

former representing State-AID employees and the latter USIA employees.

In the past, lack of grievance procedures in the foreign service brought outcries for reform from the American Foreign Service Association, a professional organization.

However, AFSA recently announced it is

pleased with the new executive order which gives foreign service employees the right to organize unions.

During the past year, some congressmen also expressed concern over shortcomings in grievance and appeals matters within the foreign service.

Consently, Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., introduced a bill to provide an appeals procedure within the State Department while Sens. Jack Miller, R-Iowa, and Frank Moss, D-Utah, both offered legislation designed to set up an appeals review board outside the State Department.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 7, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O magnify the Lord with me and let us exalt His name together.—Psalms 34: 3.

Almighty God, our Father, amid the changes of this swiftly moving age and troubled as we are by many things, we would be sure of Thee, without whom all our labor is in vain. During these days which try our souls as we seek to lead our Nation in just and good ways, help us to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our national life, for we know that only with Thee can we continue to be a channel of liberty to those who seek to be free.

May Thy special blessing rest upon our beloved colleague, DICK WHITE, in his sorrow, and upon these representatives of our people as they face the difficult problems of this troubled time. Enable them by Thy grace to be true to Thee, true to the high ideals of our democratic faith, and true to the brightest and best within themselves.

In the spirit of Him who was always true to Thee we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

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

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

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

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

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

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

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

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

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

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1862) for the relief of Frank J. McCabe.

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

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

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

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

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

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

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

There was no objection.

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2394) for the relief of Antonio Benavides.

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

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

There was no objection.

**MRS. CONCEPCION GARCIA
BALAURO**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2703) for the relief of Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Balauro.

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

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

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu.

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

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

There was no objection.

VLADIMIR RODRIGUEZ LA HERA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2076) for the relief of Vladimir Rodriguez La Hera.

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

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

**AMPARO CORONADO VIEUDA DE
PENA AND HER THREE MINOR
CHILDREN**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4679) for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena.

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

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

LESLEY EARLE BRYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6201) for the relief of Lesley Earle Bryan.

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

H.R. 6201

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lesley Earle Bryan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant admissions authorized pursuant to the provisions of section 21(e) of the Act of October 3, 1965.

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.

MATYAS HUNYADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6907) for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi.

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

H.R. 6907

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Matyas Hunyadi may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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.

ANDRIANO BOTELHO MONIZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7011) for the relief of Andriano Botelho Moniz.

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

H.R. 7011

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adriano Botelho Moniz may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. Albert G. Linder, citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 6, 7, and 8, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "and a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. Albert G. Lindner, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status, under 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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHUNG CHI LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7641) for the relief of Chung Chi Lee.

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

H.R. 7641

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a) (9) and section 212(a)(10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Chi Lee may be issued a visa and admitted to the United

States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided further*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds of exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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.

**MARIA MANUELA DA JESUS
GAMBINO**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4050) for the relief of Maria Manuela da Jesus Gambino.

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

H.R. 4050

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Manuela da Jesus Gambino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a) (1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Manuela Amaral shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Silverio De Amaral, lawfully resident aliens in the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EILBERG

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. EILBERG: In the committee amendment strike out "sections 203(a) (1)" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 203(a) (2)".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, 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: "For the relief of Maria Manuela Amaral."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA
DOS REIS**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6504) for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker,

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EMILIA RUFFOLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10142) for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. GLORIA VAZQUEZ HERRERA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1974) for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Vazquez Herrera.

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

H.R. 1974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Vazquez Herrera shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, after the words "visa fee," strike out the remainder of the bill.

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUZ MARIA CRUZ ALEMAN PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2052) for the relief of Luz Maria Cruz Aleman Phillips.

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

H.R. 2052

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luz Maria Cruz Aleman Phillips shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant admissions authorized pursuant to the provisions of section 21(c) of the Act of October 3, 1965.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, after the words "visa fee," strike out the remainder of the bill.

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWREY LUMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2131) for the relief of the Howrey Lumber Co.

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

H.R. 2131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the Howrey Lumber Company, El Paso, Texas, the sum of \$6,006.85, in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement for moving expenses which it incurred (over and above the amount of such reimbursement approved within the limits of Public Law 88-300 by the International Boundary and Water Commission) in transferring to a new location in 1967 as a result of its displacement in connection with the Chamizal agreement. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$6,006.85" and insert "\$5,927.35".

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. DAVID G. SIMONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3413) for the relief of Dr. David G. Simons, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

H.R. 3413

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor David G. Simons, lieutenant colonel, United States Air Force (retired), of Houston, Texas, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$8,757.65 representing the amount of overpayments of military retired pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel David G. Simons as a result of an erroneous determination by the United States Air Force that he was excepted from the Dual Compensations Act restrictions while employed by the Veterans' Administration hospital.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel David G. Simons an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT W. REISER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3751) for the relief of Albert W. Reiser, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

MAJ. HENRY C. MITCHELL, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5299) for the relief of Maj. Henry C. Mitchell, retired.

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

H.R. 5299

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Henry C. Mitchell, United States Army, retired, of Tallahassee, Florida, the sum of \$514.15 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising out of his family's move (in July 1964 prior to the delayed issuance of moving orders) from Columbia, South Carolina, to Nashville, Tennessee, while he was on active duty with the United States Army. Such claims consist of fees paid to movers, a travel allowance for his wife and children, and a dislocation allowance.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARY R. UTTECH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5315) for the relief of Gary R. Uttech.

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

H.R. 5315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gary R. Uttech, of Mosinee, Wisconsin, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$312.50, representing overpayments of active duty pay received by him as a member of the United States Navy for the period June 8, 1966 to October 10, 1969, inclusive, as a result of administrative errors on the part of Government personnel who failed to make required deductions in his pay for authorized bond allotments and leave.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gary R. Uttech an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, and page 2 lines 1 through 14: Strike all of section 2.

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN W. SHAFER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6820) for the relief of John W. Shafer, Jr.

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

H.R. 6820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John W. Shafer, Junior, of Troy, New York, is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$3,150 representing the amount of postage deficiency in his fixed credit account as the Superintendent of Office Services at the Albany, New York, Post Office.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said John W. Shafer the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the loss referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of any amount appropriated by this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same is unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor punished by a fine not to exceed \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, on such terms as it deems just, the United States Postal Service is authorized to compromise, release, or discharge in whole or in part the joint and several liability of John W. Shafer, Junior and John F. Schumacher, employees at the Albany, New York, post office, for a deficiency in the amount of \$3,150 in the stamp stock of John W. Shafer, Junior."

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JERRY L. CHANCELLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7946) for the relief of Jerry L. Chancellor.

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD P. LARIVIERE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald P. Lariviere.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSANNA THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9473) for the relief of Mrs. Rosanna Thomas.

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

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ALBERT G. FELLER AND FLORA FELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 247) for the relief of Albert G. Feller and Flora Feller.

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

S. 247

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert G. Feller and Flora Feller, of Ketchikan, Alaska, the sum of \$267.12, representing the cost to them of having the body of their deceased son transported from Anchorage, Alaska, to Ketchikan, Alaska, such son having drowned prior to return from his United States Army preinduction physical examination in Anchorage.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same is unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2: Strike "in excess of 20 per centum".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 341) for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader.

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

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

There was no objection.

DAVID J. CRUMB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 888) for the relief of David J. Crumb.

S. 888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriations available for payment of travel expenses to David J. Crumb, formerly stationed in Roseburg, Oregon, who incident to permanent change of station was ordered to report for duty at his new station in Pinedale, Wyoming.

on December 31, 1967, the real estate expenses which would have been payable to him under the provisions of section 5742(a) of title 5, United States Code, and Bureau of the Budget Circular Numbered A-56, revised October 12, 1966, without regard to the time limitation contained in section 4.1d of the Circular: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts authorized to be paid by this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim of Mr. Crumb, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered 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 Private Calendar.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 13120 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday, March 11, to file a report on H.R. 13120, to provide for modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if that is the bill which his committee is bringing out which has to do with the value of gold in this country?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is correct. It passed by a vote of 26 to 1.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, by request I must object to this request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULES HEARINGS

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

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Small Business Subcommittee, of which I am the chairman, will hold hearings on April 11, 12, and 13 on two small business bills. The first bill, H.R. 10792, would increase the overall SBA lending ceiling from \$3.1 billion to \$5.8 billion. This is the money that SBA may have outstanding in loans at any one time. It does not provide any additional funds or authorize the expenditure of any funds

but simply allows SBA to continue operations once it has reached its ceilings. The bill also provides several ceilings for expenditures under various SBA loan programs. It is estimated that SBA will reach its current loan ceiling in July of this year and, unless this legislation is enacted, the agency will have to discontinue its lending policies even though it will have money on hand for loans. The second bill, S. 1905, is an omnibus small business bill that deals not only with regular SBA lending programs but also the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company and volunteer programs of SBA. The hearings will be held in room 2128 of the Rayburn Building beginning at 10 a.m. each day.

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

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

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had the pleasure of having breakfast with members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from my home State. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, this meeting and a later briefing by the commander in chief of the VFW before our committee are particularly useful to me.

Briefings such as these are excellent examples of the tireless efforts by the VFW to improve the way of life for our Nation's veterans.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the activities of the VFW. The VFW, with 1,700,000 members in 10,000 posts, provides important services to our veterans as well as the Nation as a whole.

