The 1965 law is difficult to implement. Ecologically, it is difficult to link water quality standards to pollutant discharges. In contrast, the Kemp bill establishes a practical goal for zero discharge instead of an inflexible legal requirement.

My bill provides that firms must achieve zero discharge unless they can

factually show that the goal cannot be reached at reasonable cost.

It shifts the burden of proof from the regulating government to the polluter and thus has the additional benefit of easing enforcement procedures.

I believe that the philosophy and main thrust of the provisions of this bill are of critical importance and should be contained in the final water pollution control legislation which will be passed by this Congress.

I have made several additions to the legislation now under consideration which I believe make a better and stronger bill. For example, I felt that the Senate-passed bill lacked adequate financing in some areas.

The legislation I am introducing today would add approximately \$100 million for a cleanup program for the Great Lakes, based upon a study made by the Environmental Protection Agency. The water of the Great Lakes is the primary physical fact in the lives of the more than 35 million people now living and working in the Great Lakes region in Canada and the United States. A program to clean and restore the Great Lakes must no longer be delayed.

I have included a new section in this legislation which contains the provisions of a bill which I previously introduced to regulate the disposition of wastes by subsurface injection. The subsurface environment must be protected so as to yield the maximum environmental benefits to man. This section will help accomplish this by giving the Environmental Protection Agency exclusive authority for determining, first, those subsurface areas and stratigraphic zones which are suitable for subsurface disposal or storage of wastes; second, those wastes—including sewage—which are suitable for subsurface disposal; and third, criteria for the construction and operation of wells for the disposal or storage of such wastes.

We must act now before our subsurface environment has gone the way of Lake Erie and our other surface waters.

Reimbursement is of critical importance to the States' pure water programs. An additional \$1 billion is included in my legislation to provide adequate financing for conventional reimbursement. The bill also provides reimbursement for sewage treatment plant built without Federal assistance during earlier stages of the Federal program. I feel that the House will eventually agree that Federal participation for retroactive grants should be 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize the need to amend both Senate and House reimbursement sections, I am including at the end of my remarks a letter from Henry L. Diamond, Commissioner of the State of New York, Department of Environmental Conservation, which points out that the amendments which I have proposed are both equitable and necessary.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that industry as a whole, as demonstrated by the achievements of Dow Chemical and Hercules, will come to the conclusion that the philosophy of a reasonable goal should not be thrust aside because the urgings of the inefficient or those too timid to accept change. The material follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION,
Albany, N.Y., February 8, 1972.

To: Members, New York Congressional Delegation.

Subject: Legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its effect on projects pending in New York State.

I appreciated the opportunity to meet last week with Members of the Delegation and their staffs regarding water pollution legislation, particularly as it relates to the 45 projects that had been withdrawn from consideration by the Environmental Protection Agency and the 112 projects which had been scheduled for submission to EPA.

We were pleased that the Delegation was anxious to assure that provisions in any legislation that is enacted will not impede the progress of water pollution control in New York.

Attached is a summary of the six most important provisions in pending legislation, with comments on how we believe these provisions affect the best interests of New York State.

Several Members requested data on prefinancing commitments by the State and municipalities for projects in their Districts. Enclosed is a list of commitments for all the projects involved in New York State.

We appreciate your help greatly.

Sincerely,

HENRY L. DIAMOND,
Commissioner.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM—EFFECT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON PENDING PROJECTS IN NEW YORK STATE

1. FINANCING

a. Attached (Tab. A) is a table showing the details of the following:

I. New York's pending projects (three-year projection) (Total eligible cost through FY '74), \$1,790 million.

As detailed in Tab A, following is a summary of how these projects could be financed under the various proposals being considered by Congress:

II. *Senate bill*, which would provide over a four-year period financing for New York projects costing, \$1,442 million.

III. *House bill*, which would provide over a four-year period financing for New York projects costing, \$3,395 million.

IV. *Administration budget*, which would provide over a four-year period financing for New York projects costing: under Senate formula, \$765 million; under House formula, \$1,315 million.

V. *Administration proposed legislation*, which would provide over a three-year period financing for New York projects costing, \$585 million.

b. *State Matching grants:*

The above financing is based on the maximum Federal share which would be available if the State provided matching grants (i.e., 10% under Senate formula, 15% under House formula, and 25% under Administration's proposed legislation).

As you know, authority for New York's basic grant program expires March 31, 1972. The Legislature is being requested to provide a State matching grant that will result in a municipality receiving the maximum Federal share under any proposed legislation.

If the authority is not approved by the Legislature, the minimum Federal financing (i.e., 60% under Senate and House bills, and 30% under administration proposed legislation) would be available for projects in New York, and municipalities would finance everything over the Federal share.

However, with no State matching grant, the available Federal funds under each formula would finance a far greater number of projects, as indicated by the following:

Senate bill, 60% Federal grant, would finance over a four-year period for New York projects costing, \$1,681 million.

House bill, 60% Federal grant, would finance over a four-year period for New York projects costing, \$4,243 million.

Administration budget of \$2 billion a year, would finance over a four-year period for New York projects costing: under Senate formula (60% grants), \$955 million; under House formula (60% grants), \$1,644 million.

Administration's proposed legislation, 30% Federal grants, would finance over a three-year period for New York projects costing, \$1,072 million.

c. Allocation to States on basis of population (Senate bill), or basis of need (House bill).

As can be concluded from the above, all but the House proposal fall short of meeting the needs in New York State.

Financing under the House bill is far superior, since funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of need (under which New York would receive approximately 13% of the funds under present criteria of need.)

If the needs criteria are not changed, and if the eligibility criteria for construction grants are not changed, funds would be available under the House bill to finance not only the \$1,790 million worth of projects now in the pipeline or in the pre-application stage, but would enable the State to plan with confidence for its program beyond Fiscal Year 1974.

A new survey of needs of the States is expected to be issued shortly, and New York's relative position may drop somewhat, perhaps to 10% or 11% of the total national need. The figures listed above under the House bill would therefore be commensurately reduced. Nevertheless, the House needs formula is in the best interests of New York State.

d. *Financing if eligibility criteria for construction grants are changed significantly.*

Authorizations for funding of construction would be a purely academic exercise if the eligibility criteria were changed significantly, since no grant could be approved until the new criteria are met. This is explained in detail under item 3 of this document, which recommends a two-year transition period for the States and municipalities, to enable them to continue their current pollution abatement efforts, and at the same time to prepare to meet the new criteria.

e. *Recommendations:* That the Delegation support—

- (1) The authorizations in the House bill;
- (2) Allocations to the States on the basis of need.

2. ADVANCE FUNDING OF PROJECTS;
PREFINANCING AUTHORITY

a. *Advance funding of Projects:* Under both the Senate and House bills, the States would be permitted to "borrow" against future allocations, but only up to the amount for which they would be eligible over a four-year period. (Note: The House language is somewhat unclear on this point.)

Comment: New York State strongly supports the advance funding provision, to enable the State to move forward quickly with most of the 157 projects now in the pipeline. The New York Delegation should recognize, however, that this authority is limited, and is not comparable to prefinancing/reimbursement authority in the 1966 Act, which did not limit the amount of prefinancing the State and its municipalities could undertake.

b. *Prefinancing/reimbursement authority for future projects:* There is no provision in either the House or Senate bill to prefinance projects in the future.

Comment: New York does not support a continuation of this authority, unless there is an iron-clad guarantee that any funds prefinanced in the future would be reimbursed by the Federal Government. If all the funds authorized in the House bill are made available to the States, there would be no need for any State to prefinance a portion of the Federal share of the cost of projects.

c. *Recommendations:* That the Delegation—

- (1) Support advance funding of projects
- (2) Oppose continuation of prefinancing authority unless such authority is supported by an iron-clad guarantee of reimbursement.

3. NEW CRITERIA AND CONDITIONS

a. *New Criteria:* The estimates under 1. above are based on criteria promulgated under the 1966 Act. Since costs increase with each higher degree of treatment, and since additional facilities would become eligible for grant assistance, the funds authorized would commensurately reduce the number of projects that could be financed. The problem of costs incurred through new or additional criteria are more thoroughly discussed under item 5 of this document.

b. *New Conditions for Grant Awards*

The Senate bill gives six conditions under which grants for treatment works would be approved by the Administrator (See Tab B for details of key conditions)

Comment: An analysis indicates it is unlikely that any State will be able to meet all these conditions for at least two years, if the conditions are as stringently applied as others have been in the recent past. No project could be approved until these conditions are met.

The additional conditions will require revisions of applications and plans for projects that New York now has ready to be submitted to the EPA. These revisions will involve a time period of several months for small projects, and several years (at least two or three) for large projects.

The House bill would, with one major exception (noted in Tab B attached) permit New York's program to continue without interruption.

c. *Recommendation.* In order to continue the momentum of the current pollution abatement program, and to provide sufficient time to meet the new conditions, it is recommended that any new additional conditions be applicable two years after enactment (instead of January 1, 1973, as provided in the House bill.)

See page 4 of Tab B for suggested language.

4. REIMBURSEMENTS

The total eligible reimbursables for New York State was estimated to be \$1.3 billion as of December 31, 1971. The final figures on New York's eligibility will not be known until the end of 1972, when all bids are expected to be in, and construction contracts are awarded. (See Tab C for details).

a. *Senate bill.*

(1) \$2 billion is authorized for—
(a) "Conventional reimbursements" (such as undertaken by New York and about 25 other States between FY '67 and FY '71).

Comment: The Senate report stated that the reimbursable balance as of July 1, 1971 totaled \$1.63 billion, of which the New York share was approximately half.

However, the national total had grown to \$1.85 billion by September 30, 1971, and is expected to increase to a minimum of \$2.5 billion by the end of 1972.

(b) *Retroactive grants* to raise Federal share to 50% for those States which were eligible for only 30-33% Federal grants.

The EPA Administrator, in a recent report giving a State-by-State breakdown, estimated that \$456 million will be required for retroactive grants. The New York figure is \$4.1 million.

Comment: If the \$2 billion authorization is retained in final legislation, the available funds appropriated by Congress will be allocated on the basis of the ratio of eligibility.

(2) \$400 million is authorized to bring the Federal share to 30% for projects approved prior to FY '67.

Comment: This authorization is particularly significant for projects in cities, which were limited to \$250,000 per project during the period 1956-1961, and \$600,000 through 1966.

Several projects in New York State may be eligible for these additional funds.

b. House bill.

(1) \$2 billion authorized for "conventional" reimbursements. Retroactive grants (from 30% to 50%) are not included in the House bill.

(2) \$750 million is authorized for projects approved prior to FY '67 (same provision as Senate bill, but with higher authorization).

c. Recommendation. That retroactive grants be included in the House bill, and the authorization for "conventional" and retroactive grants be increased to \$3 billion.

5. NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES AND ENGINEERS STUDY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COST OF MEETING NEW CRITERIA

a. The Senate bill would require:

For industries: "best practicable control technology" by January 1, 1976 and "complete elimination" of discharges by January 1, 1981, except that in the latter case, if compliance is unattainable at a reasonable cost, "best available technology," taking into account the cost, would be required.

For municipalities: the bill would require:

First: "secondary treatment" by January 1, 1976;

Second: "best practicable waste treatment technology" by January 1, 1981, including wastewater reclamation and land disposal of discharges; and,

Third: to the extent practicable, complete elimination of discharges "at a later date" (Under the "Declaration of Policy" the bill establishes a policy that discharges into the navigable waters be eliminated by 1985.)

If the discharge requirements to be achieved by 1981 are insufficient to protect the quality of any stream or other receiving water for any water use including propagation of shellfish, fish and wildlife and swimming, more stringent controls can be required unless a discharger proves that the economic and social benefits (including the water improvement) are not sufficient to justify the economic and social costs.

b. The House bill would establish essentially the same effluent limitations as in the Senate bill for achievement by 1976, but adds a provision for extensions for periods not to exceed two years if completion of construction is proven to be physically or legally unachievable by that time.

In the House bill, however, the provision for more stringent effluent limitations related to receiving water quality standards would be based on the principle of best use designation under the existing law, but would require such standards to be extended to cover all navigable waters.

The effluent limitation goals for 1981 and 1985 for complete elimination of discharges or best available treatment technology in the House bill would not be implemented unless specifically authorized by Congress after evaluation of a comprehensive study of the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits to be submitted within two years by the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering.

Comment: The House bill requirements are much more practical and capable of achievement than those of the Senate bill in the face of economic, technological and environmental constraints (including the Federal Government limitations on funding Federal shares of municipal project costs as discussed under Item 1, "Financing," above) during the period up to 1976. Achievement of present pollution abatement goals and the new national objective of effluent limitations based on best practicable control technology for industries and secondary treatment for municipalities, if not already equalled or exceeded due to the requirements of existing or new receiving water quality standards, should not be inhibited by the simultaneous confusion over achieving goals set for 1981 and 1985, the

costs and benefits of which have not been carefully evaluated.

Recommendation: New York's present water quality standards and policies require that its waters be suitable for *recreational purposes* for people and protection of fish, shellfish and wildlife, with exceptions such as New York Harbor, East River, the Lower Buffalo River and the Lower Genesee River, where the cost of achieving water quality suitable for swimming and suitable for the propagation of aquatic life would be far in excess of the uses—i.e., shipping, etc.—for which those waters are used or would be in the foreseeable future.

If New York's current program is permitted to continue, present standards will largely be met by 1976. The costs of meeting present standards are extremely high, but there is no question regarding the State's commitment in this regard.

New York supports the goal of even higher standards, and the upgrading of its standards is a continuing process, a step at a time. For example, phosphate removal in the Great Lakes Watersheds is not required under the State's Federally approved standards, but is required by New York State policy, and is being achieved.

New York has attempted to estimate the cost of the "great leap forward" to "no discharge" by 1981 for industry and 1985 for municipalities, and the policy of restoration of all waters to their *natural* chemical, physical and biological integrity, declared by the Senate bill. The State's estimates are based on the considerable experience it has had in dealing with the problem of costs when standards are upgraded even slightly.

New York strongly supports a study of social and economic costs of achieving "no discharge" of pollutants. The study should be conducted by a group that has unquestioned expertise. The provision in the House bill for such a study, to be completed in two years by the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering, and the requirement for subsequent statutory action by Congress before any "ratcheting up" of effluent limitations for 1981 and beyond, clearly is an approach which would prevent confusion and possible expenditures of billions of dollars, the benefits from which now can only be guessed, if indeed any at all would be realized.

6. PERMITS

a. Senate bill.

The Senate bill provides for a new National Permit System, covering both municipal and industrial discharges to navigable water. It does not provide specifically for discontinuation of the 1899 Refuse Act Permit Program (which covers only industrial discharges).

The Administrator of EPA would be authorized to approve any State permit program which complies with specific requirements in the bill as well as additional guidelines to be developed by the EPA. However, the Administrator would have the authority to review and veto each and every permit issued by a State after his approval of the State program. He also would be authorized to withdraw approval of a State program and resume Federal EPA issuance of permits in a State.

No provision for appeal (to a quasijudicial or administrative board, for example) by a State or a discharger to an action of the EPA with regard to approval of a State permit program or an individual permit is included in the bill, other than to the courts.

EPA would be authorized to enforce directly the effluent limitations and other requirements of either a State or EPA issued permit.

b. House bill.

The House bill provisions on the new National Permit System are similar to the

Senate bill, with the following improvements:

(1) Issuance of permits under the 1899 Refuse Act Program would be terminated upon enactment of the bill, and all future permits would be issued under the new National Permit System.

(2) The EPA Administrator would be authorized to approve a State program for issuance of permits under the National System in the interim between enactment of the bill and promulgation of the National System guidelines.

(3) The EPA review and veto of permits issued by a State under the National System would be restricted to those discharges from sources in a State which affect another State.

c. Comments: The House bill is much superior to the Senate bill, in that it would much more quickly and efficiently terminate the pollution abatement confusion caused by the present red tape and overlapping and duplication of the 1899 Federal Refuse Act Permit Program (FRAPP) with permit programs in many States.

The FRAPP, started in December 1970, will result in expenditures of \$5.7 million in FY '72 by EPA alone (the Army Corps of Engineers also is deeply involved), and is budgeted in FY '73 for an increase to \$9.7 million, as compared to the annual Federal assistance of \$10 million for all aspects of the 50 State water pollution control programs.

During this period FRAPP has abated no pollution, and has issued about 20 permits from tons of paperwork involved in over 20,000 applications.

d. Recommendations: The House bill provisions should be supported as a considerable improvement over the Senate bill.

However, the following provisions should be added to maintain the continuity of present State permit programs until any new EPA guidelines can be promulgated and full compliance achieved therewith:

(1) A State-operated permit program, which was in effect prior to the effective date of the Act, shall remain in effect and constitute the National Permit System in a State, under the following conditions:

That the EPA Administrator approve a State program

That a State notifies EPA that it intends to participate in a permit program under the National System

That the permit program of a State appears to comply substantially with Federal guidelines for approval on the effective date of the Act, or will comply with the guidelines in the near future.

(2) State permits shall be effective upon issuance. The Federal Government shall have direct authority to veto or override the State permit for discharges other than those affecting other States only during the first year after enactment, or until full compliance with promulgated guidelines is achieved.

(3) To provide an opportunity to appeal any discretionary actions by the Administrator authorized in the legislation, particularly Sections 101, 106, 304 and 402 (Permits).

