

required in various space throughout a building without reducing the level at work stations;

We have raised (by 4 degrees) the setting on room thermostats serving office space during the airconditioning season to a range of 76-78 degrees;

And, we have lowered the setting (4 degrees) on room thermostats serving office space during the heating season to a range of 70-72 degrees; and

In addition we have made appropriate temperature and lighting changes in other types of space to realize similar energy savings.

Lessors who provide building services and utilities have been notified by the regional PBS offices to take appropriate action to reduce the anticipated energy consumption during the next 9 months by 7 percent.

Federal agencies have been notified that the aforementioned practices are being initiated, to the extent feasible, in all GSA-managed buildings in a way which will not impair the provision of vital services, nor curtail the proper functioning of the departments and agencies. In addition, each Federal agency has been requested to designate a headquarters representative as a point of contact to assist in realizing these objectives. These revised operating practices already

have been adopted in our Central Office and Regional Office Building, both in Washington, with excellent results.

As an example of savings that may be realized, 22 percent of the fluorescent light tubes have been removed from buildings here in Washington, with an opportunity to do more. Assuming we are able to achieve similar savings throughout the nation, we will eliminate approximately 1.2 million tubes and save 164 million kilowatts of electrical energy each year.

We believe that with the changes in operation, we will be able to reduce our overall energy consumption by approximately 20 percent. This equates to over 1 billion kilowatt hours of electricity or 600,000 barrels of oil or 580,000 tons of coal that may be saved per year. But we're not stopping here:

—We have begun a building profile study to determine the energy consumption characteristics of existing buildings as affected by their physical features.

—We are conducting an Air Change Rate Study to determine the minimum number of air changes required for acceptable heating and air conditioning of buildings.

—We are conducting a study of lighting levels and distribution required for the performance of the various work tasks in Federal buildings.

—And we are conducting a study to develop a fully automated building control system using computer techniques and sophisticated equipment to optimize operations, manpower and energy utilization.

The research and the efforts in existing buildings will help GSA accomplish the President's conservation goal. They can be far more valuable, however, if we can get them out to industry and local government. To that end, we have written to all of the nation's governors and the mayors of 20 of our largest cities to urge their cooperation in the energy conservation effort.

We think we have a strong start in the race to alleviate an energy crisis. But all of our efforts are really minimal when you consider that we only have the responsibility for 200 million square feet out of 2.5 billion square feet of space. 200 million out of 2.5 billion!! That means that you are very important. Have your employees turn off lights, lower thermostats, etc. I hope we can rely on you for this assistance in our effort, and we will assist you in yours, because it will take the voluntary cooperation of many Federal employees if it's going to be a complete success.

Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 24, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Charles F. Betts, associate conference council director, North Alabama Conference, the United Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

O living God, who has made today a time for greatness, be to this House of Representatives a sign that hope's promised hour is now.

May all of us receive this day's alarms as a call to choose for the truths we cherish. Against the winds that push toward war, may we take one step toward lasting peace. Surrounded by broken dreams of personal glory, may we act with a stronger trust in common people. Pressured by the insistent demands of human need, may compassion claim a new place in our hearts.

Stir us, O Lord, to live as those who intend the future. Give us courage to right those wrongs nearest us. And give us energy to shape the swirling forces of change for mankind's good. In Thy name 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 SENATE

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

H.R. 5943. An act to amend the law authorizing the President to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states

on the Council of the Organization of American States;

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on the Near East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled "U.S. Interests in and Policy Toward the Persian Gulf"; and

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution to reprint and print the corrected Report of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States.

The message also announced, that the Senate receded from its amendment to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H.R. 9639) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs," and concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States.

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

S. 1526. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act to authorize the President to extend certain privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity.

REV. CHARLES F. BETTS

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I was honored today to have my brother-in-law, the Reverend Charles F. Betts, from my State of Alabama, give the opening prayer on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Reverend Betts is from Birmingham, Ala., and received the bachelor of arts degree from the University of Alabama, bachelor of divinity degree from Emory University, and served for 3 years as director of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Alabama.

He has served as pastor of several United Methodist Churches in Alabama and at the present time is the associate conference council director, North Alabama Conference, of the United Methodist Church.

I am very happy to have this member of my family to offer prayer here today.

TANKS AND PLANES FOR PEACE

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we must not let Watergate—serious and critical as it is—prevent an opportunity for lasting peace in the Middle East and throughout the world. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, there are those in the world who would take advantage of the Washington situation to advance their sinister ends. The second cease-fire in 24 hours has been broken by the aggressors, apparently fearful that their aggressive war is ending disastrously. When the third cease-fire is reached we must make sure that this is not a trick or stalling tactic by the aggressor nations, designed to stop the Israeli flanking movement and gain time to regroup and reattack with new Russian armament.

Regardless of cease-fires or resumption of fighting it is essential in the interest of peace that the United States provide Israel with military armaments for its defense. While the Russians continue to pour in arms and materiel to the aggressor nations the United States has no alternative.

Appeasement is not the answer. Submission to oil blackmail is not in the interest of peace. Appeasement and blackmail led directly to World War II, the bloodiest in history. The raving racist Hitler was aided and abetted by appeasement. Blackmail was his trump card. We must not let it happen again.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge the House to approve the resolution calling for tanks, ammunition, and planes for Israel. Lack of modern equipment in Israel will only whet the appetite of the aggressor and contribute to more war with the risk of a world conflagration. To strengthen Israel is a giant step toward world peace.

A RESOLUTION TO RESTORE COX, RICHARDSON, AND RUCKELSHAUS TO THEIR POSITIONS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, while I believe the investigation to determine whether there are grounds for impeachment of the President, initiated by the House of Representatives, should continue and the Senate should make such inquiries as it chooses to make and the Watergate grand juries under Judge Sirica should continue their investigation, nevertheless, I think the President should immediately restore the office of independent prosecutor and rename Archibald Cox to that position, should renominate Elliot Richardson as Attorney General, and renominate William French Buckley as Deputy Attorney General. I am introducing in the House today a resolution that it is the sense of the House and Senate that the President should do that.

THREAT OF VETO ON ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, because I believe the whole House is entitled to know what goes on concerning the Alaskan pipeline conference, both behind the scene as well as on the scene, I take the time of the House this morning to tell of a threat of a veto.

I was visited yesterday by Mr. Roy Ash to convey that message to me, that he would recommend a veto unless the bill were changed materially. He requested changes in five areas.

Not only is it the 11th hour for Mr. Ash to be approaching me on this matter, but it is half past quitting time, because the conferees have had their last meeting. While we will review any technical or inadvertent mistakes in our deliberations, we are not receptive to Mr. Ash, or other members of the administration,

who approach us at this late hour on opening up the whole bill to accommodate their wishes.

I am not impressed by Mr. Ash's threat that we must rewrite five provisions of the bill which he advocates, or else. I am including at the end of my statement the factsheet which was presented to me.

The five points that he mentioned included the provisions to exempt stripper wells from price controls. The conferees as of yesterday after being polled by committee staff, have agreed to a 10-barrel limit which had been in the original Senate bill. This partially removed objections by Dr. John Dunlop, Chairman of the Cost of Living Council.

On the other points, the conferees had given considerable consideration to: First broadening the Federal Trade Commission's regulatory authorities; second, taking from the Office of Management and Budget the prerogative of screening regulatory agencies questionnaires and turning them over to the General Accounting Office for review; third, Senate confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office and the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration; and, fourth, the provision for liability without fault up to \$100 million for oil spills at sea. This point certainly is not urgent as it will be 3 years until completion of the pipeline before any oil on tankers.

The conferees have given consideration to all of these points. Mr. Ash and other Government officials have had sufficient time since the Senate bill was passed in July and the House bill on August 2 to make their views known to the individual conferees but they have only now become dragons spouting fiery threats of a veto if their wishes are not followed by the conferees, the conference reconvened and the bill amended to, first, restrict power of the Federal Trade Commission; second, protect the power of the Office of Management and Budget over regulatory agencies; third, protect the power of the President to make appointments without Senate review; and fourth, reduce the extent of oil company liability for oil spills at sea.

Mr. Ash and his party were in my office when word came that the President had agreed to obey the order of the court in regard to the Watergate tapes.

Possibly Mr. Ash did not overhear, or did not get the message inherent in that announcement.

In any event, I did not appreciate what seemed to me rather highhanded ultimatums to reconvene the conferees and revise the bill to suit Mr. Ash's tastes about the OMB's powers, the President's powers, and the oil company's marine liability.

I am very much for the bill as it is being reported, and I believe a large majority of the House Members support it.

It was for that reason I assured Mr. Ash and his party that they were completely free—it was their right—to attempt to get someone to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees.

I believe in decisions openly and regularly arrived at—not deals consummated in executive meetings at the point of a popgun pointed by Mr. Ash.

Following are the objections Mr. Ash presented to me:

FACT SHEET—CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ACTION ON ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL (S. 1081)

The following agencies have deep reservations about the following provisions approved by the Conference Committee on the Alaskan Pipeline Bill:

Cost of Living Council—opposes exemption from the Stabilization Act of the output of leases the wells of which produce less than 20 barrels per day. Inasmuch as 40 percent of the nation's crude is estimated to come from wells under the twenty-barrel criterion, the maintenance of a ceiling on the balance would be untenable. Domestic prices would inevitably rise to world prices. The immediate effect would be to increase gasoline prices at the pump to 8 cents per gallon and home heating oil by an even greater amount.

Department of Justice—opposes authorization of the Federal Trade Commission to take its enforcement actions in its own name directly into Federal courts at all levels if the Department of Justice does not first take the action proposed by the FTC. This provision would set a precedent for similar autonomy by all other agencies and seriously damage the Department of Justice's control of federal litigation.

Energy Policy Office—The requirement that the incumbent Director (as well as the incumbent head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration) would have to be confirmed by the Senate is particularly troublesome in view of the President's veto of a similar requirement for the OMB Director and Deputy Director on constitutional and policy grounds.

Offices of Management and Budget—opposes deletion of the authority granted OMB under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 to review and approve requests for business information by all independent regulatory agencies. The authority transferred to the General Accounting Office would be a review and advisory one only, so that GAO could not ultimately prevent an agency from making burdensome, duplicative requests. GAO opposes the transfer. The immediate and predictable result would be a proliferation of requests for information from industry.

Industry—We are informed that the petroleum industry is quite concerned with the strict liability provisions governing the sealeg portion of the oil transportation scheme. A significant burden of proof would be placed on the vessel owner or operator, and he would be liable for the first \$14 million of allowable claims. The balance up to \$100 million would be paid out of a fund created by taxing oil owners five cents per barrel. However, other legal liability could exist as well. Industry representatives have conveyed the initial reaction that these provisions require them to seriously reassess the desirability of becoming involved in the Alaska Pipeline venture.

THE PRESIDENT IS NOT OFF THE HOOK

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to release the Watergate tapes is a welcome one, but it is by no means the end of the constitutional and leadership crisis his administration has precipitated.

Still unresolved is the question of access to the letters and documents related to those tapes which Special Prosecutor Cox had been seeking. Still unresolved are the apparently endless leads which Mr. Cox and his staff had been following and which reportedly touch on crimes

not directly related to the Watergate affair, but which involves this administration at its highest levels.

In view of this, the House of Representatives must press on with its inquiry into grounds for impeachment and it must begin now to prepare for its prosecutorial role in an impeachment proceeding. I call upon the Judiciary Committee to move immediately to take on the investigative and prosecutorial functions demanded by a preimpeachment inquiry and the impeachment proceeding itself. In particular, the committee must begin now to put together the professional staff and other resources that are necessary and should such an effort require additional funds in the committee budget, I am confident the House will vote its approval.

In addition, the reestablishment of a completely independent special prosecutor to continue the work of Mr. Cox and his staff is an immediate and urgent priority. It is vital that the rule of law be reaffirmed and applied to the leaders of Government, as well as to private citizens. Unless and until that is done, our National Government will be crippled by a cloud of suspicion and distrust.

GROWING NEED FOR INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR TO PURSUE INVESTIGATIONS ONCE UNDER MR. COX'S JURISDICTION

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I approved a letter to Mr. Archibald Cox concerning the ITT affair.

I wrote this letter as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Special Subcommittee on Investigations. This subcommittee has spent 10 months investigating the actions of the Securities Exchange Commission with regards to the ITT-Hartford merger, and other related matters to the ITT affair.

My letter makes four points:

First. Mr. William Casey, former Chairman of the SEC, in my judgment with the knowledge and encouragement of certain White House officials, did everything he could to keep from a committee of the Congress certain ITT documents.

Second. Possible improprieties involved with the transfer of Hartford stock by ITT to Mediobanca of Italy, and later to the Dreyfus Fund;

Third. Inconsistencies between the testimony by Charles Colson to our subcommittee and a memorandum he wrote to H. R. Haldeman over a year earlier; and

Fourth. The revelation before our subcommittee that officials in the White House passed documents held by the FBI to investigators for ITT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to whom do I send my letter?

Mr. Henry Petersen announced last year that he had withdrawn himself from consideration of ITT matters. He said that he did so, because he had testified before the Senate during the Kleindienst confirmation hearings. Since these hear-

ings form the main reference point for certain aspects of the ITT investigations, Mr. Petersen felt that he could not properly participate in the ITT investigations.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, serious study needs to be given to the question of who is going to finish, with thoroughness, the ITT investigation begun by Mr. Cox. One must contend now that there is a growing need for an independent prosecutor to pursue this and other investigations once under Mr. Cox's jurisdiction.

REFUSAL TO ACCEPT NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I note with some interest that Le Duc Tho has refused to accept the Nobel Peace Prize. I congratulate Mr. Tho on his decision because his announcement is a recognition of what every fair minded and impartial observer in the world recognizes, and that is that there does not exist any peace in South Vietnam. It has been estimated that 50,000 people have been killed since that so-called peace came into existence.

If Mr. Kissinger wants to be honest about it he should elect to turn down his share of the Nobel Peace Prize as well.

WATERGATE, ITT, AND NOMINATION OF GERALD R. FORD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who just referred to a letter he had written concerning ITT to Mr. Cox, that Mr. Cox was the wrong place for his letter to be sent. Mr. Cox was appointed Watergate special prosecutor, and any letter that the gentleman has written concerning ITT should be directed to the head of the Department of Justice.

Incidentally, yesterday I informed this House I was willing to debate the merits of the impeachment of the President. However, a President can be impeached for only certain reasons. The action of the President in releasing the tapes yesterday afternoon has removed the President from any probability of possibility of impeachment.

I would also like to say I stressed yesterday that a week ago last Friday the nomination of GERALD R. FORD for Vice President was met with acclamation by most Members of the House and the Senate and that we should rapidly move forward with the confirmation of GERALD R. FORD as Vice President.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I am

introducing legislation to authorize industrial operations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The projected plans for nuclear power development and expansion in the Hudson Valley in New York and throughout the United States has understandably troubled many of us. People are rightfully concerned about safety and want to be reassured. Therefore, now is the time for a full-scale scientific inquiry into the licensing and regulation of nuclear powerplants. The Congress and the American people have a right to know more about the problems and hazards involved before we make a commitment to nuclear power that will soon be irrevocable.

My bill would authorize a comprehensive investigation by the National Academy of Sciences, which would then report its findings and recommendations back to Congress within 1 year. During the period that the study is being conducted, the AEC would be prohibited from issuing any new construction permits. The scope of the inquiry will include such items with safety implications as: First, current AEC licensing procedures; second, present criteria for selecting the location of nuclear plants; third, plant security and design; fourth, ongoing AEC monitoring of plant operations; fifth, the level of routine radioactive emissions now permitted; sixth, environmental effects of nuclear plants; seventh, the risk of accident; and eighth, present plans for protecting the public should an accident occur.

I do not mean to downplay the seriousness of the energy crisis. We must deliver new energy sources as quickly as we can. But, at the same time, we cannot allow ourselves to be panicked into a nuclear energy policy that could prove disastrous in the long run.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS HOUSE WILL CONDUCT ITS IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY IN AN ORDERLY, THOROUGH, AND EXPEDITIOUS FASHION

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, like everyone else, I was glad to hear that President Nixon has agreed to turn over the Watergate tapes to the court.

That is a very appropriate recognition of the fact that we are a Nation of laws and not of men, and that no man—not even the President—is above the law.

This action by the President, however, does not change the status of the impeachment resolutions referred to the Judiciary Committee yesterday. It permits the House and the Judiciary Committee to undertake the inquiry in an orderly, thorough, and expeditious fashion.

The House is not driving toward a preordained objective. It is, instead, conducting a careful and deliberate inquiry into possible grounds for impeachment.

But there is no doubt that we owe it to the American people to conduct the most conscientious investigation of

which we are capable. The House leadership has already said—and I repeat today—that we will support the Judiciary Committee with all the special staffing, financial assistance and other resources necessary to this inquiry. Chairman RODINO will be able to supplement his excellent judiciary staff with whatever specialists or experts he needs.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1973, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1081, GRANTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers in the conference on S. 1081, granting rights-of-way across Federal lands, have until midnight Friday to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

THE CASE OF BORIS PAVLOVICH AZERNIKOV

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is not complying with the very declaration they signed in 1966, the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man, which sets forth the principle of free immigration for all people. Today in the Soviet Union people are not free to emigrate.

Boris Pavlovich Azernikov is a physician who submitted documents for emigration to Israel at the end of June 1971, and on August 10 of that year was arrested.

Boris had attended an ulpan—program of intense Hebrew study—in Leningrad and joined the organization in April of 1970.

In June of 1970 Boris worked to create a Zionist youth summer camp. Then on June 15, a few hours after the so-called plane hijacking in the Leningrad airport a search was made in Boris' apartment and his place of work. He was not in Leningrad at the time but was vacationing in Odessa. Boris was not arrested, but a friend with him was and this friend was convicted at the second Leningrad trial to 5 years in prison.

After his return to Leningrad Boris was summoned for questioning by the KGB. He was summoned 25 times during the summer and autumn of 1970. The KGB had found typewritten brochures on Jewish culture, history, and language in this room in Leningrad.

During 1970 and 1971 Boris was required to testify in the first and second Leningrad trials in which he gave testimony in defense of the defendants. When Boris was arrested, after applying for his passport for emigration to Israel, he was presented with the same charges as those convicted at the second Leningrad trial. Judging by everything the KGB had no other "new materials"

except his conduct at the two trials. The question is whether Boris' arrest is a warning of an even harsher policy in relation to the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the situation confronting Soviet Jews is awaiting our immediate attention. We are their only hope. We can help by passing the Mills-Vanik amendment.

SUCCESSFUL SURGERY ON THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would yield to Chairman JAMES HALEY of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs if he were here. I would like to report to the Members that he reported to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning the good news that our friend and colleague, Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, was operated upon this morning in Houston for the removal of a huge aneurysm from his aorta.

Mr. Speaker, the physicians have pronounced the surgery a success. I am happy to report this to the House.

RELEASE OF TAPES NOT ENOUGH

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was relieved as were most House Members by the announcement yesterday in court by the President's counsel that the tapes and various documents and memorandums will be released to Judge Sirica and that the President will comply with the law.

Nevertheless, I want to point out that last night I spent some hours in my district office. I could not get away because the phone was constantly ringing. I had three people helping answer the calls and I talked to many people myself.

Very few of them who called seemed mollified by this apparent concession of the President.

Something has happened—the dam has broken, as I said yesterday—and the people are expressing long pent-up feelings.

Mr. Speaker, the President and his supporters should be advised that the President has two strikes on him and that one more major defiance of morality and law that he committed in the firing of Mr. Cox or in the refusal in the first instance to obey a desire of the courts, will give momentum to impeachment proceedings that will not be stopped.

IMPEACHMENT SHOULD BE EXAMINED BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I was more than gratified a few moments ago to hear the very distinguished majority leader of the House, my friend, Mr. O'NEILL from Massachusetts, inject into these somewhat ribald discussions we have been hearing here in the last couple of days about the impeachment of the President, some reservation and restraint into the prior discussions. I want to thank him.

I believe he is entirely right that the impeachment procedure should be examined by the Judiciary Committee in a sensible light and the findings then brought to this floor.

I do not believe it is inherent upon this House membership to discuss mollification of the people by the President. Rather we should stick to the plain, ordinary truth without satire.

I am not alluding to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL). I allude to another Member who spoke on the floor today. I would like to compliment Mr. O'NEILL; his remarks were timely.

What has been done, what we have seen and witnessed in many respects here on this very floor, has been the conviction, without a bona fide indictment, of the President of the United States before the evidence is in.

I simply say if these people who are so hellbent to have the President removed from office have any information, regardless of what it might be, that it be just cause for impeachment, that would satisfy the constitutional requirements, then let them come forward now and speak their piece or forever hold it in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 546]

Alexander	Gray	Moorhead, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Myers
Ashley	Grover	Rees
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Blaggi	Harrington	Ryan
Blatnik	Harvey	St Germain
Bolling	Hastings	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Shipley
Buchanan	Henderson	Shriver
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Burke, Fla.	Ketchum	Steele
Carey, N.Y.	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Chisholm	Lott	Sullivan
Dellums	McCloskey	Symington
Derwinski	McKay	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Macdonald	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Ark.	Veysey
Gettys	Mitchell, Md.	Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that the Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests, but not for speeches.

RICHARDSON AS SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for a special prosecutor has been made more imperative, not less, by the events of recent days. Still at stake is the integrity of the governmental processes which have now been under question for over a year.

The integrity of our Government, and the confidence of the American people in it, cannot be restored by lodging the responsibility for this investigation within the Department of Justice. Congress should establish and fill the office of the special prosecutor immediately.

This is not because the Department is without integrity. In fact, the events of recent days make clear that the leadership of the Department has demonstrated remarkable integrity at considerable personal sacrifice.

Nor do I mean to insinuate that the man who would be in charge of the investigation, Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen, lacks the ability or desire to prosecute the Watergate case fully.

As Mr. Richardson stated yesterday, the investigation remains within the Justice Department now, "the situation is fraught with great difficulty." Perhaps the greatest difficulty will be the credibility of the entire investigation, not because of the people leading it, but because of the way they gained their position of leadership.

Always hanging over Mr. Petersen and others will be the sword of Damocles which slew Archibald Cox. Will the public believe that the sword has been forever sheathed?

If "the whole milieu of national concern" was the reason for the President's wise decision to give up the tapes yesterday, as Alexander Haig suggested, that national concern must be satisfied by continuing the independence of the special Watergate prosecutor.

In all that has developed in the last few days, one man stands head and shoulders above the rest—Elliot Richardson. He has demonstrated clearly that his integrity is above reproach. Of utmost importance to Congress, he has demonstrated that his word is binding; that he can make a commitment to Congress and stand by it, no matter who challenges it.

For this reason, I suggest that the Congress designate Elliot Richardson special Watergate prosecutor. His demonstrated integrity should be sufficient to assure Republicans and Democrats alike that he will keep whatever commitment he might make to Congress and to the American people in assuming this new responsibility. More than any other person, Mr. Richardson can help to restore the public confidence in the institutions of government, which is so lacking today.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 607, LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 607) to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, 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 Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1973.)

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, S. 607, a bill to amend and extend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, was passed by the House on September 5, 1973, by an overwhelming vote of 368 to 11 and it previously passed the Senate on May 9, 1973. Your conferees met September 19 and have produced a conference report which reflects, in my opinion, the basic provisions of the bill as passed by the House. There were seven items in disagreement on this conference report and only two of them were major controversial points.

The conference report adopted the House provision authorizing the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, instead of the Secretary of HEW, to conduct research on multiple layers of lead-paint film and to submit a complete report on his findings and recommendations to the Congress no later than December 31, 1974.

The conference report also contains the Senate provision with the House provision providing for consultation of the Secretary of HEW and the Secretary of HUD with regard to steps and conditions to be taken to prohibit the use of lead paint in residential structures receiving any Federal assistance and would also prohibit the application of lead paint in the manufacture of certain toys and utensils that may be used by children.

Probably the most controversial provision in conference was the establishment of a new definition of the safe level of lead paint. The present definition of the safe level of paint is 1 percent lead by weight. The conferees adopted the House provision that the new definition of safe level of lead based paint would be 0.5 percent up until December 31, 1974, and that after December 31, 1974, the definition of lead-based paint would be 0.06 percent lead by weight except that if prior to December 31, 1974, the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, based on studies conducted in accordance with section 301(b) of this act, determines that another level of lead, not to exceed 0.5 percent, is safe shall be effective after December 31, 1974.

Authorizations contained in the Senate-passed bill were \$300 million and in the House passed bill were \$105 million. Conferees agreed on a total authorization of \$126 million greatly below the level in the Senate bill and only \$21 million above the authorizations contained in the House passed bill.

The conference report also contains the House provision providing for Federal preemption of any and all laws of States and local governments regarding the requirement prohibitions and standards relating to lead content in paints on any other surface coating in materials which differs from the provisions of this act or regulations issued pursuant thereof. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The final item in disagreement was the Senate provision providing that no funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act shall be available for lead-based paint poisoning control of the type authorized under the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The conference report contains this provision.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this conference report basically reflects the bills as was passed by this body on September 5, and believe that the House should act promptly to approve this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WINDALL).

Mr. WINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on S. 607, the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act now before us.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) has stated, our conference was quite constructive. The report will verify that the bill has been strengthened without sacrifice of major features passed by the House.

As I have previously stated, there is an urgency associated with the prevention of poisoning of our children through the ingestion of lead-based paint. It is a matter that demands the application of all appropriate resources and facilities for the most comprehensive and effective results.

I urge passage of the bill as reported by the conference.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that in this bill today we have four times the amount of money authorized which is spent each year for rheumatoid arthritis, and three times as much money as is spent in the detection and research on diabetes. This is all out of proportion. Certainly I want to see sufficient funds in this bill to take care of children who have lead poisoning from the ingestion of lead-based paint, but, again, we are going overboard and spending too much in this area.

We are not basing our authorizations on morbidity, mortality, or economic impact of the disease.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 607, a bill to amend the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The Senate approved the report last week, and I urge the House to give its assent today. This is a good bill; although it does not provide the assistance I had hoped for when I introduced H.R. 3006, it does combine the best features of the House and Senate passed bills and represents a significant step toward detecting, curing, and preventing a disease which afflicts some 400,000 American children.

Fewer than 16,000 of these young victims actually receive treatment and half of them are left mentally retarded. About 200 youngsters die each year from lead poisoning.

In my city of New York there are 30,000 children who each year suffer from lead poisoning, but fewer than 1,000 cases are reported each year. Lead poisoning is a disease endemic to the slums. Although the city outlawed the use of lead in interior paints more than 10 years ago, leaded paint still remains on walls which have been covered with new unleaded coats.

Nearly 2½ million children are vulnerable to lead poisoning because they live in substandard housing with leaded paint peeling off interior walls. Many mothers are unaware of the dangers of eating lead chips and are not prepared to indicate to the physician that such dangers exist in the home. What is more, the early symptoms of lead poisoning are vague—nausea, lethargy and crankiness—consequently both parent and physician have a difficult time attributing the symptoms to their proper cause.