Its "Buddy Poppy" sales on behalf of our disabled veterans are well known. Perhaps not as well known, but equally important, are its activities and interests in our veterans hospitals, rehabilitation of disabled veterans, as well as its efforts to see that each of our Nation's veterans is gainfully employed in jobs fitting with their service to our country.

Their community activities on behalf of all of us merit special mention. They sponsor many important civic organizations. The youth of this Nation benefit from their sponsorship of many youth organizations and programs.

Loyalty Day and Voice of Democracy programs and other activities by the VFW help continue to remind all of us of our American heritage. Programs such as these are vitally important to the continuation of attitudes that have helped make this country great.

BUSINESS INVESTMENT SURVEYS SUGGEST STRONG ECONOMIC EXPANSION

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, a strong advance in business investment will help

insure a healthy rate of economic growth this year. Recent surveys of business intentions indicate that there will indeed be an upsurge in investment throughout the coming months.

The February Commerce-SEC survey of business plans to invest in new plant and equipment shows that firms intend to spend 10.5 percent more this year than they did in 1971. This is not only several times greater than the increase in 1971, but also indicates an improvement in investment intentions since December. The survey suggests that the business sector will be a full participant in the economic expansion this year and that businessmen find economic prospects quite favorable.

These conclusions are upheld by the recent McGraw-Hill survey of business investment plans for 1972. This highly respected private survey indicates that businessmen will spend more than \$90 billion on new investment this year, 11 percent more than last. Moreover, this acceleration will be widely shared by many industries.

Recent figures on actual business spending confirm these surveys of anticipated spending. New orders for manufacturers goods surged more than 6 percent in January, the sharpest monthly gain in nearly 16 years. New orders for durable goods, including capital equipment, jumped nearly 10 percent in the month. This data shows that businessmen are beginning to implement their increased spending plans.

We should not judge the economic outlook on the basis of 1 month's favorable statistics alone. However, when coupled with the unusually favorable surveys of anticipated business investment, the recent data strongly suggests a vigorous economic expansion throughout the year.

MOSCOW AND WARSAW TREATIES NOW CONSIDERED IN THE PARLIAMENT OF WEST GERMANY

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion of late regarding the Moscow and Warsaw Treaties now under consideration in the Parliament of West Germany. Much of that discussion has taken the form of warnings that the defeat of these treaties would be harmful to relations between the United States and West Germany.

In point of fact, however, quite the opposite is true. In these treaties the current West German Government makes substantial moral and political concessions to the East without obtaining reciprocal concessions. The treaties therefore tend to place West Germany under obligation to the East and her ties with the United States cannot help but be diminished as a result.

As our able colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), so correctly pointed out in his recent statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 29, 1972, pages 6119-20—in "going it alone"

in negotiations with the Soviets, the West Germans will almost surely find themselves very vulnerable to future Soviet extortions if the treaties are ratified. Great pressures will be brought to bear upon them to give considerable economic technological, and scientific aid to Communist regimes and to recognize the permanent existence of the various Communist governments, including East Germany. The result could well be, as my colleague has suggested, the reunification of Germany but under a Communist regime.

I feel confident this is not the desire of the German people, and it is certainly not in the interests of the Western World, in the community of which West Germany has been a stalwart ally.

Few Americans with any knowledge of the content of these treaties can logically arrive at the conclusion that their defeat could possibly damage United States-West German relations so gravely as would their ratification.

BUSING LEGISLATION FRUITLESS

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague here today to oppose legislation that would force their children and mine to rise before dawn, ride for 1 hour to school, and then return by the same 1-hour route at night.

This legislation is intended to achieve integration of our schools, certainly a commendable goal. However, in the name of commonsense, it is fruitless and wasteful legislation. It would achieve percentages of racial balance in our schools, but nothing else.

It means the destruction of our neighborhood school system which has served us well. It means wider communication gaps between teacher and parents which is vital to the future educational course of our children. It destroys the pride in a community institution which has caused its neighbors to work voluntarily for it and to support it.

As a matter of practicality, such legislation is wasteful. In my home State of Ohio, schools are pressed to the wall for financing. They need all of the community support they can get. Some schools in my State, I must point out, have scheduled classes for only a short time because they did not have enough money for full terms. If the added tremendous expense of new buses, drivers, and maintenance is added to the already hard-pressed budgets of such schools, then those schools would necessarily have to cut back again on quality education.

My friends, legislation to give equal rights to all is desirable and commendable. But this legislation is not right. Quality education can solve most of this Nation's problems in the future. We cannot achieve that quality if we subordinate the basic goal of education for some other purpose.

CXVIII—455—Part 6

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 602, DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENTS RECOVERED BY THE CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 602). To provide for the disposition of judgments, when appropriated, recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraphs 7 and 10, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this conference report was a unanimous report, but in keeping with the policy of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, particularly the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) I assume he would like to put some explanation of the conference action in the Record at this point.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, the gentleman is correct, and I would like to have that come after the statement of the managers is read.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 1, 1972.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the use of two judgments recovered by the Indians of the Flathead Reservation. The bill as it passed the Senate authorized the money to be used for any purpose requested by the tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The House amendment to the bill specified that 90 percent of the judgment will be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe, and that the balance will be available for any purpose requested by the tribe and approved by the Secretary. This provision was in accord with the request of the tribe, and it represented a compromise with the members of the tribe who lived away from the reservation. These off-reservation members wanted a 100-percent per capita because they get little benefit from the money spent on the reservation.

After the House had passed the bill

with a 90-percent per capita provision, the tribe passed a new resolution asking for an 80-percent per capita distribution, and some of the off-reservation members objected.

The conferees compromised on an 85-percent per capita distribution.

I recommend that the conference report be approved.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 671, DIVISION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR THE BLACKFEET TRIBE IN MONTANA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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., in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 279-A, and for other purposes, 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 1, 1972.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a division of an Indian Claims Commission judgment between the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, and for the use of the money after it is divided. The division between the tribes has been agreed upon by the tribes themselves, and is therefore not in dispute.

The bill as it passed the Senate, and the House amendment to the bill, which was in the nature of a substitute, differ

in three respects. The conferees agreed on the House version on two of the points of difference, and they agreed with the Senate on one of the points of difference.

The two House provisions that were accepted by the conferees related to a per capita distribution among the members of the two tribes of approximately 89 percent of the judgment, and for the use of the balance of the judgment for such purposes as the tribes might request and the Secretary approve. In addition, the conferees modified the language defining eligibility to share in a per capita distribution of the Gros Ventre money in order to conform to standard practice regarding dual tribal membership.

The provision of the Senate bill that was accepted by the conferees provided that a per capita payment to an Indian will not be considered when determining his eligibility for welfare assistance under the Social Security Act. This is a departure from the practice normally followed by the Congress in legislation of this kind. In fact, I believe the provision has been used only once before in connection with an Indian claims judgment. The conferees agreed to the provision only because of a unique situation that prevailed in connection with this judgment, and the statement of the managers emphasizes that there is no intention to depart from the general legislative policy which says that Indians are entitled to participate in the Social Security Act programs equally with all other citizens, and are not entitled to special privileges under that act.

Mr. Speaker, this is another unanimous decision by the conferees, and I recommend that the conference report be approved.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. As a further clarification, there are no nongermane amendments in this conference report?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct; not in this one nor in the preceding conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-188)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:
I am pleased to submit to the Congress

the Twenty-First Annual Report of the National Science Foundation, covering the fiscal year 1971. This report highlights the essential contribution of science to the progress of the Nation and the betterment of the quality of life for every citizen.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1972.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON LABOR RELATIONS PROBLEMS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on March 16 the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin hearings on labor relations problems in professional sports.

Our witnesses on March 16 will be a number of football players who have been active in past and present negotiations between the NFL Players Association and the team owners. We will be announcing further hearings at a later date.

The relationship between the players and the owners in professional sports has changed rapidly in the past few years, especially since the National Labor Relations Board took jurisdiction over professional sports.

We plan to find out whether NLRB coverage has helped the players and the owners to get along better.

I am personally interested in whether NLRB coverage has given the players at least some protection against some of the more capricious owners.

A good example of capricious conduct by a club owner is provided by the current negotiations between a 22-year-old pitcher with the Oakland Athletics baseball team, Vida Blue, and Charles Finley, owner of the Athletics. Finley has told Blue to either accept his final offer for a new contract or get out of baseball. Finley is quoted in a recent Red Smith column as saying:

I won't trade him and I won't sell him. Either he accepts what we have offered or he's through in baseball.

If professional athletes are at the mercy of the owners to this extent, perhaps it is time we considered changes in our labor laws to give the players some protection.

I include Mr. Smith's column in the RECORD at this point:

VIDA AND CHARLEY
(By Red Smith)

Vida Blue, the brightest individual star in baseball last summer and the biggest attraction in the American League, has been presented with a simple choice by the man who owns him: Either play for \$50,000 this year or get out of the game.