Section 509 should be appropriately revised, in order to include establishment of a quasijudicial hearing board. Suggested language is proposed in *Tab D*.

PROJECTS PLANNED, NEW YORK STATE

	Total eligible cost
45 projects, withdrawn Jan. 20 from EPA.....	\$546,000,000
112 projects, originally scheduled for submission to EPA prior to Mar. 31, 1972.....	937,000,000
Total, projects in pipeline.....	1,483,000,000
55 projects—preapplication stage.....	307,000,000
Total program that could go forward by June 30, 1974.....	\$1,790,000,000

¹ For construction starts in fiscal years 1973 and 1974 these costs will require adjustments (higher).

II. SENATE BILL, S. 2770 (\$14,000,000,000 OVER 4 YEARS)

[Allocation to New York: 8.08 percent—based on population; Federal matching: 70 percent maximum (if State matches with 10 percent grant) local share would be 20 percent]

Fiscal year	Authori- zation (billions)	New York State share (8.08 percent) (millions)	Will finance project costing total of (millions)
1972	\$2		
Less ¹	.20		
Subtotal	1.80	\$137.4	
Less 5 percent ²	.10	\$53.6	
Balance	1.70	83.8	\$120
1973	3		
Less ¹	.20		
Subtotal	2.80		
Less 5 percent	.15		
Total	2.65	214.1	306
1974	4		
Less 5 percent	.20		
Total	\$3.80	\$307.0	\$439
1975	5	404.0	577
Grand total	13.15	1,008.9	1,442
10 percent State matching required			145

¹ \$200,000,000 set aside for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for Washington, D.C. treatment plant.

² 5 percent of authorization earmarked for planning agencies for waste management.

³ Already allotted.

III. HOUSE BILL (\$20,000,000,000 OVER 4 YEARS)

[Allocation to New York: 13 percent—based on current criteria need (in accordance with "cost of clean water" S. Doc. 92-23) Federal matching: 75-percent maximum (if State matches with 15-percent grant) local share would be 10 percent]

Fiscal year	Authori- zation (billions)	New York State share of 13 percent (millions)	Will finance projects costing total of (millions)
1972	\$2	\$260	\$275.2
Less		\$53.6	
Balance		206.4	
1973	5	650.0	867.0
1974	6	780.0	1,040.0
1975	7	910.0	1,213.0
Total	20	2,546.4	3,395.2
15 percent State matching required			509.0

¹ Already allocated.

IV. ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED BUDGET (\$2,000,000,000 A YEAR)

Allocations to New York Under Senate and House Formulas

A. Under Senate formula—[Allocation to New York: 8.08 percent based on population; Federal matching: 70-percent maximum (if State matches with 10-percent grant), local share would be 20 percent]

Fiscal year	Admini- stration budget (billions)	New York State share (8.08 percent) (millions)	Will finance project costing total of (millions)
1972	\$1.7	\$83.8	\$120
1973	1.7	137.4	196
1974	1.9	153.5	219
1975	2.0	161.6	230
Total	7.3	536.3	765
10 percent State matching required			77

B. Under House bill formula—Allocation to New York: 13 percent on basis of need; Federal matching: 75-percent maximum (if State matches with 15-percent grant, local share would be 10 percent)

Fiscal year	Admini- stration budget (billions)	New York State share (millions)	Will finance project costing total of (millions)
1972	\$2	\$260.0	
Less		\$53.6	
Total		206.4	\$275

Fiscal year	Authori- zation (billions)	New York State share (8.08 percent) (millions)	Will finance project costing total of (millions)
1973 to 1975	\$6	\$780.0	1,040
Total	8	986.4	1,315
15-percent State matching required			197

¹ \$200,000,000 set aside for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for Washington, D.C. treatment plant.

² Balance available. (See table II above.)

³ Already allocated.

V. ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED LEGISLATION

[\$2,000,000,000 a year, for 3 years equals \$6,000,000,000; Federal matching: 55-percent maximum; State matching required 25 percent; Allocation: Basis of need¹ and for reimbursements; Reallocation: To areas of special need]

Fiscal year and total appropriation	To New York allocation for new projects ¹	Allocation to New York for reimburse- ments	Total alloca- tions to New York
1972, \$2 billion	\$125,099,000	\$280,861,000	\$405,960,000
Less	\$53,600,000		
Balance	71,499,000		
1973, \$2 billion	125,099,000	280,861,000	405,960,000
1974, \$2 billion	125,099,000	280,861,000	405,960,000
Total, \$6 billion ²	375,300,000	842,600,000	1,217,880,000
Less	\$53,600,000		
Balance	\$321,700,000		

¹ Basis of need:

Each year to be allocated on basis of population	\$900,000,000
Each year to be allocated to States with matching grants	400,000,000

Available each year for new projects	1,300,000,000
Each year to be allocated for reimbursements	500,000,000

² Already allocated.

³ \$200,000,000 each year for Administrator's discretionary fund for areas of special need.

⁴ In addition, all funds available for reallocation would be used in areas of special need.

Comment: The \$321.7 million available to New York for new projects (See 2nd column) would finance \$585 million worth of projects over 3 years, if the State provides 25% grants (total \$146 million).

This amount would barely cover the cost of the 45 projects recently withdrawn from EPA.

If the State does not provide 25% matching grants, the Federal share will drop to 30%, in which case, the \$321.7 million available would finance \$1,072 million worth of projects over a 3-year period.

It should be noted that any allocation for reimbursement (see Column 3 on previous page) would not be available to provide the Federal share for any new project.

TAB B: NEW CRITERIA AND CONDITIONS

Six new conditions in the Senate bill must be met before grants can be awarded. Some present real problems, although others can probably be met. Those that probably cannot be met by most states within the time frames allowed are described below:

1. Title I (Sec. 106(h)) of the Senate bill lists requirements to be met before State program grants can be approved (a State program must be approved before a construction grant can be awarded.) Two of the most complex and time consuming are:

Establishment of procedure for review of the location of new and modified sources of pollution to which national standards of treatment performance (including discharge prohibition) would apply (the timetable is two years)

Establishment and operation of monitoring devices, methods, systems and procedures (including biological) as well as procedures to analyze data on quality of water, including classification according to eutrophic conditions (the timetable for which is one year).

Comment: Based on considerable experience under which similar requirements have been administered in the past by Federal

agencies, and the fact that the Administrator's required actions would be subject to citizens suits under the bill, conformance with the provisions of this section would effectively preclude approval of any construction grant application in fiscal year 1973, and possibly not within the life of the bill.

House bill: Contains no similar provision.

2. Title II, Section 204(a)(3)(A) of the Senate bill provides that the State water pollution control agency must certify a treatment works as having priority over other works in the State, "and have or will qualify for a permit under Section 402 of the Act."

The House bill changes this provision to "and have qualified for a permit in accordance with section 402 of this Act."

Comment: Issuance of a permit entails compliance with the applicable requirements of:

Sec. 209 (Waste Treatment Management), which may not be available until four years after enactment.

Sec. 301, effluent limitations, to be developed by EPA

Sec. 302, certification that there will result non-interference with attainment of January 1, 1981 effluent limitations

Sec. 306, national standards of performance for all new and modified sources.

Sec. 307, non-existent toxic and pretreatment effluent standards, to be developed by EPA.

Sec. 308, inspection and monitoring of all sources.

Sec. 403, guidelines for ocean discharge criteria, to be developed by EPA.

The Administrator of EPA would be constrained to implement strict interpretations of the above provisions, since non-discretionary actions by him would be subject to citizens suits under the bill.

Under these conditions the EPA could not approve a construction grant until all the above criteria are met. Although there are timetables for development of criteria and guidelines, until they are developed, no State can give assurance that its program or a project could comply, thereby qualifying the project for a construction grant.

3. Title II, Industrial participation in municipal treatment plants.

Section 204(b)(1) of the Senate bill requires that before approval of any treatment works, the Administrator shall determine that: (A) there has been adopted a system of charges for each category of user to assure that it will pay its appropriate share of the costs of operation and maintenance (including replacement); (B) there will be full recovery from industrial users of that portion of the estimated reasonable capital cost of construction allocable to the treatment of industrial waste which is the Federal share of the cost of construction; and (C) capability for adequate construction, operation and maintenance (including replacement) of the treatment works.

In the House bill, this provision would be effective January 1, 1973.

Section 204(b)(2) of both bills directs the Administrator, within 180 days of enactment, to issue guidelines on payment of waste treatment costs by industrial and non-industrial users.

Section 204(b)(3) of the Senate bill provides that revenues derived from recovery of capital costs from industrial users apportionable to the Federal share of eligible project costs shall be transmitted to the Administrator for deposit by him in the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The House bill provides that such revenues would go to the municipality for operation and maintenance and future expansion or replacement of facilities.

Comment: Present Program: Industry is charged on the basis of quantity and strength of discharge into a municipal system, and industry pays its proportionate share of the municipality's share of the cost of construc-

tion, plus a proportionate share of the operation and maintenance costs. Such charges are covered by service contracts which bind an industry to the payments over the life of the facility (usually 20 years), even though the industry may close down operations within that period.

These fees (except for operation and maintenance) are retained by the municipality and are utilized for retirement of bonds sold to finance the municipal share.

Senate Bill: Industry would be liable for its proportionate share of the Federal and municipal share of the capital cost (in other words, if there is no State grant, industry would be liable for its share of the entire cost of the project; if there were a State 10% grant, industry would be liable for its share of 90% of the cost of the project).

Industry's proportionate share of the Federal cost of the project would be returned to the Treasury, and its proportionate share of the municipality's share would be returned to the municipality, as at present.

House Bill: Same as Senate, except that payment of industries portion of the Federal share would be paid to the municipality.

Problems:

1. Repayment of the Federal share by industry would remove all incentive for industry to participate in a municipal system in those cases where it has a choice to go it alone, and negates the regional concept of wastewater treatment. Under the circumstances, in most cases it would be not only less expensive for industry to build and operate its own plant (less capital intensive and under the complete control of this industry), but by so doing, it is eligible for both State and Federal tax advantages as well.

2. This requirement will result in the scrapping of already completed plans and specifications for a large number of projects (including most of the 157 projects) which are ready to go in New York, where industrial-municipal agreements have been made under the present rules. The results will be especially burdensome on municipalities; i.e.:

There is no provision in the pending legislation for recovery of costs of preparing non-usable plans.

Precious time is lost in the preparation of new plans.

Where industrial flows are removed from a municipal plant, the latter is usually much oversized and beyond the capabilities of the municipality to finance, construct and maintain.

3. Payment of industry's proportionate share of the Federal and municipal shares would result in payment to municipalities higher than its share of the project.

For example, if industry is responsible for 50% of the effluent into a municipal plant costing \$2 million,

Under the House bill:

Half of 75% of the cost (the Federal share) is \$750,000.

Half of the 10% of the cost (municipal share) is \$100,000.

Presumably, the municipality would use a portion of these funds to retire its 10% of the cost (\$200,000) and the balance would go into a "sinking fund" which would perhaps be reserved for payment of a new treatment system 20 or 30 years later.

The problem is that "sinking funds" are not generally permitted under New York State law. Experience has taught us that hard-pressed municipalities tend to use such reserve funds for more immediate and urgent problems, such as schools, hospitals, roads, etc.

4. The most immediate problem, however, is that:

in the Senate bill, these provisions would be effective immediately upon enactment.

in the House bill, the user charge provision (see 3, above) would not be effective until January 1, 1973, but this date needs to be pushed farther into the future.

To accomplish this, the following wording

should be incorporated into whichever Federal legislation is enacted, in order to utilize the effort expended on projects already designed according to current standards and to bridge the gap during which new criteria, standards and procedures are available for processing of applications for Federal grants under the policies of S. 2770 and H.R. 11896:

"Effective on the date of enactment of this Act and extending through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, all applications for Federal financial assistance shall conform to the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961—(Public Law 87-88), the Water Quality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-234), the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966—(Public Law 89-753), and the Water Improvement Act of 1970—(Public Law 91-224).

"For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974 and thereafter, all applications for Federal financial assistance shall conform fully with all the requirements of this Act."

TAB C: REIMBURSEMENTS DUE NEW YORK STATE—FOR PROJECTS APPROVED FROM FISCAL YEAR 1967 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1971 ALLOCATIONS

Projects approved (352)—eligibility for reimbursement

State	\$611,564,201
Local (New York City share: \$349 million)	678,566,789
Total	1,290,130,990

This figure is predicated on estimates based on firm experience on bidding in New York State. Many projects, particularly the larger ones, have a dozen or more contracts that are let out for bids. Hopefully, all bids will be in, and construction contracts awarded, by the end of 1972. Until then, no final figure on New York's eligibility for reimbursement will be available.

How bids, which are higher than estimates, affect reimbursements

First Stage: At the time a project is approved by the Federal government, financing must be committed to pay the entire estimated eligible cost, on a shared basis between the Federal, State and local governments.

When a Federal grant award is made, this grant amount is deducted from the limited allocation New York receives from the Federal government. Federal grants have averaged 10% over the past five years. However, since New York projects are eligible for 55% Federal financing, the State and the municipality must agree to prefinance the balance of the Federal share.

Meanwhile, in addition to prefinancing, the State agrees to provide a basic 30% State grant toward the project, and the municipality agrees to pay its 15% share of the cost.

Second Stage: A more precise estimate of the actual cost of a project is available after all the bids are in and construction contracts are let.

At that time, if there is an increase in the original estimated cost, and the increases are accepted by all three levels of Government, financial commitments are adjusted upward so that the entire new estimated eligible cost is accounted for on a shared basis.

At this point, a choice must be made with regard to financing commitments for the Federal share of the increase:

(1) Increase the Federal grant amount by using current Federal allocations, thus reducing the availability of Federal funds from New York's limited allocation (which would otherwise be used to finance new projects); or

(2) Leave the Federal grant amount as originally agreed, but increase the State and municipal prefinancing of the Federal share of the cost.

Because of the inadequacy of Federal fund-

ing, the only real option available to New York has been the second route.

EXAMPLE OF INCREASED PREFINANCING COMMITMENTS

	Estimated eligible cost (original)		Revised eligible cost (based on bids)	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Federal grant.....	\$150,000	10	\$150,000	7 1/2
State prefinancing....	300,000	20	450,000	22 1/2
Local prefinancing....	375,000	25	500,000	25
Federal share.....	825,000	55	1,100,000	55
Basic State grant....	450,000	30	600,000	30
Local share.....	225,000	15	300,000	15
Total.....	1,500,000	100	2,000,000	100

TAB D: SECTION 509—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

(Sections (a), (b) and (c) to be revised to accommodate new additional language, as follows.)

Establishment of a Quasijudicial Hearing Board

"(d) Any person, including a state or any of its agencies and subdivisions, feeling aggrieved by action of the Administrator in the

(1) Issuance or denial of a waste disposal permit or

(2) Termination or modification of a waste disposal permit,

(3) All matters arising from actions of the Administrator pertaining to such other matters as approval or denial of a State permit program, and those arising in connection with Sections 101, 106, 304, [and possibly 508]

may obtain review thereof before a quasijudicial environmental protection hearings board established under subsection (g) of this section, by filing a notice of appeal within 45 days of the action taken by the administrator, setting forth the basis for its request, and the relief sought. The burden of persuasion shall be on the requestor and the board shall affirm the administrator unless it finds that the administrator's action was, on the basis of all the evidence before it:

(1) Beyond his authority; or

(2) Inconsistent with the water quality protection policies of this act; or

(3) Constituted a clear mistake in the interpretation of the law or evaluation of the facts.

(e) Any state [or person] feeling aggrieved by an action by the administrator may obtain a review thereof before the environmental hearings board by filing a notice of appeal within 60 days. The board shall affirm the administrator if it determines that there is clear and convincing evidence, taking into account the entire record before it, to support the position of the administrator.

(f) Review of a final decision of an environmental protection hearings board shall be available to any person, including the United States or a state or any of their agencies or subdivisions, in a United States Court of Appeals following the same procedures and time requirements for review proceedings as are applicable to review of final decisions by the Federal Power Commission on applications for licenses to undertake hydroelectric projects.

(g) An environmental protection hearings board of three members sitting as a quasijudicial body federal agency, is established. No member shall be otherwise employed by the federal or state governments and no more than two shall be members of the same political party. The members shall serve for six year terms except for two of the first appointments who shall serve four and two year terms respectively. The chairman shall be designated by the President. Any decision of the board must be agreed to by two members to be final. The administrator shall provide the board with such office space and equipment and administrative, financial, secretarial and clerical assistance as the board may require.

The members of the board shall be compensated for services and for travel, lodging and subsistence in the same amounts as commissioners of the Federal Power Commission.

The threefold objectives of my bill are to restore and maintain the natural chemical, biological, and physical integrity of the Nation's waters; to establish pollution control in the Great Lakes; and to provide adequate reimbursement to the States for the construction of treatment works. This bill estab-

lishes a timetable to achieve an ambitious goal.

I realize that some industry groups have weighed in with dire predictions. But a careful evaluation of the language and intent of my bill will point out that this gloomy outlook is unwarranted. But we must all face the fact that much remains to be done at the Federal level even though the States and localities have, in many areas, attacked the pollution prob-

lem with vigor. Therefore Federal guidelines for these procedures are needed.