Even hospital treatment to remove the lead is not a completely effective means

to combat lead poisoning. Simply sending a delead child back to a leaded environment where he can once more swallow peeling chips of lead-based paint is as ridiculous as curing a man of pneumonia and then forcing him out into a freezing rainstorm with no shoes, no hat, and no coat.

This bill authorizes \$63 million a year for 2 years for the detection, treatment, and elimination of lead-based paint poisoning plus research to find the best methods to remove lead-based paint from interior and exterior surfaces of residences.

This legislation, as approved by the conferees, limits the lead content of interior paint to 0.5 percent by weight until December 31, 1974. After that date, the limit drops to 0.06 percent, unless the Product Safety Commission shows that a higher level—not to exceed 0.5 percent—is safe.

I commend the conferees for writing a valuable piece of consumer health legislation and urge my colleagues to support this measure. Its enactment will stand as a tribute to our late colleague William Fitts Ryan of New York, who for so long worked for this type of legislation and to whom much of the credit must be given for the current awareness in the Congress and in the Nation about lead poisoning.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to on S. 607.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 600

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for three years. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substi-

tute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 600 provides for consideration of H.R. 3927, which, as reported by our Committee on Education and Labor, would extend for a period of 3 years the Environmental Education Act of 1970. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee.

House Resolution 600 further provides that, after general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, at which time it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee would rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation would continue the highly successful environmental education programs which were instituted under the authority of the 1970 act. While the primary focus of these programs has been in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities, environmental studies have actually been aided at all levels: from preschool to college and adult education levels.

The committee has noted that in fiscal years 1971 and 1972, a total of 236 projects in environmental education were supported in all of the 50 States, including 78 projects for curriculum, 33 for statewide assessment and dissemination, 21 community education programs, 20 outdoor study centers, 15 personnel training programs, and 69 other individual grants.

The result of environmental education on such a broad scale has been an increasing national awareness of the critical role that the individual citizen plays in helping to solve the problems of environmental pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the battle against pollution is a continuing one. Building upon accomplishments under the 1970 act, H.R. 3927 would assist the public to acquire a better understanding of such major problems as land use and area development, automobile pollution requirements and the energy crisis. To accomplish its objectives H.R. 3927 would authorize the following appropriations: Fiscal year 1974, \$5 million; fiscal year 1975, \$15 million; and fiscal year 1976, \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 600 in order that H.R. 3927 may be considered.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 600 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3927, extending the Environmental Education Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. The rule also makes the committee substitute in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The primary purpose of H.R. 3927 is to extend for 3 years the Environmental Education Act.

This act provides grants to encourage awareness of environmental problems. For example, in fiscal years 1971 and 1972, a total of 236 projects in environmental education were supported, including 78 projects for curriculum, 33 for statewide assessment and dissemination, 21 community education programs, 20 outdoor study centers, 15 personnel training programs, as well as 69 small grants.

There are no departmental letters in the committee report. However, the report indicates that administration witnesses opposed this bill, preferring instead the administration-proposed Better Schools Act, a special education revenue sharing, which would allow States and local school districts to support environmental projects as their priorities determine.

Minority views were filed by Members LANDGREBE, ASHBROOK, and HUBER arguing that there is no valid reason for extending this act. They point out that ecological issues have been brought to "the height of public consciousness." They also point out that this narrow categorical grant program, is not consistent with the President's budget, or his effort to provide broader categories of assistance, thus leaving more discretion at the local level.

Additional views were filed by Members QUITE, ERLBORN, ESHLEMAN, KEMP, and TOWELL, noting that this act was never intended to be permanent legislation. They propose a 1-year extension to provide an orderly phaseout of Federal involvement.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the position of a Member on the subject legislation, the rule is an open rule and should be adopted in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 3927.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 15, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—369

Abdnor	Cronin	Hanrahan
Abzug	Culver	Hansen, Idaho
Adams	Daniel, Dan	Harsha
Addabbo	Daniel, Robert	Hawkins
Alexander	W., Jr.	Hays
Anderson, Calif.	Daniels	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews, N.C.	Dominick V.	Heinz
Andrews, N. Dak.	Danielson	Helstoski
Annunzio	Davis, S.C.	Henderson
Archer	de la Garza	Hicks
Arendt	Delaney	Hillis
Armstrong	Dellenback	Hinshaw
Badillo	Dellums	Hogan
Bafalis	Denholm	Holifield
Baker	Dennis	Holt
Barrett	Dent	Holtzman
Bauman	Devine	Horton
Beard	Dickinson	Hosmer
Bell	Diggs	Howard
Bennett	Dingell	Huber
Bergland	Donohue	Hudnut
Bevill	Dorn	Hungate
Blester	Downing	Hunt
Bingham	Drinan	Hutchinson
Blackburn	Dulski	Ichord
Boggs	Duncan	Jarman
Boland	du Pont	Johnson, Calif.
Bowen	Eckhardt	Johnson, Colo.
Brademas	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Brasco	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Bray	Eilberg	Jones, Okla.
Breaux	Erlenborn	Jones, Tenn.
Breckinridge	Eshleman	Jordan
Brinkley	Evans, Colo.	Karth
Brooks	Evins, Tenn.	Kastenmeier
Broomfield	Fascell	Kazen
Brotzman	Findley	Keating
Brown, Calif.	Fish	Kemp
Broyhill, N.C.	Fisher	Kluczynski
Bryhill, Va.	Flood	Koch
Burgener	Flowers	Kuykendall
Burke, Calif.	Foley	Kyros
Burke, Mass.	Ford, Gerald R.	Landrum
Burleson, Tex.	Ford	Latta
Burton	William D.	Leggett
Butler	Forsythe	Lehman
Byron	Fountain	Lent
Carey, N.Y.	Fraser	Litton
Carney, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Long, La.
Carter	Frenzel	Long, Md.
Casey, Tex.	Frey	Lott
Cederberg	Froehlich	Lujan
Chamberlain	Fulton	McClary
Chappell	Fuqua	McCloskey
Chisholm	Gaydos	McCollister
Clancy	Glaime	McCormack
Clark	Gibbons	McDade
Clausen, Don H.	Gilman	McEwen
Clawson, Del.	Ginn	McFall
Clay	Goldwater	McKinney
Cleveland	Gonzalez	McSpadden
Cochran	Goodling	Madden
Cohen	Grasso	Madigan
Collier	Green, Pa.	Mahon
Collins, Ill.	Griffiths	Mailliard
Conable	Gubser	Mallary
Conte	Gude	Mann
Conyers	Gunter	Maraziti
Cotter	Guy	Martin, N.C.
Coughlin	Haley	Mathias, Calif.
	Hamilton	Matsunaga
	Hammer	Mayne
	schmidt	Mazzoli
	Hanley	Meeds

Melcher	Reid	Stubblefield
Metcalfe	Reuss	Stuckey
Mezvinsky	Rhodes	Studds
Michel	Riegle	Symington
Milford	Rinaldo	Talcott
Miller	Roberts	Taylor, Mo.
Minish	Robinson, Va.	Taylor, N.C.
Mink	Robison, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Minshall, Ohio	Rodino	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell, Md.	Roe	Thompson, N.J.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rogers	Thomson, Wis.
Mizell	Roncalio, Wyo.	Thone
Moakley	Roncalio, N.Y.	Thornton
Montgomery	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
Moorhead, Calif.	Rose	Towell, Nev.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rosenthal	Treen
Morgan	Rostenkowski	Udall
Mosher	Roush	Ullman
Moss	Rousselot	Vander Jagt
Murphy, Ill.	Roy	Vanik
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Waggoner
Natcher	Runnels	Waldie
Nedzi	Ruppe	Walsh
Nelsen	Ruth	Wampler
Nichols	Sarasin	Ware
Nix	Sarbanes	Whalen
Obey	Satterfield	White
O'Brien	Scherle	Whitehurst
O'Hara	Schneebell	Whitten
O'Neill	Schroeder	Wiggins
Owens	Sebellus	Williams
Parris	Seiberling	Wilson, Bob
Passman	Shoup	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Patman	Shuster	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Patten	Sikes	Winn
Pepper	Sisk	Wright
Perkins	Skubitz	Wyatt
Pettis	Slack	Wydler
Peyser	Smith, Iowa	Wylie
Pickle	Smith, N.Y.	Yates
Pike	Snyder	Yatron
Podell	Spence	Young, Alaska
Powell, Ohio	Staggers	Young, Fla.
Preyer	Stanton	Young, Ga.
Price, Ill.	J. William	Young, Ill.
Price, Tex.	Stanton	Young, Tex.
Fritchard	James V.	Zablocki
Quile	Stark	Zion
Quillen	Steed	Zwack
Railsback	Steelman	
Randall	Steiger, Wis.	
Regula	Stevens	
	Stokes	
	Stratton	

NAYS—15

Ashbrook	Davis, Wis.	Martin, Nebr.
Camp	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Poage
Conlan	King	Symms
Crane	Landgrebe	Young, S.C.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mollohan

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson, Ill.	Grover	Ryan
Ashley	Hanna	St Germain
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Blaggi	Harrington	Saylor
Blatnik	Harvey	Shipley
Bolling	Hastings	Shriver
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Steele
Brown, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Steiger, Ariz.
Buchanan	Johnson, Pa.	Sullivan
Burke, Fla.	Ketchum	Van Deerlin
Corman	McKay	Veysey
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Vigorito
Derwinski	Mills, Ark.	Widnall
Esch	Myers	Wolf
Gettys	Rarick	Wyman
Gray	Rees	
Green, Oreg.	Rooney, N.Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Macdonald.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Shriver.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hastings.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Wolf with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Esch.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Myers.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas, with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Aspin.
 Mr. McKay with Mr. Van Deerlin.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3927 with Mr. Roush in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3927, a bill to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

BACKGROUND

The Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, Mr. Chairman, held hearings on this bill during April and May. On May 24, the subcommittee reported H.R. 3927 by a vote of 7 to 3 and on May 30, the measure was reported out of the full Committee on Education and Labor by a voice vote.

The strong favorable vote in both the subcommittee and the full committee reflects, Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan support the Environmental Education Act enjoys.

I should like at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to commend, in particular, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee (Mr. PERKINS) as well as the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking minority leader (Mr. QUINN), the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), the gentlelady from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the original act, signed into law on October 30, 1970, pro-

vides flexible and broad authority for support of environmental education activities, particularly in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities.

Specifically, the Environmental Education Act provides for:

The encouragement, and support of the development, demonstration, and evaluation of innovative and improved curricula in environmental studies;

The dissemination of significant materials for use in teaching at the preschool, elementary, secondary, college and adult education levels;

The initiation and maintenance of programs in environmental education at the elementary and secondary schools level;

Preservice and inservice teacher training programs;

The training of other educational and public service personnel, including community, business, and professional leaders, as well as Government employees at the local, State, and Federal levels;

Adult and community education programs;

The development of programs and materials for use by the mass media in dealing with ecological problems;

Outdoor ecological study centers.

GREAT NEED

Evidence of the great need for the environmental educational program, Mr. Chairman, lies in the following statistics:

In the 3 years in which this effort has been funded, fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, the Office of Environmental Education has received over 4,700 applications, with requests totaling approximately \$180 million.

Yet the Office of Environmental Education, Mr. Chairman, has been able to fund only 286 projects at a cost of \$5.843 million.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, both the educational community, and the public, understand the need to better inform our citizenry about the wide array of problems we call environmental if we are to adequately address such problems as air and water pollution and the energy crisis.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3927 extends the act for 3 additional years—that is through fiscal year 1976, at the following levels:

Fiscal year 1974, \$5 million.

Fiscal year 1975, \$15 million.

Fiscal year 1976, \$25 million.

The bill further provides for the continuation of the Advisory Council on Environmental Education through June of 1976.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 3927

Mr. Chairman, without exception, the question of the need for environmental education has not been challenged and the committee views this measure as the best Federal approach to environmental education activities.

There were suggestions that we extend the act for 1 year in order for the Education and Labor Committee to consider consolidating this program with other education measures. The committee has concluded overwhelmingly that environ-

mental education should not be a part of a consolidation plan and agrees with the earlier actions of the subcommittee that the broad flexible authority reflected in this act does not fit the definition normally referred to as a "narrow categorical program."

PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT

Mr. Chairman, there have been many expressions of support for the concept of environmental education, but perhaps none more heartening than the many statements issued in the past several years by President Nixon.

For example, the President said in his February 8, 1971, message to Congress:

The building of a better environment will require in the long term a citizenry that is both deeply concerned and fully informed. Thus, I believe that our educational system, at all levels, has a critical role to play.

On June 29 of this year, yet another eloquent statement of Presidential support was heard when the President delivered a lengthy statement on the energy crisis.

Said the President:

But the final question of whether we can avoid an energy crisis will be determined by the response of the American people to their country's needs.

And, he concluded:

I believe that the American people must develop an energy-conservation ethic.

The committee has therefore, Mr. Chairman, accepted the views expressed by President Nixon, as well as other members of this administration; namely, that environmental education studies and activities are a cornerstone of effective action aimed at solving environmental problems and enhancing environmental protection.

And we have accepted, as well, Mr. Chairman, the opinion of the many students, educators, environmentalists, and other public witnesses, that extension of the Environmental Education Act is essential to the development of better understanding on the part of the American people of the ecological problems we are now beginning to confront.

OTHER PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman, let me take just a minute before concluding my remarks to comment on several problems which members of the Committee on Education and Labor have encountered with respect to the administration of the Environmental Education Act.

I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the intent of Congress with respect to the National Advisory Council on Environmental Education as well as the position of the Office of Environmental Education within the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress originally approved the Environmental Education Act, we clearly intended that there be a strong and active advisory body for the Office of Environmental Education.

Yet the Advisory Council, mandated by the law, was not appointed for a full year after passage of the legislation, and we have discovered that the Council was not actively involved in the development and implementation of the environ-

mental education program as we intended.

So I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Advisory Council, which is continued by the legislation before us today, is to be fully involved with the continued development of the programs supported by the Office of Environmental Education.

Yet another area of concern, Mr. Chairman, has been the fact that, until recently, the Director of the Office of Environmental Education has not had the access to the Commissioner of Education which we in Congress intended when we approved this act.

So that there will be no misunderstanding on this point, either, Mr. Chairman, let me make clear the intent of Congress that the Office of Environmental Education is supposed to be an important element in the Office of Education, and the Director of that Office is to report directly to the Commissioner of Education, and not be submerged within the bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by noting that we debate this bill to extend the Environmental Education Act at a time of grave crisis with respect to the wise allocation and use of our resources.

For we must, within the very near future, make crucial decisions on the energy policies which will be established as national goals.

We will have to make some judgments, for example, on the wisdom of offshore drilling in the Atlantic to seek additional sources of oil.

We will have to decide the proper means of allocating scarce fuel oil so that families are not facing bitter winters without adequate heat.

And we will, of course, have to continue to grapple with the problems of automatic emissions which are now the most significant source of the pollutants which are befouling our air.

Mr. Chairman, it is critical to the formation of sound judgments on these matters of crucial national importance that the public be informed and aware of the issues involved.

The Environmental Education Act, Mr. Chairman, is designed to stimulate and strengthen public discussion of these issues. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join with me to support passage of H.R. 3927.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, initially I want to commend the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, our colleague from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, for his work on this legislation. Largely through his insights and leadership in 1970, we constructed and approved an act which in a variety of ways deals with problems which we had ignored for too long a time.

The Environmental Education Act is a well-designed response to widespread pleas from school officials for aid to as-

sist the public in a better understanding of environmental problems and what we must do about them. In the intervening 3 years, progress under the act has been substantial despite inadequate appropriations. Clearly the act has contributed toward the stimulation of a broad national awareness of and interest in ecological issues.

Everyone of the 50 States participated in well over 200 projects in environmental education which were supported in fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972. Thousands of teachers and community leaders received training and participated in workshops designed to deal with many areas of interest in environmental studies.

As has been indicated, appropriations have been modest. But Mr. Chairman, to the extent that these appropriations were available, the record shows a significant amount of activity under the act in line with congressional intent.

The bill before us today seeks to extend the act for an additional 3 years. The committee report provides ample justification and support for taking such action. I will mention only one item as it by itself demonstrates why the act should be extended. During the last 3 years, close to 5,000 applications have been received requesting funds totaling \$180,000,000. Only 286 requests were funded.

In effect, the interest and requests of schools across the Nation are still pending and it is in response to these that we are urging the continuation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed authorizations for the 3-year program are more modest than I would want and far more modest than what our hearing record shows is needed. The proposed authorization for the current fiscal year is only \$5,000,000. This is \$20,000,000 less than last year's authorization. For fiscal year 1975 and fiscal year 1976, the authorizations move to \$15,000,000,000 and \$25,000,000,000 respectively.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I think it is a bill which deserves the support of the House membership.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, my love of the outdoors and the beauty of nature has always been a source of great strength and inspiration to me. I am concerned as an individual that this Nation do everything to protect our environment and the gifts that God has given to us. Anything that we, as Members of Congress, can do to provide the means which help protect and improve the quality of the world I favor. Quite often, however, the question of how best to achieve a goal becomes a point of disagreement. Today we have before us the Environmental Education Act which pro-

vides dollars to educate children about ecology and how they can contribute to a cleaner, healthier environment. While I am supporting this bill I think it is important that my colleagues be aware that there are other Federal dollars from other legislative authorities which are being spent within the public schools on this subject and, in fact, exceed the amount which is being expended under this act.

During the deliberations on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Committee on Education and Labor I attempted to incorporate environmental education into a package of programs being consolidated in a new title. It was my feeling then that schools throughout the Nation should be given an opportunity to make the determination as to where environmental education programs fit in relationship to all other programs and that they—the local schools—should be allowed to establish and set their own priorities. I was convinced that the existing programs which are presently funded under title III of ESEA gave school systems the flexibility that I was seeking and were making a significant impact in our schools. A compromise consolidation plan was adopted by the committee but environmental education was not included as part of the agreement. While I still believe that environmental education should have been a part of the consolidation, and would hope that it would be incorporated in some future Congress, I feel that the consolidation which we developed was a good one.

So that Members may be better able to understand just why I felt environmental education would be a good basis for building a base of support under consolidation, I am inserting at this point a listing of title III projects on environmental education which was compiled by the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Services and Centers and was supplied to me by the Office of Education. Although the projects listed were funded in fiscal year 1972 they reflect what the Office of Education is still doing under this title.

TITLE III ESEA—ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RELATED PROJECTS

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III

Los Angeles City Unified School District, Los Angeles, California, \$292,000.

Title: A Model Educational Program in Ecology, K-Adult Education

A comprehensive program in ecology from K-Adult Education will be developed, implemented and monitored. A sequential program in environmental education will be developed, and instructional materials for pupil and teacher use will be prepared. An ecology center complex will be established; two mobile ecology laboratories will be developed; and a television series on ecology for elementary and secondary school levels will be produced.

District School Board of Lee County, Fort Myers, Florida, \$111,400.

Title: Model Strategy for an Effective Environmental Education Program.

A program to foster environmental awareness, sensitivity and responsibility on the part of students at all grade levels will be implemented. Curriculum materials for grades

6-8 will emphasize understanding ecological consequences. For grades K-5 materials will center on environmental awareness, sensitivity, and very basic ecological concepts. Students will acquire skill in sampling, surveying, and maintaining environmental conditions.

Community Unit School District No. 200, Woodstock, Illinois, \$80,000.

Title: Woodstock Environmental Education Project.

An environmental education program will be established to develop positive attitudinal and behavioral patterns of teachers, students, and other citizens concerning environment so as to effect improvement and enhancement of environmental quality. Students, teachers, and parents will identify environmental problems of the area, State, and Nation; will formulate proposed solutions to identified problems and will develop materials and programs to augment the existing curriculum. Through these activities, participants will gain understanding of ecology and will learn to identify environmental problems, and to work through legal means for orderly solutions.

Shawnee Mission Unified District No. 512, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, \$111,000.

Title: Cooperative Learning Through Environmental Activities in Nature.

An environmental education program will be established which will eventually serve the entire school district. The program will include cross-curricular involvement, interaction among children at all grade levels, indoor-outdoor ecological study, urban-suburban-rural-underdeveloped areas field studies, and cooperative use of existing county park facilities and nonprofit outdoor education foundation facilities. An environmental education laboratory will be cooperatively developed. Selected school personnel will participate in a summer workshop to develop the program and related audiovisual materials including programmed cassette tapes for small group student field study.

School District of City of Wyandotte, Wyandotte, Michigan, \$240,000.

Title: Strategies for Environmental Education—Project SEE.

A model environmental education program aimed at developing people who are consciously aware of their environment and are motivated to assume an active role in efforts to maintain and improve the environment will be implemented. The curriculum will include specially designed environmental education packages which will be utilized by selected students. Efforts will be made to involve the entire community in the project on a continuing basis. University personnel will assist in the preservice and inservice environmental education of teachers.

Sole Supervisory District to Putnam and Westchester Counties, BOCES, Yorktown Heights, New York, \$250,000.

Title: The Area Education Agency's Role in Developing Environmental Education.

An educational program involving two school districts will be developed. Activities in each district will focus on establishment of multi-district student environmental monitoring network concerning air, water, soil, waste, noise and population to function first within the project area and later to spread throughout and beyond the State. The project will also establish a clearing-house to deal with environmental materials for elementary and secondary education and will plan for the active involvement of State Education Department and State Environmental, Conservation Staff, as well as the 45 other Boards of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) in the State.

Golden Valley School District No. 275, Golden Valley, Minnesota, \$162,469.

Title: Community Environmental Studies Program for Grades 5-12.

An environmental studies program will be

established to promote environmental literacy through continued exposure to underlying principles and concepts presented within the matrix of the learner's immediate experience. Participants will make naturalistic field observations to describe the socioecological research, classical design and statistical procedures, controls, social action and survey methods. The learner's knowledge of man-land problems will stem from observations and experiences with environmental problems in the social context within which they occur.

Berks County School Board, Reading, Pennsylvania, \$112,000.

Title: An Interdisciplinary Problem Solving Approach in Environmental Education.

An interdisciplinary, problem-solving curriculum in environmental education for all age levels will be developed in conjunction with the State-funded construction of facilities at the Nolde Forest State Park. The curriculum will be developed around five major resource areas—water, earth, biological resources, meteorological resources, and heritage—and will be pilot-tested in the Park facility and surrounding communities. Teacher training in the use of the facilities and curriculum will also be conducted.

Anderson School District No. 5, Anderson, South Carolina, \$115,000.

Title: An Environmental-Ecological Education Center.

An environmental/ecological education center will be established for exceptional students, including academically talented and handicapped students. A resident and day environmental learning center will be developed on a 45 acre site near a lake. There all environmental resources and problems peculiar to the area will be investigated by the participating students and their teachers.

Carteret County Board of Education, Beaufort, North Carolina, \$100,000.

Title: School Community Cooperative Environmental Studies Project.

A program designed to promote self-directed and investigation-oriented learning which molds schooling with education in the "real life" of the community and the total environment by placing students in actual situations to observe the functioning of the socioeconomic system. Three classes of juniors and seniors of "moderate abilities and ambitions" will be placed in a full-year, half-way elective course replacing their regular English, social studies, and science program in order to conduct individual and group field research in the community.

Laramie County School District #1, Cheyenne, Wyoming, \$60,000.

Title: ECO Curriculum Development and Learning Laboratory.

A curriculum development and learning laboratory and satellite sites will be established to develop and present an environmental education curriculum for Grades K-12 and a special curriculum for handicapped children. The curriculums will emphasize knowledge of environmental problems, methods of solving these problems and will be developed by instructional teams from social, behavioral and hard sciences.

In addition, the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services has reported 60 projects totaling \$4,419,051.

PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SUPPLEMENTARY CENTERS AND SERVICES

ALABAMA

Reading Enrichment and Outdoor Education, Tuscaloosa, Ala., \$30,000.

ALASKA

The Kenai Environmental Education Program, Soldotna, Alaska, \$85,463.

ARIZONA

Space Sciences In A Controlled Environment, Buckeye, Ariz., \$25,000.

CALIFORNIA

Project MER (Marine Ecology Research), Pleasant Hill, Calif., \$75,658.

Humboldt County Environmental Education Project, Eureka, Calif., \$105,145.

COLORADO

Cultural Relationship of Man to His Environment—Past, Present, Future, Delta, Colo., \$14,400.

CONNECTICUT

Pratt Outdoor Center, New Milford, Conn., \$2,500.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Model Comprehensive Program in Urban Environmental Education, Wash., D.C., \$130,000.

FLORIDA

Broad Spectrum Environmental Education, Program, Cocoa, Fla., \$151,713.

Interdisciplinary Environmental Education, K-12, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla., \$135,974.

Environmental Sensitivity Project, Pensacola, Fla., \$81,000.

Environmental Laboratory, Arcadia, Fla., \$50,000.

GEORGIA

Student-Teacher Environmental Relationships Investigations, \$199,127.

Project Success Environment, \$244,000.

ILLINOIS

Operation Survival Through Environmental Education, Grafton, Ill., \$124,810.

The Upper Mississippi River Eco-Center, Thomson, Ill., \$83,380.

INDIANA

Indianapolis Public Schools Resident Outdoor Education Program, Indianapolis, Ind., \$10,000.

IOWA

Project Eco, Ames, Iowa, \$84,547.

Handicapped Children's Nature Study Center, \$17,923.

LOUISIANA

Environmental Education Curriculum, Development, St. Martinville, La., \$93,293.

MAINE

Maine Environmental Education Project, Yarmouth, Maine, \$52,385.

Maine Environmental Improvement, Yarmouth, Maine, \$93,293.

MARYLAND

Environment—A Basis for Curriculum, Oakland, Maryland, \$185,629.

MASSACHUSETTS

Project SCENIC, Auburn, Mass., \$40,000.

Project QUEST (Quality Urban Environment Studies Training), Brockton, Mass., \$56,465.

Project ECOS (Environmental Center for Our Schools), Springfield, Mass., \$97,365.

MICHIGAN

Discovery Through Outdoor Education, Mt. Clemens, Mich., \$54,985.

Education in the Natural Environment, Grand Rapids, Mich., \$24,900.

MINNESOTA

Eco-Experiences, Grand Marais, Minn., \$90,000.

MISSOURI

Environmental Ecological Education Program, Chesterfield, Missouri, \$91,000.

MONTANA

Powell County Environmental Curriculum, Center, Deer Lodge, Montana, \$27,100.

Environmental Education Curriculum Project, Hamilton, Montana, \$20,696.

NEVADA

Verdi Outdoor Education Facility, Verdi, Nev., \$36,000.

NEW JERSEY

Pollution Control Education Center, Union, N.J., \$83,905.

Implementation of the New Jersey State

Master Plan for Environmental Education, Upper Montclair, N.J., \$442,600.

NORTH CAROLINA

Environmental/Ecological Education, Morganton, N.C., \$75,542.