"I won't trade him and I won't sell him," Charles Finley, proprietor of the Oakland Athletics, has told the young pitcher's agent and attorney. "Either he accepts what we have offered or he's through in baseball." This isn't the first time a baseball employer has threatened a hired hand. "Let him sit home and rot," is a cliché as old as the reserve

clause and the holdout. Charles Finley is perfectly capable of cutting off his nose to spite his face, as Hawk Harrelson can testify. But what he is saying this time is that sooner than pay what he admits Blue is worth, he would freeze out a 22-year-old who pitched a no-hitter breaking into the majors, led the team to a divisional championship with a personal won-lost record of 24 and 8, and in his first big league season won the Most Valuable Player award in the American League and the Cy Young Award as the best pitcher in baseball.

If Charley Finley can do that, then he has a death wish bigger than his Napoleon complex.

Eight hours of negotiation-by-fear in his employer's insurance office in Chicago left young Vida shocked, but Robert J. Gerst, the Los Angeles attorney who represents him, was not impressed by Finley's ultimatum.

"Charley," he said, "I do not believe that you would tear a million dollars into little pieces and scatter them over Michigan Avenue from your window on the 27th floor."

TRUE BLUE CADDY

Because he had pitched a one-hitter and a no-hitter after joining the Athletics in late 1970, Blue's contract for his rookie season called for \$14,750, slightly above the major league minimum. He had received a \$25,000 bonus when the A's signed him out of high school in Mansfield, La. When he blossomed as a star last summer, Finley bought him a blue Cadillac with "VBLUE" on the license tags and gave him a credit card for gasoline. It was written that "the only thing lacking was a slice of watermelon."

Vida wanted to give the car back but was talked out of it. However, he did not conceal his anger when Finley suggested that he'd be willing to pay \$2,000 if Vida would adopt True as a middle name. The young man said Vida Blue had been his father's name and that he did honor to his father's memory every time he pitched.

This year Finley's opening offer was \$45,000, an increase of 300 per cent. Gerst suggested \$115,000, close to 800 per cent. Charley said, \$50,000 and that was final.

"I asked him," Gerst reports, "if he could give any reason why Vida shouldn't get the average salary of the 10 best paid pitchers in the majors. Starting with Bob Gibson at \$150,000, Ferguson Jenkins and Juan Marichal, then Tom Seaver at \$120,000, Denny McLain, the two Perrys, Claude Osteen at \$75,000, Dave McNally and Jim Palmer, we estimated that an average figure would be around \$92,500. We offered to settle for that."

"Finley didn't give us any reason why Vida shouldn't get it. In fact, he admitted that Vida was worth it and said if he were in Vida's position he'd be asking the same. 'But' he said, 'I won't pay it.'"

"In 1970 Charley said the same thing to Reggie Jackson, who went into a fit of rage. Vida was just as angry when he heard it. Since our meeting in Chicago I've talked to Finley twice on the phone and written him two long letters. 'Charley,' I've urged him, 'don't make the same mistake you made with Reggie Jackson.'"

AREA CODE 415

There is an interesting parallel between these discussions and Tom Seaver's bargaining with the Mets' Bob Scheffing. Seaver compared his and the team's victory totals over five years, took note of attendance figures and arrived at an asking price. Says Gerst: "We discussed the fact that a million fans paid to see Vida last year and the whole American League drew only 11-million. Here are the figures: League attendance was 11,870,504; in Vida's 39 starts, attendance was 909,422 for an average of 23,318; in 19 starts on the road Vida drew 530,000 for an average

of 28,300, compared with the league average of 12,200; Oakland did 914,993 at home and 370,000 of these saw Vida's 20 starts. In August, when Vida was rained out in Baltimore, Charley was quoted to the effect that it cost him \$30,000. He didn't deny it."

It has been written that other club owners are rooting for Finley, and that's probably true up to a point. That point would be reached when Charley told his lodge brothers they would have to get along without the boxoffice appeal of the Most Valuable Player and Cy Young Award winner. They would, then review the figures, noting especially how many millions the American League lagged behind the National at the gate. The telephone in Oakland would not stop ringing.

PAYING DESERVED TRIBUTE TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the presence this week in this Capital of the United States of representatives of one of the largest organizations of American veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to urge all my colleagues to join in paying deserved tribute to that fine organization of patriotic and loyal Americans.

Many of us will be joining VFW members tonight at their annual dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel and will be meeting separately throughout this week with VFW delegations from our respective States and congressional districts. I for one am always inspired by these meetings with men and women from every sector of our society, of all races, faiths and creeds, but with the common experience of having served their country in a military unit during a foreign war. They also share a common belief in the need to maintain our national security and to keep alive the pride of Americans in this Nation and its living institutions.

It is fitting that yesterday, March 6, as this conference of VFW leaders began in Washington, the House unanimously passed by a record vote of 358 yeas the bill H.R. 12828, the Veterans Education and Training Amendments of 1972. This 1972 GI bill is principally based on a draft proposal submitted by the Veterans' Administration in November, 1971, and was strongly supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veterans organizations.

H.R. 12828 provides a 14-percent average increase in all forms of financial aid available for education and training under the GI bill. This was a cost-of-living-based increase, conforming with the administration's original proposal of 8.6 percent which was based upon a now outdated cost-price index.

The bill does provide one exception to these increases, in that section 304 requires veterans to pay a small 10 percent of certain programs that are currently fully subsidized, thereby tending to increase the veteran's sense of responsibility toward those programs.

In order to make programs more accessible to the survivors of veterans, certain restrictions on their entitlement to educational benefits are removed by H.R. 12828. Section 318 makes widowers of female veterans eligible for certain survivor benefits previously denied.

Veterans have complained about groups obtaining Veterans' Administration mailing lists through loopholes in the Freedom of Information Act. I am pleased that the veteran's right of privacy is recognized and protected by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee adding section 320 to the 1972 GI bill, to require that all Veterans' Administration mailing lists be treated as confidential.

Another meritorious amendment is adding section 321, providing a 20-percent increase in funds given to States as reimbursement for administrative costs incurred by their participation in this program. This corresponds with actual cost increases.

The increased benefits provided the veterans, his dependents, and survivors by this bill will cost an estimated \$293 million for its first full year of operation. I submit this is small indeed compared to the very great debt this Nation owes to those who have served honorably in its defense.

I gladly voted for this legislation, and for two other bills affecting veterans which passed the House last week—H.R. 11185, a bill clarifying the exemption of certain income of veterans organizations from Federal income tax, and H.R. 9900, excluding from gross income for Federal income tax purposes the compensation of Americans held prisoner in the Vietnam conflict.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended for their very great efforts on behalf of young Americans held captive and hostage by the Communists—these men will never be forgotten if the VFW has anything to say about it.

One of the leading points in the National, State, and local Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative objectives, one I am sure each Member of this House will hear stated by VFW visitors from his congressional district or State this week, is their great desire to amend the Federal Holidays Act to restore Veterans Day or Armistice Day to the traditional date of observance, November 11, a day of real meaning particularly to veterans of World War I and their families.

On December 13, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1009, a resolution proposing to change Veterans' Day back to November 11. In my remarks on the House floor on December 14, I said:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am not the only Member of Congress who has received numerous letters from constituents protesting against the change of Veterans Day from November 11 to the fourth Monday in October, which first became effective this fall.

I have heard from many veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and the conflict in Vietnam, as well as from many nonveterans who feel strongly much of the true meaning and traditional significance of Veterans Day, or Armistice Day as many of us still know it, has been lost by shifting it from its actual historic date. I share their concern that Veterans Day could become just another Monday holiday, only

2 weeks following still another Monday holiday, Columbus Day.

November 11 is a date of great historic significance, a date which automatically stirs the memories of this Nation and reminds it of the tremendous debt it owes to those who have served and are serving in its defense. It makes as much sense to commemorate our veterans on the fourth Monday in October as it would to commemorate our Nation's birthdate of independence on the fourth Monday of June rather than on July 4.

It is not too late to restore Veterans Day to its appropriate date on the calendar. I strongly urge my colleagues to support such action, proposed in the bill which I introduced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive a letter dated December 17, 1971, from Mr. Francis W. Stover, director, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, pledging the full support of the VFW for early passage of my resolution. I insert this letter at this point in my remarks:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
December 17, 1971.

HON. WILEY MAYNE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYNE: It was gratifying, indeed, to read in the Congressional Record of December 14, 1971, your remarks regarding returning Veterans Day to November 11th and, also, that you introduced House Joint Resolution 1009 to accomplish this purpose.

As you are aware, we have a mandate from our last National Convention to return Veterans Day to November 11th and our Commander-in-Chief, Joseph L. Vicitte, has made this one of his Priority Legislative Goals.

In view of the foregoing, be assured you have the full support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. in this legislation and we hope for its early passage.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1972, I again addressed the House and urged action on this legislation. In closing my remarks today, I would reiterate the following statement I made on the House floor last week:

Mr. Speaker, I again urge the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and of the subcommittee to which House Joint Resolution 1009 has been referred to take immediate action with regard to this and similar resolutions introduced by colleagues, and I urge my brothers of this House to honor those who have served their Nation in its wars by expediting early restoration of Veterans Day to its appropriate historical date, a date of significance to all veterans and to the Nation. We can do no less.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SHOULD DIRECT NASA TO RE- COMPETE SPACE SHUTTLE MAIN ENGINE CONTRACT

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1971, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced the selection of the Rocketdyne Division of North

American Rockwell Corp., Canoga Park, Calif., for negotiations leading to the award of a cost-plus-award-fee contract for the space shuttle main engine.