The Federal Government owes the State of New York about \$1.3 billion—\$611,564,000 to the State and \$678,566,000 to the localities for projects that have been prefunded. With adequate Federal legislation the State will continue its aggressive program under Henry L. Diamond, commissioner of environmental conservation. I now include those projects at this point.

REIMBURSABLES OWED NEW YORK STATE AND ITS MUNICIPALITIES FOR PREFINANCING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AS OF DEC. 31, 1971

Project C-36					Prefinancing		
Cong. Dist.	Project No.	Applicant	Eligible project cost	State	Local		
CENTRAL SECTION							
33	228	Endicott (V), Broome	\$1,693,867	\$109,085			
33	223	Johnson City (V), Broome	2,280,469				
33	226	Kirkwood S.D. No. 1, Broome	10,675				
33	242	Vestal (T) S.D. No. 1, Broome	62,432				
33	295	Vestal (T), Broome	118,043		\$13,317		
34	271	Auburn (C), Cayuga	274,154				
34	263	Port Byron (V), Cayuga	349,643				
34	285	Weedsport (V), Cayuga	600,694				
35	113	Norwich (C), Chenango	3,820				
31	181	Watertown (C), Jefferson	1,790,140				
35	254	Canastota (V), Madison	1,015,280				
35	259	Chittenango (V), Madison	477,937				
35	360	Hamilton (V), Madison	553,824		61,133		
32	303	Camden (V), Oneida	58,585		6,894		
35	308	Onondaga (County) DPW, Manlius S.D., Onondaga	87,625		2,504		
35	296	Onondaga (County) Jail, Onondaga	95,300		21,817		
35	251	Salina (T), Onondaga	467,600				
31	125	Central Square (V), Oswego	280,526				
31	132	Fulton (C), Oswego	1,432,201	\$154,660			
31	283	Canton (V), St. Lawrence	77,500				
31	196	Ogdensburg (C), St. Lawrence	23,767				
33	239	Owego (V), Tioga (C)	605,127				
33	278	Dryden (V), Tompkins	744,405				
33	224	Ithaca (C), Tompkins	13,867	\$138			
33	267	do	302,537				
EASTERN SECTION							
29	298	Altamont (V), Albany	162,500				
28	258	Hudson (C), Columbia	1,033,870				
30	180	Port Henry (V), Essex	69,398				
28	108	Canajoharie (V), Montgomery	58,490	\$140			
28	338	Cooperstown (V), Otsego	941,698				
29	203	Niskayuna (T), Schenectady	885,718				
29	291	Schenectady (C), Schenectady	133,000		14,799		
28	195	Sharon Springs (V), Schoharie	6,189				
30	194	Lake George (V), Warren	62,855				
30	284	Lake George (T), Warren	590,300				
SOUTHEASTERN SECTION							
4	318	Cedarhurst (V), Nassau	907,932				
3	236	Glen Cove (C), Nassau	47,748	\$4,632			
4	250	Lawrence (V), Nassau	1,650,516				
3	190	North Hempstead (T), Nassau	86,812	\$310			
7	109	Jamaica, New York City	148,936	\$42,641			
26	229	Hillcrest Center, Westchester	211,172				
27	265	Cornwall (T), Orange	153,208				
27	203	Montgomery (V), Orange	5,695				
25	176	Orangetown (T), Rockland	27,307	\$251			
25	275	do	242,200				
28	232	Ellenville (V), Ulster	145,427				
26	67	Port Chester (V), Westchester	77,879	\$9,057			
WESTERN SECTION							
38	182	Cuba (V), Allegany	42,221				
38	215	Jamestown (C), Chautauqua	44,407				
38	193	Erie County S.D. No. 2, Erie	3,802				
39	238	Erie County S.D. No. 3, Erie	1,894,569				
37	370	Erie County, Erie County Home and Penitentiary, Erie	322,232		39,411		
40	324	Tonawanda (T), Erie	1,284,489		141,105		
37	199	Batavia (C), Genesee	367,989				
34	260	Lima (V), Livingston	401,991				
36	281	Brighton (T), Monroe	750,328				
37	240	Brockport (V), Monroe	882,321				
36	147	East Rochester (V), Monroe	8,023	\$38			
37	315	Gates-Chili-Ogden S.D., Monroe	638,059		77,359		
36	202	Henrietta (T) S.D. No. 1, Monroe	16,185				
36	231	do	491,839				
37	246	Hilton (V), Monroe	235,021				
36	264	Irondequoit (T), Monroe	623,400				
36	288	do	233,686				
36	233	Penfield S.D. No. 3, Monroe	197,644	\$691			
36	287	Penfield (T), Monroe	86,377				
36	270	Perinton (T), Monroe	229,627				
36	243	Pittsford (T), Monroe	185,200				
36	192	Rochester (C), Monroe	42,018				
WESTERN SECTION—Continued							
36	249	Webster (V), Monroe	\$701,619				
40	350	Youngstown (V), Niagara	42,964		\$4,568		
34	157	Phelps (V), Ontario	19,769				
34	273	Victor (V), Ontario	582,065				
37	217	Medina (V), Orleans	77,333				
36	252	Newark (V), Wayne	152,260				
34	145	Penn Yan (V), Yates	18,623	\$49			
CENTRAL SECTION							
33	544	Binghamton (C), Broome	9,906,100		1,837,245		
33	306	Dickinson (T) S.D. No. 3, Broome	112,000		13,740		
33	533	Port Dickinson (V), Broome	443,815		49,368		
33	304	Union (T), Broome	1,506,000		157,700		
33	528	Vestal (T) S.D. No. 4, Broome	829,000		108,780		
34	535	Aurora (V), Cayuga	1,210,700		194,655		
34	601	Fleming (T), Cayuga	388,000		79,680		
34	349	Moravia (V) (EFC), Cayuga	914,505		137,998		
34	477	Env Facilities Corp., Port Byron (V), Cayuga	223,400		33,750		
34	647	Sennett (T), Cayuga	97,000		12,100		
35	277	Bainbridge (V), Chenango	660,700		64,815		
35	300	Greene (V), Chenango	667,900		42,541		
35	549	Sherburne (V) (EFC), Chenango	1,178,494		230,471		
32	572	Dolgeville (V), Herkimer	1,376,900		268,925		
32	461	Herkimer (V), Herkimer	1,741,800		219,900		
32	479	Little Falls (C), Herkimer	5,340,850		1,122,278		
31	556	Brownville (V), Jefferson	818,615		180,098		
31	478	Cape Vincent (V), Jefferson	422,200		37,540		
31	547	Evans Mills (V), Jefferson	238,000		45,460		
31	465	Philadelphia (V), Jefferson	270,600		29,540		
31	292	Watertown (C), Jefferson	1,338,552		29,460		
32	301	Castorland (V) (EFC), Lewis	210,900		42,180		
32	491	Env Facilities Corp., Martinsburg (T), Glenfield S.D., Lewis	153,400		22,380		
32	606	Lowville (V), Lewis	441,200		35,540		
32	302	Kirkland (T), Oneida	293,000		35,860		
32	371	Oneida County S.D., Oneida	28,060,200	783,810	7,015,050		
32	470	Waterville (V), Oneida	880,880		107,694		
34	319	Camillus (V), Onondaga	64,700		6,334		
35	452	Manlius (T), Fremont S.D., Onondaga	253,928		12,660		
35	467	Marcellus (V), Onondaga	381,000		46,620		
35	633	Minoa (V), Onondaga	661,500		165,375		
35	450	Onondaga (County), Cicero S.D., Onondaga	1,725,556		211,016		
34	234	Onondaga (County), Camillus (T), Onondaga	684,925	\$40,168	\$20,548		
34	482	Onondaga (County), Geddes (T), Onondaga	1,492,663		196,695		
35	358	Onondaga (County), Ley Creek Modification to STP, Onondaga	3,361,400		384,429		
35	313	Onondaga (County), Morgan Road, Onondaga	3,187,829		389,937		
35	266	Onondaga (County), Tully (V), Onondaga	3,873,000	\$32,146	\$154,954		
35	454	Central Square (V), Oswego	938,000		98,200		
35	474	Fulton (C), Oswego	129,547		16,820		
35	462	Fulton (C), Oswego	1,163,294		164,121		
35	386	Oswego (C), Oswego	6,100,000		890,600		
35	336	Env Facilities Corp., Pulaski (V), Oswego	1,074,500		183,395		
31	369	Canton (V), St. Lawrence	2,635,600		293,120		
31	520	Colton (T), St. Lawrence	363,416		36,056		
31	486	DeKalb (T), St. Lawrence	198,200		33,440		
31	316	Edwards (V), St. Lawrence	181,000		16,100		
31	444	Fine (Y), St. Lawrence	103,400		10,940		
31	468	Heuvelton (V), St. Lawrence	629,000		56,000		
31	464	Norwood (V), St. Lawrence	892,500		99,200		
31	320	Potsdam (V), St. Lawrence	3,110,500		488,650		
31	501	Stockholm (T), St. Lawrence	190,624		21,231		
31	435	Waddington (V), St. Lawrence	397,250		79,445		
33	552	Owego (T), Tioga	3,570,000		574,000		
33	412	Dryden (T), Varna S.D., Tompkins	152,600		18,670		
EASTERN SECTION							
29	562	Altamont (V), Albany	40,623		4,374		
29	387	Coeymans (T), Albany	1,738,700		245,315		
29	317	Colonie (T), Albany	1,093,700		133,315		

Footnotes at end of table.

REIMBURSABLES OWED NEW YORK STATE AND ITS MUNICIPALITIES FOR PREFINANCING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AS OF
DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Cong. Dist.	Project No. C-36-	Applicant	Eligible project cost	Prefinancing	
				State	Local
EASTERN SECTION					
29	377	Colonie (T), Dry River area, Albany.....	\$556,000		\$121,500
29	571	Colonie (V), Albany.....	560,400		140,100
29	591	Colonie (T), Newtonville, S.D., Albany.....	770,000		101,000
29	523	Guiderland (T), Albany.....	588,574		109,185
29	524	Menands (V), Albany.....	215,835		43,167
31	353	Keesville (V), Clinton.....	1,231,500		169,002
31	521	Plattsburgh (C), Clinton.....	11,570,515		2,374,324
28	256	Sidney (V), Delaware.....	1,950,000		419,400
30	522	Env Facilities Corp., Westport (V), Essex.....	525,053		60,297
32	471	Gloversville (C), Johnstown (C), Fulton.....	8,780,900		1,244,180
28	503	Athens (V), Greene.....	926,280		114,650
28	514	Catskill (V), Greene.....	2,934,600		414,020
32	473	Indian Lake (T), Hamilton.....	379,000		77,780
29	516	Env Facilities Corp., Amsterdam (C), Montgomery.....	11,466,600	\$671,280	2,866,650
28	607	Oneonta (C), Otsego.....	4,945,600	989,120	989,120
30	255	Hoosick Falls (V), Rensselaer.....	1,592,200		201,090
30	569	Saratoga County, Homestead Infirmary at Providence, Saratoga.....			
29	441	Niskayuna (T), Schenectady.....	112,600		18,440
29	625	Niskayuna (T) S.D. No. 6 Ext., Schenectady.....	979,000		244,750
28	580	Schoharie (V), Schoharie.....	135,000		590
28	543	Richmondville (V), Schoharie.....	341,102		59,946
30	466	Granville (V), Washington.....	253,000		35,660
			916,000		138,000
SOUTHEASTERN SECTION					
27	619	Beacon (C), Dutchess.....	5,693,765		1,224,520
27	378	Poughkeepsie (T), Arlington S.D., Dutchess.....	3,871,400		473,510
27	511	Poughkeepsie (T), Ireland Estates Dutchess.....	79,844		9,785
28	519	Millbrook (V), Dutchess.....	353,400		59,730
28	469	LaGrange (T), Titusville, S.D., Dutchess.....	179,010		21,335
27	340	Wappinger (T), Dutchess.....	159,800		34,180
3	341	Great Neck (V), Nassau.....	433,503		64,897
3	289	Great Neck S.D., Nassau.....	1,174,759		57,200
5	305	Long Beach (C), Nassau.....	260,000		48,877,076
5	361	Nassau County S.D., No. 3, Nassau.....	151,416,000	13,122,630	70,815
3	351	Port Washington S.D., Nassau.....	637,030		17,113
3	342	Roslyn (V), Nassau.....	131,200		17,113
14	86	Newtown Creek, New York City.....	64,488,733	119,249,888	10,102
15	357	Owls Head, New York City.....	106,900		370,710
16	346	Port Richmond, New York City.....	3,030,492		119,287
21	406	Bowery Bay, New York City.....	975,340		132,527
23	214	Wards Island, New York City.....	1,405,147		665,583
18	363	do.....	1,083,775		132,527
11	345	Coney Island, New York City.....	4,559,005		665,583
8	166	Tallmans Island, New York City.....	237,636	158,274	21,569
7	321	Jamaica, New York City.....	718,951		143,419
27	368	Cornwall (T), Orange.....	1,135,923		20,956
27	475	County of Orange, Orange Farm, Orange.....	171,665		95,960
27	352	Goshen (V), Orange.....	691,000		43,960
27	508	Maybrook (V), Orange.....	348,000		7,287
27	480	Middletown (C), Orange.....	66,300		1,090,793
27	53	Newburgh (C), Orange.....	8,013,170		289,060
27	364	New Windsor (T), Orange.....	2,348,202		178,540
27	456	New Windsor (T) S.D. No. 9, Orange.....	1,110,126		41,965
27	362	Walden (V), Orange.....	323,900		305,014
27	507	Walkkill (T), Orange.....	1,287,118		634,362
27	492	Joint Regional Sewerage Board, Haverstraw (T) and West Haverstraw (V), Rockland.....	4,344,663		145,950
25	290	Orangetown (T), Rockland.....	3,533,600		357,900
25	712	do.....	663,400		28,538,800
25	9	Piermont (V), Rockland.....	357,900		1,720,100
25,27	274	Rockland County, S.D., No. 1, Rockland.....	28,538,800		195,000
25	268	Stony Point (T), Rockland.....	1,720,100		55,800
2	343	Huntington (T), Huntington, S.D., Suffolk.....	195,000		225,000
2	237	Northport (V), Suffolk.....	55,800		321,735
1	536	Riverhead S.D., Suffolk.....	225,000		344,650
28	253	Liberty (V), Sullivan.....	321,735		1,781,439
28	322	Rockland (T), Livingston Manor S.D., Sullivan.....	344,650		1,390,810
28	365	Fallsburgh (T), South Fallsburgh S.D., Sullivan.....	1,781,439		146,514
28	498	New Paltz (V), Ulster.....	1,390,810		185,811
25	247	Buchanan (V), Westchester.....	146,514		900,752
25	88	Peekskill (C), Westchester.....	185,811		573,500
WESTERN SECTION					
38	420	Alfred (V), Allegany.....	900,752		189,253
38	311	Belmont (V), Allegany.....	573,500		91,130
38	356	Caneadea (T), Allegany.....	869,200		
WESTERN SECTION—Continued					
38	354	Friendship (V), Allegany.....	\$533,310		\$11,215
38	279	Salamanca (C), Cattaraugus.....	2,814,100		421,648
38	245	Silver Creek (V), Chautauqua.....	1,408,385		42,252
33	325	Chemung County S.D. No. 1, Chemung.....	1,748,700		213,915
33	632	Chemung County S.D. No. 1, Ext. D., Chemung.....	193,310		42,630
33	297	Elmira (C), Chemung.....	433,600		51,159
39	197	Cheektowaga (T), Erie.....	158,304		
39	385	Erie County, Erie County S.D. No. 3, Erie.....	229,130		30,411
41	257	Lackawanna (C), Erie.....	1,440,600		15,567
37	407	Elba (V), Genesee.....	448,237		56,630
34	314	Avon (V), Livingston.....	1,313,420		160,661
34	561	Genesee (V), Livingston.....	1,026,040		225,742
36	327	Brighton (T) S.D. No. 2, Monroe.....	4,905,000		618,975
36,37	414	Gates-Chili-Ogden S.D., Monroe.....	2,772,600		338,890
37	329	Greece (T), Monroe.....	227,800		38,372
37	310	do.....	277,701		35,285
36	422	Henrietta (T), Monroe.....	\$368,400		\$31,500
36	476	do.....	1,698,780		299,649
36	425	Honeoye Falls (V), Monroe.....	1,195,000		150,000
36	424	Irondequoit (T), Monroe.....	127,000		10,512
36	261	Pittsford (V), Monroe.....	144,500		21,560
36	489	Pittsford (T), Monroe.....	143,000		136,264
37	293	Scottsville (V), Monroe.....	1,079,389		77,545
37	383	Spencerport (V), Monroe.....	634,300		861,288
36	299	Webster (T), Monroe.....	4,019,200		62,620
36	419	Webster (V), Monroe.....	496,000		2,117,170
40	359	Lockport (C) (EFC), Niagara.....	8,468,860	\$1,967,314	42,830
40	487	Lockport (T) S.D. No. 3, Niagara.....	255,100		128,110
40	382	Middleport (V), Niagara.....	1,046,400		177,100
34	272	Farmington (T), Ontario.....	813,500		6,213,500
34	560	Geneva (C), Ontario.....	6,213,500	1,298,110	1,553,375
34	330	Ontario County, Ontario.....	171,334		14,877
37	539	Holley (V), Orleans.....	1,316,300		289,585
34	372	Seneca Falls (V), Seneca.....	2,700,720		330,366
34	416	Waterloo (V), Seneca.....	1,109,300		140,055
38	530	Env Facilities Corp., Addison (V), Steuben.....	1,004,200		220,930
38	421	Bath (V), Steuben.....	2,208,500		344,272
38	579	Canisteo (V), Steuben.....	1,093,700		240,615
38	331	Corning (C), Steuben.....	1,759,000		145,360
38	373	Erwin (T), Steuben.....	1,188,000		22,970
38	280	Hornell (C), Steuben.....	2,991,200		220,918
38	576	North Hornell (V), Steuben.....	290,000		184,741
36	415	Clyde (V), Wayne.....	1,552,400		149,753
36	422	Lyons (V), Wayne.....	1,082,475		184,741
36	484	Macedon (V), Wayne.....	1,185,695		149,753
36	367	Newark (V), Wayne.....	1,550,000		189,600
36	380	Sodus (V) (EFC), Wayne.....	811,915		130,533
36	490	Env Facilities Corp., Wolcott (V), Wayne.....	672,353		84,935
37	417	Perry (V), Wyoming.....	1,568,598		392,150
34	312	Dundee (V), Yates.....	486,680		110,502
34	332	Jerusalem (T), Keuka Park S.D., Yates.....	558,270		68,320
CENTRAL SECTION					
33	693	Dickinson (T) S.D., No. 5, Broome.....	199,800		41,330
33	545	Endicott (V), Broome.....	3,807,900	238,170	951,975
34	483	Auburn (C), Cayuga.....	7,326,600	2,146,170	1,831,650
32	602	Thruway Authority, Schuyler Service Area, Herkimer.....			
31	502	Env Facilities Corp., Carthage (V), West Carthage (V), Jefferson.....	5,680,000	954,000	1,420,000
32	515	Boonville (V) (EFC) Oneida.....	1,016,856		203,388
35	447	Onondaga (County), Meadowbrook-Limestone S.D., Onondaga.....	9,025,000		2,088,790
33	605	Cayuga Heights (V), Tompkins.....	2,910,000	133,770	727,500
EASTERN SECTION					
29,30	388	Albany County S.D., Albany.....	72,000,000	14,100,000	8,000,000
29,30	570	Albany (C), Albany.....	6,133,369	832,710	791,592
31	697	Plattsburgh (T), Route 3 S.D., Clinton.....	396,000		99,000
31	442	Lake Placid (V), Essex.....	2,547,575		574,016
29	590	Bethlehem (T), Albany.....	8,549,660	2,953,738	2,137,415
31	443	Saranac Lake (V), Franklin-Essex.....	2,190,000		510,150
32	620	Speculator (V), Hamilton.....	870,000		192,260
29	598	Thruway Authority, Pattersonville Service Area, Montgomery.....			
29	599	Thruway Authority, Mohawk Service Area, Montgomery.....			
30	555	Department of Correction, Great Meadows Correctional Institution, Washington.....			