Environmental/Ecological Education, Oteen, N.C., \$75,542.

Environmental Science Study Curriculum, Washington, N.C., \$84,965.

OHIO

Center for the Development of Environmental Curriculum, Willoughby, Ohio, \$136,000.

Robinson Environmental Centers, Akron, Ohio, \$125,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

Tayamentasachta, Greencastle, Pa., \$14,752.

Transdisciplinary Involvement Program, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$20,800.

Environmental Education Program, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$5,678.

Project LIFE (Living Instruction for Ecology, Waynesburg, Pa., \$27,000.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Oceanographic Science Conceptual Schemes Project, Charleston, S.C., \$27,345.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inter-Lakes Environmental and Outdoor Education K-8, Chester, S. Dak., \$47,902.

Environmental Education K-12, Rapid City, S. Dakota, \$42,400.

TEXAS

Study of Ecology of Lower Rio Grande Valley, Harlingen, Texas, \$10,000.

Environmental Education Curriculum for Ft. Worth Indian School District Outdoor Learning Center, Ft. Worth, Texas, \$20,000.

VERMONT

Development of Outdoor Ecological Laboratory, Bellows Falls, Vt., \$15,000.

VIRGINIA

Craig County Conservation and Recreation Exploration (CARE), New Castle, Va., \$77,000.

Program for the Gifted, Hampton, Va., \$54,403.

WASHINGTON

Weather Satellite Station, Kirkland, Wash., \$33,000.

Center for Ecological Studies, Mount Vernon, Wash., \$55,016.

A Model Marine Science Lab, Poulsbo, Wash., \$78,000.

Project Ecology (Environmental Career-Oriented Learning), Seattle, Wash., \$25,000.

WISCONSIN

ICE—Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Green Bay, Wisc., \$89,302.

K-12—Environmental Education Curriculum Menomonie, Wisc., \$25,000.

WYOMING

Kemmerer Outdoor Lab, Kemmerer, Wy., \$61,046.

GUAM

Environmental Education for Guam Schools, Agana, Guam, \$53,102.

The total sum for projects submitted is \$6,052,920.

ESEA TITLE III PROJECTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

ALASKA

The Kenai Environmental Education Program, Mr. Peter Larson, Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, Environmental Education Program, P.O. Box 1266, Soldotna, Alaska 99669.

ARIZONA

Project OUTREACH, Dr. Paul Plath, 2042 W. Thomas Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85015.

CALIFORNIA

A Model Educational Program in Ecology, Kindergarten Through Adult, Mr. Grant R.

Cary, 1044 N. Hayworth, Los Angeles, California 90048.

An Environmental Approach to Investigation and Inquiry in Science, Mr. Leon Hunter, Barstow Unified School District, 551 South H Street, Barstow, California 92311.

Planning Solutions to Urban Educational Problems, Mr. William Webster, 1025 Second Avenue, Oakland, California 94606.

COLORADO

Cultural Relationship of Man to His Environment—Past-Present-Future, M. C. Kreutz, Route 1, Box 66, Delta, Colorado 81416.

CONNECTICUT

Pratt Outdoor Center, Dr. Daniel Hart, Paper Mill Road, New Milford, Connecticut 06776.

Project Outdoors, Mrs. Norman B. Newton, Natural Science Center, 269 Oak Grove Street, Manchester, Connecticut 06040.

Talcott Mt. Science Center, Mr. Donald La Salle, Montevideo Road, Avon, Connecticut 06001.

DELAWARE

Environmental Laboratory, Mr. Hess G. Wilson, New Castle-Gunning Bedford School District, Blount Road, New Castle, Delaware 19720.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Model Comprehensive Program in Urban Environmental Education, Mr. Rueben Pierce, Department of Science, Presidential Building, 415-12th Street, N.W., Washington D.C.

FLORIDA

Broad Spectrum Environmental Education Program, Dr. Clair Bemiss, 705 Avocado Avenue, Cocoa, Florida 32922.

Interdisciplinary Environmental Education K-12, Mr. John Arena, 3600 S.W. 70th Avenue, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33314.

Environmental Learning Laboratory, Mr. John A. Reynolds, P.O. Box 759, Arcadia, Florida 33821.

Environmental Sensitivity Project, Mr. Roy Hyatt, Environmental Studies Center, 2501 North Hayne Street, Pensacola, Florida 32503.

Model Strategy for an Effective Environmental Education Program, Mr. William F. Hammond, Gwynne Institute, 2266 Second Street, Ft. Myers, Florida 33901.

Resource-Use Outdoor Education Center, Mr. James M. Phillips, P.O. Box 539, Perry, Florida 32347.

GEORGIA

Student-Teacher Environmental Relationships Investigations, Mr. Fred Schlein, Savannah Youth Museum, 4405 Paulsen Street, Savannah, Georgia 31405.

ILLINOIS

Woodstock Environmental Education Project, Mr. James Hires, Woodstock School, 14124 South Street Rd., Woodstock, Illinois 60098.

Operational Survival Through Environmental Education, Mr. Ray Miller, Box 122, Grafton, Illinois 62052.

Sell: Student Endowment Learning to Live, Barry Gowin, Superintendent, Meridian Community Unit School District 101, Mounds, Illinois 62964.

IOWA

Project ECO, Dr. Luther Kiser, 120 S. Kellogg, Ames, Iowa 50010.

KANSAS

Cooperative Learning Through Environmental Activities in Nature (Project CLEAN), Mr. Ernie Kumpf, 7235 Antioch Street, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66204.

Environmental Education Demonstration Project, Mr. Donald French, 1601 Van Buren, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

KENTUCKY

Environmental Education, Mr. Harold Grooms, Bourbon County Board of Education, Paris, Kentucky 40361.

MAINE

Maine Environmental Education Project, Mr. Dean Bennett, Intermediate School, Yarmouth, Maine 04096.

MARYLAND

Environment—A Basis for Curriculum, Mr. Ernest Spoerlien, Garrett County Board of Education, 40 S. Fourth Street, Oakland, Maryland 21550.

MASSACHUSETTS

Project SCENIC, Mr. Paul Lemire, Randall School, West Street, Auburn, Massachusetts 01501.

Project SURVIVAL, Mr. Richard Todd, Locke Junior High, Allen Road, Billerica, Massachusetts 08121.

Project QUEST (Quality Urban Environment Studies Training), Mr. Bill White, Brockton High School, Brockton, Massachusetts 02402.

Project ECOS (Environmental Center for Our Schools), Mr. Clifford Phaneuf, 195 State Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 00108.

MICHIGAN

Strategies for Environmental Education, Mr. Thomas Sparrow, 639 Oak Street, Wyandotte, Michigan 48192.

MINNESOTA

Environmental Learning Center, Mr. Gerald Foldenauer, Cook County High School, Grand Marais, Minnesota 55604.

Education in the Natural Environment, Mr. Robert Block, 820 Pokegama Avenue North, Grand Rapids, Michigan 55744.

Inter-disciplinary Environmental Workshop, Mr. Robert Hofflander, Box 152, Windom, Minnesota 56101.

Environmental Science Center, Mr. Richard Myshak, Independent School District No. 275, 5400 Glenwood Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55422.

Community Environmental Study Project, Mr. Mike Naylor, 5400 Glenwood Avenue, Golden Valley, Minnesota 55422.

Mobile Science Laboratory, Mr. Charles Carpenter, Brookside Junior High School, 1209 Columbus Street, Albert Lea, Minnesota 56007.

Environmental Mobile Laboratory, Mr. Sherwood Cleveland, Box 191, Anoka, Minnesota 55303.

MISSOURI

Environmental Ecological Education Program, Mr. Verlin Abbott, Parkway School District, 455 North Woods Mill Road, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017.

MONTANA

Powell County Environmental Curriculum Center, Mr. Gary Swant, Powell County High School, Deer Lodge, Montana 59722.

Environmental Education Curriculum Project, Mr. John Smith, 408 Daly Avenue, Hamilton, Montana 59840.

NEVADA

Verdi Outdoor Education Facility, Mr. Brian Wise, Verdi Elementary School, Verdi, Nevada 89439.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Nature Study Center, Mr. Emile Rocheleau, Monadnock Regional High School, RFD #1, Keene, New Hampshire 03431.

Squam Lakes Science Center, Mr. Gilbert Merrill, Holderness, New Hampshire 03245.

Dartmouth Outward Bound Center, Mr. Frederick S. Bartlett, P. O. Box 481, College Hall, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755.

NEW JERSEY

Pollution Control Education Center, Dr. James M. Caufield, Union Public Schools, 2369 Morris Avenue, Union, New Jersey.

Implementation of the New Jersey State Master Plan for Environmental Education, Dr. Edward Ambry, New Jersey State Council for Environmental Education, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043.

NEW MEXICO

Outdoor Education, Mr. John Cox, 724 Maple, S.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

NEW YORK

The Area Education Agency's Role in Environmental Stewardship, Dr. Frank Thompson, 42 Triangle Center, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

NORTH CAROLINA

Environmental/Ecological Education, Mr. Earl Whitener, Burke County Schools, Drawer 989, Morganton, North Carolina 28655

School/Community Cooperative Environmental Studies, Mr. Will Hon, Courthouse Annex, Beaufort, North Carolina 28516

Environmental/Ecological Education, Dr. Larry Liggett, Environmental Education Center, 13 Veterans Drive, Oteen, North Carolina 28805

Environmental Science Study Curriculum, Mr. William Moffit, Washington City Schools, P.O. Box 466, Washington, North Carolina 27889

OHIO

Center for the Development of Environmental Curriculum, Mr. Dennis M. Wint, 37047 Ridge Road, Willoughby, Ohio 44094

PENNSYLVANIA

Knowledgeable Action to Restore Our Environment (Project KARE), Dr. Donald L. Wright, Colony Office Building, Route 7 & Butler Pike, Bell, Pennsylvania 19422.

An Interdisciplinary Problem-Solving Approach in Environmental Education, Mr. Louis Ritrovato, Nolde Forest State Park, Box 392—R.D. 1, Reading (Cumru), Pennsylvania 19601.

Tayamentasachta, Mr. Fred C. Kaley, Greencastle Antrim S.D., 370 S. Ridge Avenue, Greencastle, Pennsylvania 17225.

Transdisciplinary Involvement Program, Mr. Frank Christy, Fox Chapel Area S.D., 611 Field Club Road, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15238.

Environmental Education Program, Dr. Robert C. Campbell, State College Area S.D., 131 W. Nittany Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania.

Living Instruction for Ecology, Mrs. Alberta R. Covert, Central Green S.D., Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Oceanographic Science Conceptual Schemes Project, Gary Awkerman, 3 Chisolm Street, Charleston, South Carolina.

An environmental-Ecological Education Center, Mr. Ryan Faulkenberry, Anderson County School District No. 5, P.O. Drawer 439, Anderson, South Carolina 29621.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inter-Lakes Environmental and Outdoor Education K-8, Mr. Major Boddicker, Chester Area School District, Chester, South Dakota 57017.

Environmental Education K-12, Dr. E. R. McLaughlin, Instructional Materials Center, 827 Franklin Street, Rapid City, South Dakota 57701.

TENNESSEE

Oak Ridge Schools Phase II Simulation Project, Mr. Peter H. Cohan, Cooperative Science Center, Inc., 156 Adams Lane, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830.

TEXAS

Living Curriculum, 5th Grade, 3210 W. Lancaster, Fort Worth, Texas 76107.

Study of Ecology of Lower Rio Grande Valley, 1409 E. Harrison Street, Harlingen, Texas 78550.

VERMONT

Development of Outdoor Ecological Laboratory, Mr. William Lienhard, Atkinson Street, Bellows Falls, Vermont 05101.

VIRGINIA

Craig County Conservation and Recreation Exploration (CARE), Mr. Walton F. Mitchell, Jr., P.O. Box 245, New Castle, Virginia 24127.

WASHINGTON

Weather Satellite Station, Mr. Clayton Lanum, Lake Washington School District, Box 619, Kirkland, Washington 98033.

Center for Ecological Studies, Mr. Patrick Hayden, Mount Vernon School District, 1219 E. Division Street, Mount Vernon, Washington 98273.

A Model Marine Science Lab, Mr. Andrew Driscoll, School of Marine Science, Route 1, Box 631, Poulsbo, Washington 98370.

WISCONSIN

ICE—Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Mr. Robert J. Warpinski, CESA No. 9, 1927 Main Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

K-12—Environmental Education Curriculum, Mr. David Schlotz, Menomonie Public Schools, 718 North Broadway, Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751.

WYOMING

Conservation Center for Creative Learning, Mr. Robert Legoski, Starrett Junior High School, Lander, Wyoming 82520.

Kemmerer Outdoor Lab, Mr. Bill Mowry, Kemmerer Junior High School, Kemmerer, Wyoming 83101.

ECO Curriculum Development and Learning Laboratory, Dr. Bill Edwards, Rural Route 1, Box 550A, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001.

PUERTO RICO

San Cristobal: Environmental Studies, Mrs. Ines Julia Guzman de Perez, Social Studies Program, Department of Education, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Environmental Studies Program, Mrs. Doris Jadan, Outdoor Education Teacher, Department of Education, P.O. Box 630, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7056, the Environmental Education Act extension. The passage of the Environmental Education Act of 1970 was a major step toward awakening the American public to the environmental problems and possible solutions which lie in the years ahead. The programs it has funded have begun the process of establishing an understanding of ecological issues.

It would be hard to do anything at all which would not help this much-neglected field. But, although the act of 1970 was a great beginning, neither the act, nor its administration has fulfilled early hopes. The Congress has not tried to accommodate to the wishes of an unenthusiastic bureaucracy, or more importantly, to the needs of local and regional environmental educators.

When this act passed in 1970 the public response was overwhelming. In that first year, without any advance publicity, almost 2,000 project funding requests were submitted within 2 weeks. Despite growing administrative apathy at the Office of Environmental Education and discouraging amounts of redtape, this outflow of interest and support continued. The Office of Environmental Education was moved five times in 18 months. The Federal Advisory Council was extremely late in getting started and never did fully function. Programs which were successful were not shared with those who were attempting similar projects, nor was information on successful

projects generally disseminated or coordinated.

The record of the Congress has not been all that good either. We have consistently underfunded the program. This year we are actually considering an extension after the appropriations bills have already been considered. This, to me, does not represent much of a commitment to the ideal of environmental education.

On May 15 I testified before the Select Subcommittee on Education in favor of a bill which had initially been drafted by a group of some of the outstanding environmental educators in the midwest region. I cannot adequately explain this bill to this committee in 5 minutes, so I do not intend to introduce that as a substitute here. But, I am extremely hopeful that it will receive more than a cursory review in next year's hearings.

My bill is one attempt to overcome some of the known difficulties we have encountered, by making limited, but important changes. The committee bill, which I will support, has ignored known problems and while it will keep environmental education afloat, it will condemn our Federal environmental education program to continued mediocrity.

The primary purpose of my proposal would remain the same as the act the committee bill extends; to educate our citizens of all ages about environmental quality and substance. That purpose is great, but the committee bill, unfortunately, would not achieve it. My proposal will come closer to the achievement of these purposes.

The principal features of my proposal, as distinguished from the existing law are these:

First. The purposes and findings are only altered to stress local responsibility.

Second. Reorganization of the National Advisory Council.

Third. Decentralization of OEE by the creation of regional councils and offices.

Fourth. Allowing State input in grants and allocation of 90 percent of Federal grants at the regional level. This would free the central OEE for coordination, information, and financial assistance and give local people "the piece of the action" they need; and

Fifth. Providing for 1-year funding at \$10 million to force annual program re-evaluation.

My proposal will not make up for insufficient funding, but it will provide for more effective use of the funds now available.

I will support the committee bill, but I consider it a half-hearted effort, indicative of a congressional unwillingness to seek effective solutions to real problems.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it was 3 years ago, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, that the Congress first passed the Environmental Education Act, unanimously if my memory serves me. I was one of those, along with the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS),

the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), who wrote the original Environmental Education Act. The reasons for its original enactment apply today with equal or greater force. I might note that while we did have strong expressions of support from those within the executive branch, who identified this as a high priority program their deeds have not measured up to their words. There has been something less than enthusiastic support, the kind of support that is needed to give the program a reasonable chance to achieve its purpose and to demonstrate its value.

Since we enacted the original law 3 years ago, however, there have been several changes in the country and the world that make it even more urgent that it be renewed and vigorously implemented. In recent months we have come face to face with some tough issues that require hard choices involving attitudes toward the environment and other high priority national needs. We are facing the question of utilization of our coal resources versus the problems of strip mining and air pollution from burning certain kinds of coal. We are faced with the need to license construction of nuclear plants, while at the same time being concerned with the effects of radiation and thermal pollution.

We want to have clean water. We passed a tough Clean Water Act some months ago, but there was a price tag on the measure necessary to achieve clean water. We want clean air.

We are now finding it necessary to pay the cost in terms of the investment in new technology and application of air-pollution-control devices to assure clean air.

We are finding that limitations on the use of chemicals, fertilizers, herbicides and insecticides conflict with the growing need to provide ample supplies of food at stable prices.

We are finding—and I would say particularly in the West—that our failure to make provision for the intelligent use of DDT under carefully controlled circumstances will deprive us of billions of board feet of lumber, because of tussock moth infestation, that we require to meet the housing requirements of the Nation. We are faced with these hard choices. The need, therefore, is to have some intelligent basis for making rational decisions, so that we can meet important national goals while transmitting to future generations a clean and wholesome environment.

The bill before us does not provide for conservation education; it provides for environmental education covering a whole spectrum of issues.

These include conservation but include also the economics that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) will call to the attention of the Members. It includes also the necessity of incorporating as a component in all of education the environmental considerations, and this includes, in addition to economics, the engineering, the scientific disciplines, the architectural studies and all the rest. There needs to create an awareness of the environmental concerns in making the decisions in all of these

disciplines. For these reasons we cannot afford not to continue with the kinds of innovative programs such as this to help build this basis of knowledge and understanding on which the public and their representatives in government can make intelligent decisions.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans are aware of the deterioration of the quality of the environment and genuinely desire to reverse that trend. Three years ago when the original Environmental Education Act was passed unanimously by both House and Senate we recognized that our normal system of education had not adequately prepared us to meet current demands on the environment's fragile resources. Three years ago we were impressed with the necessity of providing a contingent education for sound resource management and environmental planning. It was clear that the education system needed to be revised and revitalized in this area if we were to cope effectively with the ecological crisis.

Environmental education of an adequate nature was not then envisioned as simply another name for conservation education or outdoor education. It was more far-reaching, embracing approaches and materials from the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities coordinated into a total view of man's relationship with his surroundings. Just adding courses dealing with environmental problems to existing curricula would fall far short of the need.

That need for understanding went beyond the reach of our public schools. The Environmental Education Act, signed into law October 30, 1970, was intended by the Congress to address the environmental needs of all citizens.

Congress took action on many environmental fronts, but the creation of an effective program to increase citizen awareness of the serious consequences of ecological mismanagement was considered essential.

President Nixon emphasized the point saying:

The basic causes of our environmental troubles are deeply embedded. It should be obvious that we cannot correct such deep-rooted causes overnight. We must see nothing less than a basic reform in the way society looks at problems and makes decisions. Our educational system has a key role to play in bringing about this reform. It is also vital that our entire society develop a new understanding and new awareness of man's relation to his environment—what might be called environmental literacy. This will require the development and teaching of environmental concepts at every point in the education process.

That key idea referred to by the President in 1970 was reemphasized in testimony given by Tom Dustin, executive secretary of Izaak Walton League, before hearings on the Environmental Education Act in April. He said:

It is essential for the well-being of our nation, and indeed of much of the rest of the world, that the confrontation between environmental imperatives and the developments of civilization be lowered. Our experience leads us absolutely to the conclusion that only through education is there the slightest hope of creating a public outlook capable of achieving this goal.

The work envisioned in the Environmental Education Act of 1970 has just

begun. The Office of Environmental Education is beginning to overcome initial difficulties. It is becoming a visible and efficient beacon directing national attention toward new and imaginative environmental education.

After undergoing the trials and expenses of making this program operational, it is now proposed that we dismantle it, that its impetus be sifted back through other agencies into the system deemed inadequate in the first place.

But the need has not diminished and the goal has not been met. Provided initially with such a very modest budget for so momentous a task, appropriations never even approximated authorizations. Actual program funding totaled only \$1.7 million in 1971 and \$3 million in 1972. Three thousand five hundred applications were received but only 236 grants were awarded. Original provisions of the bill authorized \$45 million over the 3 years.

The estimated program funding for fiscal 1973 is \$3.1 million. Despite these limitations, public interest has remained high and fiscal 1973 applications are expected to reach earlier levels.

Because of cuts below the original intent of the act, there has not been a fair opportunity to see how well the program really can work. Even so, the act has served a tremendously valuable role in stimulating environmental programs all across the country.

The arguments presented against continuing the Environmental Education Act have been adequately answered in the Education and Labor Committee's report, accompanying H.R. 3927 which I introduced with the distinguished chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAs of Indiana.

It is my pleasure to serve on that subcommittee and I wish to take this opportunity to commend the very able efforts of its chairman, Mr. BRADEMAs, and thank him for initiating the informative and worthwhile hearings on this measure. I recommend the record of those hearings, conducted in April and May of this year, as presenting strong support for continuation of the Environmental Education Act.

As an original sponsor of the 1970 act, I would also like to include portions of my statement during initial passage of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks today.

It is of upmost importance that this extension of the Environmental Education Act be adopted, that our sincere efforts of the Congress only 3 years ago will not have been in vain. In making this judgment there are two price tags to be considered. One in the very moderate cost of renewing this worthwhile program. The other, if we continue to live on borrowed time, will be the price we will someday have to pay for our ecological misunderstanding. I do not think we can afford to pay that price.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 3, 1970, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 20, pp. 26991-92]

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ORVAL HANSEN IN SUPPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

As we enter the decade of the 1970's, con-

cern about the quality of the environment has intensified. We see all around us disturbing signs of the ecological crisis and the steady deterioration of the environment. The danger we face in the degradation of the quality of the water, air, soil, and other elements necessary to sustain life should not be underestimated.

The President, Members of Congress, and the public have indicated their willingness and desire to allocate a greater share of this Nation's resources to counteract pollution and to provide expanded and improved recreational facilities for our citizens.

To help provide the assurances that these resources will be wisely and efficiently used we must build a base of knowledge and understanding to serve as a foundation for the comprehensive programs needed to awaken the Nation to the crisis and to stimulate an adequate response. There is need for a major educational effort directed at developing a better understanding and attitudes toward our environment in order that future generations will not be confronted with the same problems.

The problem is much deeper than the development of improved technology and better methods of pollution control. While we must continually strive to improve technology and to find better ways to dispose of our waste, the more basic need is to develop an awareness in all of the people of the dimensions of our environmental problems and to equip them with the knowledge and understanding needed to solve these problems.

There are real signs of hope for our country and for mankind. Throughout the country there is an awakening concern, especially on the part of young Americans, to the dangers to the environment which go far beyond protests against pollution of our land, water and air. The rapidly rising awareness of the environment reflects a deepening sensitivity to the fundamental values of human life.

To meet the ecological crisis we will need an informed citizenry that is educated about the whole spectrum of issues that are called environmental. There is also a need to change basic attitudes toward the environment and man's place in it. The Environmental Education Act that is before us today is a response to these needs.

Environmental education is defined in the bill as follows:

"The educational process dealing with man's relationship to his natural man-made surroundings, and includes the relation of population, resource allocation and depletion, conservation, technology, and urban and rural planning to the total human environment."

At the present time most environmental education in the school system is limited to education and conservation. Few textbooks or integrated courses of study are available which represent an adequate presentation of ecological principles, of the problems and responsibilities connected with environmental management or of the fundamental criteria needed to maintain an ecological balance.

The bill before us proposes to help remedy these deficiencies by:

Encouraging and supporting the development, demonstration and evaluation of innovative and improved curriculums in environmental studies;

Providing for the dissemination of significant materials for use in programs at pre-school, elementary, secondary college, and adult education levels;

Initiating and maintaining programs in environmental education at the elementary and secondary school level;

Conducting preservice and inservice teacher training and training of other educational and public service personnel, community, business and professional leaders, and Government employees at local, State and Federal levels;

Operating adult and community education

programs which would attract individual citizens and citizen groups in their communities;

Developing programs and materials for use by the mass media in dealing with the environment and ecology, and

Planning outdoor ecological study centers.

While there are encouraging signs that educational institutions throughout the country are developing programs of environmental education, witnesses before the committee emphasized the need for the kind of Federal leadership that this bill will provide.

It is anticipated that during the first operative year of the bill, priority will be given to the development of new and improved curriculums in environmental studies. This is a fundamental step in the establishment of an effective nationwide educational effort aimed at increasing environmental awareness on the part of young people and adult citizens alike.

The bill also provides a curriculum developed with Federal funds as well as other curriculums deemed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to have use in environmental education programs may be tested in pilot programs to determine their effectiveness. The bill allows for a more effective system of dissemination of the curriculum materials and other information regarding the environment and ecology which are developed under funds provided by the bill.

The bill provides that grants may be made for the preparation and distribution of materials and the development of programs suitable for use by mass media in dealing with the environment and ecology.

It is significant that the training programs provided for under the bill are not limited to the traditional formal classroom. A great deal of valuable environmental education can and does occur outside the classroom and outside the school itself. There are many noneducational institutions that can qualify for grants to provide training programs outside the ordinary classroom setting. Under one of the provisions of the bill the Secretary is authorized to make small grants—up to \$10,000 annually—to citizens groups, volunteer organizations working in the environmental field, and other public and private organizations for conducting courses, workshops, seminars, symposiums, institutes and conferences especially for adult and community groups.

Mr. Speaker, while the amount of money authorized by this bill is relatively modest when measured against the magnitude of the challenge, it can provide a powerful stimulus to harness and mobilize the collective concerns, talents and energies of those within and outside the educational system in the development of programs that can help to turn the tide and give this generation an opportunity to leave the world we live in to future generations in better condition than we found it. In meeting this challenge the problem we face and the response we must make was eloquently summed up by an eminent theologian Prof. Joseph Sittler of the University of Chicago, who emphasized the importance of our own attitudes toward the world we live in and the need to develop a reverence for the earth. In his testimony before the subcommittee Professor Sittler said:

"If the world of not-self is felt as a mere resource to be used it will surely be used; if the world is regarded as a gift, a wonder, as a reality having an integrity of its own—it will be rightly used. That proposition is swiftly and powerfully true; and our present ecological crisis is a result of the denial of its truth. For nature, though often silent is not without power to condemn as well as power to bless man. And, when man so uses nature as to deny her integrity, defile her cleanliness, disrupt her order, ignore her needs—the reprisals of insulted nature taken an often slow but terribly certain form. Na-

ture's protest against defilement is ecological reprisal."

The prompt passage and effective implementation of this bill will reassure an anxious nation that the Congress is determined to rise to the challenge.