The eventual contract called for the design, development, and delivery of 36 engines by June 1978 at a proposed cost of \$500 million.

The selection of Rocketdyne ended a 12-month competition during which Rocketdyne, the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft, and the Aerojet Liquid Rocket Division of General Tire Corp., conducted preliminary design studies and produced program definition documents. Proposals for the SSME were received by NASA from the three companies on April 21, 1971.

On the basis of 1,100 points, Rocketdyne received a total of 711.4 points, Pratt & Whitney got 705.6 and Aerojet General 644.

The point spread between Rocketdyne and Pratt & Whitney represents 0.6 percent of the total possible points.

In addition, the Source Evaluation Board of NASA found that the Pratt & Whitney proposal contained the lowest costs and that Pratt & Whitney also led Rocketdyne in other categories of the evaluation, including: Work approach, organization and management structure, planning and methodology, visibility and control, and in overall performance rating.

On August 3, 1971, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft filed a protest with the General Accounting Officer over the procedures used by NASA in selecting Rocketdyne as the negotiating contractor for the space shuttle main engine. This was the first protest filed by Pratt & Whitney in its 45 years as a Government contractor and was based on the company's belief that NASA failed to observe pertinent statutes and regulations governing procurement conduct to insure fair and open competition.

Since the filing of that protest, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, through its attorneys, has submitted additional data to GAO to support its contention that NASA did not use the negotiation process to obtain improved final offers as required, and an investigation by General Accounting Office auditors has raised serious questions concerning unfair advantage to Rocketdyne during SSME competition.

Efforts on the part of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft to support its contentions have been extensive and I believe the findings are persuasive enough to warrant a recompetition of the space shuttle main engine contract by NASA. I would urge the Comptroller General, as he nears a decision in this matter, to resolve the protest in a manner which best carries out the intent of the Congress to provide for fair and open competition in Government procurement contracts.

Among the contentions submitted to the GAO by Pratt & Whitney Aircraft as a result of its research and investigation into the SSME competition are the following:

First, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft contends, with supporting documents, that during the SSME competition the Rocketdyne Division of North American Rockwell benefited unfairly from an existing contract with NASA for sup-

port of Saturn engines. Specifically, Pratt & Whitney contends that reports prepared by Rocketdyne and submitted to NASA concerning the Saturn launch support contract show that the work performed by Rocketdyne applied specifically to the SSME and that the test parameters for Rocketdyne technology are the SSME specifications and conditions, rather than those for Saturn engines. The first knowledge of the existence of these reports did not come to Pratt & Whitney until after the NASA Source Selection Board made its decision to select Rocketdyne as the negotiating contractor for the SSME.

In addition, Pratt & Whitney contends, with support from a separate GAO auditor's report, that Rocketdyne engineers charged their SSME work to the cost reimbursement Saturn launch support contract thereby affording Rocketdyne more NASA funds.

Second, Pratt & Whitney contends, with supporting documents, that none of the Rocketdyne reports on the Saturn launch support contract which involved space shuttle main engine related technology were filed at the Marshall Space Flight Center document repository under the heading "Space shuttle." NASA maintained no cross-reference system and no subject index which would permit an individual with proper access to this facility to ascertain what materials were available on any particular subject more particularly described than in the five index categories—Saturn, space shuttle, space station, skylab, and specifications and standards. The 400-plus page catalog of "Saturn" reports does not list reports by the subject contained therein, but rather only by the report number. In order to successfully use the Marshall Space Flight Center repository, Pratt & Whitney would have had to have known: First, that SSME related technology was in fact being developed under the Saturn launch support contract, and second, the subject matters covered by the various report numbers. Pratt & Whitney contends that it was never informed that such work was in fact going forward under the Saturn support contract nor was it informed that the numbered reports were the reports which contained descriptions of SSME related technology.

Third, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft submits that a letter of May 27, 1970, from Dr. Eberhard Rees, Director, Marshall Space Flight Center to Charles W. Matthews, M.D., Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Manned Space Flight, NASA, indicates an unfair competitive advantage given to Rocketdyne by NASA. That letter contains the following statements:

We believe the Rocketdyne engine people today are the best available in the industry, but they will remain competent only so long as we keep them challenged and busy. An example of how the Rocketdyne engineering skills will be kept at peak efficiency during periods of minimal problem solving effort is through the Linear Engine task, planned for FY-71. . . . Approximately one-third of the contracted manpower is planned to be expended on this task during FY-71. The contribution to technological advancement is secondary.

Fifth, Pratt & Whitney contends that

NASA arbitrarily and capriciously terminated the XLR-129 contract which Pratt & Whitney won in open competition with Rocketdyne. The XLR-129 program represented the only high-pressure, staged-combustion, oxygen-hydrogen engine contract ever awarded in the United States, and was intended as the forerunner of the SSME. Termination of the XLR-129 program came in the face of U.S. Air Force, Department of Defense, and NASA recommendations that the XLR-129 program with Pratt & Whitney be continued. The reason given by NASA for termination of the XLR-129 program was that its continuation would prejudice the phase B competition for the SSME and give Pratt & Whitney an unfair competitive advantage. Yet, in mid-1970, at the time the XLR-129 program was being phased out, Rocketdyne was initiating its Saturn launch support contract, which, Pratt & Whitney contend, gave Rocketdyne an unfair competitive advantage during the Phase B competition for the SSME.

The foregoing are but the highlights of a 144-page reply brief filed with the General Accounting Office by Pratt & Whitney Aircraft pursuant to its protest in the SSME award.

I believe that congressional intent would be best served and public confidence in government bidding procedure would be reinforced by a decision of the Comptroller General directing NASA to recompetitely the space shuttle main engine contract.

HENOCIDE AFOOT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a fowl deed is about to take wing in the U.S. Senate. A bill—S. 2895—to kill off mother hens by the thousands—maybe millions—is fluttering around the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

And pity of pities, all the flapping about it so far has been on behalf of those moneyed barons of the egg industry who must see profit in the blood of slaughtered hens. "Henocide" it is called.

They demand that Government take the blame for mandating the death of defenseless hens—hens in the prime of motherhood, no less.

If you read the bill itself, you will probably be like the little boy in the chickenyard who dropped the bubble gum he was chewing. He was confused.

But plucked down to bare facts, the henocide bill is nothing more than a scheme to use the lethal authority of Government to force up the market price of eggs by killing hens.

When the truth is out, the villains will flock to cover.

Imagine the cluckings Ralph Nader and his raiders will give forth when they hear of henocide. But loud as may be these cluckings, they will be smothered to nothing in feather-flying fury when gals of the women's lib discover this ugly ultimate in male chauvinism. They will surely ungirdle their sharpest clawings for those who would slaughter only

female chickens—doing nothing, not even harmless, painless vasectomy to the males, the real perpetrators of production.

Surely, they will bare their beaks and demand roostercide instead of hencide.

If, despite Nader's raiders, women's lib and commonsense, the dastardly deed is done, who will come out on top? The eggopoly, of course. About 400 giant firms will, they think, be better off and the rest of us will have egg on our face.

In truth the bill would set up an eggopoly able to get the Feds to man the chopping block with penalties of violators set at \$5,000 a cackle. With anti-trust immunity, the eggopoly could engage in a premeditated conspiracy to raise consumer prices with hardly any fuss and feathers.

Happily for hens, the Senate Agriculture Committee adjourned Monday for lack of quorum. Next try is scheduled for Thursday.

The Congress would be feather-brained to pass the bill. It is a chicken-hearted concoction by bird barons who would scratch out a few extra pennies from the agony of motherhood. If they had any gizzard at all, they would take care of their own troubles with grit—and with no ifs, ands or Butz.

FARM PRICE CONTROLS ARE NOT NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with wage earner income up 240 percent and farm income up just 7 percent in the past 20 years, placing a lid on future farm price increases would clearly be the wrong move at the wrong time.

It is true that some farm prices are at 20-year highs, but what other segment of our economy has its income at the level received in 1950? Between 1950 and 1972, farmers have had many periods of unprofitable prices and certainly must have an opportunity to recoup their losses.

Some consumer-oriented publications have recently painted the farmer as getting rich while housewives are being victimized at the supermarket.

A quick look at income improvement of the farmer and the consuming public dispels that unwise, incorrect, and unfair assumption. With wage earner income going up 240 percent in the past 20 years, it is clear much of the increased food costs were caused by stepped-up handling, shipping, and processing costs involved in getting food from farm to consumer. The average hourly labor cost for marketing food products has increased 66 percent in the past 10 years.

Looking at several food items, it is interesting to note the relatively small portion the farmer gets of what we pay at the supermarket. The rest goes for handling and processing costs.

For example, farmers in January received just 74.1 percent of the retail cost

of choice beef. Pork producers received 44.1 percent of the dollar spent for their product at the meat counter; dairy farmers were paid 29.9 percent of the retail price for their milk; poultrymen, 30.5 percent of the retail egg costs, and wheat growers, just 3.5 percent of the price of white bread.

Prices received by farmers are not inflationary when considering that farm food prices have increased just 7 percent from 20 years ago. During that same time, wholesale food prices increased 22 percent and retail food prices went up 44 percent.