Footnotes at end of table.

REIMBURSABLES OWED NEW YORK STATE AND ITS MUNICIPALITIES FOR PREFINANCING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AS OF
DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Cong. Dist.	Project No. C-36--	Applicant	Eligible project cost	Prefinancing		Cong. Dist.	Project No. C-36--	Applicant	Eligible project cost	Prefinancing	
				State	Local					State	Local
SOUTHEASTERN SECTION						CENTRAL SECTION--Continued					
2, 3, 4, 5	28	493	Tivoli (V), Dutchess.....	\$239,000		32	449	Env Facilities Corp., Vernon (V), Oneida.....	\$1 300,000	\$44,260	\$325,000
	3	432	Glen Cove (C), Nassau.....	1,035,000	\$136,680	35	448	Onondaga (County), Lake-shore S.D., Onondaga.....	18,700,000	5,520,130	
	628	Nassau County S.D. No. 3, Phase II, Nassau.....	93,945,000	27,722,970	789,000	31	584	Potsdam (T) S.D. No. 1, St. Lawrence.....	192,000	13,140	38,400
3	130	Oyster Bay (T), S.D. No. 1, Nassau.....	136,000			EASTERN SECTION					
20	178	North River, New York City.....	770,285,000	224,061,600	192,571,170	29	604	Cohoes (C), Albany.....	4,741,000	538,560	1,185,250
16	593	Port Richmond, New York City.....	189,140,000	38,866,150	47,285,000	31	630	Plattsburgh (T), Cumberland Corners S.D., Clinton.....	381,000	17,480	95,250
21	398	Bowery Bay, New York City.....	86,502,000	24,818,050	22,625,500	28	366	Stamford (V) (EFC), Delaware.....	2,108,000	202,080	421,600
18	395	Wards Island, New York City.....	68,000,000	19,266,720	17,000,000	28	614	Env Facilities Corp., Delhi (V), Delaware.....	1,650,000		270,884
11	405	26th Ward, New York City.....	47,805,000	13,927,760	11,951,250	28	612	Coxsackie (V), Greene.....	1,997,000	105,720	499,250
7	400	Jamaica, New York City.....	37,322,000	3,420,650	9,330,500	29	721	Fonda (V), Fultonville (V), Montgomery.....	2,560,000	116,910	640,000
22	397	Hunts Point, New York City.....	65,936,000	18,785,226	16,484,000	28	589	St. Johnsville (V), Montgomery.....	2,180,000		545,000
11	347	Spring Creek, New York City.....	18,590,978	734,000	4,647,745	29	613	Hagaman (V), Montgomery.....	410,000	28,030	102,500
27	294	Washingtonville (V), Orange.....	733,000		161,260	28	463	Richfield Springs (V), Otsego.....	648,000	51,540	129,600
27	282	Carmel (T), Putnam.....	1,068,000			30	594	Corinth (V), Saratoga.....	772,000		154,400
27	244	Env Facilities Corp., Cold Spring (V), Putnam.....	1,879,000		404,220	29	645	Schenectady (C), Schenectady.....	22,000,000	5,362,894	5,500,000
2	577	Northport (V), Suffolk.....	820,000		180,400	30	686	Lake George (V), Warren.....	58,000	2,620	14,500
1	355	Suffolk County, Suffolk County Community College Suffolk.....				SOUTHEASTERN SECTION					
28	608	Ulster (T), Ulster.....	2,177,000		478,940	3	629	Graat Neck S.D., Nassau.....	6,500,000	440,000	1,625,000
24	568	Westchester (County), Yonkers, (C), Westchester.....	58,000,000	9,154,600	14,500,000	3	609	North Hemstead (T), Belgrave S.D., Nassau.....	730,500	85,860	182,625
26	634	Yorktown (T) Yorktown Heights, S.D., Westchester.....	3,000,000		750,000	4	559	West Long Beach S.D., Nassau.....	110,000		21,500
WESTERN SECTION						7	403	Rockaway, New York City.....	56,910,000	16,654,150	14,227,500
38	409	Olean (C) (EFC), Cattaraugus.....	6,350,000	1,813,440	1,587,500	8	404	Tallmans Island, New York City.....	43,863,000	12,798,210	10,965,750
38	379	Dunkirk (C), Chautauque.....	15,100,000	3,844,220	3,775,000	27	600	Env Facilities Corp., Florida (V), Orange.....	1,000,000	74,150	250,000
38	410	Jamestown (C), Chautauque.....	333,300	16,570	83,325	27	668	Warwick (V), Orange.....	972,380	61,704	243,095
38	583	Springville (V), Erie.....	631,800		138,996	27	527	Suffern (V), Rockland.....	325,000	15,000	81,250
34	623	Conesus Lake County, S.D., Livingston.....	5,575,200	836,280	1,393,800	2	669	Huntington (T), Centerport S.D., Suffolk.....	6,460	150,000	37,500
34	426	Mount Morris (V), Livingston.....		1,298,650	285,703	1, 2	624	Suffolk (County), Southwest S.D., Suffolk.....	280,000,000	74,000,000	56,000,000
37	626	Churchville (V), Monroe.....	1,189,500	30,750	297,375	27	563	Monticello (V), Sullivan.....	250,000		50,000
36, 37	581	Gates-Chili-Ogden, S.D., Monroe.....	1,338,400		208,650	28	497	Kingston (C), Ulster.....	2,900,000	53,750	725,000
36	500	Irondequoit Bay PWD, Monroe.....	120,338,040	30,722,962	30,084,510	25	671	Westchester (County), Tarrytown Ext., Westchester.....	5,000,000	1,462,020	1,250,000
37	496	Northwest Quadrant PWD No. 1, Monroe.....	40,193,000	4,362,800	10,048,250	WESTERN SECTION					
36	375	Rochester (C), Monroe.....	79,040,000	18,792,500	19,760,000	38	610	Ellicottville (V), Cattaraugus.....	795,700	28,970	198,925
37	603	Thruway Authority, Scottsville Service Area, Monroe.....				38	635	Randolph (V), Cattaraugus.....	793,000		158,600
34	459	Env. Facilities Corp., Clifton Springs (V), Ontario.....	1,069,000		235,180	39	616	Buffalo Sewer Authority, Buffalo (C), Erie.....	99,775,000	4,605,000	24,943,750
34	617	Holcomb (V), Ontario.....	606,000		133,320	37	622	Batavia (T) S.D. No. 1, Genesee.....	256,100		
36	582	Palmyra (V), Wayne.....	696,000		173,470	37	627	Corfu (V), Genesee.....	701,740	65,592	175,435
37	537	Arcade (V), Wyoming.....	1,092,000	90,330	273,000	37	578	Gates-Chili-Ogden S.D., Monroe.....	26,637,000	7,871,480	6,659,250
CENTRAL SECTION						34	538	Montour Falls (V), Schuyler.....	287,925		57,585
31	701	Norfolk (T) S.D. No. 1, St. Lawrence County.....	585,000	40,530	117,000	30	437	Env Facilities Corp., Schroon (T), Schroon Lake S.D., No. 1 Ext., Essex.....	1,239,570	45,411	247,914
35	551	Homer (V), Cortland.....	1,680,000	27,300	420,000	Total.....					
31	653	Alexandria Bay (V) (EFC), Jefferson.....	2,200,000	69,960	550,000				2,997,983,282	611,564,201	678,566,789
31	513	Dexter (V), Jefferson.....	196,000	12,300	49,000						
31	595	Orleans (T), Thousand Island Park S.D., Jefferson.....	830,000	47,310	207,500						
32	636	Camden (V), Oneida.....	1,420,000		355,000						

¹ Projects prefinanced not eligible for reimbursement. Not included in totals.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT (H.R. 12931)

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule XXIII section 6 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I am inserting a copy of the three amendments which I plan to offer to title II of the Rural Development Act, H.R. 12931, which is scheduled for consideration on Wednesday, February 23, 1971:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12931, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY Mr. BLACKBURN

Page 18, insert immediately after line 6 the following:

(h) Section 12 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (1) This Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661). Construction and operation measures for the benefit of fish and wildlife resources, including measures for the mitigation and compensation of project related losses to such resources, will be incorporated into works of improvement authorized under this Act if joint approval of such measures is given by the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the State fish and game agencies.

"(2) In the case of financial or technical assistance or construction by the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary shall transfer to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, out of appropriations or other funds made available for investigations, engineering, or construction, such funds as may be necessary to conduct all or part of

the investigations required to carry out the purposes of section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act [16 U.S.C. 662(e)]."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12931, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY Mr. BLACKBURN

Page 18, insert immediately after line 6 the following:

(h) Adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 13. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not grant any funds for engineering or construction of any stream channelization measure under any program administered by him under this Act unless construction of such channelization began prior to the effective date of this section or unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency publish in the Federal Register their determination that such channelization would be in the public interest.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12931, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. BLACKBURN

Page 13, strike out line 3 and all that follows thereafter down through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The definition of the term "works of improvement" in section 2 is amended by—

(1) striking out "or" at the end of clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;
(2) inserting a comma at the end of clause (2);

(3) inserting after clause (2) the following new clauses:

"(3) the conservation and proper utilization of land, or

"(4) the conservation and preservation of natural areas"; and

(4) adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The cost-benefit ratio of works of improvement described in clause (4) of this definition may be computed in the same manner as is done with respect to drainage projects for municipal water supply."

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM:
CONGRESSIONAL VISITATION,
FEBRUARY 18-24, 1972

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in addresses and statements in and out of the Congress, I have warned of the impending giveaway of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal in the current treaty negotiations and on February 9, 1972, I made a press release inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

Although most of the large newspapers in the mass media of the United States have failed to deal with the Isthmian Canal situation objectively, there are some that have, among them the Miami Herald.

A recent special newsstory from Panama in that paper states that snags are now stalling the negotiations with positions between the Panamanian and United States negotiators hardening, with the former demanding complete sovereignty and the latter falling far short of meeting this demand. This indicates that the efforts of congressional leaders opposing any surrender at Panama have had an impact.

The newsstory states that our negotiators have agreed to cede part of the Canal Zone to Panama, control of business activities of the canal and Canal Zone Government activities such as police and courts.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has not authorized the surrender of any territory or property of the United States in the Canal Zone. The Constitution vests this power in the Congress, which is the ultimate authority in the determination of these matters.

The Subcommittee on the Panama Canal under its able chairman, Mr. MURPHY of New York, on February 18 went to the Canal Zone for its annual visitation, February 18 through February 24, during which it will have an opportunity to obtain facts from residents who know the situation in realistic depth. Meanwhile, I can report that concern over the Panama Canal situation has become widespread in the United States despite the failure of the mass media. The people of the Nation and the Con-

gress will await the report of the subcommittee findings with great interest.

The indicated newsstory follows as part of my remarks:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 2, 1972]

SNAGS STALL NEGOTIATING ON CANAL

PANAMA.—From the Panamanian point of view, negotiations with the United States for a new treaty governing the U.S.-controlled Panama Canal are not going as well as had been hoped, say reliable sources here.

Since the current round of negotiations began in mid-1971, Panama has repeatedly demanded complete sovereignty over the U.S.-administered Canal Zone but sources here indicate that U.S. concessions so far have fallen short of meeting the demand.

At the same time, the United States reportedly has hardened its position.

Even Panamanian officials hold out little hope of reducing the U.S. military presence in the Canal Zone, believing that the best they can expect is a limitation on the size and number of U.S. bases and their activities.

According to sources here, concessions so far agreed to by the United States include:

Return of a portion of the present 10-mile wide Canal Zone that slices the country in half to immediate Panamanian jurisdiction, with the return of the remaining areas subject to a joint commission to be created.

Concessions to Panamanians to operate the commissaries, shoe stores, furniture stores, etc. presently operated by the Panama Canal Co. for its civilian employees.

Control of Canal Zone courts by Panama and police force with a proviso that certain offenses will not come under Panamanian jurisdiction for interim periods varying from two to seven years.

Control by Panama of the postal system in the present Canal Zone area.

In view of strident and repeated public demands by Panama's military dictatorship headed by Gen. Omar Torrijos it seems at least questionable whether such a treaty would be acceptable even though it fulfills many of Panama's aspirations.

If an impasse does develop, observers do not discount the possibility that the Torrijos government might attempt to apply pressures through a march on the zone.

Apart from a recent statement by treaty negotiator Fernando Manfredo that the negotiations are continuing, there has been no official comment here on the talks.

According to these reports, Manfredo and another member of the negotiating team, Panamanian Ambassador to Washington Jose de la Ossa, are to be replaced by Diogenes de la Rosa and Juan Antonio Tack, the present Panamanian foreign minister who has voiced some of the most strident Panamanian demands.

MORE WASTE ON F-111

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office recently released a report that details the Air Force's acquisition of spare parts for the F-111 program.

The report reveals that the Air Force procured most of the spare parts for the F-111 from the prime contractors instead of purchasing them from the subcontractors. The result, according to the GAO, has been a markup or giveaway of \$56 million. In other words, the Air Force chose to line the pockets of General Dynamics with an extra \$56 million rather than purchase the spare parts from the appropriate subcontractor.

This latest GAO report is just one more sign that the Air Force has been guilty of the grossest mismanagement of the entire F-111 program. The original per copy cost of the F-111 was \$3.4 million but the cost has now escalated to \$15 million. Despite a dramatic reduction in the number of planes purchased, the program is costing 1 billion more than forecast.

In addition to purchasing spares through the prime contractor the Air Force bought many spare parts too soon. The price tag for the early purchase was \$116 million. Of the \$116 million, \$9.6 million has already been declared excess by the Air Force and in all probability will be scrapped during 1973.

Rather than adjust the rate of purchasing spares because of changes in the program, the Air Force continued to buy spares as if the program was proceeding on schedule. Hence, the Air Force clearly ignored the fact that the program was delayed and wasted millions of dollars on unneeded spares.

The Air Force's program management of the F-111 has been a disgrace. The Pentagon has apparently learned little, if anything, about improving the management of major weapon systems programs.

As waste continues, the American people may be forced to choose between unilateral disarmament or bankrupting the National Treasury in the name of national defense. That choice is unacceptable—the waste must stop now.

U.S. SUPPORT OF POLICY TOWARD
TAIWAN

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, for the United States to even consider the possibility of turning the island of Taiwan over to the so-called People's Democratic Republic on mainland China, would be such a breach of our commitments that the very thought is repulsive.