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding and I commend him for his remarks, and particularly for raising the point that it is essential for any environmental education program to deal in truth and in fact rather than in blind emotionalism.

Today this country is in serious trouble in many areas because too many persons claiming to be environmentalists, who are, in reality, only self-proclaimed experts are dealing exclusively in emotionalism rather than in fact. Thus we have a total banning of the use of DDT in our forests and we have almost a billion board feet of timber destroyed this year alone from the Tussock moth and the gypsy moth. We have what amounts to the complete ban on sulfur dioxide in our atmosphere because standards have been set that cannot be attained. As a result, 400 central power stations have been forced to burn oil rather than coal, which thus has helped precipitate the present energy crisis we face today.

We find situations in which the Environmental Protection Agency is setting unreachable standards for the amounts of heat that can be absorbed by some of our rivers and lakes, making it virtually impossible to build nuclear reactors or fossil fuel plants in many areas where they are required.

What we need is a discussion of fact with respect to the environment; not fancy and blind emotionalism that ties our hands. It is certainly my hope that any educational program dealing with the environment, while teaching the value of preserving the environment, will also teach us to deal in truth and in fact rather than in blind emotionalism.

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

Mr. ESHLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, commend the gentleman for what he had to say as well as indicate my awareness of the importance of the point the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) just made and indicate my own intention to support the amendment the gentleman from Idaho has already indicated will be offered later by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) which will provide for taking into account in the educational programs the economic impact.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time merely to join with the other Members in support of this legislation.

One of the comments that has been raised by some who have questioned this legislation has been that this act was never intended to become a permanent act. While I think the extension of this act for another 3 years is in no way nec-

essarily making it permanent, I think the problems we have been facing with the environment and the beginnings we are now making in schools and in places where young people can be reached toward educating them to not only the problems but also how to live in our environment. I hope nobody is going to feel that the continuation of this act for the next 3 years is in any way overextending the interest that the Congress should have in the environmental problems facing this country.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3927 to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

This act was conceived in 1970 after the Congress and the administration recognized the important need to provide solutions to the grave environmental problems which this Nation faces. The purpose of this act is to provide comprehensive environmental education activities and courses in schools and organizations throughout the United States so as to educate both children and adults to the environmental problems of the day.

Yet as important as the need is for this legislation, this administration has seen to it to provide the act with pitifully inadequate funding. In the 3 years in which this effort has been funded, the Office of Environmental Education has received over 4,700 applications from schools and organizations seeking \$180 million. Unfortunately out of these requests only 286 requests have been able to be funded at a total appropriation of only \$8.694 million. This represents a tragic situation, as many of the casualties represented extremely worthwhile and innovative programs which would have greatly aided this effort.

Yet despite these fiscal adversities and limitations, the Environmental Education Act can point with considerable pride to the significant accomplishments it has achieved in the stimulation of public concern and action on ecological issues.

It is because of my strong belief that education is a key to the solving of our environmental crises, that I urge this worthwhile program be extended for 3 years. It is only through this extension that a unified national effort to reach solutions to these real problems can be achieved.

To continue the present funding policies will only result in continued large-scale apathy of the public to these important problems.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay particular tribute to the Committee on Education and Labor and the distinguished sponsor of the bill, Mr. BRADEMAS, for reporting out this excellent legislation. I urge its immediate passage so as to indicate to the American people our concern with the preservation of our environment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we consider the extension of the Environmental Education Act at a time when the ecology movement must be given strength by fully informing the American people as to the problem which confronts us. As Dr. Robert McCabe, president of the National Association for Environmental Education told the Education and Labor Committee:

We are in the crucial transitional phase of moving from volunteerism to institutionalization.

Concern with the environment has lost much of the crusade-like glamor it had only 3 or 4 years ago, and our task is to replace that initial attractiveness with an educational foundation for a lasting commitment.

In three state of the Union messages and three special messages on the environment, President Nixon has spoken for the need for environmental literacy, new values and attitudes, and environmental awakening. The President tells us:

The building of a better environment will require in the long term a citizenry that is both deeply concerned and fully informed. Thus, I believe that our educational system of all levels has a critical role to play.

Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said that—

Governmental action to protect the quality of life in California or anywhere can succeed only if the public understands and supports that action. Therefore, the first and most important role for government is in our schools.

I trust that these words were the product of genuine conviction and not uttered merely because it seemed the fashionable thing to do at the time. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Education Act meets the very objectives of which the President and his HEW Secretary have spoken so enthusiastically, and it thus deserves the support of every member of this House.

The Environmental Education Act has already demonstrated its effectiveness. In my district, with its significant heavy industry and a large industrial labor force, the problems of pollution and working environment are of grave concern to all citizens. Last year the Office of Environmental Education indicated its willingness to work with union people by funding the Committee for Environmental Information in St. Louis. CEI has brought members of the United Auto Workers and the Teamsters Union together with environmental writers and scientists for the purpose of identifying special environmental information needs of industrial workers, and developing the educational material necessary to meet those needs. It is this type of educational structure that the Environmental Education Act has fostered, and we need more of the same.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this extension so that every sector of the American community can be informed of the real problems facing life on this planet.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, what began just 2 years ago as a demonstration effort to stimulate environmental education has predictably become a full-fledged permanent member of the categorical aid program club. Once an idea gets programed around here it turns into flypaper—you just cannot get rid of subsidizing it at the Federal level. That which is to be temporary will be permanent and self-justifying. It is a closed process that feeds on itself.

Through its seed money the Federal Government has moved what I think is

a very good idea of environmental education off the ground and given it wings of its own. Widespread public support and enthusiasm for the concept should be adequate to assure that it will be incorporated in many school curricula and community programs.

State and local government are generally in much better financial shape these days than the Federal Government to carry the ball for environmental education. As a matter of fact, this coming week we will be asked to vote on another national debt limit increase. Washington cannot afford to pick up every idea that comes along and put money into it. Moreover, the U.S. Treasury nurses a whole host of narrow, categorical programs that are either outmoded or which could be spun off and picked up locally. This program is a good place to start.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(c) (1) of the Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1532) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Subject to section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, the Advisory Council shall continue to exist until July 1, 1976."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by some of the wording in this bill, particularly in the majority report. I notice something new, the word "S-y-n-e-r-g-i-s-m."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or someone conversant with this bill, if that means a sneeze or a cough? Just what does that mean?

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my friend from Iowa that this phrase was employed, as the committee report indicates on page 10, not by the Committee, but was originally employed by the Office of Education for defending its proposition, which the Committee did not accept, that environmental education activities could be supported under other legislative authorities as distinguished from this one. It was used in that context.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it seldom fails in this place, when we have a first class boondoggle before us, that there is some fancy word put on display.

How did the gentleman pronounce that?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from Indiana did not pronounce it, but the gentleman from Iowa did pronounce it correctly.

Mr. GROSS. I spelled it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Synergism.

Mr. GROSS. I have never seen a boondoggle that did not contain something like this. I wondered if this was a word of common usage down in the hills and hollows of Kentucky and the sand dunes of Indiana—synergism.

I thank the gentleman. He has explained something that I had never before seen, and I have been around a few years.

The committee report says that on October 8, 1971—and the gentleman understands I am reading from the majority report—"Dr. Rodney Brady—"

I do not know what kind of a doctor he is—on October 8, 1971, Dr. Rodney Brady of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare promised the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations a breakdown, totaling \$11.2 million, of funds being spent on environmental education and other authorities.

Over 6 months later, on April 17, 1972, Dr. Don Davis, formerly with the Office of Education, was unable to give the House Select Subcommittee on Education such a breakdown, but instead provided the committee with a listing of only \$4.6 million while promising that a listing of \$11.4 million would be available in June 1972. Dr. Davis went on to claim that the Office of Education would be spending over \$14 million in fiscal 1973 on environmental education.

The committee did not receive the 1972 listing until May 17, 1973—fully 18 months after the list had first been promised.

The committee still has not received the 1973 breakdown.

The committee goes on to say on page 11 of the report that—

The Committee, in light of the 18-month delay involved in producing this so-called "synergy"—

Or whatever it is—

list, as well as the changing contents of the listing, and the doubtful nature of many of the projects included, is not satisfied that the Office of Education did, in fact, spend over \$11 million in 1973 under other legislative authorities, on environmental education.

Despite all of these doubts and the failure of these bureaucrats to give the committee the information it sought, the committee is going to provide \$5 million in the current fiscal year, \$15 million for fiscal year 1975, and \$25 million, five times the amount this year, for fiscal 1976.

If we vote for this bill, we will be the biggest dupes on Earth.

What in the world is to be done under the terms of this bill? Educate people in what?

I believe one Member said that moths have destroyed a billion feet of lumber, or something to that effect. Is this \$45 million for moth eradication?

What is it to be spent on? How much other money is being spent on the so-called environment? The record is silent. This bill ought to be defeated out of hand.

Yesterday we had before the House a message from the President and a bill accompanying it, calling for delegated power to the President—untrammeled power—to spend \$2.2 billion in financing his intervention in the war in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Where is it proposed to get \$2.2 billion for that purpose? And there is a forgiveness clause in the legislation that the administration sent up. The beneficiaries of that \$2.2 billion need not pay back one single dime if the bill is enacted as the administration wants it.

When is it proposed to start saving some money around here to pay these bills? Or is the House going to go on irresponsibly piling up the national debt, increasing the deficit and inflation?

This unjustified request for \$45 million in this bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 548]

Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Myers
Ashbrook	Gettys	Nichols
Aspin	Gialimo	Rangel
Barrett	Gray	Rees
Blaggi	Green, Oreg.	Reid
Blatnik	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Gude	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	St Germain
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Sandman
Buchanan	Harvey	Saylor
Burke, Fla.	Hastings	Seiberling
Clark	Hébert	Shipley
Cleveland	Horton	Shriver
Corman	Hosmer	Steele
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Steelman
Danielson	Ketchum	Stelger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	Leggett	Sullivan
Derwinski	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McKay	Van Deerlin
Drinan	Macdonald	Veysey
Dulski	Mills, Ark.	Wiggins
Esch	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 3927, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 368 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Page 2, line 7:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "and" after "1972," and by inserting after "1973," the following: "\$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHUSTER: at the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. 3. Section 2(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "while giving due consideration to the economic implications related thereto" following "maintain ecological balance."

SEC. 4. Section 3(2) of such Act is amended by inserting "and economic impact" following "technology."

SEC. 5. Section 3(c)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "economic" following "medical."

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ALBERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

VISIT TO THE CHAMBER BY FORMER SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise my colleagues, if they have not already learned it, that one of the greatest Members ever to serve here, one of the greatest leaders this Congress ever produced, younger than ever, honors us with his presence today, Speaker McCormack.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the thrust of my amendment provides that the economic implications of environmental decisions should be recognized as an inherent part of the environmental issue. My amendment provides that we give balance to the question of our environment. Specifically, my amendment does three things. First, it changes the purpose of the act to give due consideration to the economic implications of the environmental question; second, it changes the definition of the act which defines environmental education to include the economic impact as part of environmental education.

Third, it changes the knowledge and experience required for members of the Environmental Educational Council to include economic experience and education as part of the background which such members should possess.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must concern ourselves with protecting the environment but at the same time we must face the reality of considering the very important economic implications relating thereto.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has discussed his amendment with us on this side of the aisle and we are prepared to accept it.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN).

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's amendment strengthens the bill and we accept it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for offering his amendment to this bill. It emphasizes one of the major purposes of the original bill and carries out the clear intent of the Congress as spelled out in the bill's legislative history. I support the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER). Often we find ourselves embroiled in very heated rhetoric concerning any environmental issue and in our very forthright desire to clean up our environment we overlook the necessity for close scrutiny of the economic impact of our activities.

This legislation will provide us a very fine vehicle with which to insure adequate review of any economic environmental situation under consideration. I am firmly convinced that we must not allow ourselves to needlessly jeopardize one segment of our environment in our earnest quest for a more palatable place to live. At times we tend to overlook the "environmental impact" of the loss of jobs on a community and all its programs when a major industry of that city is forced to close its doors, because of stringent environmental regulations.

Mr. Chairman, please do not misunderstand what I am saying. I have spent most of my adult life involved in our environment. As a professional meteorologist I was harping on the need for cleaner industries and automobiles long before it became a popular pastime for many of our pseudoenvironmentalists. I have despaired as the atmosphere over my fine Dallas-Fort Worth metropolises area has become increasingly polluted and have stood in amazement at the seeming lack of concern for our total environment.

The essence of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we are now calling for a hard look at our "total environment" when we are making those much needed long-range planning decisions aimed at a better place to live and a cleaner environment in which to exist. I am saying that the economic portion of our "total environment" has been virtually ignored and that situation simply cannot be allowed to continue. A man is miserable if he breathes heavily polluted air or is angered by foam in the water he drinks—but, Mr. Chairman, I would proffer that he is equally disturbed if his job is taken from him by an environmental issue that has not given just consideration to his economic needs. I would suggest that his understanding of our aims for a cleaner environment are greatly curtailed if he is worried about how he is to feed his family. I would insist that his hope for a better tomorrow is greatly dimmed if he is sleepless at night, because he has no income with which to meet his mortgage payments. Mr. Chairman, we must consider every aspect of our environment if we are to be truly encouraged toward a better tomorrow, and I most earnestly submit that the economic impact on any activity is an integral part of that environment. Mr. SHUSTER's amendment will provide at least one vehicle with which we can review the "total environment" we are all so earnestly discussing.

I would again reiterate that my genuine concern for our environment predates our current "fad environmentalist" by at least 15 years. But, as a trained meteorologist, and as a former small businessman, I can see both sides of the fence. I would question where the income to clean the parks and streets is going to come from if we arbitrarily close those job-producing factories. I would wonder where the taxes to pay for the local and national "environmental councils" are to come from if our American worker is out pounding the pavement trying to simply find a way to feed his family. Mr. Chairman, my district has been, in the past, highly dependent upon Federal national defense expenditures. Many of my folks at home are aerospace workers and, because of the cutback in defense aviation production, are either working reduced hours or are simply out of work. I do not feel justified, Mr. Chairman, in adding to the burdens of these fine people by asking them to give up additional jobs without strong justification. We simply cannot say "close down this business because it is polluting"—but must diligently work toward finding that well balanced "compromise" for which our system of government is so famous. Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that Mr. SHUSTER's amendment is a step in that direction and I wholeheartedly urge its passage.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman. It is about time we start to concern ourselves with the environmental rulings that seriously affect our economy and which have helped to bring on the present energy crisis.

I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the amendment he has offered.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I support his amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has called the attention of this House to the importance of coupling considerations of how to improve the quality of our environment with the economic implications thereof. Congressman SHUSTER serves with great distinction on the Public Works Committee, and there is no better place in the Congress to learn this fact.

One of our areas of jurisdiction is the economic development of disadvantaged areas in the United States. Another one of our jurisdictions is a matter of controlling water pollution. These considerations are often in head on and crushing conflict.

Mr. Chairman, it makes absolutely no sense in the world to improve the quality of our environment if there is nobody

around with a decent job who can afford to enjoy it. This is not to say and I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me that we must relax our efforts to improve the quality of our environment. This is simply to say that we have to do so in an intelligent manner and give our job producing industries fair opportunity to adjust to new requirements. We must also be mindful of the fact that they are sometimes competing with industries in other parts of the world where environmental requirements are not as strict as ours.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleagues may be interested in a recent poll of my constituents in which I addressed myself to the precise problem area which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania addresses. I asked my constituents, whether in view of the fact that major public projects of economic significance must undergo extensive assessment as to their environmental impact, should major environmental measures be subjected to similar scrutiny as to their economic impact. More than 75 percent of my constituents answered in the affirmative, which reveals a heartening public awareness of the need to give balance to the environmental issue.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this does not mean that we should relax our efforts to improve the environment, rather it means that we should make a common cause of commonsense, so that our battle can be more effectively waged.

Other questions in my poll revealed that my constituents consider improving the environment one of the major problems facing our country, that it is not receiving adequate attention by various levels of government, and even with the energy crisis facing us, environmental restrictions should not be relaxed. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his efforts to bring balance to the issue.

Mr. Chairman, on another note, I would like to state for the RECORD that I am not recorded as being present for the proceedings under the last quorum call. I was attending a meeting in the Rayburn Building cosponsored by the Public Relations Society of America, George Washington University, and International Management and Development Institute. My distinguished constituent, James Carter, who is chairman of the Nashua Corp. in Nashua, N.H., was with me at the meeting. We were not notified of the quorum call in a timely manner and although I reached the floor before the proceedings under the quorum call concluded, the Chair did not recognize my presence.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANDGREBE moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I take note of the amendment that just passed that perhaps sugar-coats this bill a little bit and makes it perhaps more acceptable to some, but in my opinion it still leaves us dealing with an unnecessary bill and a bill which is, if nothing else, certainly fiscally unsound.

Mr. Chairman, before us today is a bill extending the Environmental Education Act for 3 years and authorizing expenditures over seven times as great as the amount spent during the past 3 years of its operation.

Apparently the sponsors and supporters believe that there has been not enough propaganda by the Federal Government for the express purpose of creating a nature ethic. On the contrary, the act has succeeded in achieving its stated goal of raising the national consciousness to a high level of environmental concern. During the past 3 years the country has been swept by hysterical movements seeking to enlighten us about the ecology crisis to the point where we are faced with a severe fuel shortage which may rapidly push our civilization in the direction the ecologists wish it to be pushed—back to nature.

The supporters of the 3-year extension of this act apparently believe insufficient damage has been done so far. They are determined to enlarge the propaganda machine which has contributed to the stoppage of the Alaskan pipeline, the cessation of offshore drilling, the banning of DDT, and the slowing down of the building of electric generating plants and oil refineries. The full consequences of these "achievements" have yet to come and might be felt by all of us this winter.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a moment to read the first paragraph of the additional views for those Members who may have overlooked them; the additional views introduced by my colleagues, Mr. QUINCY, Mr. ERLINBORN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. TOWELL:

Quite often a Member of an authorizing committee finds himself in the awkward position of supporting the concept or program under his Committee's jurisdiction but opposing the specific piece of legislation authorizing it. Such is the case with H.R. 3927. While we agree with the intent of this bill, we feel that the time has come for responsible Members of Congress to critically evaluate each program as it is up for renewal and determine whether it should be continued as an individual categorical program or combine its purposes with programs having broader goals.

I would also like to read just a few lines of the minority views introduced by myself, Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. HUBER:

There is no valid reason for extending the Environmental Education Act.

First of all, the Act was never intended to be permanent. Its purpose was to stimulate nationwide interest in environmental education—a goal which, as explained by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Sidney P. Marland in his testimony before the Select Education Subcommittee, has been fulfilled.

My dear colleagues, I would remind the Members that the administration is

opposed to this legislation. It is unnecessary legislation; it is fiscally unsound legislation.

The purposes of the original act have been achieved, which is in itself unfortunate. But some Members of Congress wish to see the program continue. The only reason I can fathom for their support of the extension is that they fear it to be considered "anti-environmental." At the risk of being so considered, I advocate termination of this program, and defeat of H.R. 3927, for I am on the side of the human beings, and not, as Justice William O. Douglas once declared that he was, on the side of the fish. The 45 million dollars that this bill would authorize are dollars collected from the workingmen and women of this Nation and ought to be returned to them for their use as they see fit, and not as we see fit.

If this bill passes, specific instructions should accompany it, stating that its funds must be used to finance educational programs designed to explain why it is more important not to disturb the migratory pattern of reindeer than it is to have a warm home in the winter and the use of a private automobile. Perhaps the extended Act could also fund programs explaining why it was necessary that 10,000 people should die of malaria in Ceylon last year following the prohibition of the use of DDT.

Once the American people understand that those deaths resulted because DDT allegedly weakened the shells of eggs laid by certain birds, they will be well on the way toward developing a "nature ethic."

In conclusion, I believe that passage of this bill will only serve to debase public understanding of man, nature, and the economy. Like all governmental programs that exceed the proper limitations of a government, this program is doing more harm than good. Its effects on the thinking of the American people are incalculable, but the effects of such thinking are becoming more obvious as winter approaches, and the energy crisis worsens.

I respectfully urge the acceptance of my motion.

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I hope it will promptly be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SYMMS

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SYMMS: On page 2, line 10, strike the remaining portion of the bill following "1974."

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. My amendment, very simply, stops this bill from being a 3-year authorization and brings it back to a 1-year authorization.

I think after we have gone through a cold winter, we may have a little different outlook on some of the environmental hysteria that has swept this country in the past 10 years. I think it would be well advised for the House to save the \$40 million my amendment would deauthorize and keep in mind next year in June, if we feel that this is a valuable program, and we could then extend the act at another time when it would be more appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, it was just last week in the House that we passed a mandatory fuel allocation rationing bill. Both proponents and opponents of the bill pointed out that we were not doing anything to produce any oil or petroleum products. I would think that this amendment would be very sensible, and both those who find themselves opposing and those who are for this concept, can support this amendment instead of authorizing millions and millions of dollars to be spent in the future. We could bring it back and authorize it for 1 year.

I would say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) in his amendment, does make the bill a little bit more palatable, but I believe as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) has pointed out, we still have our same problem here; that is, what business is this of the Federal Government in the first place?

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the evidence set forth in the debate earlier today and by virtue of the evidence adduced in the hearings and summarized in the committee report, it seems clear to me it is essential that this program be funded for at least another 3 years in order to carry out the purposes of the act.

I hope the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SYMMS) there were—ayes 58, noes 64.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 252, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—140

Abdnor	Bray	Clawson, Del
Archer	Breaux	Cochran
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Cohen
Armstrong	Burgener	Collins
Ashbrook	Burleson, Tex.	Collins, Tex.
Bafalis	Butler	Conable
Baker	Byron	Conlan
Bauman	Camp	Crane
Beard	Cederberg	Daniel, Dan
Bevill	Chappell	Daniel, Robert
Blackburn	Clancy	W., Jr.

Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Gillman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gross
Guyer
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanrahan
Harsha
Heinz
Henderson
Holt
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson

Ichord
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lent
Lott
Lujan
McClory
McEwen
Madigan
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Michel
Milford
Miller
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Nichols
Parris
Pettis
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Rallsback
Rarick
Rhodes
Robinson, Va.

Rogers
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rose
Roussetot
Ruth
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebeli
Sebelius
Shuster
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stuckey
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Treen
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wylder
Wylie
Young, Fla.
Young, S.C.
Zion

NOES—252

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Badillo
Barrett
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Brasco
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clay
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Cronin
Culver
Daniels
Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Drinan

Dulski
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evens, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fraser
Frenzel
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Glaimo
Gibbons
Ginn
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gunter
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hills
Hinshaw
Hogan
Hollifield
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keating
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Leggett

Lehman
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McKinney
McSpadden
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Martin, N.C.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Quie
Randall
Rangel
Regula
Reuss
Riegle

Rinaldo
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shoup
Sikes
Slask
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder

Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Symington
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Ullman
Vanik

Waldie
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Aspin
Blatnik
Bolling
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Coughlin
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Gettys

Green, Oreg.
Grover
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hébert
Johnson, Pa.
Ketchum
McKay
Macdonald
Mills, Ark.
Myers
Rees

Reid
Rooney, N.Y.
Ryan
St Germain
Sander
Saylor
Shiple
Shriver
Steele
Sullivan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Veysey
Young, Alaska

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment that just failed by a rather substantial margin. I do not know that it is all that important that the 1-year extension be defeated in favor of the 3-year, but the point I would like to make here is the difference between the appropriation level of the past several years and the authorizing level, and to point out here again that an authorizing level is no magic figure.

If we go back to when this act was initially authorized, it was at a \$5 million level for 1971, and it moved to 15 in 1972 and 25 in 1973, and here we are in 1974, after taking another look at it, proposing to extend it right back at the authorizing level we initially thought we had to have 3 years ago. So it kind of proves to me, and to some of those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations, that we have been right all along in restraining ourselves when it came time to appropriate for this program. Maybe we ought not be criticized as severely as we are sometimes when we do not appropriate more than 25, 50, or 75 percent of the authorizing level for some of these pieces of legislation.

So it is only with a word of caution that I speak here today. I wonder whether or not we are still escalating this authorization figure too rapidly. Taking a look at the committee report, we find that in 1971 the program was authorized at \$5 million and we only appropriated \$2 million; in 1972 it was authorized at \$15 million, and we saw fit to provide only \$3½ million; and in fiscal year 1973 it was authorized at a level of \$25 million and we appropriated \$4 million. But then there was only \$1.45 million

actually spent in the fiscal year because of a contract problem in the Division of Contracts and Grants in the Office of Education.

So I am not altogether sure, depending upon what kind of arguments we get in the balance of the debate here, as to whether I will be supporting the bill on final passage or not, but I simply wish to issue the warning here that I am quite sure that our Committee on Appropriations, if it is passed at this level of funding, will not be inclined to appropriate the full amounts authorized in the legislation.

If I vote no on final passage it does not necessarily mean I am absolutely opposed to the legislation, but rather the excessive limits of the authorizing levels.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In reading the report, did the gentleman find any real justification for the program and the amounts of money that are here proposed, or any amount, for that matter? Did he find any real justification?

Mr. MICHEL. I cannot see the arguments at the level at which the authorization is pegged. I do not feel, however, that we ought to dismiss it out of hand. I am not yet to that point, but willing to give it a further chance, because some of these programs in the initial experimental stage have not had the opportunity to operate fully. I am willing to give it a chance to succeed, but I have not been overwhelmingly impressed with what has been done to date.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder why the committee proposes to quintuple the appropriation of \$5 million in this fiscal year to \$25 million in 1976, and a 3-year total of \$45 million when there is no real justification. Why we do not get figures in this report as to the total spending for all the environment programs?

Mr. MICHEL. The questions the gentleman from Iowa raises are very good ones, and they are, frankly, unanswered, unless the chairman of the committee can answer them.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there are two points. First of all, as the gentleman will realize in reading the report, members of our committee were equally critical of the failure of the Office of Education to make available, after repeated requests on our part, the kind of information to which the gentleman from Iowa has alluded. We shall continue to badger the Office of Education to give us such information.

Second, with respect to the amount of money authorized and appropriated, as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, the authorizing figure for fiscal year 1974 is \$5 million, and the House has

already voted \$4 million. In that respect I think there is a closer linkage between the authorization and appropriation figures than might first appear.

The gentleman from Indiana is sensitive to this kind of point the gentleman from Illinois has made. That indeed is one of the reasons several of us on the subcommittee reduced the overall authority in the bill from the \$60 million as the bill was originally introduced to \$45 million.