Food clearly is a good buy and getting better each year—when we realize that we work less time to earn our food dollars now than in the past. Twenty years ago, U.S. consumers spent 23 percent of their take-home pay for food. Last year the average spent on food was just 16 percent of take-home pay and Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz has forecast that in 1972, this figure will be reduced to 15.5 percent.

This change has come about because our farmers are the most efficient producers of food in the world. At the dawn of our Nation, more than 90 percent of our people were engaged in food production. Today less than 5 percent of our people are farmers. One farmer now supplies food for himself and 50 other persons which is 3 times the number fed by each farmer 20 years ago.

This level of efficiency was forced on farmers because of sharply increased farm costs. Consider these changes in the past 20 years:

First. Farmers are paying 2.4 times higher wages for labor.

Second. Farm machinery prices are nearly double.

Third. The level of all prices that farmers pay for goods and services has increased 50 percent.

Fourth. Farm real estate taxes per acre are 3.6 times higher.

Fifth. Investment in food and fiber production has more than doubled.

Sixth. Debts of all farmers are nearly 5 times larger.

There is no doubt about the claims that food costs are increased over a year ago, but consumer interests should be pleased that in January, the cost of food remained the same as it was in December, 1971, according to the Department of Labor.

There are factors other than those already cited which caused food prices to increase. Our improved per-person income has resulted in all of us eating higher quality food. This has resulted in more people competing for the volume of products made available on the supermarket shelves. The average consumer today eats 114 pounds of beef and 40 pounds of poultry each year. This level of consumption compares with 54 pounds of beef and 13 pounds of poultry consumed in the 1930's.

Some persons blame farmers for creating scarcities to raise per unit prices of their product. The truth is that farmers produced a record amount of meat last year and they are planning to pro-

vide an equal amount this year with a little more beef and a little less pork coming to market.

U.S. farmers produced 21.7 billion pounds of beef in 1971. That was 42 percent more than 10 years ago. Population of the United States increased 13.4 percent during that same period. In recent weeks, beef output is down slightly from a year ago but farmers on January 1, 1972, were finishing 14 million cattle for slaughter, nearly 8 percent more than last year.

A year ago, while consumers were enjoying terrific bargains in pork, hog prices were declining to disaster levels. According to the University of Illinois, farmers lost about eight cents for each pound of pork produced during a 9-month period in 1971. Losses were so severe that a substantial number of farmers quit producing hogs. As a result, pork output this year has been about 15 percent less than the excessive supplies of a year ago. USDA surveys indicate hog production for 1972 will be 7 to 9 percent less than last year. If this information proves accurate, the supply of pork will provide 67 pounds per person during 1972, or three to 4 pounds more than average per capita consumption during the past 10 years.

Some consumer groups are suggesting substantial increases in meat imports. According to L. H. Simerl, extension economist at the University of Illinois—

Imports of meat cannot be increased enough to have any large effect upon prices of meats. There just isn't any place to get a large amount of beef roasts and steaks, or ham, pork chops, and bacon. Most of the meat that is imported is beef that is suitable only for making hamburger. And the supply of that is limited.

Additionally, the nations which ship us meat could have imported 45 million more pounds than they did in 1971 without exceeding the quota established.

Farmers are more concerned about price controls than meat imports. Secretary Butz said recently that farmers will agree to price controls on farm products when farmer returns have gone up as much as industrial wages. He cited wage contracts already negotiated for coal miners, railroad workers, and aerospace industry employees which exceed the 5.5 percent pay guidelines and asked:

Those rates won't come down; can farmers say the same?

Secretary Butz said:

If management and labor will demonstrate their sincere willingness to abide by the guidelines: if industry turns out goods like our farmers are turning out a record food supply, agriculture will talk about food price controls. When the need for controls will abate and we can all look forward to the kind of sound growth in an economic system which made the country strong.

I agree with Secretary Butz and urge all who are quick to consider clamping controls on farm prices to consider the total picture agriculture faces and its tremendous contributions of the past along with its productive, efficient promise for the future. When this is done, I feel confident controls on farm prices will be rejected.

THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take just a few minutes today to make some comments on the proposed \$360 million Tocks Island Dam project on the Delaware River at Stroudsburg, Pa.

I have commented on this dam before, and I have some material today which I believe is worthy of being inserted in the RECORD to bring the environmental and economic issues into clear focus for the Congress.

The Tocks Island Dam was first authorized in 1962 as a multipurpose water supply, recreational, flood control, and electric power project. Since that time the project has been enshrouded with local and now national controversy. No construction funds were put in the budget of the Army Corps of Engineers for the project until last year; at that time no environmental impact statement, as required by section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act, had been filed or approved by CEQ. Congress went ahead and appropriated the money for it, following a pay-now-study-later philosophy, which I think is entirely wrong when it comes to making sound, rational national environmental policy judgments.

In the fiscal year 1973 budget for public works, which we will be taking up shortly, \$14 million was requested by the Army Corps of Engineers for construction of the dam. Despite the passage of a year, we still have no approval of project by CEQ nor have fundamental questions about the feasibility of dam been resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD today at the conclusion of my remarks a summary of a report recently released by the environmental defense fund on the viability of the Tocks Island project. It is an important addition to the information we have on Tocks Island, and I would urge the membership to study the document closely.

Basically there are three unresolved questions in regard to the Tocks Island Dam.

The first concerns the question of the cultural eutrophication in the dam as evidenced by the consultant's report done by McCormack Associates for inclusion in the Corps of Engineers environmental impact statement. Because this statement was not filed before the public works bill was voted on, the Congress went ahead and appropriated funds even without knowing the dangers of eutrophication in the proposed dam waters.

The recommendation of the McCormack reports was that the high nutrient loads of the Delaware should be ameliorated prior to impoundment. It now appears that the costs of the Tocks Island Dam will include a \$360 million item for a regional sewerage treatment plant to deal with these problems of eutrophication. This in turn will require a massive commitment from the governments of three different States: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

The second unresolved question is whether the dam is really necessary in light of many nonstructural alternatives that have recently been proposed.

One of the purposes of the dam is to develop the water supply for New York City, but there are other ways to do that, which might not require the construction of a massive, expensive dam across the Delaware River. What about using the Hudson River to take the pressures off of the Delaware River? This alternative has not been adequately studied to date.

Second, there is the possibility of high-flow skimming, an alternative suggested by Dr. Smith Freeman of Princeton University, which represents an alternative without creating all of the dangers associated with a major impoundment of water.

Third, the Federal Task Force on Flood Control Policy recommends alternatives to the traditional use of structures for water resource management. The report offers the use of flood plain zoning and flood insurance to deal with these problems on the rare occasions when there is flooding on the Delaware River. Such methods may in the long run be more effective and less damaging than building large impoundments.

The third and final unresolved question, and a very important one, is whether the whole project is economically viable.

I think there is considerable question as to whether the cost-benefit ratio cited in the existing impact statement is accurate. I believe that the benefits have been overestimated and the costs underestimated.

For example, the National Park Service estimates that the operation of the park at Tocks Island will cost the National Park Service 2.18 times what the Corps of Engineers estimated.

In addition, the Corps of Engineers in preparing the material in their proposal used a discount rate of 3½ percent, rather than the existing rate of 5 percent. It is worth noting the proposed regulations for evaluation of public works projects by the Water Resources Council calls for a rate of 7 percent.

There is the further question as to whether the corps accurately predicted the impact of drought and drawdown in establishing recreational benefits.

Mr. Speaker, there are other public policy factors involved. A major project representing major commitments brings into question whether or not we have the technology and the financial backing of the States to make the project work and to assure its success.

The history of the Army Corps of Engineers is well documented in Arthur Morgan's recent book, "Dams and Other Disasters." Morgan, the first Chairman of TVA, has documented cost overruns as high as 391 percent on some public works projects. Clearly, no one can accurately predict the eventual cost of Tocks Island in terms of financial and natural resource commitment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the public is being asked to foot the bill for a project which may not be able to sustain itself

economically. Are we going to be running at a deficit every year or will we have a project that stands on its own two feet?

I have contacted all four Governors of the States involved and have asked them to review the status of the project. I have found that Governor Cahill of New Jersey has suspended his endorsement of the project pending further study; Governor Peterson of Delaware has not withdrawn his approval, but has agreed to review his position; Governor Shapp of Pennsylvania has done likewise, and I have every reason to believe that Governor Rockefeller of New York is currently reviewing New York's position in light of an impending financial commitment for dealing with eutrophication.

So, when the appropriation bill of the Public Works Committee comes to the floor of the House this year, I again plan to offer an amendment to delete construction funds for Tocks Island Dam.

I think until we have the answers, we should not follow the policy of build now and study later.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the membership the summary of the Environmental Defense Fund's report, prepared by Dr. Leo Eisel which I am inserting in the RECORD today.

The summary referred to follows:

SUMMARY
GENERAL

This report summarizes an investigation by the Environmental Defense Fund of the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir. This Corps of Engineers' project on the Delaware River would create a 37 mile long reservoir with more than 800,000 acrefeet of storage for water supply, flood control, recreation, and hydropower. Analyses of the proposed reservoir, its functions, and costs and benefits are presented in succeeding sections of this report.