In the first place, Taiwan is not a part of, and has never been a part of, the People's Democratic Republic or any other Communist government. Historically, Taiwan was for many centuries a completely undeveloped area with only rudimentary local government. About three centuries ago, the Chinese Empire incorporated the island, but something like 75 years ago, the same Empire ceded the island to Japan. It was part of the Japanese Empire until the end of World War II when it became, and still is, a part of the Republic of China. It has never been a part of the People's Democratic Republic of China and the Communist government has never exercised the slightest degree of control of this island.

If there were no Republic of China, the government in Peking would still have no legitimate claim in this area. The overwhelming majority of the people are Taiwanese—not of the same race as the mainland Chinese. Even though they have developed and prospered as a province of the Republic of China, they have certainly evidenced not the slightest de-

sire to become a part of the People's Democratic Republic.

The United States has historically followed the policy of recognizing and supporting the independence of those nations who have established their own governments. Certainly the Republic of China on Taiwan has proclaimed and maintained its independence. We have recognized it and most of the nations of the world have recognized it although some have become fearful and have withdrawn their recognition. The fact remains that there is a functioning government and a sound economy now operating on this island. It has shown one of the most remarkable economic growths in any part of the world. The Government has brought education, opportunities, and dignity to the people. The United States has publicly committed itself to the defense of this Government on this island.

I accept President Nixon's statement that—

We shall maintain our friendship, our diplomatic ties, and our defense commitment.

To do otherwise would dishonor the principles which have made us a great Nation.

OFFSHORE ATLANTIC OIL DRILLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House to the continuing concern of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and, I am sure, many of the other States along the eastern seaboard, over the prospect of imminent exploration off the Atlantic coastline for new sources of oil. The Interior Department, as matters now stand, holds the key in this matter. Countless Members of Congress have already voiced their concern to this Department, lest the Department rush into this matter without first giving it the most careful consideration. As an indication of the seriousness with which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts views the situation, the legislative commission on marine boundaries and of the great General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is in the midst of hearings on the whole controversy. Last Friday I testified before this commission. At this time, I wish to go over my prepared testimony with my colleagues here because of the tremendous importance I attach to the whole controversy. If nothing else, I hope it will serve as a reminder to the House that our concern of a month ago or 2 months ago, when the announcement was first made has not in any way diminished, but rather has, in fact, been reinforced upon further reflection. It only remains for me to add at this point that I believe Senator William M. Bulger, of Boston, the chairman of this commission, deserves the gratitude of all Americans along the eastern seaboard for the tremendous public serv-

ice he is performing in focusing the attention of his commission on this matter of gravest concern.

My testimony follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION ON MARINE BOUNDARIES AND RESOURCES, FEBRUARY 16, 1972

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the other members of the commission for extending to me the invitation to appear before you today to testify before the commission in the course of the hearings you have been conducting on offshore oil drilling. I feel that the Massachusetts Legislative Commission on Marine Boundaries and Resources is performing probably the most vital public service within its powers in airing the controversy surrounding even the merest possibility of developing the "potential" (or perhaps more correctly, the "possible") offshore oil reserves on Georges Bank near Cape Cod. Hopefully, at the conclusion of the hearings the public, and probably more importantly, the Interior Department, will have a better feeling for just how concerned the residents of this State are about such a prospect, without getting involved in States' rights controversies or the meaning of federalism. I think it entirely reasonable to argue that the citizens and residents of a State such as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have every right to have their say about something as related to their immediate environment as offshore oil drilling. In other words, even if we were to go along with the Interior Department's authority to formulate this Nation's energy policies—which I do not—it seems entirely within the right of the citizens of this Commonwealth to have the final say about whether their very health and well-being, the very food they eat and the very jobs related to the sea around us should be potentially endangered.

This would seem to be a decision entirely within the proper jurisdiction of this Commonwealth and its legislative and judicial institutions. In other words, maybe the citizens of Louisiana and Texas do not mind having offshore oil drilling in their very tidal waters, but should the citizens of Massachusetts have legitimate concerns and fears, then they should, at a very minimum, be carefully considered by the formulators of this Nation's energy policies.

In fact, if the Interior Department does not begin to display more statesmanship on this issue and seriously negotiate every step of the way, each States' legitimate concerns for the well being of its citizens in deciding on a policy of exploration and then later on the development of any potentially productive offshore oil fields, then I would be prepared as to go so far as to argue that our Constitution gives our State some sort of veto power over the whole matter. In saying so, I say so fully confident that in this we, the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts would not be alone, but would probably be supported by citizens in most of the States along the Atlantic seaboard.

The fact of the matter is the Interior Department is no longer dealing with an uneducated, ignorant citizenry when it comes to the whole matter of environmental dangers and water pollution. The past five years have witnessed an astounding increase in the awareness of our people, of the dangers to our very life and health in haphazard tampering with the environment, uncoordinated and hastily decided use of our natural resources. In other words, no longer should this Nation's national fuel policies be decided solely on the basis of future energy requirements and what is good for a few major oil producers. Energy requirements, future heating needs, future jobs in the oil industry have to be considered against the all-encompassing background of what our en-

vironmental concerns must be. The fact of the matter is the last five years have shown us that offshore oil wells can lead to serious damage to the surrounding marine environment, can ruin miles of shoreline, and ultimately, can lead to staggering costs of clean-up and restoration. If we have learned nothing else from the serious problems with offshore oil drilling in the Pacific, it is that we must in fact proceed more carefully and with greater caution in the future. That is a minimum statement of what our attitude should be with regards to possible offshore oil drilling along the Atlantic seaboard. Serious study may well reveal that in fact, there is no possible way of guaranteeing against repetition of episodes like those experienced off California. In that case, we may well decide the risk is simply not worth it and that the Nation's energy requirements will have to be met some other way. At the moment, I do not pretend to have the information to take either position in this controversy. But I am sure that we all have the information to insist that the Interior Department just simply has not given the matter sufficient study and time, to be in a position at the moment to award even exploratory contracts off our shores. Much more time and study and consideration of all the worse possibilities must be insisted upon by this commission and hopefully by other States along our seaboard.

If the Interior Department does not in fact slow down in its enthusiasm for exploring new oil sources off our Nation's coast or to the north in Alaska, then I am afraid that our forefathers' wisdom of entrusting the executive branch of our Government with the formulation policies will be seriously in question. Increasingly, Members of Congress, representing citizens such as ours are becoming convinced that they must assert themselves in the policy making area and at the very minimum, insist on a veto authority over the policy making functions of Government agencies such as the Interior Department. This Nation's energy policies for the next 100 years are just becoming too important, either from the viewpoint of environmental considerations or the increasingly limited supply of natural energy sources, to leave them in the hands of the bureaucracy if the bureaucracy is not going to exercise the restraint for which the bureaucracy is supposed to be well known for. I am always amazed at how long it takes the bureaucracy to make a decision on somebody's social security check or on a routine V.A. case. It seems, however, that the Interior Department lately is trying to break all kinds of track records, first in the case of the trans-Alaska pipeline and now that there is a prospect of oil fields being developed off our Atlantic coast. I just do not think that this is the sort of field which lends itself to such speedy action.

To go back to a point that I just made in passing: Even those interested in safeguarding what energy resources this Nation has and are primarily interested in this to the exclusion of environmental considerations—ever for these people there is justifiable reason for proceeding with caution in this area. If this Nation's oil resources are as scarce as the experts say they are, and if one of a nation's most important resources is its ability to meet future energy requirements, then I can see many reasons for postponing a rapid development of any oil fields which might exist off our coast until we absolutely have no alternative. In other words, let's save these vital resources for some future dire emergency. Meanwhile, let us do what I have been advocating all along and import the bulk of our energy requirements. In other words, it seems to me that it would be a very intelligent policy for a nation concerned about its own dwindling supply of fuel to buy as much of the foreign source

fuel available and save its own as much as possible. In other words, why be so concerned about the fact that we might be importing more and more oil or more and more natural gas in the years ahead? As long as foreign nations are prepared to sell us this valuable commodity at lower prices than we can possibly produce it for ourselves in this country, and we know our own supply is limited, then from every viewpoint of national security, it seems to me that we should buy as much as we can from overseas.

Now, this might seem strange coming from someone like myself who has advocated consistently the damage of importing too many manufactured items from overseas. I am all too familiar with the hundreds of thousands of jobs that have been lost around this nation, the number of factories that have closed down because of the flooding of our markets with cheap foreign imports. I have spent the last thirteen years petitioning one administration after another, one government department after another, to change our policies and stop this flooding and loss of jobs, all to no avail. The only department which seems to be at all concerned about imports in our government, irony of ironies, seems to be the Interior Department, worried about oil imports of all things—the very thing we need all we can get of and would not cost us a single job in the process. In other words, given this nation's seemingly insatiable demand for oil, it seems that we should be making increasingly greater reliance on imports and conserving whatever limited natural resources of our own we possess. This would keep domestic production at its present level, would not lead to the need for tapping offshore oil resources such as is proposed now and would in fact result in a tremendous savings for our consumers. Make no mistake about it, this offshore oil exploration which is being considered today will not result in any substantial savings for New England consumers. On the contrary, it represents a continuation of the same worn out attitude which has dominated the Interior Department for years now of restricting imports and artificially restricting our oil supply to domestic sources. In other words, I feel that the proposal to rush ahead with explorations off our sea coast is a last-ditch, desperate effort by our domestic oil producers to tap any domestic sources available so that they can continue to control the price mechanism of this vital necessity of modern day life. The way they can do this is to continue to have an alternative to opening up our ports to cheaper foreign oil imports. In other words, as I see it, this proposal of the Interior Department represents a two-pronged threat to Massachusetts: unspeakable environmental dangers and a continuation of high fuel oil costs for the state.

The alternative to both threats is simple and has been too long overlooked by the Interior Department and that is, import more foreign oil. In 25 years, we may, because of some disruption in foreign supply, have to look to other sources to develop and maybe then a decision will be made that it is worth all the risks and go ahead and develop these offshore oil drills. But my point today is, let's not rush into this, let's wait the 25 years. By then, we should know much more about controlling oil spills and blow-outs. Who knows, too, by then we may have a reasonable alternative, a fuel substitute to oil for our energy requirements.

In conclusion, therefore, I feel strongly that the Interior Department should refrain from proceeding any further with oil exploration on the Atlantic Seaboard until all of the environmental factors have been evaluated and considered. Of equal importance, I feel we must make a start to re-examine our whole national energy policy. The present policy is clearly a hangover from an earlier period. It represents the complete domination of our nation's energy thinking

by powerful oil interests. The time has come to rethink everything from scratch and I am convinced that in the process, we will find how little we need to develop these offshore Atlantic oil fields. In short, Mr. Chairman, the time for reaction is over, the time for new thinking is at hand. A freeze on future major development of this nation's fuel supply is probably the only way we are going to successfully bring this about. Let those of us in Massachusetts used to initiating change, familiar with revolution and new ideas, not hesitate to let the word go out from this day forth that this state, for one, has decided to blow the whistle on the present order and the fuel barons. If I may borrow a word from your eloquent chairman, let us serve notice on the rest of the nation that we will no longer be held hostage to a bankrupt view.

THE SMALL COMMUNITIES PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND TRAINING ACT OF 1972

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill entitled "The Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1972." This measure is designed to build upon and to complement the legislative recommendations contained in the pending Housing and Urban Development Act of 1971, H.R. 9688, which represents the most forward-looking and progressive housing and urban development legislation proposed in the Congress in several decades.

H.R. 9688 represents the fruit of nearly a year's intensive study and analysis by the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The chairman and members of that subcommittee, led by our colleagues WILLIAM A. BARRETT, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, and WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, are to be highly commended. As a result of their comprehensive and objective study of Federal community development and housing production efforts, H.R. 9688 contains many provisions that can significantly improve the quality of housing and the urban environment, in both small and large communities.

The purpose of my bill is to strengthen H.R. 9688 as it relates specifically to the many small communities and urbanizing areas of the country outside of our metropolitan areas. Although H.R. 9688 is aimed primarily at the problems of the Nation's urban areas, my proposed amendments recognize, as does the Housing Subcommittee, that the problems of large cities and those of the countryside are interrelated. Every citizen who leaves a nonmetropolitan area and migrates to a city and is ill-equipped for that labor market becomes an additional tax burden to the city. Unless we encourage the growth and revitalization of our small towns, we cannot slow the continuing migration of their citizens, and their problems, to large urban centers. We cannot achieve the balanced growth which, although often belabored, is essential to the environmental, economic, and social health of the entire Nation.

The proposals contained in the Small Communities Planning, Development,

and Training Act of 1972 can be enacted separately or incorporated into the omnibus housing bill expected to be reported this spring by the Housing Subcommittee. I urge the subcommittee to give careful and sympathetic consideration to these proposals.

A further purpose of my bill is to enhance our recognition and understanding of the severity of our people's problems outside metropolitan areas—problems that are often rendered invisible by the glare of publicity cast on the problems of our large cities. The problems of the cities, of course, cannot be minimized: a large majority of our population grows increasingly crowded into small areas of our land, and each year over half a million more rural Americans migrate to metropolitan areas. In fact, however, the problems of small communities outside metropolitan areas are extremely severe and may be worsening.

Over the past 50 years there have been important national population changes with far-reaching effects. Since 1920, while the national population has almost doubled, the urban population has almost tripled. During that same time period, the nonmetropolitan areas have not shared in the population increases. Their population has remained at about the same level of 50 million. The composition of this group of citizens, however, has changed significantly: the proportion of farmers has decreased substantially and the numbers of unemployed, and underemployed, the weak, and the old all have increased sharply. In fact, the decades of country-to-city migration have left nonmetropolitan areas with long-term problems of a critical nature.

Recent testimony before the Senate Finance Committee by representatives of the newly formed Coalition for Rural America revealed what the present pattern of national urbanization has left in its wake:

One-half of our rural citizens live in poverty; 60 percent of the nation's inadequate housing is found outside the major metropolitan areas; 30,000 rural communities lack adequate water systems and more than 45,000 have no sewer systems at all; the infant mortality rate in rural areas exceeds the national average by 20 percent, and for non-white infants it is almost twice as high.

This lack of basic modern facilities and amenities directly affects the health of small town residents. It encourages the young to depart and impedes the balanced economic development of our country which could help us protect our living environment.

Title I of the bill would provide for the establishment of a Community Development Bank substantially identical to the Urban Development Bank provided for in title VIII of H.R. 9688. The bank would be a Federal corporate agency raising its funds through the sale of taxable obligations in the credit market and lending those funds at a lower-than-market rate to States, counties, cities, towns, and other public bodies. My bill—in section 105(d)—would direct the Community Development Bank to give preference in the processing of loan applications to applications of communities with populations of less than 50,000. Be-

cause their obligations are unrated by the security-rating services or because their borrowings are in small amount, these small communities most often bear the high interest rates required by private investors. As a result, they find it most difficult to provide the facilities needed to accommodate present and future community needs. A preference for small communities would direct the bank's activities into the area of most critical need in the field of municipal finance.

My bill would also recognize that outside of metropolitan areas nonprofit groups are often empowered to undertake what are essentially public facility projects. Section 105(a)(2) of the bill make such nonprofit groups eligible for the Community Development Bank's loan assistance.

Title II of the bill would amend the public facility loan program, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to enable this program to more effectively serve the needs of small communities in financing essential public facilities.

This title of the bill would be unnecessary if the Community Development Bank or Urbank proposal, containing a small community preference, is enacted. I recognize, however, that Urbank is a very controversial proposal which faces formidable opposition—unfortunately, from the very groups it is intended to benefit. If Urbank, or a Community Development Bank, is not enacted, a modified public facility loan program would certainly be a necessity.

The present public facility loan program operates at a \$40 million program level, permitting approximately only 75 loan approvals for public facilities of all kinds, including water and sewer facilities, health facilities, gas utilities, industrial parks, and city streets and county roads. Last spring, HUD estimated that application demand for public facility loans for small communities would exceed available funds by almost \$100 million, despite the fact that the interest rate for loans, set by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development at the beginning of the fiscal year, was 5½ percent. Under the existing program, interest rates on loans are set by statute at one-half of 1 percent above the average rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the Federal Government comprising the public debt, or 3 percent, whichever is higher.

I propose to amend the public facility loan program to give small communities an alternative method of financing which would result in lower interest costs to them, at a very small loss to the Federal Government.

Except in periods of tight money, most municipalities can get loans for public facilities in the tax-exempt money market at a lower rate of interest than the statutory lending rate used in the existing program. As a result, most of the program activity is with small municipalities in the South and Southwest which are outside most principal money markets, or whose projects and financing prospects are marginal. Furthermore,

Federal direct lending programs are strongly opposed by the Treasury, and it is doubtful that a higher program level can be obtained.

In 1970, however, housing legislation contained an alternative financing mechanism for public bodies sponsoring new community projects which I feel can be of great benefit to small communities wishing to use the public facility loan program. Under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development guarantees the taxable obligations of State and local public bodies issued to finance new community projects, and make grants to those bodies to cover the difference between the interest rate on the taxable obligations and the interest rate which the obligations would bear if they were tax-exempt obligations.

My bill would provide this new method of financing as an alternative to direct loans in the public facility loan program, with one modification. Under title II, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would simply make grants to cover 40 percent of the interest cost on the community's taxable obligation. The reason for this change is that the job of estimating the difference between the taxable and tax-exempt rate is simply too much of an administrative burden, especially in the case of small communities. This alternative method of financing would make the program more broadly available to small communities throughout the country, reduce interest rates for those communities willing to issue taxable obligations, and stem a part of the loss to the Treasury that is involved in tax-exempt financing and that is increasingly alleged as an inefficient subsidy to public borrowers.