So I would say finally I support the point made by the gentleman from Illinois. I think certainly it is something we should have in mind. The authorizing committee tries to use its best judgment and the Appropriations Committee tries to use its best judgment, and the authorizing committee thinks the figures in the bill represent our best judgment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman from Indiana speaks of the original proposal as having been for \$60 million, he is simply bearing out the usual action of that committee. They are never modest in asking for money in the Labor and Education Committee. I am not at all surprised that they settled for \$45 million rather than \$60 million, but I am concerned by the gentleman's admission that they sought information and could not get it, yet, without justification, the committee seeks to hike spending on this boondoggle up to \$45 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years, pursuant to House Resolution 600, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 335, nays 60, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—335

Abdnor	Flood	Melcher
Abzug	Flowers	Metcalfe
Adams	Foley	Mezvisinsky
Addabbo	Ford, Gerald R.	Milford
Alexander	Ford,	Minish
Anderson,	William D.	Mink
Calif.	Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio
Andrews, N.C.	Fountain	Mitchell, Md.
Andrews,	Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.
N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Mizell
Annunzio	Frenzel	Moakley
Arends	Fromm	Mollohan
Armstrong	Fulton	Moorhead,
Ashley	Fuqua	Calif.
Badillo	Gaydos	Moorhead, Pa.
Baralis	Gialmo	Morgan
Barrett	Gibbons	Mosher
Bell	Gilman	Moss
Bennett	Ginn	Murphy, Ill.
Bergland	Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.
Bevill	Grasso	Natcher
Blaggi	Gray	Nedzi
Blister	Green, Pa.	Nelsen
Bingham	Griffiths	Nichols
Blackburn	Gubser	Nix
Boggs	Gunde	O'Byrne
Bolander	Gunter	O'Brien
Bowen	Guyer	O'Hara
Brademas	Haley	O'Neill
Brascoe	Hamilton	Owens
Bray	Hammer-	Parris
Breaux	schmidt	Passman
Breckinridge	Hanley	Patman
Brinkley	Hanna	Patten
Brooks	Hanrahan	Pepper
Broomfield	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins
Brotzman	Harsha	Pettis
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Peyser
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Pickle
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Pike
Burgener	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Burke, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Preyer
Burke, Mass.	Heinz	Price, Ill.
Burton	Helstoski	Price, Tex.
Byron	Hicks	Pritchard
Carey, N.Y.	Hillis	Quile
Carney, Ohio	Hinschaw	Quillen
Carter	Hogan	Rallsback
Casey, Tex.	Hollifield	Randall
Cederberg	Holtzman	Rangel
Chamberlain	Horton	Regula
Chappell	Hosmer	Reuss
Chisholm	Howard	Rhodes
Clancy	Hudnut	Riegle
Clark	Hungate	Rinaldo
Clausen,	Hunt	Roberts
Don H.	Jarman	Robison, N.Y.
Clay	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	Roe
Cohen	Jones, Ala.	Rogers
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Okla.	Roncallo, Wyo.
Conable	Jones, Tenn.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Conte	Jordan	Rooney, Pa.
Conyers	Karth	Rose
Corman	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Cotter	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Coughlin	Keating	Roush
Cronin	Kemp	Roy
Culver	Kluczyński	Roybal
Daniels,	Koch	Runnels
Dominick V.	Kyros	Sarasin
Danielson	Landrum	Sarbanes
Davis, Ga.	Latta	Schroeder
Davis, S.C.	Leggett	Sebelius
de la Garza	Lehman	Seiberling
Delaney	Lent	Shoup
Dellenback	Litton	Shuster
Dellums	Long, La.	Sikes
Denholm	Long, Md.	Sisk
Dent	Lujan	Skubitz
Diggs	McClory	Slack
Dingell	McCloskey	Smith, Iowa
Donohue	McCollister	Smith, N.Y.
Dorn	McCormack	Snyder
Downing	McDade	Spence
Drinan	McFall	Staggers
Dulski	McKinney	Stanton,
Duncan	McSpadden	J. William
du Pont	Madden	Stanton,
Eckhardt	Madigan	James V.
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Stark
Edwards, Calif.	Mailliard	Steed
Ellberg	Mallory	Steelman
Erlenborn	Mann	Steiger, Wis.
Esch	Maraziti	Stephens
Eshleman	Martin, N.C.	Stokes
Evans, Colo.	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Stubblefield
Fascell	Mayne	Stuckey
Findley	Mazzoli	Studds
Fish	Meeds	Symington

Talcott	Walsh	Wright
Taylor, N.C.	Wampler	Wyatt
Teague, Calif.	Ware	Wylder
Teague, Tex.	Whalen	Wyllie
Thompson, N.J.	White	Wyman
Thomson, Wis.	Whitehurst	Yates
Thone	Williams	Yatron
Thornton	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
Tiernan	Wilson,	Young, Ga.
Towell, Nev.	Charles H.,	Young, Ill.
Udall	Calif.	Young, Tex.
Ullman	Wilson,	Zablocki
Vanik	Charles, Tex.	Zion
Waggonner	Winn	Zwach
Waldie	Wolff	

NAYS—60

Archer	Dickinson	Poage
Ashbrook	Fisher	Powell, Ohio
Baker	Flynt	Rarick
Bauman	Goldwater	Robinson, Va.
Beard	Goodling	Roussot
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Ruth
Butler	Holt	Satterfield
Camp	Huber	Scherle
Clawson, Del.	Hutchinson	Schneebell
Cochran	Ichord	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Jones, N.C.	Symms
Collins, Tex.	King	Taylor, Mo.
Conlan	Landgrebe	Treen
Crane	Lott	Vander Jagt
Daniel, Dan	McEwen	Vigorito
Daniel, Robert	Martin, Nebr.	Whitten
W. J.	Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Young, S.C.
Dennis	Miller	
Devine	Montgomery	

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Ill.	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Aspin	Harrington	Ryan
Blatnik	Harvey	St Germain
Bolling	Hastings	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Ketchum	Shipley
Buchanan	Kuykendall	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	McKay	Steele
Derwinski	Macdonald	Sullivan
Frey	Mills, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Gettys	Myers	Veysey
Green, Oreg.	Rees	Widnall
Grover	Reid	Young, Alaska

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Derwinski.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Burke of

Florida.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Harvey.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hastings.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Myers.

Mr. McKay with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Johnson of

Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, through some mistake, I am recorded as having voted "no" on roll-call No. 544, on yesterday, October 23, 1973. I did not intend to vote "no." I support the measure then under consideration and wish to make my support clear. If the rules allowed, I would ask unanimous consent that the printed recording of my vote in the permanent RECORD be changed.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION ACTS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9639) to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment as follows:

Immediately after the matter to be inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment insert the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing two sentences, (1) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, no special assistance factor under this section 11 shall, for any State, be less than the average reimbursement paid for each free lunch (in the case of the special assistance factor for free lunches), or for each reduced price lunch (in the case of the special assistance factor for reduced price lunches), in such State under this section in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972; and (2) adjustments required by the sentence immediately preceding this sentence shall be based on the special assistance factors for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, as determined without regard to any increase required by the application of this sentence."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to our action on last Thursday rejecting a Senate amendment to the school lunch program, the Senate has adopted a further amendment which I believe is responsive to the House concerns.

As was indicated in our previous debate, the school free and reduced price lunch program in four States—New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Rhode Island—would be adversely affected by the provisions of H.R. 9639. The first Senate amendment which we rejected

was designed to hold harmless these States from any loss in section 11 funds for free and reduced price lunches. That Senate amendment would have continued indefinitely a preferred reimbursement rate for these States, and I believe it was because of this indefinite continuation that the House rejected the Senate amendment.

Recognizing our concern, the Senate yesterday receded from its initial amendment with an amendment which in effect holds harmless these four States only for the current fiscal year. As my colleagues know, H.R. 9639 guarantees a minimum 45-cent reimbursement rate for free lunches and a minimum 35-cent reimbursement rate for reduced price lunches. The Secretary may set a higher rate. If the Secretary promulgates the minimum rate, however, under the Senate amendment the rate in New York will be 46.5 cents, in New Jersey 45.8 cents, in Rhode Island 45.5 cents, and in Maryland 45.4 cents instead of the 45-cent rate which will be paid elsewhere. These are the average rates paid in these four States last year.

The important and significant difference in the amendment before us now and that rejected last week is that the preferred rate is only guaranteed in the current fiscal year. It is a 1-year hold harmless provision which I believe in equity and justice we should adopt.

Unless we adopt this provision, there is a likelihood that these four States will receive less section 11 funds than they received last year.

Mr. Speaker, the States have incurred this indebtedness in good faith. They acted last year under the law. In terms of dollars the difference totals \$2,400,000. Assuming the same number of lunches are served as last year, New York will receive \$1,852,000; New Jersey, \$260,000; Maryland, \$182,000; and Rhode Island, \$77,000—more than what they would receive without the amendment. After the fiscal year, I must repeat, these four States will be treated like all other States.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with the gentleman from Kentucky in urging that this body concur in the Senate amendment. As I had indicated in my comments the other day when we debated the Senate amendment, it would be acceptable to me for us to have the hold-harmless provision for this school year. We are already in the school year, and we have the budget problems right now. However I did not want such a provision to continue beyond this school year for special treatment for those States.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the language is written so that the adjustments that are needed because of increased cost of living will not be made on top of, say, in the case of New York, 46½

cents, but rather on top of 45 cents, just as all the other States, and so with the expected increase in the cost of living all States would be treated the same, or if we did not have an increased cost of living then they would all still be the same at 45 cents.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely correct.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman again for yielding me this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on rollcall No. 545 I was recorded not present. I was present and recorded myself present, but I was shown as not present in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE UNITED STATES STILL LIVES

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the surprise decision by the President yesterday to abide by the lawful decisions of the court of appeals and the district court is a victory for the American people.

Bowing to unprecedented public outrage and pressure, the President was literally forced to do the right thing. This was not an exercise in leadership as much as an exercise in leadership as it is still a commendable first step to reestablishing confidence in the American institutions.

I hope the President in his speech tonight will again heed the people's voice and reestablish the Office of Special Prosecutor. In so doing, I urge the President to give both verbal and written assurances that he and his White House aides will not only give the special prosecutor full independence, but also full cooperation in his multifaceted investigation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing that would help ease the cataclysmic events of last weekend than the reappointment of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General and Archibald Cox as special prosecutor.

Never in my political career have I witnessed the torrent of mail, telegrams, and telephone calls that followed the actions of the President this weekend. Of

the over 340 letters and telegrams and 120 telephone calls, there was only 1 letter and 7 telephone calls supporting the President. The rest overwhelmingly called for the immediate impeachment of the President, and calls I have been receiving today indicate a continuing support for the preliminary investigation being undertaken by the House Judiciary Committee.

I am hopeful that the President will act constructively in his speech tonight and move to reaffirm the people's faith in our institutions. However, I am confident that even if the President falls short in his own efforts to restore confidence in his Presidency, the American people are eminently capable of continuing their Government institution.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the United States lives—its strength is in its people and in its elected officials who heed the basic good instincts of our people.

TAX TREATMENT OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today deals with the tax treatment of real estate investment trusts. The real estate investment trust—REIT—industry was accorded special tax treatment with the enactment in 1960 of the Federal tax amendments which, in general, provided real estate investment trusts with the same general conduit principle that had been applied to mutual funds; that is, substantially all of the income of the REIT must be passed through the REIT each year to its shareholders. This income will be taxed to them, and not to the REIT owners. In the case of REIT's this means that the income from equity and mortgage investments in real estate and other permitted income sources would be distributed to investors each year and taxed to them without being subjected to a tax at the REIT level.

The purpose of this special tax treatment for REIT's is to provide an opportunity for small investors to secure advantages from investing in real estate normally available only to those with larger resources. This allows these smaller investors to invest in real estate assets under professional management and allows them to spread the risk of loss by the greater diversification of investment which can be secured through the means of collectively financing projects which the investors could not undertake individually.

In order to qualify as a REIT under the present tax laws for purposes of the conduit treatment, the trust must satisfy three tests on a year-by-year basis: organizational structure, source of income, and nature of assets. These conditions are intended to allow the special tax treatment for REITs only if there really is a pooling arrangement which is evidenced by their organizational structure, if their investments are basically in the real estate field and if the income is

clearly passive income from real estate investment, as contrasted to income from the active operation of businesses involving real estate.

With respect to the organizational structure, a REIT, in general, must be an unincorporated trust or association—which would be taxable as a corporation but for the REIT provisions—managed by one or more trustees, the beneficial ownership of which is evidenced by transferable shares or certificates of ownership held by 100 or more persons, and which would not be a personal holding company even if all its adjusted gross income constituted personal holding company income.

With respect to the income requirements, at least 75 percent of the income of the REIT must be from rents from real property, interest on obligations secured by real property, gain from the sale or other disposition of real property—or interest therein, including mortgages—distributions from other REIT's, and abatements or refunds of taxes on real property. An additional 15 percent of REIT income must come from these sources, or from other interest, dividends, or gains from the sale of securities. Income from stock or securities held less than 6 months, or real property held less than 4 years—except in the case of involuntary conversions—cannot equal as much as 30 percent of the REIT's income.

With respect to the asset requirements, a REIT must have at least 75 percent of its assets in real estate, cash and cash items, and government securities. However, not more than 5 percent of the assets can be in securities of any one nongovernment-non-REIT issuer, and such holdings may not exceed 10 percent of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer. In addition, no property of the REIT may be held primarily for sale to customers.

In addition, a REIT is required to distribute at least 90 percent of its income—other than capital gains income—to its shareholders during the taxable year, or declare it as a dividend by the due date for filing its tax return for the year—including any extension—and pay the dividend within 12 months from the close of the taxable year. If all of these conditions are met, then a REIT is qualified for the special conduit treatment which allows the income that is distributed to the shareholders to be taxed to them without being subjected to a tax at the trust level so that the REIT is only taxed on the undistributed income. Otherwise, a REIT that does not meet the requirements for qualification would be treated as a corporation, in which case all of its income would be taxed to the REIT first, not just the undistributed income.

Although the provisions have been amended from time to time, the basic rules with respect to REITs have remained the same since their enactment in 1960. Since that time, the REIT industry has grown enormously in size and is responsible for a large proportion of the investment in the real estate field in the United States today. There are, however, certain problems that have

arisen with respect to the REIT provisions which could significantly affect the industry if they are not modified.

Basically, these problems relate to the fact that under present law if a REIT does not meet the various income, asset and distribution tests, the REIT will be disqualified from using the special tax provisions even in those cases where the failure to meet a requirement was unintentional. This would have the effect of not only changing the tax status of the REIT itself—which could result in substantial economic loss to the REIT since its income would be subject to tax at the corporate rates at a time when it has already been distributed to shareholders—but also would affect the interests of the public shareholders in the REIT. It appears to me that to totally disqualify a REIT where it unintentionally fails to meet one or more of the qualifying requirements is too harsh a penalty and that less drastic penalties should be provided, which will nevertheless maintain the original objectives in the REIT law provisions.

The bill that I have introduced is intended to alleviate this type of problem in those cases where a REIT inadvertently fails to meet a requirement for qualification and also deals with a limited number of other problems. The following is a brief summary of some of the major features of the bill:

First. Under present law, a real estate investment trust—REIT—is required to distribute 90 percent of its taxable income each year to its shareholders. If it does not meet this requirement, the trust will be disqualified as a REIT and must pay tax on its income as if it were a regular corporation. This could cause problems for a REIT which in good faith believed it met the 90-percent distribution requirements, but upon audit, did not meet the requirements—this could occur, for example, with an increase on audit of the taxable income of the REIT. The bill establishes a deficiency dividend procedure which would allow a REIT that fails to meet the income distribution requirements upon an audit by the Internal Revenue Service to make a late distribution to its shareholders, to avoid disqualification. This procedure would only be available if the REIT initially missed the 90-percent distribution requirement for reasonable cause. Furthermore, the REIT would be subject to interest and penalties on the amount of the adjustment under this procedure.

Second. Under present law, certain percentages of a REIT's income must be from designated sources, and if the source tests are not met it must pay taxes on its income as if it were a regular corporation. This could cause problems for a REIT which in good faith believed it met the income source tests, but upon audit, did not meet the tests—this could occur, that is, with an increase on audit of the REIT's gross income. The bill provides that a REIT that fails to meet the income source test upon audit by the Internal Revenue Service would not be disqualified but would be allowed to pay tax on the amount by which it failed to meet the source tests. This provision would be available only if the REIT initially had

reasonable ground to believe and did believe that it met the income source tests.

Third. A REIT also may inadvertently have difficulty under present law meeting the income source tests if it must foreclose on a mortgage that it owns. For example, the interest a REIT receives on a loan secured by a real estate mortgage may be qualified income, but the rents received from the same property acquired upon foreclosure may not qualify. The bill provides that a REIT would not be disqualified because of income which it receives from foreclosure property since, presumably, the REIT should not be held responsible for the type of lease or other transaction entered into by its mortgagee. At the election of the REIT, a 2-year grace period—generally subject to two 1-year extensions—would be afforded so that the REIT could liquidate the foreclosed property in an orderly manner.

However, during the grace period, the REIT would pay corporate tax on the nonqualified income received from property acquired on foreclosure.

Fourth. Present law prohibits a REIT from holding any property for sale to customers. This rule has been difficult to apply because of the absolute prohibition on holding such property and because of problems involved in determining when a REIT holds property for sale. The bill changes this rule to allow the REIT to have up to 1 percent of its gross income from such sources; this income however, would be subject to corporate tax. Any income from such sources in excess of 1 percent would be subject to an additional tax under the provisions discussed in paragraph (2) above, rather than disqualify the REIT, provided the REIT had reasonable ground to believe that the excess income would not be determined to be from such sources.

Fifth. Certain types of income which customarily are earned in the real estate business but which now do not qualify under the income source tests are treated as qualifying income under the bill. These include first, certain rents from property leased together with the real property; second, charges for services customarily furnished in connection with the rental of real property whether or not such charges are separately stated; and third, commitment fees received for entering into agreements to make loans secured by real property. Because these and the other amendments discussed above remove a significant portion of income from the category of unqualified income—which now may be 10 percent of a REIT's gross income—the income source requirements are increased by the bill so that unqualified income could be only 5 percent of gross income.

Sixth. Under the bill, REIT's would be permitted to operate in corporate form; under present law, REIT's must operate as a trust or association.

Seventh. Certain other changes are made concerning technical rules applicable to REIT's, such as, regarding income from sale of mortgages held for less than 4 years, and regarding options to purchase real property.

I would like to point out that prior to

my introducing this bill the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation reviewed in detail the matters dealt with in the bill. On the basis of this initial study, the staff recognizes the need for corrective legislation in the areas covered by this bill and advises me that the solutions proposed probably are reasonable ones.

I have requested the staff to continue to review the bill to make sure that the solutions adopted, particularly in the more difficult problem areas, are the best ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am authorized to say that in the introduction of this bill today the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) also will appear as cosponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring the bill introduced by Mr. LANDRUM dealing with the tax treatment of real estate investment trusts. The special tax treatment of real estate investment trusts was provided in 1960 primarily to allow small investors to pool their resources for purposes of investing in the real estate field. In general, a real estate investment trust—REIT—is treated for tax purposes as a conduit in which case the income that is earned on its investments must be passed through to the investors and is taxed to them rather than being taxed at the REIT level, as long as the REIT meets certain qualifying requirements.

The real estate investment trust industry has grown at a rapid pace since the enactment of the special tax provisions in 1960. It has contributed significantly to the expansion in the real estate field by providing an additional source of investment money, especially during periods when other channels for mortgage loans and other real estate investment money has been tight.

Although the success of the REIT's since the enactment of the tax provisions has been considerable, certain problems have arisen with respect to some of the tax provisions applicable to REIT's which in certain cases have the effect of disqualifying a REIT if one of the conditions for REIT status is not met, even though it may have been inadvertent on the part of the REIT. Disqualification of a REIT could present significant problems, since the failure to meet a qualifying requirement may not be determined until a future year in which case the income has already been distributed by the REIT to its shareholders. This bill deals with these types of problems, as well as certain other problems, to allow a REIT to continue its special status when it has inadvertently failed to meet a requirement for qualification.

I understand that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which initially reviewed this legislation, recognizes the need for corrective legislation in the areas covered by this bill and will continue to review

the legislative proposals contained in the bill. I agree with Mr. LANDRUM that the staff should make sure in its further study that the solutions proposed are the best ones.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President's decision to release the tapes cannot divert us from pursuing an investigation of conduct which could lead to his impeachment.

The country's stubborn system of justice has begun its inexorable movement toward truth, and no act of the President, however desperate, can stop it.

Too much has occurred, much of it even before the incidents brought to light by Watergate. In my judgment, the President's prolonging of the Indochina war was, of itself, an impeachable offense.

The Watergate revelations, and the Agnew affair have revealed the Nixon administration as the most corrupt in the history of the Nation.

Reviewing incidents of the past several months is like reading a James Bond thriller, and the last chapters have yet to unfold. Recall with me, if you will, the paranoic yet effective political sabotage which corrupted our electoral processes, the conspiracy, bribery, burglaries, espionage, destruction of accusatory documents, wiretaps, land deals, economic favors, and all the rest involving the top-most political figures in the Nation, persons closest to the Chief Executive of the most powerful Nation in the world, his Cabinet officers, the Vice President, perhaps the President, himself.

We must find out exactly what happened. Why is the executive branch allowed to misuse its power to such an extent? What is the nature of the Presidency today? What business did the Deans and Ehrlichmans, and Haldemans have in the White House in the first place? Were they performing legitimate business of the country? Is it legitimate business to violate the rights of Americans to select a Presidential candidate? Is it a legitimate business which protects special interests and grants favors to friends of the President?

We must have answers to these and similar questions before the conscience of our democracy will be satisfied. Only the truth will preserve the continuity of our Government and the truth will prevail.

Despite this scandal, the worst in U.S. history, our standards are high and our institutions strong. Otherwise, unscrupulous conduct surrounding the Presidency might never have been exposed in the first place. It is this strength, our Republic, which will carry us through the present crisis and make us even stronger.

We need not fear the actions of one man, however powerful or dictatorial he seeks to be, so long as we maintain our freedom under the law of the land, our

freedoms to question, to expose, to seek and live the truth.

WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, the war in the Middle East is a tragic event for millions of Arabs and Jews caught up in the irrationality of armed conflict. It is also fraught with dangers for America.

We have a historic and traditional responsibility toward the security of Israel—a responsibility which cannot be abrogated. At the same time, however, we have an ever-growing dependence on the Arab nations of the Middle East for our energy needs. We can in no way equate these two exigencies, and I am certainly not suggesting that we negotiate the security of Israel for the sake of our energy needs. However, there have been statements in the national news media to suggest that the threat of an oil embargo by the Arab nations should not be taken too seriously. In order to put the so-called oil question of the Middle East conflict into focus, I would like to discuss with my colleagues the degree of our Nation's dependence on Middle East oil resources.

Most estimates agree that during the first half of this year, the United States imported an average of 807,000 barrels per day of crude oil from Saudi Arabia, Iran, Algeria, and Libya. Another 230,000 barrels per day comes from Egypt, Tunisia, and Kuwait. In addition, a considerable amount of Arab crude oil is sent to Canada, Europe, and the Caribbean to be refined into fuel oil, gasoline, and other distillates before it is shipped to the United States. We are currently purchasing about 336,000 barrels of refined product from Europe, of which about 80 percent originated in the Middle East. From the Caribbean, we are getting some 1.6 million barrels per day. Of this amount, about 16 percent, or 250,000 barrels per day, is refined from Middle East crude. Canada now exports about 1,056,000 barrels per day of crude oil to the United States from its western oil fields. In turn, Canada purchases Middle East oil for consumption in its eastern regions. Presumably, a Middle East embargo would force Canada to further limit its exports, and it is estimated that Canada would withhold about 400,000 barrels a day for its own use.

Therefore, the result of an embargo by the Arab oil producing nations would be a reduction of Arab oil imports to the United States of about 2 million barrels per day.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting, by any means, that our dependence on Middle East oil should be the determining factor in our policy in that region of the world. However, at the same time, we cannot ignore the energy-related consequences of our actions in the Middle East.

UNPARALLELED ARTISTRY

Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the death of Maestro Pablo Casals removed from the living Earth a musical genius and a human being whose great soul reached out to all mankind. Although the world is diminished by his passing, he left behind a legacy that will forever enrich the lives of all who heard him perform.

On the occasion, in 1969, of his last appearance in Washington, a performance of his oratorio "El Pesebre." I was moved as I listened to the magic sounds he produced to jot down what I was pleased to call a poem—an effort to express, however inadequately, the feeling aroused in me by his unparalleled artistry.

I was bold enough to send the maestro my effort, and shortly afterward I received a generous letter of acknowledgement from Senor Casals. He even invited me to visit him should I ever come to Puerto Rico, where he had made his home for many years, an invitation which I regret to say I never had the pleasure of accepting.

My poem, entitled simply "Pablo Casals," has never been published. I insert it here, not in pride of authorship, but as a heartfelt tribute to a man who, during his long life, brought beauty into the lives of a multitude of people:

PABLO CASALS

Music—Music, the word does no justice to the sound—
Sound—it's almost a sacrilege to call it sound—
Vibrations—it would seem vulgar—to speak so of his work—
What then, what then is this thing Casals creates?
The Universe in motion tempered by the soul,
The rhythm of the heavens,
The wind of light,
The sound of time,
The voice of God—
We should sample of his wonders with the utmost of delight,
For few will have the privilege of being in his presence—
And when he shall leave us, to grace the heavens with his soul—
We shall be jealous of the Lord,
And through an eternity and more
The angels will lay claim to him, but we on earth shall still exclaim:
"Though the beauty of his soul befits the heavens,
"Pao' nonetheless belongs to us."
—KIKA DE LA GARZA.

APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting for the consideration of the Congress a measure calling for the appointment of a special prosecutor to continue the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the perpetration of gross crimes in connection with the 1972 election for the Presidency of the United States.

This measure calls for the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to appoint such Special Prosecutor.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has broken faith with the American people and with the Congress in firing Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. However, I do not believe that this particular action warrants impeachment proceedings. What he did was legal, but it certainly was with flagrant disregard of our understanding at the time of the appointment of Mr. Cox.

I think it critical to any such discussions to point out that the President has not directly flaunted a court order. That is a critical point in consideration of impeachment discussion.

Mr. Cox was appointed upon the confirmation of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General. It was our clear understanding that when such Special Prosecutor was named, he would be allowed to conduct an investigation wherever the trail might lead.

It was, therefore, astounding to find Mr. Cox was issued orders to cease and desist in his efforts to secure the Presidential tapes through lawful court proceedings. He was placed in a position where compliance was impossible and he was dismissed in an unprecedented act.

The incident was then followed by the resignation of the Attorney General and the firing of the Deputy Attorney General. They had no other choice, for to have done otherwise would have been to destroy the very reason they were nominated and confirmed—to bring respect back to the U.S. Department of Justice.

While my bill does not designate the individual to be named, that not being proper, it would certainly be my recommendation, if asked, that Mr. Cox be named to this new position.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult period when our institutions of Government have suffered losses of credibility, the like of which this Nation has seldom seen.

It is time that this administration stopped going on television with a plea to the American people to explain one crisis after another and get down to the business of governing. I cannot find in any of these speeches any comments that would have been as productive as allowing the special prosecutor to continue and complete his work.