These analyses conclude that legitimate needs for water supply, flood damage prevention, outdoor recreation, and peaking power exist in the Delaware River Basin and its service area. The construction of a large and expensive main stem reservoir, Tocks Island, to meet these needs and desires is a very traditional solution. In the highly urbanized Northeast with its plethora of environmental problems, the traditional solution is no longer adequate; water resource planners must employ innovative solutions not entirely dependent on structures. The succeeding analyses conclude that Tocks Island Reservoir, in its presently proposed form, is an environmentally and economically unacceptable solution to the water resource problems of the Delaware River Basin.

WATER SUPPLY

1. Corps of Engineers' calculations and studies of the Tocks Island Reservoir water supply function are inadequate and misleading. They do not support the Corps' claims of water supply needs and benefits associated with the Tocks Island Reservoir project.

2. Delaware River Basin Commission calculations and studies indicate Tocks Island Reservoir is being built not to satisfy future municipal and industrial needs in the Delaware River Basin, but to satisfy projected future demands for power plant cooling water and export water for New York City and New Jersey.

3. Projection of vast increases for power plant cooling water (2400 percent increase by 2020) are based on numerous assumptions regarding future power plant siting (i.e., salt water versus fresh), the thermal efficiency of future nuclear and conventional

plants, and the efficiency of future cooling systems. These assumptions should be explicitly studied before including 425,600 acft of water supply storage in Tocks Island Reservoir. Thermal pollution from a 2400 percent increase in power production in the Delaware Basin may be so environmentally detrimental that the increased generating capacity should not be built.

4. According to the DRBC, a major proportion of the water supply storage in Tocks Island Reservoir is necessary for low flow augmentation to replace the vast volumes of water scheduled for future exportation by New York City and New Jersey. More than 1860 cfs per day (1200 mgd) of water will be exported to New York City and New Jersey by 1980; firm yield of Tocks Island Reservoir is 980 cfs. For purposes of comparison, municipal in-basin consumptive use in 1980 is estimated to be only 153 cfs per day (99 mgd). Numerous studies have recommended development of the Hudson River for water supply to New York City. Development of the Hudson would reduce New York City's exportation requirements and the consequent need for low flow augmentation storage in Tocks Island Reservoir. This alternative has not been considered by the Corps in their investigation of alternatives or in the Environmental Impact Statement.

5. If 300 mgd of water must be exported from the Delaware Basin to northern New Jersey, it can be accomplished by high flow skimming without constructing additional reservoir storage according to a Freeman, Mills and Kinsman study. Their investigation demonstrates the feasibility of the alternative from standpoints of both economics and engineering and indicates that flows adequate to protect the fresh-water "reservoir" in the Delaware estuary can be maintained while high flow skimming 300 cfs annually.

6. In estimating future water demands and the benefits from satisfying these demands, the DRBC and the Corps have ignored existing possibilities for reducing future water demands. These possibilities range from more optimal pricing policies for municipal and industrial water to the installation of a different toilet design in new homes. For years, economists have demonstrated the inefficiency of water pricing schedules and the desirability of reducing demand through the installation of meters and application of an innovative rate schedule. The Corps of Engineers has ignored this research and the alternative of reducing demand in the Delaware Basin and its service area (i.e., New York City and northern New Jersey). The problem is not the existence of feasible alternatives for reducing water use and demand while maintaining the quality of life, but the intransigent attitudes of the Corps of Engineers, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the City of New York.

FLOOD CONTROL

1. The flood of record in the Delaware Basin (1955) was a hydrologic event which will occur on the average, once in 200 years. Expenditures of approximately \$40 million to prevent 97 percent of the damages from a flood which will occur, on the average, only once in 200 years, should not be readily accepted and should be subject to additional analysis by decision makers.

2. The 1966 Federal Task Force on Flood Control Policy suggested that in order to implement a more adequate federal flood control policy, flood plain occupants should bear a more representative share of costs than they do at present. The federal cost per acre for protecting flood plain land with Tocks Island Reservoir is \$3600-\$5200. One wonders whether it would be reasonable to require present and future flood plain occu-

pants to invest a substantial portion of the \$3600-\$5200 per acre necessary to prevent an estimated 97 percent of the damage from an event which would occur, on the average, once in 200 years?

3. In estimating future flood control benefits from Tocks Island Reservoir, the Corps assumes development in the flood plain will continue at the same rate as in the past. This totally ignores the recommendations of the 1966 Federal Task Force on Flood Control Policy and the limited but existent, flood plain management efforts of DRBC. Furthermore, it ensures continued future demand for flood control.

EUTROPHICATION

1. The McCormick Report on eutrophication potential in Tocks Island Reservoir concluded that "... accelerated cultural eutrophication is likely to occur after creation of the proposed Tocks Island Lake." Accelerated cultural eutrophication would have serious detrimental effects on the use of Tocks Island Reservoir for water supply and recreation and on general environmental quality of the proposed Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

2. The Environmental Defense Fund supports the Council on Environmental Quality's requests for additional studies on the eutrophication problem. The responsibility for developing a regional waste water treatment system in a 1000 square mile rural area above Tocks Island Reservoir must be placed squarely on the Delaware River Basin Commission. Before reservoir construction is initiated, DRBC should be required to implement an adequate waste water treatment and control program for both point (municipal and industrial) and nonpoint (agricultural) waste water sources.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

1. The project is not economically viable and has a benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.0. In general, benefits have been overestimated and costs underestimated.

2. Particularly egregious examples of benefit overestimation and cost underestimation exist in the recreation benefit-cost analysis. The investment costs of recreation facilities have been underestimated. The National Park Service, the agency required by law to manage the recreation facilities at the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area estimates an investment cost 2.18 times larger than the Corps' estimates for comparable sites.

3. In evaluating the time stream of benefits and costs, the Corps has used a discount rate of 3½ percent. The existing (January, 1972) rate is 5½ percent and the recently proposed set of Water Resources Council Guidelines would set the rate of 7 percent. There is no economic justification for evaluating this project at 3½ percent. Continued use of the 3½ percent rate amounts to subsidizing the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir project at the expense of other more economically viable projects. Why spend taxpayers money on a low yield project when it means excluding a higher yield project because of budgetary limitations?

4. The annual power benefits have been overestimated by more than 1.5 million dollars.

5. The Corps has overestimated: length of the recreation season, value of a recreation day and annual flood control benefits. The Corps has underestimated recreation activity in the Tocks Island area in the absence of the project; cost of operating, maintaining and replacing recreation facilities; and the consequences of inclement weather on beach attendance. The impact of drought conditions and resulting reservoir drawdown on recreation attendance have not been adequately considered.

QUIRK OF FATE BRINGS POLICE-YOUTH TIES IN MANSFIELD, MASS.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are all too used, in the media and in our own experience, to witnessing what appears to be an unbridgeable gap between the young people of this country and duly constituted authority, usually in the person of the police.

There are two sides to the story, of course, but that does not diminish the sadness and waste of the situation.

There are also exceptions to the rule and they immediately generate the hope that all bridges may not be burning. One such exception is evident in the town of Mansfield in the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent.

It happened by accident, but that does not detract from the fact that the police and the young people of the town have found a modus vivendi and each is learning from the other.

The accident was a fire which destroyed the Mansfield Town Hall and forced the police department to locate in the town high school. That was 14 months ago, and, after some initial animosity, the two antagonists have settled down to live together and have even found they have something to offer each other.

If ever a fire was heaven sent, Mr. Speaker, that one in Mansfield 14 months ago was, in view of the very rare and precious thing that has risen from its ashes.

I submit to you a full account of the situation as reported in the February 21 issue of the Boston Herald Traveler:

QUIRK OF FATE BRINGS POLICE-YOUTH TIES IN MANSFIELD

(By Joe Purcell)

MANSFIELD.—A quirk of fate is generating new thinking here in the sensitive area of police-youth relations.

It was given impetus when a fire destroyed the town hall 14 months ago forcing police to take up temporary quarters in the high school.

In the interim—while plans proceed to build a new town hall—police and youngsters are giving each other a double-take and finding much to admire.

Says N. Lawrence D'Afile, the town's police chief: "We need better facilities but this is the best, the very best, working conditions that I have had in my 22 years with the Mansfield Police Department. I am closer to the young. I am closer to the school system."

Supt. of Schools Lyman C. Avery says: "My reaction is a positive one—it's been an extremely happy, temporary marriage of law enforcement and public education." He added, "This has been a valuable experience for the youngsters."

A distillation of the remarks of some 10 students, chosen at random, seems to say: "They (the police) are okay. We're glad they're here in the school. At first there was some opposition. Now there is none. Yes, we respect each other, too. It's all to the good."

When Chief d'Afile moved in to 200 square

feet of space in the high school first floor receiving area, he was greeted with a huge message draped on the front of the modern structure, "Pigs—Off Campus." The sign was taken down. The chief played it cool. He said nothing.

The first week some of the more adventure-some young jumped into their cars at the end of the school day "and peeled out" the chief said, "jazzing up their motors." Again the chief and his men—two sergeants and 11 patrolmen—diffused the situation with cool.

"Then," the chief said, "everything settled down. Now they come in and say 'hello' and they see we haven't got horns. They discover we're not bogeymen, that we're not brutal and the talk progresses."

Says Sgt. Edward Sliney, "I think even the problems up town with young persons, those not in school, have lessened. Maybe the word is getting around. We have a lot of kids who drop in and shoot the breeze and look at the teletype and a few have asked, 'How old do you have to be to get on the force.'"