The total amount of borrowing guaranteed by HUD could not exceed \$200 million. If the interest rate on this \$200 million of small community obligations averaged 7½ percent, the total interest payable would be \$15 million. HUD would pay 40 percent of these interest charges, or \$6 million. Thus, for the sum of \$6 million, HUD could finance \$200 million worth of public facility projects. And, the total interest paid on the \$200 million—\$15 million—would be taxable by the Federal Government.

Title III of the bill incorporates the entire community development block grant program from H.R. 9688, with slight modification. It would attempt to assure that the \$500 million to be provided annually in H.R. 9688 for nonmetropolitan areas in the form of block grant funds would be distributed with due consideration given to the needs and wishes of the people and groups most directly involved in rebuilding small communities outside metropolitan areas. My modification—contained in section 306 (c) of the bill—would direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take into account locally developed plans and ideas for community development programs, and to utilize, whenever possible, program administration advice from interested local individuals, groups, and organizations with demonstrated competence in planning and carrying out

development programs in small communities.

Title IV of the bill contemplates the establishment of a National Community Affairs Institute that would be analogous in purpose and activity to the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. Since its beginning in 1968, the Urban Institute has fulfilled the high expectations held out for it as an urban research and development institute of the first order; and already the Institute has rewarded the confidence of those who supported its finding by developing a program of studies and activities of direct relevance to the solution of many urban problems.

The Institute's recent research efforts, for example, have included the development of "urban indicators" that would allow us, over a period of time, to monitor the vital signs of city conditions in respect to housing, poverty, education, health, transportation, recreation, economic developments, and other matters. In addition, the Institute has done research in the areas of income maintenance programming and an analysis of the "exploitation thesis" of metropolitan-wide maldistribution of tax burdens and public benefits.

The National Community Affairs Institute proposed in title IV of the bill would mobilize this kind of research and evaluative capability for the solution of similar problems affecting small communities. The Institute would study new and improved modes of governmental service financing, the process of urbanization of hinterland areas, structures, and processes of adaptation to rapid technological and economic development, citizen group participation in the community development process, and much more. In addition, the Institute would provide technical assistance to small communities to help develop strategies for the solution of general and specific problems. Finally, it would provide timely, independent, and continuing evaluation of Federal, State, local, and private programs aimed at meeting the problems of small nonmetropolitan communities. Like its urban counterpart, the Institute would be supported by contracts with and grants from Federal agencies and private organizations, and could contract with public and private bodies for services and studies meeting mutual needs.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take all steps necessary to provide for the establishment of the Institute, utilizing the broad research and development authority contained in existing law. The Secretary would have the flexibility to establish the Institute in any manner he deemed appropriate, with one exception: the Director of the Library of Congress would serve as the chairman of the new Institute's board of directors. The purpose here is to assure that the Institute will be responsive to the Congress, and help to enhance the capability and resources of the Congress in legislating for small communities.

Title V of the Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act of 1972 provides for a fellowship pro-

gram for the training of professionals and other specialists in the broad fields of planning and development for small communities in nonmetropolitan areas. The existing urban studies fellowship program, authorized by the Housing Act of 1964, would be amended to add this new program.

Under the urban studies fellowship program, about 100 fellowships are awarded each year by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the training of professionals in various fields of urban studies. Stipends and allowances for up to two dependents are permitted. Tuition and fees are paid directly to the institutions by HUD. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be authorized to provide these additional fellowships for training in planning and development for small communities upon the recommendation of the board of directors of the Community Affairs Institute would be established by title IV of the bill.

I believe the provisions of my bill, when added to the outstanding work of the Housing Subcommittee, would enable many small communities in nonmetropolitan areas to begin solving both their immediate and long-term problems. I urge all Members of the House to support the bill.

HEARINGS ON EMERGENCY CRIME CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 am pleased to announce that my esteemed colleague, JOHN F. SEIBERLING of Ohio, and I have been advised that the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings in late April or early May on our Emergency Crime Control Act (H.R. 11813). We were informed of this shortly before the recess last week by the distinguished chairman of our Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York. In a conference in his office, Mr. CELLER asserted the concern shared by so many Members of Congress over the implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act by the Justice Department. We discussed the fact that too little of the money appropriated by Congress pursuant to this Act is reaching the high-crime urban areas, and that red-tape is delaying the funding of projects.

The Emergency Crime Control Act is based on the concept of revenue sharing. It would channel Safe Streets Act funds to large metropolitan areas in the form of block grants, with the money being controlled by criminal justice coordinating councils at the county level. Projects would be funded according to needs as perceived by local officials. The text of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and the rationale for it are set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 32, page 41573.

Additional material relating to the bill appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 36, page 47456; and volume 118, part 1, page 1120; and part 3, page 2567.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article that appeared recently, relative to this issue, in the Plain Dealer, Ohio's distinguished morning newspaper:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 12, 1972]

STANTON AND NIXON AIDES CLASH ON CRIMEFIGHTING

(By Richard G. Zimmerman)

WASHINGTON.—James V. Stanton, Cleveland's freshman congressman, is heading for a collision with the federal government in the fight against crime in the streets.

Backed up by complaints from across the nation, Stanton's goal is the speedy distribution of federal crime-fighting aid directly to the 56 largest cities.

Stanton D-20, and John R. Seiberling, D-14, Akron, have introduced the Emergency Crime Control Act to accomplish this.

Stanton, the once-powerful president of Cleveland City Council, who now chafes in frustrating anonymity, says President Nixon's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is inefficient and wasteful in channeling funds.

Critics of the LEAA have used it as an illustration of what might happen if Nixon's proposals for general revenue-sharing were enacted, they complain that LEAA bloc grants are going unspent because of bureaucratic bungling at the state level.

If states could not spend LEAA funds quickly and wisely, the critics argue, how would they handle the huge grants that would be available under revenue-sharing?

But more important were the complaints of big-city mayors and police chiefs that LEAA funds, even when they did filter down, were too skimpy to meet the needs of high-crime urban centers.

Stanton's bill would channel the funds straight to cities that have more than 250,000 population through a \$5-a-head grant over a three-year period and force cities and counties to cooperate.

To counter the criticism the administration last month announced a \$160-million three-year "high-impact" anticrime program in eight major cities, including Cleveland.

Stanton, however, argues that this program covers only eight cities while his covers 56; that funds under the LEAA plan could vary so much per year that a city could not plan ahead; that it does not cover the suburbs, as his does, and that the LEAA money would still flow through the slow-moving states while his bill would send it directly to the cities.

Dean Fohlne, deputy LEAA administrator, argued against all these points. He said, for instance, that the high-impact program eventually would reach all cities over 250,000, although he admitted there was no timetable.

With money already available for the first year of the program, the LEAA clearly is in the driver's seat. But Congress could still look over the financing of the last two years of the program and Stanton's influence might be felt.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's pioneers of progress and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The first electronic computer was created by American Howard Aiken in 1937.

A STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF TWO BILLS TO AID LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL, H.R. 10104 AND H.R. 10500, 92D CONGRESS

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of two measures I have recently introduced to benefit this Nation's law enforcement officers and firemen and their dependents.

The measures are H.R. 10500 and H.R. 10104. Both reflect the deep gratitude this Nation owes to its protectors of life and property.

H.R. 10500 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the Federal income tax. It would do so by amending part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which relates to items specifically excluded from gross income to provide that:

[G]ross income does not include amounts received as compensation for service as a full-time law enforcement officer in the employ of the United States, the District of Columbia, a State or political subdivision thereof, to the extent that the aggregate of such amounts does not exceed \$5,000 in the taxable year.

The amendment would apply only to taxable years ending after the date of its enactment.

Here is a measure which would provide direct and speedy financial assistance to law enforcement officers and their families. This measure is a fitting symbolic and financial expression of national gratitude to those men and women who on a daily basis put their lives on the line to protect our lives and well being.

One need spend only a few hours at the side of a law enforcement officer to know the difficulties and responsibilities which are his daily and nightly companions.

The law enforcement officer performs one of the society's most difficult jobs. Many officers work under the most dangerous conditions. His employer may be a city or town that is oftentimes financially strapped and sometimes unable to provide him with a salary commensurate with the responsibilities, difficulties, and dangers of the work.

Since these officers are asked to take such dangerous risks, the financial returns they receive should reflect these conditions. H.R. 10500 would grant officers an increase in real income by reducing their Federal income tax obligations beginning the year it is enacted. This certainly is a measure deserving widespread support. I urge its speedy enactment.

H.R. 10104 would amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide for the appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy of sons of State and local law enforcement officers and firemen killed in the line of duty. It does so by amending section 216(a) of the 1936 act to provide that:

The Secretary of Commerce shall each year appoint to the Academy in order of merit established by competitive examinations

eighty qualified candidates from among sons of State and local law enforcement officers and firemen who died in the line of duty.

The determination of a State or local agency that a law enforcement officer or fireman died in the line of duty shall be binding upon the Secretary.

This measure would insure that a sizable number of openings would be available for the sons of law enforcement officers and firemen who died while protecting life and property, providing of course that those so admitted be qualified candidates. Certainly here too is a measure deserving of widespread nonpartisan support. Any measure that provides for the well-being of the dependents of those who died in service to their Nation, State, or locality deserves favorable consideration. That is particularly true when the benefit being provided is the opportunity to receive an education and an occupation which otherwise might not have been attainable.

Certainly a special allotment of appointments to the Merchant Marine Academy is not too generous a benefit to the sons of those who served their Nation protecting life and property. Nor is partial relief from Federal income tax too generous a benefit for those who enforce our laws.

I urge full congressional consideration of these worthy measures and their early enactment.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO CHINA

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, with great historical interest, I watched the live television coverage this weekend of the President's trip to China. Those first scenes of the Chinese mainland were very enlightening.

I am not one who expects the President to splice together in 1 week the frayed ends of a diplomatic cord severed some 20 years ago. Nor do I expect a resolution of the philosophical differences that foster our nuclear tensions. The President has warned against such great expectations.

But I do hope Mr. Nixon will be able to bring our political differences to the point of discussability. We are not harmed, and we may greatly gain, by exchanging views with a nation so large and potentially influential to world opinion as the People's Republic of China.

The trip, however, is much more than a beginning to discussions on the diplomatic level. If we accomplish nothing diplomatically, we have at least gained the chance to see how part of the world's most populous country lives, works, eats, dresses, speaks, and reacts to other people. The satellite coverage of the President's trip provides us with a window-like view of China and her people.

Discounting the "dressing up" by the Chinese people which probably took place before the President landed, the telecasts are showing that Peking is a clean and beautiful capital city. The avenues appear tree-lined, wide, and absent the bustle of crowds that one might expect

in a country of 750 to 800 million people. The formal square is well-kept, free of big-city debris, and pleasantly calm. The architectural design is what has to be known as Russian modern. Little of this development could have occurred on the spur of the moment in anticipation of the arrival of the President.

I also noticed great variety in the Chinese dress. It was colorful, simple, and practical. The formal uniforms so often depicted in scenes of the Chinese culture publicized prior to this visit were not as prevalent as one might have thought.

The people seemed relaxed and friendly. Even the formal greeting of the President by officers of the Chinese Government was conducted with a minimum amount of officialdom. Of course, it lacked the pomp which might be given to the Chief Executive of a country friendlier to China.

While viewing this coverage of the China trip, I could not help but realize that the Chinese people are also learning something about us. The newsmen and technical associates accompanying the President are creating an important first impression for some of the Chinese people who meet these Americans.

I am a little disappointed that more of a cross-section of the American public was not selected to travel with the President. As it is, I hope the newsmen and camera technicians will be on special guard to put America's best foot forward.

Unfortunately, the usually composed Walter Cronkite has already commented that he could have been duped into wearing a "Yankee Go Home" button because he does not understand the Chinese script on his press identification badge. He also publicly doubted if he would have a bed in which to sleep. Jocularly intended or not, these comments may be misunderstood by the hosts or by others in the worldwide audience viewing the satellite broadcast.

Other reports indicate that the press corps was provided with all the modern accommodations expected on any trip of this kind. In fact, this larger-than-ever press corps was furnished immediate long-distance telephone service at the Shanghai airport.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to emphasize that the men and women accompanying the President serve also as ambassadors of the American people on this initial journey to China. The President is skating on thin diplomatic ice and we do him and the Chinese an injustice by airing comments susceptible of being misunderstood in a worldwide broadcast. Surely these newsmen can better use this occasion to telecast a multitude of facts about the Chinese and their country and leave invidious comments out of it.

EMPLOYMENT—A LA WPA? DID SOMEONE TURN UP THE LIGHTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to read in the Washington Post last week

that the administration has launched an urgent task force study to uncover the reasons for consistent high unemployment, and more importantly, recommend ways of attacking the problem. This makes sense. One naturally puts out the fire before looking for causes.

The article, written by Post financial editor Hobart Rowen, notes that Treasury Secretary John Connally, chairman of the task force, and Charles E. Walker, his deputy, "make clear that the administration is ready to consider the pros and cons of expanded public service employment 'a la WPA.'"

The article refers to a Treasury Department memorandum that quotes the Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, Edgar R. Fiedler, as writing—

What can be done to put unemployment to work for the government, a la WPA? What benefits do governments get? What is the impact on the labor market?

A quick review of past and current accelerated public works type programs will reveal answers to these questions. The 92d Congress, during the first session, provided the administration with the necessary tool to test this approach under today's conditions.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years 150 of my colleagues joined with me in sponsoring legislation that embraced that concept of relieving the Nation's high rate of unemployment which has now reached such proportions that it affects the homes of approximately 5½ million Americans.

San Joaquin County—in the Stockton labor market—and Stanislaus County—in the Modesto labor market—in my home district in California have been listed among the "top 10" standard metropolitan statistical areas for highest rates of unemployment in the United States. The Stockton labor market is one of only four in the continental United States listed by the Department of Labor as both "substantial and persistent."

During the last session, my colleagues and I introduced legislation known as "accelerated public works" which does, in fact, embrace the concept of soaking up unemployment by providing 80 percent Federal grants to local governments to build permanent public facilities.

Although this measure passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote of 320 to 67, the President vetoed the proposal. However, I recall that during the closing days of the 91st Congress the President also vetoed the first legislation proposed that included public service employment. Last summer he signed into law the Emergency Employment Act which has already provided jobs and prevented unemployment rates from inching up even higher. I commend the administration for reconsidering its first position on that proposal and I believe the time has come to reconsider its first position regarding the accelerated public works proposal.

The APW bill vetoed by the President also extended the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. In order to keep the Economic Development Act and Appalachian pro-

grams alive, it was necessary for the House Public Works Committee to immediately report out another bill.

Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, and his committee dutifully reported a new bill that was signed into public law on August 5, 1971 (Public Law 92-65). However, Chairman BLATNIK and his committee, when drafting the new act, did not lose sight of the intent of the vetoed legislation and provided for some limited APW assistance in title I of the act. Chairman BLATNIK's foresight has paved the way to enlarge assistance to communities designated as "special impact target areas" to provide immediate useful work that will reduce the high rates of unemployment in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that will increase assistance to "special impact" areas authorized in Public Law 92-65 to approximately \$475 million. Chairman BLATNIK's Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs will begin hearings on March 7. I believe it appropriate that this committee hear testimony on this proposal which has the net effect of increasing the authorization for this purpose by only \$195 million.

Public service employment legislation has assisted in meeting the needs of communities by providing jobs and services that these communities can no longer afford. However, it falls short of creating employment in the construction industry, including the building trades, that segment of our economy that suffers from an unemployment rate double the national average.

Eligible cities and counties with exorbitantly high rates of unemployment have lists of much-needed public works projects that could be initiated at once: Storm drainage systems, sidewalk improvement, libraries, police stations, community centers, street lights and traffic signals, airport facilities, hospitals, warehouses, water purification plants, and so forth, in addition to sewage systems and many others that will aid in cleaning up our rivers and attracting industry to these communities.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of my bill to be followed by Mr. Rowen's article appearing in the Washington Post, February 18, 1972:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and not to exceed \$800,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed \$800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not to exceed \$950,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973"; and

(2) by amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "Not less than 25 per centum nor more than 35 per centum of all appropriations made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not less than 50 per centum of all appropriations made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, under the authority of the preceding sentences shall be expended in redevelopment areas designated as such under section 401(a) (6) of this Act."

URGENT U.S. STUDY WEIGHS WPA-TYPE JOBS PROGRAM

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Nixon Administration has launched an urgent study, under the direction of Treasury Secretary John B. Connally, to uncover the reasons for persistently high unemployment and recommends ways of attacking the problem.

A Treasury Department memorandum to members of Connally's task force—headed by Under Secretary Charles E. Walker—makes clear that the Administration is ready to consider the pros and cons of expanded public service employment, "a la WPA."

WPA, or Works Progress Administration, was one of the New Deal measures used to soak up heavy unemployment in 1932-33. Republican Party orators historically have condemned the WPA as a "boondoggle."

But the Treasury memo, bearing the initials of Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy Edgar R. Fiedler lists as one question to be studied:

"What is and can be done to put the unemployed to work for the government, a la WPA? What benefit do the governments get? What is the impact on the labor market?"