In an effort to see that the circumstances we have seen this week do not happen again, one section of my bill would provide that the special prosecutor not be subject to the supervision or control of the President. He can be removed only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

I doubt that such a presumptive act as the removal of Mr. Cox would be attempted again. If it were, then we would have to make a judgment on those circumstances and proceed as a government of law and not of emotion or whim.

The President has now agreed to comply with the court order to turn over the tapes to Judge Sirica. Why did he have to put us through this crisis and add further to the doubt and suspicion surrounding us in this period? He could have done this last week and alleviated the deviousness for which he must take a large share of the responsibility.

I want to add to these comments a very strong recommendation that the Congress move immediately with the consideration of a nomination of Congress-

man GERALD FORD to be the Vice President of the United States. His nomination should in no wise be a part of the controversy over the circumstances relating to the firing of Mr. Cox.

Congress can show the American people that we are not petty or partisan when such matters of grave importance are to be considered. His nomination should be considered on his fitness to serve as Vice President of the United States and on no other basis.

Personally, I have the highest possible regard for his ability and integrity.

Much is going to be said in the coming days about impeachment. It is a part of our system that those who feel such action is justified present their views. I ask only that the Judiciary Committee move with dispatch in its deliberations. I personally appreciate the statements made yesterday by Speaker ALBERT and Judiciary Committee Chairman ROBINO. They are in the finest traditions of this institution and we are fortunate to have their leadership in this sensitive time.

My colleagues, the situation is grave and the hour is late.

We are faced with a loss of confidence in government which transcends the imagination. All public officials are going to be tarred with this brush and it is a heartrending situation.

Here we face another crisis in the Middle East and an energy crisis the like of which we have never experienced. The economy is of grave concern.

The Vice President has pled guilty to a grave offense and forced to resign in order not to be sentenced to prison.

It is in this atmosphere that I call for the appointment of another special prosecutor. Back in May I said that only with a complete and total disclosure would this matter be set to rest. I said at the time:

I think it is just as important that the finger of suspicion be lifted from the innocent as it is to pinpoint the guilty.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I continue in that view.

The circumstances surrounding the firing of Mr. Cox can only add fuel to the flames of strife and discord. It is my considered judgment that the naming of another special prosecutor outside the province of the administration would be justified and warranted in these circumstances.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this measure.

NEW PROGRAM AFFECTING PEANUT FARMERS

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, just this morning the Secretary of Agriculture has announced a new program affecting all the peanut farmers in the country, most of which are in the South. The Secretary said he was going to cut off price support for peanuts found to contain aflatoxin; eliminate the transfers of allotments by lease or sale by the owner; increase the present charges from \$15 to

\$17 per ton for storage, handling and inspection costs; permit no tolerance in acreage compliance; and transfer full field and supervisory functions from grower associations to the county and State ASC offices.

These actions by the Secretary would, in effect, wreak havoc with the entire peanut industry.

I asked the representative from the Department of Agriculture what these changes were supposed to say in the way of dollars and cents. The answer was \$6.6 million.

Of course, this is a lot of money, but, Mr. Speaker, when we examine what is proposed here we see that the administration would wreck the entire economy of a section of the country to say \$6.6 million in the interests of so-called economy, while at the same time the administration wants to give \$1½ billion to Southeast Asia, \$2.2 billion in aid to Israel, \$200 million more to Cambodia, and ad infinitum.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is silly.

Apparently, certain high, heartless Agriculture officials have decided to single out the peanut-producing States of the South as whipping boys so we can give more foreign aid to countries to buy their friendship.

Today's announcement by the Agriculture Department concerning peanuts would, if implemented, severely damage the agricultural economy of my district, the Second District of Alabama—"Peanut Capital of the World."

Mr. Speaker, my district, with the possible exception of my distinguished colleague from Georgia's Second District, DAWSON MATHIS, produces more peanuts than any other district in the United States. Therefore, it is only natural that I vehemently condemn this unwarranted and callous action by a few unthinking, insipid "intellectuals" in the Agriculture Department.

I strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider these hasty actions. Furthermore, I promise that I will do all I can to fight the implementation of these discriminatory and possibly illegal actions.

WE MUST NOT RUSH INTO IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I came back to my office from the House of Representatives, the cries of "impeach him" were still ringing in my ears. Many Members of Congress exercised their right to speak out on the President, Watergate, Archibald Cox, the Presidential tapes, the obstruction of justice, and all the rest.

To hear it all, you would believe that this great Nation of ours is going to come tumbling down, and the truth is we do face a real crisis.

Yesterday, Tuesday, was the first day that the House had been in session since the President proposed his compromise to the court concerning the tapes and

since the firing of Special Prosecutor Cox and the resignations of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William French Smith.

The cries of impeachment are the end result of the frustration and bewilderment of the last 6 months as revelation after revelation of the whole sordid Watergate affair has been spread before the people. Telegrams and phone calls are coming in from all over the country now and, from what I have been told by many Members of Congress, I estimate that 99 percent of them are saying "get rid of the President."

And so there is almost a feeling of mob hysteria.

The impeachment resolutions that have already been hurriedly introduced have been referred to the House Judiciary Committee for hearings and investigation before the matter comes to the House for a vote.

Television crews have been in my office, the wire services have been ringing my phone off the wall, newspaper reporters come by or call, and everyone wants to know how I am going to vote. Everybody wants an instant comment and frankly many of them seem somewhat distressed that I will not join the crowd calling for "impeachment now."

Well, the truth is that I may well have to vote in the next few days or weeks on the question of impeaching the President, and I am not about to take a position "now" on that vote without having all the facts.

The impeachment of a President, any President, is almost too awesome to contemplate. It cannot, it must not be done in an air of frenzy and emotion. By the same token, it must not be done on the basis of partisan loyalty. In fact, if ever there was a time when a vote should be approached on a nonpartisan basis, it is in the case of impeachment.

It is true that the country has been thrown into a turmoil, and it is equally true that we must not allow that turmoil to drive us to impeaching the President unless it is clearly warranted.

The present crisis is all tied up in those blasted tapes. I urged the President months ago to release the tapes, because I felt there was such a crisis of confidence in our Government that the people desperately needed to know that the President had nothing to hide. I know that he feels very strongly about "executive privilege" and "separation of powers," but the need to come clean with the people, to me, is overriding. Fortunately, the President, at the 11th hour, has now advised the court and the Nation that he will turn over the tapes to the court. It is too early to assess the real effect of his last minute decision as far as impeachment is concerned. In the last few days, things have happened so fast that it has been extremely difficult to finish a speech before new events have changed the whole thing. At any rate, a new prosecutor must be named so this whole mess can be resolved just as soon as possible.

To those folks in my district who have urged me to move immediately for impeachment, I just have to say: "Go slow." Let us be sure what we are doing before we invoke this extraordinary remedy

which has been adopted only once in the history of this Nation. The cry for impeachment, however sincere, is one thing. But to actually cast that vote when the historic roll is called is something entirely different.

SOVIET MILITARY MIGHT: WESTERN MADE

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Korea, Hungary, Cuba, Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, the Middle East—the presence of the Soviet Union has been felt in all these and many other places. In none of these places has the Soviet Union been a promoter of peace. Soviet space shots, Soviet missiles, Soviet invasions, and Soviet aid to other aggressive countries have all depended on their ability to produce weapons of war—depended on their technology. But that is not quite true either. In a few words, there is no such thing as Soviet technology.

Perhaps as much as 90 to 95 percent of Soviet technology came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. Now this may sound incredible, but the facts substantiate this claim. Soviet aggression is dependent upon American-made and Western-made technology.

In effect the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union—its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years. Since the revolution in 1917, it has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment, and technical assistance.

By listening to administration spokesmen—or some newspaper pundits—you get the impression that trade with the Soviet Union is some new miracle cure for the world's, and particularly America's, problems.

That is not quite accurate.

Peace through trade?

The idea that trade with the Soviets might bring peace goes back to 1917. The earliest proposal is dated December 1917—just a few weeks after the start of the Bolshevik revolution. It was implemented in 1920 while the Bolsheviks held power. They needed foreign supplies to survive.

Last year the Soviets needed wheat. They only had one place to purchase that wheat—the United States. Did our Government use that Soviet need to extract something for the United States in return? Our Government did not. Instead, the American taxpayers were forced to subsidize the Soviet wheat deal with several hundred million dollars of their tax money.

Seemingly not learning anything from the wheat deal, the administration has now asked for most-favored-nation status and other concessions for the Soviet Union. When some have suggested that the Soviets should also give something in return, the State Department's reply has been that we cannot get involved in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. There seems to be no similar

prohibition about getting involved in the internal affairs of Rhodesia or other friendly countries.

The American financial newspapers give accounts of further credits from the Export-Import Bank, American governmental agencies, and American banks. First National City Bank of New York still has \$40 million in unsettled claims against the Soviet Union. An estimated \$200 million in validated claims is owed by the Kremlin to U.S. citizens.

The history of our construction of the Soviet Union has been blacked out—much of the key information is still classified—along with the other mistakes of the Washington bureaucracy.

Fifty years of dealing with the Soviets has been an economic success for the U.S.S.R. and a political and economic disaster for the United States. It has not stopped war, it has not given us peace. It has given the Soviets increased industrial and military power and the ability to accomplish its never ceasing goal of world domination.

The United States is spending billions of dollars a year on defense. A defense that is made necessary by the threat and aggression of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. While we are spending billions on defense, we still help build that enemy we are defending against.

Let us take a look at a statement made by Stalin to Ambassador Averell Harriman. This is what Harriman told the State Department that Stalin said to him:

About two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with United States help or technical assistance.

That is right, in Stalin's own words, two-thirds of Soviet large industry was made with U.S. help. By the way, today Harriman is still in favor of trade with the Soviet Union. Much of the other third was built by firms from Germany, France, Britain, Italy, and so on.

Stalin could have said also that the explosive and ammunition plants originated in the United States.

From 1930 to 1945 only two major items—SK-B synthetic rubber and the Ramzin "once-through" boiler—and about a handful of lesser designs can accurately be considered the result of Soviet technology. Almost every other important technological advance and skill was transferred from the West.

At least 218 firms from the West were involved in the building of Soviet industry and military capability from 1930 to 1945. Of this number, 139 were American. The Western buildup of Soviet technology helped make possible Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, the Berlin blockade, and Soviet aid to North Korea and Communist China while they were fighting the United States. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

Now the ability of the Soviet Union to create any kind of military machine, to ship missiles to Cuba, to supply arms to North Vietnam, to supply arms for use against Israel—all this depends on its domestic industry.

In the Soviet Union about three-quar-

ters of the military budget goes on purchases from Soviet factories.

This expenditure in Soviet industry makes sense. No army has a machine that churns out tanks. Tanks are made from alloy steel, plastics, rubber, and so forth. The alloy steel, plastics, and rubber are made in Soviet factories to military specifications, just like in the United States.

Missiles are not produced on missile making machines. Missiles are fabricated from aluminum alloys, stainless steel, electrical wiring, pumps, and so forth. The aluminum, steel, copper wire, and pumps are also made in Soviet factories.

In other words, the Soviet military gets its component parts and materials from Soviet industry. There is a Soviet military-industrial complex just as in our country. The Soviet military base depends on the Soviet industrial base just as in our country. Steel can be used for consumer goods or weapons, just as in our country when we build their industrial capacity. We build their military capacity, just as in our country.

This kind of reasoning makes sense to the man in the street. The farmer in Ohio knows what I mean. The salesman in California knows what I mean. The taxi driver in New York knows what I mean. But the policymakers in Washington do not accept this kind of commonsense reasoning, and never have.

So let us take a look at the Soviet industry that provides the parts and the materials for Soviet armaments: The guns, tanks, aircraft.

SOVIET INDUSTRY—WESTERN MADE

Advanced weapon technology relies on sophisticated computers. Between 1959 and 1970, General Electric, through its European subsidiaries sold to the Soviet Union a number of medium capacity computers. Soviet computer technology has always been years behind that of the West. GE has been helping the Soviets progress. IBM and RCA through subsidiaries have also sold computers to the Soviets. Computers would be the main purchase in any Kissinger-promoted trade expansion with our enemy.

The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corp. It is a copy of the U.S. Steel plant in Gary, Ind.

All Soviet iron and steel technology comes from the United States and its allies. The Soviets use open hearths, American electric furnaces. American wide strip mills, Sendzimir mills and so on—all developed in the West and shipped in as peaceful trade.

The Soviets have the largest tube and pipe mill in Europe—1 million tons a year. The equipment is Fretz-Moon, Salem, Aetna Standard, Mannesman, and so forth. Those are not Russian names.

All Soviet tube and pipemaking technology comes from the United States and its allies. If you know anyone in the space business, ask them how many miles of tubes and pipes go into a missile.

The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world—about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship.

About two-thirds were built outside the Soviet Union.

About four-fifths of the engines for

these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built inside the U.S.S.R. are built with foreign technical assistance. The Bryansk plant makes the largest marine diesels. In 1959, the Bryansk plant made a technical assistance agreement with Burmeister & Wain of Copenhagen, Denmark—a NATO ally—approved as peaceful trade by the State Department. The ships that carried Soviet missiles to Cuba 10 years ago used these same Burmeister & Wain engines. The ships were in the *Poltava* class. Some have Danish engines made in Denmark and some have Danish engines made at Bryansk in the Soviet Union.

About 100 Soviet ships were used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships were designed and manufactured inside the U.S.S.R.

All the larger and faster vessels on the Haiphong run were built outside the U.S.S.R.

All shipbuilding technology in the U.S.S.R. comes directly or indirectly from the United States or its NATO allies.

If you think that is bad, let us take one industry in more detail: motor vehicles.

All Soviet automobile, truck, and engine technology comes from the West; chiefly the United States. Study each Soviet plant, its equipment, and who supplied the equipment. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks—all from these U.S.-built plants.

Up to 1960 the largest motor vehicle plant in the U.S.S.R. was at Gorki. Gorki produces many of the trucks American pilots used to see on the Ho Chi Minh Trail or would see now if they were flying there. Gorki produces the chassis for the GAZ-69 rocket launcher used against Israel. Gorki produces the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles. These same vehicles were used this month in the Arab attack on Israel.

And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Co.—as peaceful trade.

In 1968 while Gorki was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and Israel, further equipment for Gorki was ordered and shipped from the United States.

Also, in 1968 we had the so-called "Fiat deal"—to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow told Congress and the American public this was peaceful trade—the Fiat plant could not produce military vehicles.

Let us not kid ourselves. Any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. I can show anyone who is interested the technical specification of a proven military vehicle—with cross-country capability—using the same capacity engine as the Russian Fiat plant produces.

THE FIAT DEAL

The term "Fiat deal" is misleading. Fiat in Italy does not make automobile manufacturing equipment—Fiat plants in Italy have U.S. equipment. Fiat did send 1,000 men to Russia for erection of the plant—but over half, perhaps well

over half, of the equipment came from the United States, from Gleason, TRW of Cleveland, and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that at that time had killed 46,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson administration doubled Soviet auto output. These are the uncontroverted facts. The Johnson administration also supplied false information to Congress and the American public.

In 1971, the Soviets received equipment and technology for the largest heavy truck plant in the world: Known as the Kama River plant. It will produce 100,000 heavy 10-ton trucks per year—that is more than all U.S. manufacturers put together.

This will also be the largest plant in the world. Period. It will occupy 36 square miles.

Will the Kama truck plant have military potential?

The Soviets themselves have answered this one. The Kama truck will be 50 percent more productive than the Zil-130 truck. Well that is nice, because the Zil-130 truck is a standard Soviet army truck. It is used in Vietnam and the Middle East.

Who built the Zil plant? It was built by the Arthur J. Brandt Co. of Detroit, Mich.

Who is building the Kama truck plant? That is classified "secret" by the Washington policymakers. I do not have to tell you why.

The Kama River plant will be only a small endeavor though if reported negotiations between General Motors and the Soviet Union are successful. GM is negotiating to build a mammoth heavy truck plant in Siberia which some reports say will be twice as large as the Kama River plant.

The Soviet T-54 tank is in Vietnam. It was in operation at Kontum, An Loc, and Hue. It is in use today in Vietnam. It is being used against Israel.

According to the tank handbooks, the T-54 has a Christie-type suspension. Christie was an American inventor, not a Russian.

Where did the Soviets get a Christie suspension? Did they steal it? No, why should they. They stole our atomic secrets, but get our technology through the front door.

They bought it. They bought it from the U.S. Wheel Track Layer Corp.

However, this administration is apparently slightly more honest than the previous administration.

In December 1971, I asked Assistant Secretary Kenneth Davis, of the Commerce Department—who is a mechanical engineer by training—whether the Kama trucks would have military capability. In fact, I quoted one of the Government's own interagency reports. Mr. Davis did not bother to answer, but I did get a letter from the Department and it was right to the point. Yes. We know the Kama truck plant has military capability; we take this into account when we issue export licenses.

These files are all classified. I cannot get them declassified. The Government will supply military technology to the

Soviets, but gets a little uptight about the public finding out. I can understand that.

Of course, it takes a great deal of self-confidence to admit in writing that you are building factories to produce weapons and supplies for a country providing weapons and supplies to kill Americans, Israelis, and Vietnamese.

Many people—as individuals—have protested our suicidal policies. What happens? Well, if you are in Congress—you probably get the strong arm put on you—not me, but most. I have personally sued the Pentagon for release of the Penkovsky papers.

If you are in the liberal academic world—you soon find it is OK to protest U.S. assistance to the South Vietnamese but never, never protest U.S. assistance to the Soviets. Forget about the Russian academics being persecuted or the Jews who cannot emigrate—we must not say unkind things about the Soviets.

If you press for an explanation, what do they tell you?

First, you get the Fulbright line. This is peaceful trade. The Soviets are powerful. They have their own technology. It is a way to build friendship. It is a way to a new world order.

This is demonstrably false. The Soviet tanks in An Loc are not refugees from the Pasadena Rose Bowl parade. The Soviet ships that carry arms to Haiphong are not peaceful. They have weapons on board, not flower children or Russian tourists.

Second, if you do not buy that line you are told, "The Soviets are mellowing." This is equally false.

The killing in Israel and Vietnam with Soviet weapons does not suggest mellowing, it suggests premeditated aggression. Today—now—the Soviets are sending more arms to the Middle East. For what purpose? To put in a museum?

No one has ever presented evidence, hard evidence, that trade leads to peace. Why not? Because there is no such evidence. It is an illusion. Our trade in the 1930's with a war-bent Japan proved that.

It is true that peace leads to trade. But that is different than what is occurring today. You first need peace and then you can trade. That does not mean if you trade you will get peace.

But that seems too logical for the Washington policymakers and it is not what the politicians and their business backers want anyway.

Trade with Germany doubled before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

Trade with Japan increased before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

What was in this German and Japanese trade? The same means for war that we are now supplying the Soviets. The Japanese air force after 1934 depended on U.S. technology. And much of the pushing for Soviet trade today comes from the same groups that were pushing for trade with Hitler and Tojo 35 years ago.

The Russian Communist Party is not mellowing. Concentration camps are still there. The mental hospitals take the overload. Persecution of the Baptists and other Christians continues. Harassment of Jews continue. Persecution of dissidents continues.

The only mellowing is when a Harri-man and a Rockefeller get together with the bosses in the Kremlin. Some think that is good for business, but it is not much help if you were a GI at the other end of a Soviet rocket in Vietnam.

There is even a question whether trade with the Soviets is good for business. In 1926 a leading Soviet spokesman had the following to say about East-West trade and Western concessions in the Soviet Union.

On the one hand, we admit capitalist elements, we condescend to collaborate with them; on the other hand our objective is to eliminate completely, to conquer them, to squash them economically as well as socially. It is a furious battle, in which blood may necessarily be spilled.

Immediately preceding Brezhnev's recent visit to the United States, a leader of the Communist Party in Moscow stated:

In politics you may conclude alliances with the Devil himself if you are certain that you can cheat the Devil.

The Soviets, like Hitler in his book "Mein Kampf," are telling us their plans, but too many in the West refuse to believe the Soviets just as in the 1930's many would not believe Hitler's own words.

I have learned something about our military assistance to the Soviets.

It is just not enough to have the facts—these are ignored by the policy-makers.

It is just not enough to make a commonsense case—the answers you get defy reason.

Only one institution has been clear-sighted on this question. From the early 1920's to the present day only one institution has spoken out. Not the chamber of commerce. Not the manufacturers association. Only the AFL-CIO has been consistently right.

From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany today, the major unions have consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet Union. Because union members in Russia lost their freedom and union members in the United States have died in Korea and Vietnam, the unions know—and apparently care.

No one else cares. Not Washington. Not big business. Not the Republican Party. Not the Democratic Party. Few of us buck the tide to warn you.

And 100,000 Americans have been killed in Korea and Vietnam—by our own technology.

The only response from Washington and each administration is the effort to hush up the scandal.

These are things not to be talked about. The professional smokescreen about peaceful trade continues.

The plain fact is that irresponsible policies have built us an enemy and maintain that enemy in the business of totalitarian rule and world conquest. The tragedy is that intelligent people have bought the political double talk about world peace, a new world order and mellowing Soviets.

I suggest that the man in the street, the average taxpayer-voter thinks more

or less as I do. You do not subsidize an enemy.

When this story gets out and about in the United States, it is going to translate into a shift of votes. I have not met one man in the street so far—from New York to California—who goes along with a policy of subsidizing the killing of his fellow Americans. People are usually stunned and disgusted.

It requires a peculiar kind of intellectual myopia to ship supplies and technology to the Soviets when they are instrumental in killing fellow citizens.

What about the argument that trade will lead to peace? Well, we have had United States-Soviet trade for over 50 years. The first and second 5-year plans were built by American companies. To continue a policy that is a total failure is to gamble with the lives of several million Americans and countless allies.

You can not stoke up the Soviet military machine at one end and then complain that the other end came back and bit you. Unfortunately, the human price for our immoral policies is not paid by the policymakers in Washington. The human price is paid by the farmers, the students, and working and middle classes of America—and our fighting men in Korea and Vietnam.

The citizen who pays the piper is not calling the tune—he does not even know the name of the tune.

Let me summarize my conclusions:

First. Trade with the U.S.S.R. was started over 50 years ago under President Woodrow Wilson with the declared intention of mellowing the Bolsheviks. The policy has been a total and costly failure. It has proven to be impractical—this is what I would expect from an immoral policy.

Second. We have built ourselves an enemy. We keep that self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive administrations. Misleading and untruthful statements have been made by the executive branch to Congress and the American people.

Third. Our policy of subsidizing self-declared enemies is neither rational nor moral. I have drawn attention to the intellectual myopia of the group that influences and draws up foreign policy.

Fourth. The annual attacks in Vietnam and the wars in the Middle East are made possible only by Russian armaments and our assistance to the Soviets.

Fifth. This worldwide Soviet activity is consistent with Communist theory. Mikhail Suslov, the party theoretician, recently stated that the current détente with the United States is temporary. The purpose of the détente, according to Suslov, is to give the Soviets sufficient strength for a renewed assault on the West. In other words, when you have finished building the Kama plant and the trucks come rolling off—watch out for another Vietnam.

Sixth. Internal Soviet repression continues—against Baptists, against Jews, against national groups, and against dissident academics.

Seventh. Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace

if we want to use it. So far it has been used as an aid-to-dependent-Soviets welfare program. With about as much success as the domestic welfare program.

Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States. Not only do the Soviets get more goods from the United States, they get them on credit. The U.S. Export-Import Bank is providing credits to the Soviet Union with an interest rate of 6 percent. It costs the Export-Import Bank 7½ percent to raise that money it lends to the Soviet Union. The U.S. Government subsidizes the Export-Import Bank, which means, of course, the American taxpayer is picking up the bill. While interest on mortgages are 9½ percent in many parts of the United States, the Soviet Union gets loans at 6 percent on materials that they will use to defeat us. If they get most-favored-nation status which this administration foolishly pushes, they will get even lower interest rates.

Why did the war in Vietnam continue for over 4 long years under this administration before it finally was ended?

With 16,000 killed under the Nixon administration alone?

We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi, in the Middle East, in Cuba or anywhere, anytime we want to, without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call.

But that has not been done. Instead, the present administration seeks most-favored-nation status for the Soviet Union, extends credits to that totalitarian country, and concludes commercial agreements. All this some want to give to the Soviets while we receive precious little in return.

We have Soviet technical dependence as an instrument of world peace. The most humane weapon that can be conceived.

We have always had that option. We have never used it. Americans should wonder why.

Few people care. I have been telling this story for more than 10 years. Now it is even fashionable for Republicans to hold hands across the caviar with our bloody Communist enemies. The press is hopelessly pro-Soviet trade. Yet the American people must be alerted. One who has done that for decades is my good friend Anthony Sutton of the Hoover Institution. He has just published a book entitled "National Suicide"—Arlington House. It is a massively factual research into the suicidal policies I have outlined today. A true patriot, Mr. Sutton deserves to be listened to by every American. I gratefully acknowledge his research and help in the preparation of these remarks. His book is must reading for those who want to avert another Pearl Harbor.

MATTER OF EXTREME URGENCY AND IMPORTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a matter of extreme urgency and importance. The activities of the President of the United States have brought our great Nation to the brink of what could be the most serious crisis in our history.

We have reached a point at which we can no longer turn on a television or pick up a newspaper without learning of still another charge of corruption and lawlessness related to the administration of Richard Nixon.

Mr. Nixon, in his tenure as President, has demonstrated a total disregard for the two most crucial elements of our democracy—our laws and our Constitution.

Since Mr. Nixon has taken office, we have seen top White House officials forced to resign because of their participation in and coverup of illegal actions; we have seen two Cabinet members—including an Attorney General—indicted on criminal charges; we have seen former White House aides plead guilty to criminal charges, and we have seen the Vice President of the United States resign his office and submit himself before the court to be convicted for criminally violating our Federal tax laws.

Further, we have watched as President Nixon has done everything in his power to subvert the judicial process and to prevent the gathering of evidence when legitimate attempts are made to seek out and convict persons who have broken our laws.

In light of the events which have occurred during this past weekend, there is little reason to doubt that the President himself has participated in the crimes of his administration—and as a result, the country is in an uproar.

In response to this, yesterday my friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and I undertook three separate actions to restore order and justice to our troubled Nation.

First, we cosponsored legislation to reestablish the Office of the Special Prosecutor and safeguard the evidence compiled by the staff of the former special prosecutor, Mr. Archibald Cox.

Second, we cosponsored a House resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee to investigate the official conduct of the President to determine whether he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor.

Third, we took the extraordinary step of introducing a resolution of impeachment—and I might add, Mr. Speaker, we did so very reluctantly. In doing so, we charged President Nixon with committing acts which, in the contemplation of the Constitution, amount to bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors, and we set forth seven specific allegations.