Supt. Avery interjects: "I can see the day in a modern community when you might see law enforcement, judicial offices, municipal offices and public schools, kindergarten through the junior college level, all housed in a central complex."—an idea the town is unwittingly nurturing because of a fire.

Eighteen-year-old Joe McLaughlin, a senior, of 271 North Main St., said, "I guess it's a good place for them (the police). When they first came here we said to ourselves 'the cops are here' and after awhile the kids accepted it. At first they resented it. I feel they're here to help us." There was a long, reflective pause and he added, "I would like to see them stay."

Lloyd Anderson, 17, another senior: "I think it's a good idea, they're here if we need them." Another senior, 17-year-old Bradford York, "I wouldn't mind taking a personal problem to the police. It shows both sides can get along with each other. When they first got here I figured there would be a lot of protest. No one said anything at all."

The police themselves maintain that some youths have come to them with nagging, family problems and have sought out advice. Says the chief: "We give it to them, straight from the shoulder."

Says senior Kathy Davison, 17: "I didn't like it at first. But you don't even know they are here most of the time. They stay in their part and we stay in ours. A junior, Robert Goyea, 16, says, "I would like to see them stay here. Our relations are better."

And so the conversation progressed. No one is uptight. There are no recriminations. There are no bars. Prisoners are shuttled to Attleboro, 11 miles away.

Chief D'Afle sits amid surroundings recalling anything but a police station. He and his crew take lunch with the faculty.

Officials, students and police are aware that something unique and agreeable is evolving—but they can't quite put their fingers on the heart of the matter.

Maybe Supt. Avery touches a wispy potential when he says: "Now, when the kids say they are going to the police station, they mean they're going to the other end of the building to talk, perhaps, about a traffic ticket—or just to talk." He added, "They (the police) have given us something and we have given them something."

THE TRAGEDY IN NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Rodino) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all share a sense of deep concern

about the situation in Northern Ireland, and I know that many of us have introduced resolutions seeking to help find a solution to this complex problem.

Recently, on February 13, over 2,000 citizens of northern New Jersey joined in a 3-hour rally at Seton Hall University to express their support for efforts to resolve the situation and achieve basic human rights in Ulster. The rally was sponsored by the Americans for Ulster Justice, under the leadership of Mr. Michael L. Delahunty, the past president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America. I was privileged to be present and address the gathering, and I am pleased to say that those attending the rally were not only citizens of Irish heritage, but representative of several different nationalities and religions. Certainly this is evidence that the tragedy in Northern Ireland is of concern to all mankind.

Subsequently, the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Essex County, N.J., met to discuss the matter on February 17 and by a unanimous vote adopted a resolution supporting the "just and legitimate goals of the Committee for Ulster Justice."

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my address to the rally on February 13 and the text of the Board of Chosen Freeholders' resolution of February 17 in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT OF HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

I am indeed honored to have the privilege of addressing the Americans for Ulster Justice Rally on the tragic situation in Ireland. At the same time I am deeply saddened that the crisis in Northern Ireland has made it necessary to hold this gathering.

On September 3, 1969, I spoke before the House of Representatives, upon introducing a Resolution directed toward helping to find a solution to the crisis then confronting Northern Ireland, I said, on that day: "I am sure we have all been deeply shocked and saddened by the strife and bloodshed that have rent this unhappy country. It is appalling to realize that the divisive forces have deteriorated into a fratricidal conflict of violence and hatred."

Certainly these words of almost three years ago are equally valid today—most unhappily so.

That day in 1969 I went on to say that "there is no doubt that the strife has developed from the Northern Ireland Government's incredibly archaic and oppressive policy, economic and social discrimination against its Catholic minority."

Today—two years and some months later—we face the same bitter situation. The Ulster Government is still not adhering to the basic principles that must be observed by any government that considers itself democratic in assuring equal protection and equal rights under the law for all its citizens.

Conditions have not improved for the citizens of Ulster, but in fact harassment and persecution have intensified. On January 30 thirteen citizens were killed in a confrontation with British troops. On February 6, a week later, thousands of Irish citizens marched in silence and dignity in the largest civil rights demonstration in Northern Ireland's history to protest the slaying of the week before. This demonstrates, beyond doubt, the dedication of the people of Ulster to achieve their self-determination and the fact that violence can be avoided.

The 50-year old history of Ulster is one of flagrant violation of the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, and one completely antithetical to the dedication of our country to equality and justice for all.

I am a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and ever since I came to Congress I have fought for the cause of equal rights. In recent years, in the United States, we have concentrated upon the "one man-one vote" principle.

Now this basic right for every individual is being fought for in Ireland, in addition to other essential elements of equality of justice—freedom against discrimination in employment, housing, education and religion.

Since August 9 of last year Irish citizens have been subject to a cruel internment policy that rivals the dictatorial operations of the Greek Junta. Tragically, the Government of Great Britain fails to realize that the presence and the increasingly aggressive activities of its troops in Northern Ireland are compounding the violence, instead of contributing to peace and a settlement of differences.

For this reason, in recent years I have participated in several legislative initiatives and other actions in the hope of helping to resolve this desperate and sorrowful situation.

In September of 1969 I introduced a Resolution urging the President to utilize all the avenues available to him to seek a settlement of the conflict, to provide assistance to the innocent victims of the conflict in Ireland and to offer all the resources of the United States relating to our own efforts to achieve the ideal of a democracy based on the principle of one man, one vote, and to assure equal opportunity in all areas for every citizen. I was very pleased, I might add, that in October of 1969 an official of the Irish Embassy in Washington called to express his government's interest in my proposal.

But, as we all know, in the meantime no significant improvement in the situation took place. The conditions of injustice, inequality and repression remained.

Last October, therefore, I joined my distinguished colleagues in Congress, Representative Carey of New York and Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, in sponsoring a resolution urging:

- (1) termination of the invidious internment policy and immediate release of all persons detained under it;
- (2) full respect for the civil rights of all the citizens of Northern Ireland and the termination of all political, social, economic and religious discrimination;
- (3) implementation of the reforms promised by Great Britain since 1968, including those reforms in the fields of law enforcement, housing, employment and voting rights;
- (4) dissolution of the Parliament of Northern Ireland;
- (5) withdrawal of all British forces from Northern Ireland and the institution of law enforcement and criminal justice under local control acceptable to all parties; and the
- (6) convening of all interested parties for the purpose of accomplishing the unification of Ireland.

Subsequently, I joined Representative Tiernan of Rhode Island in another legislative initiative—a resolution stressing use of the United Nations to help solve the problem. This includes further actions, such as arranging for consultation among all parties, including the Irish Republican Army, to bring about a cessation of the conflict. It also proposes replacing British troops in Northern Ireland with a United Nations peace-keeping force and an international inquiry into the tragic events of Sunday, January 30, 1972.

I am happy to say that on February 28 the House Subcommittee on Europe will hold hearings on the situation in Northern Ireland, and I hope that it will result ultimately in adoption of legislation expressing the deep and sincere concern of our government about the tragedy in Ulster. Through this time of travail, I would emphasize, we must all keep in mind the magnificent exam-

ple of the thousands of Northern Irish citizens who marched so courageously and peacefully last week.

In 1969 His Holiness Pope Paul spoke out for all men of good will and humanity in urging a solution without violence that would assure equal rights for all. Today, as then, we should follow his leadership and remember his words that "those who are fighting each other are Christians."

RESOLUTION No. 30107—PROTESTING INJUSTICE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Whereas, on Sunday, February 13, 1972, an assemblage of more than 2,000 citizens of all religious faiths and ethnic origins under the sponsorship of the Committee for Ulster Justice convened at Seton Hall University in support of an appeal for freedom from oppression and injustice in Northern Ireland, engendered by religious and economic discriminations; and

Whereas, this appeal for justice in Northern Ireland is supported by resolutions under bi-partisan sponsorship entered in the Hall of Congress and in the New Jersey State Legislature in affirmation of our nation's dedication to the principle of equality and justice; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Board of Chosen Freeholders proclaim support for the just and legitimate goals of the Committee for Ulster Justice, including an immediate end to the internment of citizens without trial; the removal of foreign troops from Irish soil and the start of negotiations leading to the unification of all Ireland; and, be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to Governor William T. Cahill, and the leaders of Congress and the State Legislature to assist in every way possible the implementation of the principles of justice and freedom involved.

It is hereby certified that at a recessed meeting of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Essex, N.J., held February 17, 1972, the foregoing resolution was duly adopted, nine (9) members voting in the affirmative and none in the negative.

RUTH E. STEVENSON, Clerk.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, early last month a number of my colleagues joined in praising a program founded 20 years ago to promote international understanding through student exchange programs, international cultural exchanges, and the exchange of youth who desire to accomplish needed services abroad. I would, today, like to add my voice to those who have recognized this fine program, appropriately called Youth for Understanding.

Since its inception on a small scale in 1951, the Youth for Understanding program has accomplished far more than its founders had dared hope. After beginning as a local program in Michigan, YFU has grown so rapidly that it now encompasses students in nearly every State and more than 45 countries.

Often times the channels of diplomacy and communication between nations become clogged with suspicion and distrust fostered by the competitiveness inherent in international relations because of differing economic, social, and governmental systems. In order to strive to keep those avenues of understanding open and unimpeded, it is imperative that we

develop patterns of communication which will supplement official channels.