Democrats during the past two sessions of Congress have increasingly pushed for reliance on the Government as an "employer of last resort" because of the failure of unemployment to recede. Despite a mild improvement in the economy in 1971, the unemployment rate was virtually unchanged in a 5.8 to 6.0 per cent range for the entire year.

The Connally study was initiated by a Presidential directive Jan. 20.

The task force, scheduled to report by the end of this month, will also examine these questions, outlined in a Connally memo Jan. 20.

The soundness of present statistical methods.

The regional, sex, occupational characteristics of the unemployed and how they may differ from earlier periods.

Reasons for the "mismatch" between available jobs and vacancies.

Government training programs, and whether they really work.

"Disincentives to employment" such as unemployment compensation, welfare payments and minimum wage legislation.

Task force conclusions remain to be seen. But an internal Treasury staff paper titled: "The Unemployed: Who, Where and Why," by career economist Herman I. Liebling has already concluded that a 4 per cent rate as a national goal over the next few years "is not feasible without significant inflation."

"This might apply even if some new fundamental approaches in manpower training, not now in sight, were tried."

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) had confronted Connally with the above quotation from the report during the Secretary's testimony Wednesday at the Joint Economic Committee. Connally (who was aware that the report had leaked to the JEC) insisted it had no official status, and that the Administration had not abandoned 4 per cent as the goal of policy.

The Liebling paper summarizes the general theme of recent academic reports on the unemployment problem, which suggest that more of the unemployed today are young, or female, or "disadvantaged"—and thus it is more difficult to find them jobs merely by cranking up the economy.

But it goes on to suggest that the unemployment rate probably can't be lowered below 5 per cent "without unleashing unwanted inflationary repercussions."

Setting a 4 per cent goal, Liebling said, might mean "acceptance of 4 per cent or more inflation." But a 5 per cent unemployment rate would "trade-off," or be accompanied by a more satisfactory 3 per cent inflation rate. The unemployment-inflation "trade-off" in the U.S. is "worse" than in

other countries, Liebling said, the result of "a worse mismatch of existing employment opportunities and skills than in the other (industrialized) countries, except possibly for Canada."

Task force members are the Secretaries of Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, HEW and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget was omitted, apparently inadvertently.

THE PRESIDENT AND SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have shared with my constituents a deep concern for the plight of those brave Soviet Jews and other oppressed minorities who are denied religious and personal freedom by the Kremlin.

We now have an unusual opportunity to speak up for these courageous people when the President visits Russia in May. He has indicated that he might discuss the plight of Soviet Jewry with the Kremlin leadership. This is an opportunity that should not be ignored.

The distinguished members of the Senate of my State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations have enacted a resolution requesting the President:

To call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution, to end discrimination against religious minorities, and to permit its citizens to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

I strongly endorse this resolution and urge my colleagues in the House to do the same. The struggle for religious and personal freedom by the Soviet Jews is in the best tradition of our own fight for freedom nearly 200 years ago.

I would like to insert the complete text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONGRESS TO ASK THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SOVIET UNION TO PERMIT THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION TO ALL ITS CITIZENS

Whereas, In the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world and, indeed, by the Soviet Constitution; and Whereas, People of the Jewish faith and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union are being denied the means to exercise their religion and sustain their identity; and

Whereas, The government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by denying them the same rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union and by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education; and

Whereas, The right to emigrate freely which is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations, is denied Soviet Jews who seek to maintain their identity by moving elsewhere; and

Whereas, These infringements of human rights are an obstacle to the development of better understanding and better relations

between the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States when he visits the Soviet Union be respectfully requested to call upon the Soviet government to permit the free exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution to end discrimination against religious minorities, and to permit its citizens to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is respectfully requested and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Rhode Island delegation in Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON MISSED ROLLCALL VOTE

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

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Alaskans have but one Congressman, and this makes it essential that he be on the job as much as possible. For this reason, I made two promises to the voters of Alaska when I sought this congressional seat. First, I promised to have the best voting attendance record possible. Second, I promised to make my position clear on all issues where I was unable to make a vote.

So far, there have been 518 occasions when I was asked to answer for Alaska. I have missed answering four times, the most recent being February 9, 1972, when I missed a rollcall vote in order to catch the last possible flight on which I could make the connections necessary to reach Alaska. I would like to announce my position on that vote at this time.

The question was on final passage of House Joint Resolution 1025 to provide a procedure for settling the west coast dock strike. After amendments in the nature of a substitute, this was essentially the legislation which was proposed by the President. If I had been present to vote, I would have voted against passage of the bill. The final vote was 214 to 139 in favor of passage. Because this entire issue is and was so important for Alaska, I would like to explain my position.

The bill finally voted on was a substitute for the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee which I supported. The committee bill contained two provisions which were of crucial importance to Alaska. First, it did not require compulsory arbitration. Second, specific protection was provided for shipments involving agricultural products, military cargo, and shipments to and from Hawaii and Alaska.

For Alaskans, this meant both that vital supplies could get through, and that the final settlement would not have to be coerced, as in the administration bill. I would not have missed the vote on the final passage, no matter what other conflicts I had, but for the fact that the crucial vote on this issue was taken earlier when the rule for consideration was voted on which permitted the administration bill to be substituted. Once

this vote was lost, over my own dissenting vote, the issue was effectively decided.

I am hopeful that this makes clear my position on this vote. Alaskans may expect similar statements on each occasion I am forced to miss any recorded vote.

PANDA BEAR DIPLOMACY

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

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn today, February 22, that the Government of the Peoples Republic of China is going to present President Nixon with two giant pandas as gifts for the American people.

This is encouraging news to me, because since last May I have been in communication with both the White House and the State Department about asking the Chinese Government for a panda for the North Carolina State Zoo in Asheboro.

Before President Nixon departed for the Peoples Republic of China on February 17, 1972, I sent him the following telegram reminding him of my original request:

Pursuant to my letter of last May 11, I would appreciate any action you might be able to take on your forthcoming trip to the Peoples Republic of China to secure a giant panda bear for the North Carolina zoological park in Asheboro. The giant panda is a gentle animal and would be a fitting symbol of the peace you are seeking to build between our two nations.

I am confident the North Carolina Zoological Authority would prove a faithful trustee, not only for the people of North Carolina, but for all the people of the United States, if you can arrange for the donation or sale of a panda.

With every good wish for the success of your important mission.

Respectfully,

NICK GALIFIANAKIS.

At present there are only four giant pandas outside of the Peoples Republic of China, two in North Korea, one in Moscow, and one in London.

Since the two pandas being sent to the United States are gifts to all the American people, I think it would be appropriate if one animal is maintained at the National Zoo in Washington, D.C., and the other at the zoo which nearly a year ago initiated the idea of asking the Chinese for a panda, the North Carolina State Zoo in Asheboro, N.C.

A TRIBUTE TO PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, speaking before the 13th Annual Bob Hope Dinner to raise funds for the National Parkinson Foundation at the Fontainebleau Hotel at Miami Beach, Fla., Dr. Merlin K. DuVal, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an outstanding address entitled "A Tribute to Partnership."

This dinner is a great event attended

by some 1,200 people each year who have long given their loyal support to the problem of Parkinson's disease which afflicts 60,000 new victims every year in our country, which has an annual population afflicted with Parkinson's of 1½ million persons. Bob Hope, for 13 years the honorary chairman of the dinner, was again honorary chairman and was present and in his own inimitable way was master of ceremonies for the entertainment at the dinner, assisted by some of the outstanding artists performing on Miami Beach. My wife has long been the dinner chairman. I had the honor to be toastmaster on this occasion. The National Parkinson Foundation, with headquarters in Miami, provides treatment and rehabilitation for the largest number of Parkinson's patients in the world. The Parkinson Foundation is working in close concert in its research and rehabilitation with the National Institute on Neurological Diseases and Blindness and with other authorities.

The great genius of the foundation has been Mrs. Jeanne Levey who with her husband, a victim of Parkinson's, was the cofounder of the National Parkinson Foundation.

Dr. DuVal in his able and outstanding address not only took due note of the progress made in research upon Parkinson's disease but reviewed the meaningful results possible when the Federal and private resources of the country are brought to bear on a problem. From his vantage point as Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. DuVal was able to offer much hope in what can be accomplished in dealing with this tragic affliction by such Federal and private cooperation in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the scholarly address of Dr. DuVal to my colleagues and my fellow countrymen in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

A TRIBUTE TO PARTNERSHIP

(Address by Merlin K. DuVal, M.D.)

This month, from a podium in Washington, a weekend neighbor of yours offered resounding tribute to volunteerism and to those who give so generously of their time and funds for the betterment of all of us. On that occasion, President Nixon—and Mrs. Nixon, who shares his appreciation of the enormous public good that emanates from private efforts—toasted the growing spirit of partnership between two sectors of our society. Here, tonight, we see a brilliant example of the kind of health achievement that is possible when both Federal and private resources are brought to bear on a problem.

The work of the National Parkinson Foundation and those who support it has been responsible for renewed hope for at least one million Americans afflicted by parkinsonism. On behalf of Secretary Richardson and our entire Federal health team, I want to compliment Mrs. Jeanne Levey, her officers and Board—with special reference to the dedicated efforts of Congressman and Mrs. Claude Pepper. I'm sure that you know that Congressman Pepper has been tireless in this efforts to further your cause from his office in Washington.

Bob Hope, your Honorary Chairman, was described last year by his fellow Californian, White House Counselor Finch, as a "sort of one-man ambulatory HEW"—and I'll second

that remark. I also noted that Bob Finch suggested that if we combine the generosity and energy of Bob Hope with the assets of Howard Hughes, this might make it possible to eliminate the Federal Government entirely. I'll second that too—but with one reservation. Let's not let Clifford Irving write the reorganization plan.

But for as long as the Federal Government stays in business, we at HEW will continue to do our very best to make a contribution in the health field.

Let me touch on some of our work in the battle against Parkinson's Disease. As we do in a number of areas, our first effort is to complement, with a strong research support program, the efforts of groups like the National Parkinson Institute as they work more directly with patients. Our own thrust is concentrated in the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke.

By now, the name of Dr. George Cotzias, the developer of L-Dopa therapy, and winner of a 1969 Lasker Award for Clinical Medical Research, has become thoroughly familiar to everyone with an interest in Parkinson's disease. We are proud to have supported Dr. Cotzias' work with L-Dopa, just as we are proud that we supported much of the research extending over the past 20 years which led up to this discovery. Even today, we are continuing to sponsor his program. He, too, is concerned primarily with the basic nature of parkinsonism. He has been working with possible alternates to L-Dopa, and is now studying reactions to the drug in animals.

He is particularly interested in finding a possible relationship of trace metals to parkinsonism (in fact his original interest was in manganese poisoning, the effects of which so closely resemble parkinsonism). He has been successful in breeding a strain of laboratory mice that does not absorb manganese and, incidentally, is also highly resistant to the toxic effects of L-Dopa. That parkinsonism might be traced to anything as simple as too much or too little manganese would be too good to be true, but we certainly think it's worth while to find out just what the relationship is.

We have some other major clinical groups that we're sponsoring—at the University of Colorado, and at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, for example.

The people at Colorado are doing a large study of the metabolism, or chemical fate, of L-Dopa in the body, in both animals and man. Simultaneously, they're studying the electrical activity of the peripheral nervous system and muscle in parkinsonism. Just recently they reported that they have found three distinct types of muscle fiber in human muscle, each with its own independent nerve supply. They're now trying to find out whether parkinsonism affects all three of the types, rather than one or two, and whether any difference can be found in the muscle tissue of patients on L-Dopa.

Our center at Albert Einstein was only inaugurated in 1971. This group also will devote itself largely to exploiting the research opportunities opened up by the success of L-Dopa therapy.

In addition to these large projects, we are supporting about 60 smaller, more specifically targeted projects. These cover a very broad range, and I won't try to describe them. One of them, though, is a project of special interest to us tonight that I do want to mention. This is a study that our own National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke is conducting in collaboration with the National Parkinson Institute here in Miami. One of the things we would very much like to know is whether L-Dopa really affects the natural course of Parkinson's disease, or whether it represents purely symptomatic treatment.

The National Parkinson Institute now has the largest L-Dopa therapy program in the

world. It dispenses about 100,000 2½ milligram capsules a month, and it has uniform records on the largest population of Parkinson patients of any institution in the world. We're currently analyzing data from this tremendously rich source to see if we can detect any life expectancy differences between pre- and post-L-Dopa patients. This study is going very well, and we expect to be able to report on it by the end of this year. Real knowledge of whether L-Dopa slows the progression of parkinsonism would give us a very important new research lead.

Of course there are other things we also have to find out about this interesting drug. As many of you know, one of the problems that has discouraged many patients, and their physicians, has been that the doses of L-Dopa that are necessary to obliterate tremors are so large that they also frequently produce severe, although reversible, side effects. The problem appears to stem from a natural protective mechanism that acts to prevent many drugs from getting into the brain from the blood stream. Small amounts of L-Dopa (and therefore less likely to produce side effects) are broken down so quickly in the body that adequate penetration into the brain doesn't take place. The main experimental approach to this problem, is through the use of certain "inhibitor" drugs which slow the breakdown of L-Dopa, thus allowing greater penetration, and permitting smaller doses. This is a tremendously exciting investigation because, if it's successful, it will enable us to help many of the 25 to 35 percent of Parkinson patients who cannot now tolerate L-Dopa.

We were most interested to learn that the National Parkinson Institute is negotiating with a drug company to test one of the inhibitors, known as "MK-486." This compound is being tried in a number of other centers and, if you haven't already heard it: the results are highly encouraging up to now. One group that we support in New York currently has 50 patients under treatment with MK-486, plus L-Dopa. They have found that they can reduce dosages by 80 percent, eliminate some side effects, and reduce many of the others to negligible levels.

Some other information of interest relating to long-term safety of L-Dopa has also been reported recently, patients who have been on the drug continuously for as long as three years have shown no serious untoward effects. Furthermore, we have no evidence that the drug causes any measurable alterations in brain tissue. This is very encouraging, indeed.

The data I have just discussed relates, of course, to specific treatment measures—their efficacy and the problems that are associated with them. They are of paramount importance to those of you who are so conscious of the progress of individuals suffering from Parkinson's Disease. But even beyond that awareness, I know that many of you here tonight have an even deeper concern. You look to the total health picture with a concern for those who are afflicted with a broad range of disorders. You have seen the appearance of health deficits which might not have occurred had we paid greater attention to preventive techniques. You have borne the burden that escalating costs have placed on consumed and provider alike—to say nothing of the enlarging price of the Federal budget allocated to health. And you have experienced the inadequacies of traditional methods of insuring against the expense of both chronic and acute disorders.

We, at HEW, have increasingly come to a better understanding of these matters—something the voluntary organizations have known for a long time—while dollars are important, the efficient and well-planned use of those dollars is absolutely vital. For too long, we have received only a partial return from Federal health expenditures; today, we must insist that every dollar we spend pro-

duces the maximum possible benefit to American health consumers.

This philosophy is the cornerstone of the comprehensive health strategy I came to Washington to implement, at the request of our President. And my associates and I have started to implement it. We began by streamlining the operation of HEW—the second largest but most complex of all government departments. For years, people have said that HEW couldn't be managed. I'm here to tell you it can be managed and under the inspired leadership of our Secretary, Elliot Richardson, it is being managed; and well too, in my judgment.

At HEW our concern is not, weapons systems, national parks or highways—it's people—their health; their education; their well being and their welfare. My one concern, in the Department, is health. And our goal is to make it possible for all people to have ready access to good health care at a price that is reasonable and can be reasonably afforded. We are emphasizing the prevention of disease, the control of costs and the quality of the product. And we intend to achieve these objectives without destroying the freedom which has been responsible for so many of the advances in American health technology. We are not yet prepared to bankrupt the nation with paternalistic health protection schemes. We do not think that government has the right to rob the individual citizen of his own right to choose the physician and the health facility that he believes are best equipped to meet his needs.

More simply stated, our strategy is an interlocking effort to encourage the reform and renovation of the entire health care system through more skillful health planning, health research, health manpower education and health services. And I am gratified that you who are associated with the National Parkinson Foundation also recognize the need for a fresh and innovative approach in your work with patients. I refer, of course, to the concept utilized in the Tower of Hope. This unique facility undertakes rehabilitation and research in effective, new ways—providing an environment more closely resembling the "real world" to which the chronic patient and his family must adapt.

Mrs. Levey has told us of the plans for the Bob Hope Research and Rehabilitation Institute, which will encompass some 50 beds, and laboratory facilities for 8 to 10 scientists. I can only say that we welcome and applaud this enterprise and wish you the best of good luck with it.

As I have already suggested, the conquest of Parkinson's Disease—like most of our other health challenges—will result from a partnership, an amalgam of public and private effort. Thus far, your share of the job has been handled admirably. My colleagues and I will do everything we can to match it.

Thank you.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN SPEAKS ON CHALLENGES FACING OUR NATION

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 13, 1972, the Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, distinguished Democratic national chairman, addressed the Men's Clubs of Synagogues—Beth Shalom Synagogue in Kansas City, Mo. His speech is a masterful account of the challenges facing our Nation in the year ahead, and I want to commend it to my colleagues who might not already have seen it, and to all who read this RECORD, as a timely analysis of today's problems:

REMARKS BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

And so it is with us again—another year of reckoning—the quadrennial test of man and system.