One charge in our resolution was that Mr. Nixon refused to obey the mandates issued against him by the courts of the United States. This charge was specifically directed at the President's refusal to comply with the court's order to submit to it the White House tapes which

were subpoenaed by the special prosecutor. Shortly after introducing our resolution, we learned that the President's lawyer, in an abrupt turnabout, announced that President Nixon would comply with the court's mandate and would submit the tapes to the U.S. district court. But let us look, as this morning newspaper did, at what it took to make our President comply with the court's order.

It took the resignations, in protest, of the two top Justice Department officials; the firing of the Watergate special prosecutor and abolition of his office; the breaking of a solemn compact with the U.S. Senate; a call for the President's removal from office by leaders of the AFL-CIO unions representing 13.6 million workers; a virtual breakdown of the machinery of Western Union under the weight of an avalanche of telegrams to Members of Congress calling for Presidential impeachment; the formal beginnings of an impeachment process in the House; an outpouring of critical editorial opinion from around the country, and a raw warning from his own party's congressional leaders that they could not save him unless he changed course.

Now this evening, we are told, Mr. Nixon intends to address the Nation and tell us that all is well—that by handing over the tapes, the crisis is over.

Mr. Speaker, if the President feels that by handing over the tapes he has ended the crisis, he is dead wrong.

The tapes are merely a side issue. The major question is, whether in light of all the evidence, the President has committed any crimes for which he may be impeached. The real issue is whether or not the President is fit or deserving to hold that high office—and this issue is not resolved merely because the President has announced his decision to comply with a court order to hand over the tapes.

The issue of the tapes is only a part of one of several serious charges we have brought against Mr. Nixon. The others still remain.

Mr. Nixon must be called upon to answer the charge that he attempted to corrupt the judicial process by trying to influence a judge who was presiding over a case concerning prior illegal conduct of the President or his agents.

He must be called upon to answer the charge that he deliberately misled the American people by giving false and perjured testimony, through his official agents, to the U.S. Senate with respect to the bombing of Cambodia and other military action.

Mr. Nixon must be called upon to answer the charges of illegal bugging and wiretapping, of accepting illegal campaign donations, of bribery, and of removing the Attorney General solely because he was unwilling to carry out the President's dirty work.

Mr. Speaker, at no time in my 9 years of service in this body have my constituents been so united and vocal in their outrage over any given issue. They have completely lost faith in their President

and they are frightened. The Constitution has specifically provided a mechanism to respond to the present situation, and that mechanism is impeachment.

Impeachment is a procedure by which this body makes a determination based on the evidence and facts before it as to whether or not there is sufficient evidence to justify bringing a Federal officer before the Senate to stand trial for a specific charge or charges.

The evidence is now mounting before us, and the people are waiting. The duty and responsibility is now ours alone, and we have an obligation to fulfill it. We can do so only by commencing with impeachment proceedings at once.

BLACK CAUCUS DEMANDS MOVE ON IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus I wish to share with my colleagues in the House a joint statement issued by members of the caucus.

This statement is in response to the large number of inquiries as to the position of our organization relative to the question of the impeachment of Richard Nixon. Today the Congressional Black Caucus issued the following news release:

CAUCUS DEMANDS HOUSE MOVE ON IMPEACHMENT

The Congressional Black Caucus, sharing an opinion held by millions of Americans, is dismayed and shocked by recent actions on the part of Richard M. Nixon. In the opinion of the Congressional Black Caucus, the decisions to discharge Archibald Cox and abolish the office of Special Prosecutor were both irresponsible and unconscionable. The totality of recent events culminating in the resignation of the two highest Justice Department officials unnecessarily precipitated a constitutional crisis. The end result represents not only an insult to the intelligence of American citizens but also an assault on established governmental institutions and more fundamentally the Constitution itself.

The call for impeachment of Richard Nixon is neither new nor unique. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus introduced impeachment resolutions as long as two years ago, based upon the strong contention that Nixon was carrying on an illegal war in Southeast Asia. Nixon's adventurism in Indochina was—and is—both illegal and impeachable, and the cascade of ensuing executive crimes—the ITT, Vesco, milk and wheat deals, Watergate and all its associated criminal activities, the shady campaign contributions and payoffs, and Nixon's bevy of illegal impoundments of critical social program funding—only further serve to strengthen the position that Richard Nixon should—and must—be removed from office.

The Congressional Black Caucus urges the leadership of the House of Representatives immediately to define and establish procedures and mechanics for dealing with consideration of the impeachment of Richard Nixon. We further urge that these procedures be made known to all members of the House and to the American people without delay.

The Members of the Congressional Black

Caucus oppose any consideration of Gerald Ford's nomination for Vice President of the United States. The consensus is that to do so before the question of impeachability of Richard Nixon is resolved constitutes utter misinterpretation of basic priorities. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus recommends that the Democratic Leadership of the House instruct the Judiciary Committee to hold in abeyance any consideration of Gerald Ford until a full and thorough determination has been made concerning the pending serious charges of high crimes and misdemeanors against the nation by Richard Nixon.

The Nixon agreement to comply with the order of the Court to release the tapes is a complete vindication of Mr. Cox's insistence that Nixon comply with the Court's order. The Congressional Black Caucus therefore insists that Richard Nixon now reestablish this independent Prosecutor's Office and that Mr. Cox be reappointed immediately. Only in this manner will the American people be assured of an honest, objective and vigorous pursuit of all ramifications of Watergate in the original manner promised by Nixon when he promised an investigation which would be pursued "fully and fearlessly, wherever it may lead."

The Congressional Black Caucus strongly recommends that all citizens concerned about this current crisis make their concerns known to the leadership of the House immediately. Contact Carl Albert, Speaker; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Majority Leader; John J. McFall, Majority Whip and Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman, Committee of the Judiciary.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY AT NLRB

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon consider on the floor of this House proposals for creation of a Consumer Protection Agency which will advocate the interests of consumers in Federal decisionmaking. For this reason, I wish to continue my effort to avoid the confusion experienced in the last Congress when similar bills were considered.

A Government Operations Subcommittee, on which I serve, is now considering three CPA proposals. The bills are H.R. 14 by Congressman ROSENTHAL, H.R. 21 by Congressmen HOLIFIELD, HORTON, and others, and H.R. 564 by Congressman BROWN of Ohio and myself.

The major difference among the bills is that H.R. 14 and H.R. 21 would both allow the CPA to appeal the final decisions of other agencies to the courts while the Fuqua-Brown bill would not grant this nonregulatory agency so extraordinary a power.

As you know, I have asked those Federal agencies which would be subject to the CPA's advocacy rights to list their 1972 proceedings and activities which would be subject to CPA action and to delineate them by the several categories set forth in the bills.

I have been introducing their replies in the RECORD, and have already inserted material from six small agencies: the Defense Supply Agency, the Cost of Liv-

ing Council, and four of the banking regulatory agencies.

Today I wish to call to your attention the proceedings and activities of another small, but important and highly visible, agency which would be subject to the CPA's power under the proposed bills, the National Labor Relations Board.

The NLRB, in 1972, held 2,900 unfair labor practice and representation proceedings. The chairman of the NLRB asserts that the agency "would not be classed as a consumer-oriented agency." However, in response to my request the AFL-CIO submitted a legal opinion to our subcommittee which stated that—

It is possible to imagine instances in which the CPA might wish to take a position contrary to the position of a union in NLRB proceedings.

It should be noted that, should the CPA participate in NLRB adjudications—as the AFL-CIO memorandum observes—it would join the general counsel of the NLRB as a second prosecutor against the union. The union would thus be faced with double prosecution. And, remember, the CPA has the right to carry its attack on the union into the courts by appealing an unfavorable NLRB final decision under two of these bills, but not the Fuqua-Brown bill.

The Rosenthal and Holifield-Horton bills would grant the CPA the right to appeal whenever anyone else had such a right. These bills would allow the CPA, whenever the CPA determined there was sufficient consumer interest, to intervene fully in an NLRB proceeding and then to have the unchallengeable right to appeal the resulting decision. Further, even where the CPA did not take part in the agency proceeding, the CPA could appeal the agency decision to the courts, except where the court makes certain unlikely special findings.

The Fuqua-Brown bill, however, would not allow the CPA to appeal any final decisions of its sister agencies to the courts. While the NLRB letter lists only 1,200 decisions in 1972 as appealable, it also lists new areas of jurisdiction for the NLRB, and consequently for the CPA: Horse racing, dog racing, and symphony orchestras.

While the CPA would not be likely to find a sufficient consumer interest in all or even most of the proceedings of the NLRB, the technical legal power to do so, and to appeal them, would be granted by some CPA bills. Only the Fuqua-Brown bill would withhold that power.

I might add that, for the six small agencies already reported, the number of actual 1972 decisions technically appealable by the CPA under all bills except the Fuqua-Brown bill is now approximately 1 million annually. I say "actual decisions" because under the other two bills, the CPA could appeal refusals to act as well as action. And, I repeat, we have only considered six tiny agencies.

Mr. Speaker, for these important reasons, I insert in the RECORD information from the National Labor Relations Board and the opinion letter of the as-

sociate general counsel of the AFL-CIO, which shows how the proceedings of the NLRB would be subject to the CPA advocacy powers as proposed in the various bills now in subcommittee.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1973.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FUQUA: Your letter of September 7, 1973, requesting responses to seven questions dealing with our Agency's operations and the impact if an independent Consumer Protection Agency (CPA) were created under H.R. 14, 21, and 564, has been carefully reviewed.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the National Labor Relations Board is a quasi-judicial Agency whose two principal functions are to investigate questions concerning employee representation and to resolve them through elections and to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practices brought against employers and unions. Except for rulemaking, the Board has no statutory authority to initiate proceeding *sua sponte*, and an unfair labor practice charge or election petition must be filed to invoke our jurisdiction. Any "person" may file a charge or petition. Representation proceedings under Section 9 of our Act are not subject to the adjudicatory provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act while unfair labor proceedings are so subject. Our rulemaking proceedings under Section 6 of the Act are subject to the APA and permits interested parties to participate through submission of written data, views or arguments, with or without oral argument.

With this background in mind, the following responses to your questions follows:

Question 1: Proposed Rule Making—1972.

Answer: (a) Exercise of jurisdiction over the Horseracing and Dogracing Industries (July 18, 1972).

(b) Offers of Reinstatement to Employees in the Armed Forces (August 4, 1972).

(c) Exercise of jurisdiction over Symphony Orchestras (August 19, 1972).

Question 2: Regulations, rules, etc., subject to APA Sec. 556, 557 proposed during 1972.

Answer: None.

Question 3: Administrative Adjudications subject to 556, 557.

Answer: All unfair labor practice proceedings numbering approximately 1200 in 1972.

Question 4: Adjudications imposing directly fines, penalty, etc.

Answer: None.

Question 5: Excluding proceedings subject to 5 U.S.C. 554, 556, 557, what proceedings on the record were held by the Agency in 1972.

Answer: All representation hearings, approximately 1700 in calendar year 1972.

Question 6: A list of representative public and non-public activities.

Answer: (a) Oral arguments monthly before the Board in actual cases (public).

(b) Budget hearings in House of Representatives and Senate (basically nonpublic).

(c) Administrative meetings of Board Members on administrative matter (nonpublic).

(d) Budget meetings of Chairman and budget officer (nonpublic).

(e) Rules Revision Committee Meetings (nonpublic).

(f) Panel of Board Members—on pending cases (nonpublic).

(g) Board agenda on pending cases (nonpublic).

(h) Selection Committee meetings on Regional Directors (nonpublic).

(i) Meetings with American Bar Associa-

tion Committees and Chambers of Commerce Committees (nonpublic).

(j) Hearings in unfair labor practice and representation proceedings approximately 2900 (public).

(k) Upon request, meetings with litigants by General Counsel or his representative to discuss merits of case in issue (nonpublic).

Question 7: What final actions could have been appealed in 1972.

Answer: All unfair labor practice decisions, approximately 1200 in number, are appealable to the United States Circuit Courts.

It should be kept in mind that being in the labor-management field, our Agency, unlike others, would not be classed as a consumer-oriented Agency. I trust the above information will be helpful.

Sincerely,

EDWARD B. MILLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 28, 1971.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to the colloquy between Congressman Fuqua and Mr. Kenneth Peterson during the Hearings on H.R. 14. The question was raised by Representative Fuqua whether cases could arise in which the Consumer Protection Agency might intervene under Section 204 in a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of taking a position adverse to the interests of some union. Mr. Peterson stated that he would consult counsel on this matter and provide an answer for the record.

I think that it is possible to imagine instances in which the Consumer Protection Agency might wish to intervene in a proceeding before the NLRB to take a position contrary to the interests of a union. In order for the Agency to intervene, however, not only would the proceeding have to affect the interests of consumers but the Agency would have to find that these consumer interests might not be adequately protected unless the Agency intervened. It is rather unlikely that this second finding could be made, since in proceedings where unions are respondents under the National Labor Relations Act the adverse position is already represented by the General Counsel of the NLRB and by counsel for the employer.

Since the hearing Representative Fuqua, on June 23, wrote Mr. Peterson requesting that we not only supply an answer for the record, as Mr. Peterson had undertaken to do, but that we supply "a legal memorandum on what proceedings of the Department of Labor would be subject to intervention under the bill . . ." While we would like to accommodate Representative Fuqua we simply do not have the legal staff to do so.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS E. HARRIS,
Associate General Counsel.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY MUST DEAL WITH IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, President Nixon yesterday said he will comply with Judge Sirica's order, as modified by the Court of Appeals, to make the White House tapes available.

Notwithstanding that this proposed compliance comes 3 days after the court's deadline, I am gratified by the President's dilatory law and order position.

And notwithstanding that this proposed compliance comes—

Only after a blatant attempt to subvert Judge Sirica's order;

Only after the removal of Prosecutor Cox, Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus; and

Only after a bipartisan outpouring of outrage from the Congress and the American people;

Notwithstanding these facts, I appreciate the President's new-found spirit of cooperation.

But the President has missed the point—by turning over the tapes he will not stop the movement in the House of Representatives to inquire into impeachment. Of the eight charges contained in such a resolution introduced yesterday by my esteemed colleague Representative WILLIAM FORD of Michigan and me, only one deals with the White House tapes. This body must still deal with the remaining seven charges:

First. That the President may have committed acts which, in contemplation of the Constitution, amount to bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors;

Second. That the President may have corrupted the judicial process through conversations with the deciding judge, in cases then pending in the U.S. Courts, concerning the appointment of the said judge to higher Federal office;

Third. That the President may have intentionally misled the American people, and, through his appointed spokesmen, given false, misleading, and perjured testimony to the U.S. Senate concerning his prior activities in connection with the bombing in Cambodia;

Fourth. That the President may have violated the Constitution and laws of the United States by engaging in illegal and unauthorized electronic surveillance of private citizens and into the proper and privileged activities of political opponents;

Fifth. That the President may have violated the laws of the United States by soliciting and accepting illegal donations for use in his political campaigns, and by conspiring with others to keep this illegal activity secret;

Sixth. That the President may have knowingly solicited, accepted, and concealed large cash emoluments and other things of value from private individuals to influence governmental decisions favorable to said donors;

Seventh. That the President may have violated the laws of the United States and a public pledge and promise made to the U.S. Senate, by removal of or forcing the resignation from the high office of the Attorney General of the United States, persons who were competent and faithful in the discharge of their public duties, and by appointing a person to said high office solely because he was willing to discharge a "special prosecutor" whose security and tenure was im-

munized by law from Presidential dismissal.

Indeed, with President Nixon's recent history for veracity and changing course, we cannot even now be confident that Judge Sirica's order will be complied with. And after compliance there remain the questions of the tape's contents and their electronic integrity.

In light of these matters, the Judiciary Committee must continue to develop procedures for handling impeachment resolutions and must begin the appropriate inquiries into the remaining charges set forth in those resolutions.

President Nixon cannot be permitted to trade nine tapes for complete immunity from criminal and congressional inquiry.

GEN. ALEXANDER HAIG: A CIVILIAN?

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of recent Nixon maneuvers on Watergate is the conduct of the White House Chief of Staff, Alexander Haig. It ill serves the national interest or mood to have a general in the White House whose actions and language are more appropriate to a military junta than a civilian government.

Many Americans were shocked by his "the Commander in Chief has given you an order" language to Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus and Haig's order to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor by the FBI. These may not have been significant moments when compared to the President's reckless actions over the weekend but they added to an apprehension of what was happening or might happen.

It seems the White House has no intention of abandoning the arrogant style that was the hallmark of H. R. Halde- man and John Ehrlichman. The palace guard is now run by a general who forgets that the President and his staff are the public's servants not its masters.

It is a continuing disgrace to our democratic traditions that President Nixon has given such power to men so lacking in subtlety and so contemptuous of our traditions.

When I was in the Army, I had to learn how to do things in a military manner. Now that General Haig is a civilian, he should relearn how to do things in a civil manner.

TEAPOT DOME REVISITED?

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, many voices have been raised across the land in recent months decrying what has come to

be known as "the energy shortage." Foremost among those weeping copious tears and frightening the public have been the major oil companies whose policies have, in large part, been responsible for mismanagement of our vast energy resources. Obsessed with greed and oblivious to consequences of wasteful exploitation, the few companies dominating our oil and gas industries have squeezed consumers in a variety of illegal, cynical ways.

For years, the oil industry has been characterized by monopoly and combinations in restraint of trade. A recent 2-year study by the Federal Trade Commission shows beyond a shadow of doubt that power concentrations within this industry are worsening. Eight major corporations control most supplies of crude oil, refinery capacity, pipelines and marketing networks.

Not content with such domination, these few corporations have mounted a new campaign aimed at annihilating what remains of their competition, including independent refiners and marketers. Deliberately withholding existing supplies of raw materials, they have driven significant numbers of these independent business enterprises into bankruptcy, where they are easy prey for major oil companies seeking to acquire their resources and facilities.

On the retail level, gasoline station operators are caught between the rock and the hard place as oil companies owning their franchises raise tank wagon prices and government has not allowed them, up-to-now, to compensate for such hikes. No move is made to prevent continued price hikes by the majors as their profit figures indicate. To indicate how massive such profits are, I enclose a recent report on how much money they made and what percentage of increase their profits showed in the second quarter of this year.

2D QUARTER PROFITS OF THE NATION'S 10 LARGEST OIL COMPANIES¹

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Company	Sales	Profits	Percent change from 1972
Exxon.....	\$5,830.0	\$510.0	+54
Mobil ²	2,880.0	184.2	+41
Texaco ³	2,727.0	267.5	+44
Gulf ⁴	2,397.0	195.0	+82
Standard (California).....	1,817.2	181.7	+42
Standard (Indiana) ²	1,527.2	121.3	+37
Shell ³	1,211.9	89.5	+54
Atlantic Richfield ⁴	1,069.8	68.4	+50
Continental ²	1,029.9	51.7	+24
Occidental.....	810.3	26.9	+566

¹ Ranking based on 2d quarter sales in dollars.

² Sales include excise taxes and other income.

³ Sales include other income.

⁴ Sales include excise taxes.

Source: Business Week; Aug. 11, 1973, p. 79.

This, however, is only an introduction. Not content with this kind of pillage at the expense of everyone in the Nation using gas and oil products, they have sought out every last advantage, seeking to exploit it at public expense. One such attempt involves the outcry over the "energy crisis," and how individual majors are seeking to exploit it, even

down to exploiting naval petroleum reserves.

The President indicated in his second state of the Union address that he was going to ask that the Elk Hills, Calif., Naval Petroleum Reserve be opened up in the name of this energy crisis in order to alleviate predicted shortages. Apparently he was unaware at the time of certain circumstances surrounding this reserve, which I now take the liberty of bringing to his attention.

There are four such Navy oil reserves. One is the well-remembered Teapot Dome Reserve in Wyoming. Another is a vast tract in Alaska as large as Indiana. A third is Buena Vista Hills in California. The fourth is the one I address myself to here; Elk Hills, Calif.

Exploring the Elk Hills situation, I have discovered some rather unique facts which I believe the President, the Congress, the public and the press should know.

First, Standard Oil of California operates the field and has been extracting oil from it in significant quantities at given intervals with consent of the Navy. Payment for such withdrawals has been deferred for some time. Presently, SOCAL owes the Navy some \$24 million.

Second, Shell Oil, largely foreign-owned, possesses a contract with the Navy allowing it to obtain such oil as may be pumped out of the ground at the reserve.

Third, the only pipelines leading out of the Elk Hills Reserve are owned by Atlantic Richfield and Standard Oil of California. If the reserve is opened as the President indicated and begins producing 160,000 barrels of oil daily for 1 year—which was the publicly announced production goal—then Shell will claim the oil, trade it off, and transfer title to it when it enters any other major's pipeline. Taxpayer's oil will be sold by the majors for what it will bring—an average of some \$3.60 per barrel based on going market prices in the Elk Hills area, as of today.

Informed legal opinion notes that if the reserve is opened for other than a military emergency, SOCAL could take the Navy to court, stand a chance of abrogating the contract, and seek forgiveness of the \$24 million owed the Navy in deferred payments.

Simultaneously, even if the contract remains in existence and production is expanded, SOCAL would be entitled to receive, under the agreement, some 22 percent of all production. Capital expenditures by the company could be deferred and a gross of \$576,000 daily would be realized by sale of the 160,000 barrels daily at \$3.60. SOCAL would, therefore, come into a windfall of some \$115,000 daily, at public and Navy expense, profiting from the energy shortage SOCAL weeps so copiously about. This comes to a minimum of \$42 million in pure profit for one company in 1 year alone, not counting what Arco and Shell would be making.

Another rather curious combination of circumstances came to light as I investigated the Elk Hills situation, mainly revolving around the rather intriguing ac-

tivities of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

Federal regulations prohibit issuance of oil and gas leases by BLM within a mile of a naval petroleum reserve boundary. Over Navy protests and in violation of such a rule, the BLM issued such leases around and adjacent to the Elk Hills Reserve to—by sheer coincidence—Standard Oil of California, which proceeded to drill a well within 1 mile of the reserve boundary and, by luck and accident, I am sure, hit major oil strikes.

This has resulted in significant drainage of oil pools under the Elk Hills Reserve, requiring the Navy to drill offsetting wells from which were extracted significant quantities of oil which then became available to the same company through Shell. SOCAL gains while its illegal drilling outside the reserve had caused the problem.

One question immediately arises. If SOCAL's illegal drilling near the Elk Hills boundary is forcing the Navy to drill offset wells, why are the Navy and the Justice Department not acting to obtain an injunction to restrain them? Surely they should be halted in their course until it can be ascertained whether or not their drilling is damaging the reserve. By granting of similar leases at Teapot Dome where drilling was performed to within 50 feet of the reserve boundary, the major oil pools there have also been partially drained.

This summary has only barely scratched the surface of what may end up as an offense against the public as blatant and unprincipled as the Teapot Dome imbroglio. What emerges is a cumulative attempt by several major oil corporations to loot a Government oil reserve with connivance or incompetence by Government authorities. If Elk Hills is opened to exploitation now, without built-in protections for the Navy and the taxpayer's interests, SOCAL will reap massive windfall profits, and so will other majors.

The country will be the loser, especially the Navy and oil consumers. Price-fixing also figures in this scandal, to be covered in another presentation I shall make. It is touched upon in a letter I have just sent to the President informing him of what I have ascertained. At a minimum, an excess profits tax should be imposed on any and all operations covering Elk Hills oil. Declaring private carriers to be common carriers when carrying Elk Hills oil is another useful alternative. Certainly, no one should benefit from a shortage which they have had a large part in creating. That was the useful, pertinent principle established in World War II, and it should apply today just as well.

Further, an investigation of the most intense sort is called for in regard to activities of the Bureau of Land Management and the manner in which it defied the law and the Navy in allowing this situation to develop around the Elk Hills and Teapot Dome Reserves. One year ago, in a Government Accounting Office report, this activity was reported. Yet, seemingly, it escaped congressional and Presidential attention. Today, hopefully, that situation is remedied and the people will find out how—in at least this one

way—major oil companies were seeking to use the energy crisis as a shield from behind which to loot the patrimony of our Nation.

At this point, I am including a copy of the letter I have sent to the President informing him of this situation and evidence I have unearthed. Copies of the Shell and Standard Oil of California contracts plus the GAO report are available in my office, if anyone should wish to examine them at length and in depth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1973.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I noted with interest your proposal to open up the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve in California because of the "energy shortage." Sharing your concern over oil shortfalls and wishing to ensure that neither our Navy's needs nor the taxpayer's interest should come to harm, I have delved into the Elk Hills situation, discovering factors worthy of your attention.

The question of naval oil reserves is fraught with danger to any government, particularly in light of the Teapot Dome Scandal and questions which would inevitably arise concerning opening up and exploitation of such resources. A recent report by the General Accounting Office entitled, "Capability of the Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves To Meet Emergency Oil Needs," estimates value of proven recoverable resources owned by the Navy in this reserve at a minimum of \$2.6 billion.

It is publicly proposed to open up Elk Hills to production of at least 160,000 barrels of oil daily. Shell Oil Company, largely foreign-owned, possesses a five year contract to purchase all current and projected production from that Reserve at a price based on average current posted prices, largely set throughout California by Shell and Standard Oil of California. Under such a contract, which I have a copy of, if massive production is instituted, will Shell not benefit in the form of windfall profits? Unless any new production is let out for bids to independents under open bidding, what is to prevent Shell from claiming all new production? Further, who could or would compete with Shell in such a situation? There are no storage facilities at Elk Hills, so any production must be sold and moved immediately. What is to prevent an Alaska North Slope situation from developing, when a consortium of major oil companies joined together to offer bids? Suppose their bid is far below market prices?

This oil must be marketed upon extraction. Only a pipeline assures this. It is my understanding that the only pipeline leading out of Elk Hills and from the reserve to market are owned entirely by two major oil companies: Standard Oil of California and Atlantic Richfield. There is a strong possibility that Shell could take title to Elk Hills production, immediately transferring it to the majors owning existing pipelines, in exchange for a portion of their profits to be derived from its sale. Additionally, Shell could receive other payment in form of substantial, equal allocations of oil from any other majors involved, at Shell refineries in other locations. Such tradeoffs are common between major oil companies and have been consistently termed practices in restraint of trade.

When the Shell contract was advertised and the invitation for bid was put out, bidders were required to provide prior certification of assured transportability. The sole method of transport available at the time was through the Standard Oil of California or other private carrier lines. Was the Navy aware then there was a strong possibility

of prior arrangement between Shell and Socal for use of the line? Could this not be termed collusion, especially because both Shell and Socal emerged as the prime bidders?

Use of a private carrier line means sale of oil to the carrier when it enters the pipeline. If Elk Hills is opened, Shell will be able to transfer the major share of Navy oil produced in any crisis to Socal. Socal will be able to sell it for what the market will bear, or to another private carrier yielding a substantial profit. Is this in the taxpayers interest?