There is no substitute for people-to-people contact—something which may be even more productive than governmental relations. The widely heralded Peace Corps was an official approach to this concept. It must be noted, however, that when the Peace Corps was established, Youth for Understanding had been functioning smoothly for 10 years. And although the Peace Corps has declined somewhat in magnitude, YFU has continued to grow and prosper, lending weight to the thesis that those volunteer programs which utilize the skills, talents, and youthful enthusiasm of young Americans and young people throughout the world, are the key to establishing patterns of cooperation which may help the world to someday realize a true "generation of peace."

The widespread and active support accorded to the YFU program in this country further attests to the impact this type of endeavor in drawing Americans of all faiths and beliefs together in a common purpose. In a time when strident voices from all corners of our society cause critical divisiveness which threaten to rend the fabric of the Nation, it is refreshing to take note of a program which can unite Americans in a common goal—that of the strengthening and maintenance of international understanding and cooperation.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, therefore, that I join in saluting Youth for Understanding on the completion of 20 highly successful years, and add my fervent hope that the successfulness of YFU will continue undiminished in the years to come.

VFW OVERSEAS CANTEENS DESERVE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SUPPORT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, each of us is acquainted with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization of American war veterans dedicated to the principles which have kept America free. As a life member of the VFW, I can attest to the excellence of this organization.

One of the most valuable services provided by the VFW is the maintenance of canteens for its members in overseas areas, and they service, almost exclusively, active duty personnel, retirees and present civilian employees of the Federal Government and their dependents. These canteens are operated by posts which provide valuable support to command activities in these areas, and are known for their charitable and local service records. One VFW post, Post 9723 in Naha, Okinawa, has contributed more than \$425,000 to community service programs alone in the past 11 years.

A serious drain on the capacities of these overseas posts, however, has been the inability to qualify for supportive logistical services from the military base on which, or near which, the VFW post is located. I am referring to such services

as the privilege of purchasing food supplies through base commissaries or expendable supplies through the base self-service store, use of Quartermaster Laundry Facilities and APO postal services, and similar services. Such support has already been provided for other organizations, notably the American Red Cross, the United Seaman's Service Clubs, and the United Service Organization.

The Department of Defense, although sympathetic to the problems of the VFW canteens, believes that specific statutory authorization is required for the Department to furnish these services. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide that specific statutory authority. Similar legislation is being introduced in the other body by Senator THURMOND. It should be made clear that any services provided under the provisions of my bill would be on a reimbursable basis. The canteen involved would reimburse the Government for the cost of services or goods it receives. The expense attributable to the enactment of the bill would be negligible.

I trust that Congress will act swiftly to approve this bill, which would strongly enhance the effectiveness of the VFW overseas canteens in bringing a measure of comfort to our servicemen abroad.

At this point, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the legislation:

H.R. 13631

A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to authorize assistance in providing facilities and services abroad for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States when the President finds such assistance to be necessary in the national interest

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2605. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; cooperation and assistance

"(a) Whenever the President finds it necessary in the interest of the United States commitments abroad to provide facilities and services for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in foreign areas, he may authorize the Secretary of Defense, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to cooperate with and assist the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in establishing and providing those facilities and services.

"(b) Personnel of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States who are performing duties in connection with the cooperation and assistance under subsection (a) may be furnished—

"(1) transportation, at the expense of the United States, while traveling to and from, and while performing, those duties, in the same manner as civilian employees of the armed forces;

"(2) meals and quarters, at their expense or at the expense of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, except that where civilian employees of the armed forces are quartered without charge, employees of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States may also be quartered without charge; and

"(3) available office space (including space for recreational activities for members), warehousing, wharfage, and means of communication, without charge.

"(c) No fee may be charged for a passport issued to an employee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for travel outside the United States to assume or perform duties under this section.

"(d) Supplies of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, including gifts for the use of members, may be transported at the expense of the United States, if it is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (a) that they are necessary to the cooperation and assistance provided under this section.

"(e) Where practicable, the President shall also make arrangements to provide for convertibility of local currencies for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in connection with its activities under subsection (a).

"(f) For the purposes of this section, employees of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States may not be considered as employees of the United States."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 155 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2605. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; cooperation and assistance."

LACK OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT EFFORT IN THAILAND REBUTTED

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished colleague from New York issued a statement on Friday, March 3, in which he stated that the U.S. Ambassador to Thailand—Unger—and the administration had not brought enough pressure on the Thai Government to interdict the traffic in illegal drugs going through the country and that he was introducing legislation to force the President to cut off foreign assistance to the Thai Government. He further stated that he knew of corrupt Thai officials who were involved in the trafficking.

We commend him for his efforts in this field. However, we feel that while the problem is still acute, a beginning has been made.

Bangkok is the headquarters for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in Southeast Asia since it is a strategic point in the flow of illicit drugs from the "Golden Triangle" border regions where Thailand, Burma, and Laos meet. Working with Thai police, BNDD in the fall of 1971 arrested 45 defendants with a seizure of 97 pounds of heroin and 645 pounds of opium that were intended for consumption by our troops in South Vietnam. Later in November, Thai police, following our leads, arrested three suspects attempting to deliver 8 pounds of heroin who were part of a ring selling heroin in kilogram quantities to U.S. military personnel. In December, another 2½ pounds were seized as a result of four more arrests of persons also dealing directly with American servicemen.

In January of this year, BNDD officials working with the Thai police seized 55 pounds of Southeast Asian heroin which would be worth \$5.5 million to U.S. traffickers.

Most importantly, as the result of recent negotiations a new program called the "North Thai program" was announced just last week by John Ingersol,

Director of BNDD, to deal with the "Golden Triangle" area. The North Thai program is placing a special task force of selected police officers of the Thai Government across this channel of highway communications to interdict the flow of drugs. The task force will consist of approximately 20 Thai officers equipped with modern arms, vehicles, and radio communications, acting with the daily assistance of four BNDD agents. These agents will help coordinate activities and advise in the initiation and conduct of specific operations. Through our Bangkok office use of other U.S. facilities and equipment can also be arranged according to need.

The Thai commitment will be based on an expansion of the Central Narcotics Bureau from its present manpower level of but four ill-equipped officers. With vehicles and radio communications, they will be able to establish roadblocks on command in order to halt drug convoys coming south. These will be originally detected in the northern village stations or on the border of the Triangle region itself. Such detections will be accomplished through the use of ground and air surveillance activities, the development of informants, and random spot checks of vehicular traffic. A further emphasis will be given to the detection of heroin labs and their elimination.

This new program, Mr. Speaker, is the result of an intensive effort by President Nixon to choke off the supply lines of illegal drugs. It is as important as the recent agreement with Turkey to stop the production of opium.

Already, more heroin has been seized in fiscal year 1972 by all Federal authorities than was seized in all of fiscal year 1971.

Having just returned from a drug investigation trip in South America, I am very familiar with the extreme difficulties in controlling this traffic. The hesitancy of foreign governments to come to grips with the problem, the terrain involved, the lack of local enforcement personnel and equipment, make the job extremely difficult.

But, the administration is beginning to make some important breakthroughs both in the United Nations and with individual governments. The President's commitment of resources and the establishment of the Office of Drug Abuse for Enforcement and the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotic Control illustrate his commitment to wage an all out assault against the pushers of the world.

In summary, more has been accomplished under President Nixon than ever before. However, I agree that more must be done and with the cooperation of the Congress, it will be accomplished.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORSYTHE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DU PONT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include pertinent material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORSYTHE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. BURTON in five instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 6, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12067. An Act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 8, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1715. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National Historical Publications Commission, and for other purposes; 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. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 877. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9615, a bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-900). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 878. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10420, a bill to protect marine mammals; to establish a Marine Mammal Commission; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-901). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 879. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11624, a bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1970, to authorize additional funds for the conduct of an international aeronautical exposition (Rept. No. 92-902). 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 Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 13620. A bill to assure opportunities for employment to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, to provide job training and guidance when necessary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 13621. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial

and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13622. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that public assistance recipients shall be entitled to use commissary facilities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 13623. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to require flood insurance coverage under that act for all properties covered by federally insured or guaranteed mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 13624. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13625. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13626. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit broadcast licenses to be issued for a 5-year term and to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for license renewals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ABOWREZK, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CELLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 13627. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide emergency grants for operating subsidies to urban mass transportation systems on the basis of passengers serviced; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 13628. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit the appointment by the President of certain additional persons to the service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13629. A bill to discourage the use of leg-hold or steel jaw traps on animals in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 13630. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13631. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to authorize assistance in providing facilities and services abroad for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of

the United States when the President finds such assistance to be necessary in the national interest; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13632. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself and Mr. FLYNT):

H.R. 13633. A bill to provide for the acquisition of areas having unique ecological significance and to fund such acquisitions through the land and water conservation fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.J. Res. 1093. Joint resolution to authorize the preparation of a history of public works in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DENHOLM, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ABOWREZK, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. YATES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H. Res. 874. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DOW, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. OBEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. NIX):

H. Res. 875. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. MIKVA):

H. Res. 876. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Tuesday, March 7, 1972

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of men and nations, grant to all who serve in this Government reverent spirits, devout hearts, and wise minds that they may enact and execute those