Yes, it is 1972 and the determination of America's destiny is before us again.

It occurs to me, as it may to many of you, that there probably has never been an election year when it was not said that the future of America depended on the outcome . . . that America's destiny truly lay, in whatever year it happened to be, in the decision of millions of citizens as they privately register their choice for President of the United States.

But in the year of 1972, I submit that our destiny as a nation is on the line perhaps as it has not been since the Civil War.

We, as a nation, have survived many crises, many critical tests, since that dark period in the mid-19th Century. But now, as a democracy approaching its 200th year, we could well be facing our greatest test.

For I am convinced that millions of Americans have become dubious to the point of despondency at the capacity of this system ever again to produce strong, compassionate, and trustworthy leaders. The national polls will tell you: "Politicians never keep their word."

Events of recent months and years have spawned a grim cynicism among our fellow citizens toward the most basic tenets of our form of government. Many—and perhaps most—simply don't believe that the people govern themselves . . . that their voices and needs are heard by their elected leaders . . . that theirs is truly a government not of men, but of laws.

And there, my friends, is the challenge to the party of which I am a member—the Democratic Party. Let me state right here and now that that challenge is the reason I am involved as its national chairman.

Now, you may be forgiven if you happen to believe my purpose in life is solely to win elections; it's a reputation that's hard to shed.

So let me indulge in what might seem, to some of my associates, to be heresy. I simply have no interest—*none whatever*—in dislodging Richard Nixon from the White House if the alternative is simply more of the same. America just couldn't take that in 1972.

Of course, I would take pleasure in sending Mr. Nixon back to San Clemente, or Park Avenue, or Key Biscayne, or wherever he calls home—but *only* if my party has replaced him with a leader who will lead; who will command the trust and confidence of the American people, and who will offer a solid, tangible, and positive alternative to the clumsy and insensitive bungling of the past three years.

A philosopher once said there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than the introduction of a new order of things.

But without question, the 1970s cry out for a new order of things in American society. And if my party is rightfully to seek the leadership of this nation, it must set that new order before the people in a way that will *compel* their affirmative response.

The challenge to the Democratic Party—with its incredibly broad coalition of virtually every segment of American society—is to restate in believable and contemporary terms the party's traditional concern for the interests of average citizens . . . those aspects of society that directly affect people's daily lives. The challenge is to set forth this commitment in terms that reflect the reality of 1972 rather than the realities of the Great Depression, the 1950s, or the 1960s.

You may be sure that Mr. Nixon will be hard at work telling the American people he has done his best in a difficult situation. He will pour unprecedented millions of dollars into that effort, hoping the all-time record

for summit conferences and Air Forces One fuel consumption will entice the American people away from their concern over their livelihoods, their children, their sick, their elderly, and the ever-diminishing "little extras" in life.

You may be sure that Mr. Nixon realizes fully the absence of a committed personal following and the undoubted minority position of the Republican Party as the 1972 campaign begins. And so we can expect that he will try to orchestrate a highly "presidential" campaign, quite different from the strident partisan effort of 1970. The phrase "partisans of principle" will ring throughout the land; the word "Republican" will seldom, if ever, be mentioned.

You'll be hearing a lot about "a generation of peace" and "the new prosperity based on peace" as Mr. Nixon tries to portray himself as a man of action, of vision, struggling with intractable problems inherited from the Democrats. And to some observers, the Nixon strategy will appear unbeatable, with the Democrats overwhelmed by the disadvantages of incumbency and unlimited finances.

I do not agree.

And here lies the challenge to the Democratic Party in 1972: To nominate a presidential candidate who—along with his party's platform—offers a real alternative, a leader who shows the strengths and ability to get the job done, a candidate with the capacity to make the voters say: "Mr. Nixon's best is not good enough; we can do better."

And truly, it comes down in large measure to the basic question of trust.

What are the American people to think of their leaders when they elect a man who has "a plan to end the war"—and three years later open their newspapers at the holiday season to discover that North Vietnam is under a rain of awesome new American bombs?

What are they to think of their leaders when a professed neutrality over another war in South Asia turns out to be cynically masking a spiteful bungling of all of our Asian relationships?

We can only hope that Mr. Nixon's exercise in professed neutrality—one that featured a distinct tilt against India and the people of Bangla Desh—is not repeated in the Middle East.

The objective of U.S. policy in the Middle East must be a lasting peace between Israel and the Arab nations—a peace that will assure independence and security to Israel and all other nations and people in the area. The Middle East arms race regrettably has continued, spurred by increased shipments of arms to the Arabs from the Soviet Union and certain western nations. The United States should make every effort to reduce the flow of arms into the area and press for Middle East arms limitation arrangements.

However, pending such an arrangement, the United States must correct or prevent an arms imbalance that might either threaten Israel's existence or contribute to a resumption of major hostilities.

In other words, the Nixon administration's neutrality in this area of the world must not become a pretext for endangering Israel's survival.

What are the American people to think of their leaders when Mr. Nixon—who has on 11 occasions vetoed major items of special legislation—goes out of his way to announce his "reluctance" at signing legislation to extend emergency unemployment benefits in those states most harshly affected by his administration's failure to end unemployment—which in 1971 reached a 10-year high?

The issue in 1972? It's a question I am asked nearly every day. The issue is leadership. The issue is the survival of our form of government—built as it is on a flow of power from the people, who *must* believe, if government is to be legitimate, that they are heard. The issue, in short, is trust.

And on that issue, I firmly believe Mr. Nixon has failed us utterly.

And *that* is the issue we shall present to the American people.

Reformed, restructured, and revitalized, the Democratic Party will prove to our fellow citizens that this, after all, is *still* the best form of government mankind has known. And to dramatize that effort, I would remind you that every one of you, every organization in the country such as these represented here tonight, may now, under our new reform procedures, play a direct role in the selection of our nominee and the writing of our platform. We as a party have laid the groundwork; it is time now for Democrats across this nation to avail themselves of the opportunities now existing to become delegates to the local, state, and national Democratic conventions, or to exert their influence on the selection of these delegates. You need only inquire; we shall tell you how.

With that involvement, we shall summon forth once again the commitment of every citizen to the destiny of this nation, knowing that our democracy will stand or fall on the capacity and willingness of each individual to meet his responsibilities.

We shall not venture to China, or Russia, or South America, or the Bahamas, to reach the hearts of the American people. For us, in 1972, the "summit conference" must be every word we exchange with our fellow Americans. We shall "normalize" relations here in our own land, where the challenges are unending.

We shall do it in the contest for the presidential nomination in all the states. We shall prove our fitness to lead at Miami Beach with a nominating convention unprecedented for its openness, fairness, and good sense.

And we shall do it in the fall, a few short months from now, with an appeal to the best in our people; an appeal that unites rather than divides; an appeal that utterly rejects the Nixon-Mitchell reliance on bitterness and distrust.

For the future of our nation, someone must do that. It must be done now, in this year of 1972.

It is a time for greatness, for vision, for boldness. And yet it is a time for steady, reasoned leadership that does not seek to startle and confuse the people with explosive announcements and sudden shiftings of course.

Above all, in striving to regain the confidence of the people in their elected representatives and leaders, we must be certain that we do not promise too much on the cynical presumption that "nobody really expects politicians to keep their promises anyway."

A distinguished political analyst wrote recently of this syndrome:

"Some politicians . . . have bespoken the glory of the dream, convinced obviously that this was what many Americans wanted to hear. The corollary, inevitably, was that bad news, limited promises, ordinary visions could not be offered."

"As a people, we should by now have seen the folly in this course. Dreams, like everything else, have their price. Things gained too easily at the outset cost much more later. America's resources are running thin. The social burdens of pollution and the ravaged land are mounting . . ."

"Our leaders are supposed to be our wise counselors. If they are overpromisers, as some of them surely are, then they are cruel deceivers. They must know better. On the threshold of 1972, America still is rich in the substance of good living. Its people have great qualities. But there needs to be less fanciful dreaming and more hard effort, more payment on the high price of great dreams."

And so our promise to the American people in this momentous year must be care-

fully defined. Not "this year will be a very good year in the economy" when we can't possibly know that to be true. Simply "We hear you. We understand the problems. We will set them in their proper place in the social order of things; assign them the correct priority, and then do everything within our power to come up with a solution that will be meaningful to you."

Who knows? We might even come up with a president of the United States who will be able to say, when it is appropriate, such bizarre things as, "I don't know." Or "We were wrong." Or even, "You're not going to like this for a while, but here's what we have to do."

For I believe the American people know in their hearts what their political leaders seem too seldom to realize: That we must always, in the final analysis, rely on human intelligence, human will, and human decency—always allowing for human fallibility.

The American people, in 1972, want desperately to know where this nation is going—and where it is taking them, as individual human beings.

Those in power today have defaulted. And now it is up to us to provide the answers and lead the way.

This is my commitment—and I hope it will be yours.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER):)

Mr. BLACKBURN, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARCHER), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. POAGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. McFALL, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEGICH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. GOLDWATER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEELE in six instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER in four instances.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. HEINZ.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCLURE.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT in two instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. ASPIN in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. DRINAN in three instances.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. CULVER in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. COTTER.

Mr. HUNGATE in four instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa in two instances.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2275. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Kutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 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:

1641. A letter from the Director of ACTION, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional authorization of appropriations under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1642. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1643. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that better inspection and improved methods of administration are needed for foreign meat imports under the Consumer and Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture; 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. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 828. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11021. A bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-844). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 829. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12931. A bill to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America (Rept. No. 92-845). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 819. Resolution to create a Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures (Rept. No. 92-846). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 13270. A bill. National Public Employee Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13271. A bill to implement the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13272. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the provision of home health services under the insurance program established by part A thereof without a prior stay in a hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 13273. A bill to establish more effective community planning and development programs (and expand the related provisions of existing programs) with particular emphasis upon assistance to small communi-

ties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 13274. A bill to ban the usage of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth promoter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13275. A bill to require that certain textile products bear a label containing cleaning instructions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CABELL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. REID, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 13276. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act in order to provide for the deferment thereunder of students appointed to maritime academies and colleges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13277. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students at State maritime academies and colleges as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13278. A bill to ban the usage of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth promoter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 13279. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of charitable contributions of inventory and certain other ordinary income property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13280. A bill to provide headstones for the unmarked graves of former Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 13281. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Charles County, Md., certain Federal surplus real property to be used for civil defense and other emergency purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13282. A bill to amend the act of April 9, 1966, so as to provide for the acquisition of Oxon Hill Manor for use as the official residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. GRAY):

H.R. 13283. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, 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 public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 13284. A bill to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13285. A bill to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 13286. 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.

H.R. 13287. A bill to provide that any person making an offer to supply items through the mails periodically and pursuant to an agreement to another person, must send the

other person a complete copy of the agreement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 13288. 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. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. LANDRUM):

H.R. 13289. A bill to amend section 101(1) (3) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 in respect to the application of section 4942(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to private foundations subject to section 101(1) (4) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 13290. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to expand American exports by utilizing U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay import duties on such goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COTTER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REID, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ROY, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 13291. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to expand American exports by utilizing U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay import duties on such goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13292. A bill to broaden the national housing goals, to provide housing assistance, and promote community development through block grants with emphasis upon the preservation and more efficient use of the existing housing stock and upon the revitalization of declining neighborhoods, to improve programs of Federal planning assistance with emphasis upon modernizing and increasing the management capabilities of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 13293. A bill to promote more effective operations and management of the Federal corrections system by reorganizing certain functions and creating new organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13294. A bill to suspend the duty on artificial kidneys used in hemodialysis procedure until the close of June 30, 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13295. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13296. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13297. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical or mental handicap in federally assisted programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13298. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit certain veterans up to 9 months of educational assistance for the purpose of pursuing retraining or refresher course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 13299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Santa Margarita project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCFALL:

H.R. 13300. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in order to increase the authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for public works and development facilities grants, and to require that a larger percentage of such appropriations be expended in certain redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13301. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide improved vocational rehabilitation services to individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13302. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13303. A bill to provide a pension for veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 13304. A bill to authorize financial assistance for opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 13305. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that employees of the Federal Government who are ordained ministers shall not be required to perform work on Sunday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 13306. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical or mental handicap in federally assisted programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 1071. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 1072. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H. Res. 830. Resolution to authorize each Member, Resident Commissioner, and Delegate to hire within the monetary limits of the existing clerk-hire allowance two additional clerks who are physically handicapped; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 831. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies by the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H. Res. 832. Resolution printing in red ink of any U.S. Government budget submitted to the Congress which on a Federal funds basis is in deficit; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 833. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the United States recognize Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

H. Res. 834. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 835. Resolution providing additional compensation for services performed by certain employees in the House Publications Distribution Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 836. Resolution providing for adjustment of the salary for the position of Clerk, Official Reporters to Committees of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 837. Resolution to provide addi-

tional funds for the expenses of studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 114; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

314. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Federal highway aid for urban areas, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 13307. A bill for the relief of Newtown

Presbyterian Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 13308. A bill for the relief of Aurora Javier Fructuoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 13309. A bill for the relief of Sonia Regina Jones, an alien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 13310. A bill for the relief of Jean W. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13311. A bill for the relief of Park Nam Moon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13312. A bill for the relief of Bertha Alicia Sierra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 13313. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SYRINGES FOR HEROIN, ANYONE?

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the heroin epidemic in this country is in danger of turning into a pandemic. Hard drugs are now into many high schools and even are appearing in some grammar schools. Every major city is crawling with them. Deaths among young people from overdoses are rising constantly. Everyone is deploring or worrying about this situation. Yet, tangible efforts to curb this traffic are within our reach.

One area eminently worth exploring is commerce in potential heroin paraphernalia, especially syringes and hypodermic needles. Such items are sold through the mails by some enterprises with a fine disregard for their ultimate destination and use. It is imperative that some registry and control be placed on those who manufacture and sell these products.

Instances abound in which individuals order such equipment by mail from producers, such as those dealing in veterinary paraphernalia, and receive them with no questions asked and no permanent record kept. Here is a very definite contributing factor to the situation we confront in our cities.

In several of these cases, orders were placed and goods received without questions as to whether or not the customer was a physician, veterinarian, diabetic, or narcotics addict and pusher.

The answer is that love of the almighty dollar and desire for a fast profit weighed far larger in the scales of these businesses than the potential menace their use would entail.

In the proper hands they are useful tools. In the improper hands, they are, in all truth, contributing factors to the spread of the heroin traffic and resulting addiction and crime.

For these reasons, I am joining in sponsorship of the Hypodermic Needle and Syringe Control Act of 1972. This proposal would regulate sale of needles

and syringes by registering manufacturers, importers, wholesalers, and nonpharmacy dealers with the Attorney General of the United States. Also, it would prevent interstate transfer of such paraphernalia to those lacking a prescription, medical certificate, or other lawful excuse for possessing or using them.

This measure in no way trespasses upon the prerogatives of the medical or pharmaceutical professions. Pharmacies will not be impeded in the least. Legal use of these devices will not be interfered with. But the measure will directly and significantly impede access to them by undesirable persons.

The State laws in our various jurisdictions range from the stringent to the nonexistent. It is intolerable to allow such a vacuum to continue to exist, particularly in light of the consequences which are growing daily. One theme runs through the entire drug problem. Those in authority know perfectly well what the dimensions of the problem are. They know where the poison comes from, who grows it, moves it, processes it, and brings it into our country. The powers that be are also aware of the channels through which it flows in order to reach the streets. They further know what are the contributing factors, such as the situation this measure immediately is aimed at dealing with.

Yet in spite of this situation, no one seems to be willing to crack down hard. Bureaucratic excuses proliferate. There is always some smooth fellow reassuring the public and concerned authorities with the same type of excuse. They know what is best. They are working on it. They have the big picture. Well, all I have is the actual picture of what heroin is doing on the streets of the city of New York. All I can see is the agony, death, destruction, and upheaval this traffic is causing, and I for one am heartily sick and tired of what I consider to be unconscionable delay and inability to act.

This is a good measure, and deserves the favorable attention of the Congress. It is my fervent hope that we will act accordingly and with minimal delay. No one is immune, as we all know.

Thank you.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS COMMENDED—A REPORT ON GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN RURAL TENNESSEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are much concerned today with the need for revitalizing opportunity in rural areas in America. With 70 percent of the people in this country crowded onto 2 percent of the land, we are concerned with the continuing problems of cities becoming almost unmanageable, and rural communities declining due to the loss of that most precious of our resources, their people—particularly their youth.

Much is proposed as to what should be done—ideas, suggestions, pending legislation, and much thinking on this critical question prevails.

However, experience in the rural areas clearly indicates that rural development can prosper if there is more action like that being provided by the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This experienced rural agency, now under the leadership of able Administrator James V. Smith, who knows and understands rural America, is channeling vital and important resources into many rural communities to enable them to carry through with projects that arise from their own enterprise and industry. Programs of fundamental support in farming, housing, and the improvement of community facilities are reaching the people through programs of the Farmers Home Administration.

One essential element of rural America that benefits from programs of the Farmers Home is the family farm. It is true that more big farms—corporate farms—are developing, but the family farm should be the prevailing pattern of American agriculture. Hopefully it will remain so, if agriculture is to survive as a mainstay of the rural economy and community life.