Involvement of private carrier lines in such a context means a possibility of price arrangement between the majors in question. One small bidder, Pima Refining Co., was, I have discovered, rejected in bidding because of lack of transportation facilities. Certainly examination of the invitation for bid and the transcript of proceedings on bid-letting is in order. In light of the fact that the Justice Department was supposed to review such proceeding thoroughly, was there any concern with investigation of possible collusion and antitrust action? Inexplicably, no action has been taken. Now both companies are in line to profit immeasurably from a national emergency at taxpayer expense.

After Teapot Dome, a requirement was put through under President Roosevelt that all contracts respecting any Navy oil reserves must be reviewed by Justice before presentation to the President or Armed Services Committees of each House of Congress. Existing contracts and government concessions to industry have drastically altered the viability of several of the reserves, allowing private oil interests to drain away oil from the outside, while in some cases draining it from within a reserve. Why has Justice done nothing about what seems to be an obvious situation?

Pricing discrimination and artificially low prices for state-owned crude oil involving both these companies and their posted pricing are presently under investigation in California by the Joint Committee on Public Domain of the State Assembly, headed by J. Kenneth Corey (D.-Garden Grove). Dominance by Socal and Shell, plus questions surrounding such pricing make their position vis-a-vis Elk Hills more suspect. Compounding this compromising situation is the fact that companies involved in this investigation have largely refused to cooperate. Instead, they are attempting to enjoin the state legislature's investigation of their pricing procedures, refusing to surrender requested information.

Once any oil comes into possession of majors, another windfall profit could accrue through manipulation of posted prices. A bid price is based on prices posted in vicinity of an oil field. Nothing can prevent majors involved from merely posting prices far in excess of what is charged today. The ongoing California State Assembly investigation has discovered that free market prices established by open bidding were found to differ by \$1.25 per barrel from what was being paid the state under a posted contract much like that Shell enjoys on Elk Hills, showing they have had experience in manipulation defrauding the state, which can now be applied to a massive defrauding of the Federal Government. To prevent unacceptable profits at public expense, the Federal Government should impose limitations in form of an excess profits tax on Elk Hills oil, as was done in World War II to prevent profiteering in an emergency. Another alternative open to government is to declare private carrier pipeline systems leading to Elk Hills directly to be common carriers all the way to final delivery points for the purpose of carrying Elk Hills oil during any emergency. I stand ready to sponsor any legislation you might seek to implement these objections.

Another windfall profit could be in order for Socal if Elk Hills is opened up for any

other reason than national defense. A unit plan contract is presently in force between the Navy and Socal. Socal is both unit and nonunit operator of this field. At given intervals, Socal has been permitted to remove significant quantities of oil from Elk Hills under agreement with government. Through June 30, 1973, Socal owes the Navy and taxpayers approximately \$24,000,000 in deferred payments for removals in production and cost balances related to maintenance and development of both Navy and Socal wells. These monies are owed under terms of an existing contract. Socal has been allowed to remove approximately 25 million barrels of oil from the field as payment for entering into the contract with the Navy. Socal may be able to claim the entire contract is ended if Elk Hills is opened up for any purpose other than military emergency. This would not only forgive the \$24,000,000 and the obligation concerning the 25 million barrels, but would leave Socal free to drain U.S. Government oil from the reserve through adjoining wells at will.

Alternatively, even if the contract remains in existence, and should production be opened up, Socal, under the existing contract, would receive somewhere in the neighborhood of 22% of all production. Any capital expenditures by the company in that case would be deferred in terms of payments to the government at a later date. If production is set at 160,000 barrels daily, as has been publicly suggested and projected and the price per barrel is \$3.60, based on today's going prices, the gross would come to \$576,000 daily. At least \$115,000 per day would go to Socal. This comes out to a minimum of some \$42,000,000 in one year; hardly a pittance.

Another point concerning the Elk Hills Reserve revolves around curious actions of the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department. Federal regulations prohibit issuance of oil and gas leases by BLM within a mile of a petroleum reserve boundary, unless the land is being drained by private operators already or it is determined after consultation with the Navy that the Reserve could not be adversely affected. In the cases of Teapot Dome and Elk Hills, the BLM issued such leases. At Teapot Dome, BLM allowed an oil company to drill to within 50 feet of reserve boundaries, despite protests by the Navy and in violation of regulations. This policy, I am informed, began in the fifties, when BLM allowed the first encroachments. In the case of Elk Hills, the BLM has allowed such drillings by Socal up to 1/2 mile of the reserve boundary, where the company has made major oil strikes, draining off Navy oil through the law of capture, and significantly injuring the Reserve. In self-defense, as was the case in the Teapot Dome situation, Navy has been forced to undertake offset drilling, extracting large quantities of oil. Such extractions have made more oil available to Shell under its contract. Presumably, Shell must have marketed such oil through the Socal pipeline, the major artery leading to market from that reserve.

The other day, testimony by R. G. Rothwell, Deputy Director of the Logistics & Communications Division of the General Accounting Office confirmed what I had established by independent investigations; questionable and illegal granting of permission to drill for oil to private companies has damaged and depleted two of four Navy oil reserves. In the face of Navy protests in one case and Navy inertia and inaction in the other, the Bureau of Land Management has allowed Elk Hills and Teapot Dome to be harmed. It seems that Teapot Dome has been significantly affected, both in terms of being a naval oil reserve and for purposes of relieving any emergency situation involving a domestic energy crisis.

The far richer Elk Hills field is in the process of being drained by such illegal production, in this case carried out by Socal, which

would directly benefit as a result of opening of the reserve. In this case, the Bureau of Land Management is also the major culpable party. The Navy, in fact, is currently drilling two new wells at Elk Hills to offset recently initiated additional private production next to the reserve.

A major investigation of the Teapot Dome Reserve's status is in order. It is my understanding that wells there are not capable at this point of major production. If the reserve has been harmed, we have a second Teapot Dome scandal of serious proportions. An intense investigation should be made of illegal drilling presently being carried on in the buffer zone around Elk Hills by Standard Oil of California under BLM auspices. We can no longer ignore what the General Accounting Office revealed about this state of affairs last year.

Before Elk Hills is opened to exploitation and drainage, BLM, oil company activities surrounding the reserve and the Teapot Dome situation should and must be carefully investigated and the results be made publicly known. If windfall profits have already accrued to major oil companies and more such are in the offing, we should know before further steps are taken. I assure you, sir, of my willingness to cooperate with you in protecting the public interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

In addition, it is my understanding that boundary drilling in violation of existing Federal regulations and allowed by the Bureau of Land Management has significantly harmed the Teapot Dome Reserve, creating, if proven to be true, a second scandal. I have asked the President for a complete investigation of this state of affairs, as well.

CONGRESSMAN BILL GUNTER PROPOSES TOTAL FINANCING OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Florida, the Honorable BILL GUNTER of the Fifth Congressional District, recently introduced H.R. 10889, which proposes total financing of federal elections, to include primary as well as general elections.

BILL outlined his proposal in a recent speech to the Kansas City Rotary Club where he was a guest speaker. Given the timeliness of this proposal in light of recent events in politics with which we are all aware, I thought our colleagues would want to familiarize themselves with BILL's proposal as he outlined it in his speech.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN BILL GUNTER

Nine years ago, Americans opposed public financing of presidential elections by the convincing margin of seventy-one to eleven percent.

Now, the latest Gallup Poll reveals an incredible turn-around—nearly two-thirds of those polled recently favored public financing of congressional as well as presidential campaigns.

A lot of water has spilled over the gate in nine short years.

Mr. Agnew may not have intended it, but his speech to the Nation contained the essential elements that make a strong and compelling case for public financing.

In stepping down, the former Vice President appeared as stunned by events as those he supported and those who supported him. The charges of accepting cash contributions from contractors were based, after all, he said, on common practices in politics as he knew them to be.

And there is more truth to what Mr. Agnew had to say than many would care to admit.

The fact is that as long as candidates for public office are dependent upon private contributions for the financing of their campaigns, there will continue to be influence peddling and favors to the few at the expense of the general public.

Indeed, it is evident that the most convincing argument to be made for public financing is the desirability of removing both the undue influence of monied interests, and the extortion of contributions or gifts by the politicians from the business interests of this country.

The man-bites-dog analogy occurs when the tough political fund raiser shakes down the reluctant contributor. We saw it aplenty last year. The setting of \$100,000 quotas by the Committee to Reelect the President on a number of firms which had legal and business matters pending before various Federal regulatory agencies.

The assessment of individuals at one percent of net worth for campaign donations.

The outright pressuring and shake-down of American Airlines and other businesses . . . the laundering of money through Mexico . . . the suitcases brimming with cash . . . the tax loopholes which permit big donors to avoid gift taxes by breaking down large contributions into smaller donations and distributing them to various committees supporting the same candidate.

Last year, the president and his supporters spent \$60 million to stay in office. Senator McGovern and his supporters spent nearly \$24 million in a losing effort to unseat the president. Both of the amounts are staggering . . . and both carry the same unsatisfactory and unsavory implications.

A senatorial campaign in many states can cost upward of \$2 million per candidate and \$200,000 spent in a race for the House of Representatives is not uncommon at all.

But these are only the obvious costs . . . there are other costs as well.

Disregarding the likelihood that much more than the \$145 million that was reported for Federal campaigning in 1972 was actually spent, the American citizen is becoming increasingly and painfully aware of significant "hidden expenses."

Hidden expenses are the increases you pay for milk at the grocery store and for oil at the gas pump because wealthy interests gave major contributions to a politician in a position to grant favors.

There was the matter of the \$400,000 in campaign contributions by milk producers to the President's reelection efforts, followed closely in time by a healthy boost in Federal price supports for milk.

Today, this is costing consumers . . . the public, if you will . . . between \$500 and \$700 million a year in higher prices. I might add that this sum alone would provide three to five times the cost of financing all Federal elections from President down to the fifth congressional district in the state of Florida . . . in which I have some interest.

Then there was the half-million dollars donated in 1968 and tripled to \$1.5 million in 1972 by the oil lobby to the Nixon campaigns for President. There are those who argue that there is a cause and effect relationship between that donation and the fact that despite a recommendation of his own cabinet task force, the President has resisted lifting oil import quotas.

This cost to consumers is estimated at \$5 billion a year—30 times the most expensive

estimate of the biennial cost of public campaign financing of all Federal elections.

"Should we publicly finance our election campaigns?" asked Jerry Landauer in the Wall Street Journal. "Don't kid yourself," he wrote, "We already do."

These are some examples of the hidden costs of financing elections under the present system. I hope you will agree with me that it is too much of a price to pay.

But there are other problems as well with our present system . . . a system which allocates money to incumbents, to the sure winners, to those who cozy up to, and become the handmaidens of the rich and the super rich.

Most Americans would agree that we should have vigorously competitive elections. The truth is that most elections are decided virtually by default. The incumbent has the advantage of office and more ready access to the donors.

If, however, through public financing each candidate has equal access to campaign financing, and incumbent and challenger alike are beholden to the voters in the purest meaning of the phrase . . . then, we just might revitalize politics in the United States of America.

You might see more of your elected representative. And he, in turn, might pay a little more attention to what the ordinary voter has to say.

There are five major proposals pending before the U.S. Senate and a sixth in the House of Representatives which advocate some form of public financing. I recently submitted a bill which proposed total public financing for all federal elections to include primary as well as general elections campaigns.

My bill differs from the others in certain key respects. Most importantly, it precludes private contributions to individual candidates . . . this, in my opinion, is vital if public financing is to succeed. The bill does allow private contributions up to \$100.00 to the National party of the individual's choice.

It authorizes a unique petition procedure for a candidate to qualify for federal office . . . which also serves as a safeguard to prevent persons from receiving public funds who do not have or cannot generate a substantial base of support.

In the case of a primary election for the U.S. House of Representatives, for example, the signatures of 3,000 individuals who are eligible to vote would be necessary to qualify a candidate for disbursements from the public fund.

The sum per qualified candidate in this particular race would be \$40,000. In the event of a runoff election, each candidate would receive \$20,000 and the winner an additional \$60,000 for the general election. Similar petition procedures involving greater numbers of eligible voters are provided for campaigns for the U.S. Senate and for the office of President and Vice President.

Suffice it to say that the petition procedure serves two very useful purposes.

First, it insures that persons who qualify have significant public support and, secondly, it entices incumbent officeholders as well as challengers to get out and campaign vigorously among their constituencies.

In closing, a word about cost.

Those who think I've come up with a scheme to bankrupt the U.S. Treasury are quite mistaken. Under the most generous cost analysis, which imagines three times the number of qualified candidates as ran in 1972 . . . an unlikely event . . . the total expenditure would be \$174 million a year for all federal races or less than one-tenth of one percent of the annual federal budget. To break it down another way, the cost would be \$1.25 per year per eligible voter.

If the number of candidates is, more realistically, twice the number as in 1972, the cost

would be \$150 million per year or \$1.06 per voter per year. But the real question is not whether we can afford to publicly finance elections, but whether we can afford not to. How else can we get ourselves out of the political morass we are in today?

How else can we realize an ideal we all learned not so long ago in school:

That in America, one man's vote is worth the same as any other man's.

DALLAS-FORT WORTH TO OPEN WORLD'S LARGEST AIRPORT THIS MONTH

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

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, an article concerning the mammoth engineering undertaking of the world's largest airport appeared in the September issue of Consulting Engineer.

With interest being so widespread in the Dallas/Fort Worth Regional Airport since its dedication last month, I would like to include the articles by Stanley Cohen, senior editor, for the RECORD:

DALLAS/FORT WORTH TO OPEN WORLD'S LARGEST AIRPORT THIS MONTH

(By Stanley Cohen)

Dallas/Fort Worth Airport, the largest airport in the world, is scheduled to open this month on a plot of ground that is larger than Manhattan Island. The opening will mark the completion of only the first phase of construction. The entire project is being earmarked for the year 2001, making Dallas/Fort Worth the first jumbo jetport of the 21st century.

The \$700 million airport, which sprawls across the North Texas Plains midway between Dallas and Fort Worth, covers some 17,500 acres, or more than 27 square miles. Its area is large enough to contain New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport, Chicago's O'Hare, and Los Angeles' International Airports combined. Size, however, is only the most apparent distinction. Its planners contend it will be the world's most sophisticated airport in providing passenger comfort and airline operating efficiency.

When Dallas/Fort Worth opens, this is what the passenger will find:

Four half-loop terminal superstructures with a total of 66 passenger gates. This capacity will serve some 8 million passengers expected to enplane during the first year of operation. Ultimately, 260 passenger aircraft gates will be available in 13 half-loops, accommodating an estimated 100,000 passengers a day by the year 2001.

A series of modular "mini-terminals" within each terminal loop. Each independent module will serve passengers for one group of airplanes with air traveler able to park his auto directly opposite his flight gate. Walking distances, thus, will be minimal.

Spacious runways, taxiways, and apron areas, allowing jumbo jets plenty of room to maneuver. Planes will be able to land and move quickly through taxiways into terminal areas. Movement from terminal to runway for takeoff also will be unrestricted.

An automated AIRTRANS people-mover system, with electrically-powered and guided vehicles whisking passengers and baggage throughout the airport complex. AIRTRANS will provide the link between the four terminal half-loops, remote long-term parking areas, an on-site 450-room hotel, and the Federal Aviation Administration control facility. Average riding time between any two points will be eight to 12 minutes.

On the whole the project has been planned to meet virtually every problem known to the

aviation industry, ranging from noise to saturated airways and penned-in runways, as well as a variety of environmental considerations.

A LONG HISTORY

The decision to build the world's largest airport is not made at a whim. In fact, the first suggestion of a regional airport for Dallas/Fort Worth can be traced as far back as 1927, the year that Charles A. Lindbergh flew the first solo flight across the Atlantic.

Fort Worth moved into commercial aviation in 1927 with the construction of Meacham Field on the city's far north side. That same year, the two cities held brief discussions on the possibility of a regional field. However, the talks proved fruitless, and Dallas struck out on its own with the purchase of the Army airport known as Love Field in 1928.

Both airfields were improved and expanded during the 1930s, but as larger aircraft, such as the four-engine airliners began operation, more expensive improvements were necessary. The airlines also became reluctant to operate from two fields as close together (the two cities are only 34 miles apart) as those of Dallas and Fort Worth because of the costs involved.

The question of a regional airport was raised again in 1940 when both cities requested Federal help for expansion of their airports. In 1941 the Army asked the Civil Aeronautics Administration (forerunner of the Civil Aeronautics Board) to help locate an airfield for its use midway between Dallas and Fort Worth. The CAA turned to Arlington, then a city of only 4000 people and ideally located between the two larger cities. Plans were made for a 1000-acre facility called Midway Airport to be located in Arlington (at the present site of Greater Southwest International Airport) and governed by a seven-member board drawn from all three cities. Once again, difficulties developed, this time with respect to the location of the terminal buildings, and in 1943 Arlington took over the operation of the airport at the request of the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones.

Dallas, in the meantime, decided to proceed with further development of Love Field to make it a major aviation center. Fort Worth acquired Midway from Arlington in 1947 and continued to expand it in the early 1950s into what is now Greater Southwest International Airport.

The Federal Government continued to press for a single facility, and following years of hearings, negotiations, amendments to the State constitution, and voter referendums, the Dallas/Fort Worth Regional Airport Board was formed in 1965. The New York City-based consulting firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton was engaged to prepare the site selection report, which was completed and submitted by the end of 1965. By 1968, TAMS also completed the airport master plan report and the highway development program and was retained as general consultant responsible for overall management and coordination of the project as well as planning, design, and construction management of the entire project except for the terminal complexes and the AIRTRANS system. The terminals were to be designed by a joint venture of two firms: Hellmuth Obata and Kassabaum, of St. Louis; and Brodsky, Hopf & Adler, of New York City. The AIRTRANS system was developed by the Ground Transportation Division of the LTV Aerospace Corp., of Dallas.

THE AIRPORT CRISIS

In the sweep of its size and the detail of its design, Dallas/Fort Worth is a response to the airport tangle that has been enveloping the country. Air traffic has been growing at a staggering rate. Total U.S. airline enplanements reached 170 million in fiscal 1971 and 183 million in fiscal 1972. It is expected to hit 524 million by 1984. Many airports already

are close to saturation. Los Angeles International, Moisant in New Orleans, O'Hare in Chicago, and both LaGuardia and Kennedy International in New York are running out of room. Kansas City International is the only new facility to be opened since the age of the jumbo jet. Dallas/Fort Worth will be the second and, very likely, the last for the foreseeable future.

The airport crisis has been compounded by the passage of the Airport and Airways Development & Revenue Act of 1970, in which Congress confined airport development projects to those that "shall provide for the protection and enhancement of the national resources and the quality of the environment of the nation." Since it is virtually impossible to build a major airport without matching Federal funds, many authorities believe that no new airports will be built until the act is revised.

THE NOISE FACTOR

Although Dallas/Fort Worth was begun prior to the passage of the 1970 airport act, environmental considerations, particularly noise levels, played a major part in the design and, in fact, were the principal factors in determining its Texas-size dimensions. A computer study was used by TAMS to simulate the noisiest airplane in existence, operating at full capacity and on a hot day—conditions that cause planes to make the most noise. An acceptable noise level was agreed upon—one that already has won court approval—and these tests established the boundaries of the airport. Even when fully developed to meet air traffic demands of the year 2001, the airport's northern and southern boundaries will be more than three miles from the ends of the primary runways, and crosswind runways will end two miles from the airport limits.

The sound analysis took into consideration an estimate of the number, type, and operating characteristics of aircraft expected to be in service by 2001. This information was supplemented by the findings in the Federal Aviation Administration's 1966 air traffic computer simulation study. The results confirmed that 144 peak hour operations could be accommodated.

Aircraft noise is mainly a function of engine characteristics, power setting during takeoff and landing operations, the frequency of these operations, the time of day, and the distance from aircraft. Other factors that affect noise levels, but are relatively unpredictable, are wind direction, temperature, and cloud cover at the moment of observation. All of these were taken into account in making the study.

Also significant in the noise study were projections of aircraft conversion to all-jet operations up to 1985, when it is expected that all airlines using the airport will have converted to jet aircraft. Shortly after 1985, the commercial fleet is expected to retire all turbojet equipment, replacing it with turbofan equipment. The increase in the proportion of these aircraft—including the McDonnell Douglas DC-10, Boeing 747, Lockheed L-1011 and L-500, and Boeing 2707 Supersonic—also was considered in the computer simulation, as many international flights are diverted from traditional seacoast points of entry.

ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Ecology also was considered before the site of the airport was chosen. Prior to land acquisition, approximately 12,000 acres of the site were devoted to agricultural uses. Part of the present land management program includes leasing some 2000 of these acres to a resident farmer for agricultural purposes. There are no significant bodies of water, forests, fish, or wildlife species that will be endangered, nor any recreational areas, wildlife refuges, or areas of scenic beauty that will be disturbed by the development and operation of the airport. Neighboring municipalities are rezoning land adjacent to the airport to discourage the con-

struction of such incompatible buildings as schools, hospitals, or residences.

Concern for the ecology has made the airport the site of one of the largest landscaping projects in the country. During the early stages of its design, ecology-conscious planners determined that D/FW's miles of steel and concrete should be in harmony with nature. The result was a master plan calling for greenbelts along airport roadways and in infield areas of the terminal buildings. More than 1.4 million ground cover plants, 10,000 trees, and 3600 shrubs are being used in the project at a cost of \$1.5 million.

THREE STAGE PLANNING

The overall plan for Dallas/Fort Worth Airport calls for three developmental stages, the opening to be followed by target dates in 1985 and 2001. The first stage will consist of a 3-million-square-yard runway, taxiway, and apron pavement system; taxiway bridges designed for 1¼ million-pound aircraft; a 10-lane spine highway system; all utilities and communications; four terminal buildings; and 66 passenger gates. The FAA is providing the control tower complex and navals for the airport. Highways and interchanges at the north and south entrances are being constructed by the Texas Highway Department in accordance with the highway program recommended by TAMS.

The Dallas/Fort Worth facility is the first new airport conceived and planned using the Computer Simulation Facility of the FAA's National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. In 1968, computer simulation studies by TAMS and the D/FW airport planning staff on air-space saturation beyond 1985 and subsequent projections indicated that the new regional airport and its 80 nautical-mile air-space could sustain an ultimate annual enplanement demand of more than 50 million passengers.

EXPANDABLE RUNWAYS

Initially, the airport will provide three commercial runways capable of simultaneous aircraft operations, with 66 passenger and 12 cargo gates. The master plan calls for three more runways for commercial use and a ground capacity of 230 passenger aircraft gates and 200 all-cargo gates. In addition, a 5000' runway will be built later to service general aviation, and two small landing areas are earmarked for STOL (Short Take-Off and Landing) aircraft. Runways will be sufficiently long and thick to handle any plane now in service, and they will be readily expandable to service the rocket-powered aircraft envisioned for future commercial use.

The Phase I layout will include two main north-south runways—one on each side and parallel to the terminal/spine road complex—and a single northwest-southeast crosswind runway. The main runways will be 11,400' long and 200' wide, each serviced by two, 100'-wide, full-length, parallel taxiways. The cross-wind runway will be 9000' by 200', with a single parallel taxiway.

The possibility of expansion was built into the runway system. The main runways can be extended to 13,400', and future parallel main runways extending 20,000' can be added. Additional main runways also would have single parallel taxiways. The present crosswind runway could be extended to 11,000', and another crosswind runway of similar length could be located on the west side of the airfield.

A time-oriented computer simulation was developed by TAMS to evaluate the performance of the runway, taxiway, and apron layout under various operating environments. This was used to test design and control modifications for improving the efficiency of aircraft ground operations. The program traced the entire series of operations that each aircraft performs between arrival and departure, including runway selection, landing and take-off runway occupancy, turn-off selection, taxiway routing, runway crossings,

taxiway delays, parking, apron routing, and gate assignment. Movements to and from cargo and maintenance facilities also were monitored. Operating conditions were varied to test different wind directions, weather conditions, and the effects of flow control. Airline assignments also were varied to determine maximum efficiency of operation.

The computer simulation was coordinated with the FAA and the airlines. The FAA developed the operating rules and procedures to control ground traffic at D/FW, and the airlines provided their projections of future service, including the number of flights, types of aircraft, and gate service times. The simulation concentrated on three time periods—1975, 1985, and the saturation period, probably around the year 2000. The studies showed that certain taxiways could be deleted from the ultimate plan and the construction of others could be deferred from Phase I without impairing operating efficiency.

LOOP SYSTEM OF TERMINALS

The original plan for Dallas/Fort Worth called for a standard terminal design, with long fingers, or corridors, connecting the gates to the main terminal. Parking facilities were to be located directly over the passenger terminal area, with access provided by elevators and escalators. However, horizontal walking distances would have varied from a minimum of 350' to as much as 1000', about a fifth of a mile.

In 1968, Thomas M. Sullivan, who was the chief airport planner for the Port of New York Authority and directed the development of Kennedy, LaGuardia, and Newark Airports, was appointed executive director of D/FW. He opted for a drive-to-the-gate concept, which allows the passenger to drive to an entrance opposite his aircraft, thus reducing walking distances to a minimum. As a result, the central plan is replaced with a loop system, which consists of a series of modular mini-terminals. In addition to permitting the traveler to drive directly to his own departure gate, the loop systems provide for modular expansion as airline needs grow.

The drive-to-gate concept is similar to that used at local airports in some of the nation's smallest cities. There one might find a small parking lot fronting a single terminal building which has one ticket counter, one gate, and one plane waiting to be boarded. The D/FW plan, in use since last November at the new Kansas City International Airport, enables the traveler to park his auto in front of the terminal gate serving his flight. Here again, computer simulations were used to program passenger flows and the location of the various functions within the terminal.

LONG-RANGE OUTLOOK

The mini-terminals are contained in four half-loop, crescent-shaped terminal buildings. The mini-terminals will serve a small group of airplanes, and modules can be added as more planes are used. The master plan calls for a total of 13 terminal crescents, increasing the number of gates from 66 to as many as 260, all capable of handling jumbo jets.

Ticketing, check-in services, and baggage check, as well as facilities such as newsstands, lunch counters, and rest rooms will be located near the check-in areas. From front building door to plane door, the passenger may walk as little as 120' after parking his car in front of the terminal building opposite his aircraft gate. Terminal space below the passenger level will be used for airline offices, a utility road for service equipment, and the airport's intra-airport transportation system.

A modular concept, using precast concrete members, was employed in building the terminal structures. The precast members were factory-formed off-site and trucked in for building assembly. The precast columns and beams were assembled into small modular structural units, permitting maximum flexi-

bility in the size of the facilities to meet the requirements of the individual airlines. The use of structural wedges made the semicircular shapes possible and allowed for the expansion of the terminal buildings. Each of the terminals can be expanded from a length of several hundred feet to a maximum of 3600'. The flexibility of design enabled the buildings to be constructed initially with a minimum cross section of 45', providing a corridor with small hold rooms, and enlarging where necessary to encompass baggage handling, baggage claim equipment, ticketing areas, holding rooms, amenities, and other areas that may be required by future types of aircraft. Holding the modules to a workable size will make it easy to modify the buildings with minimum interference to the normal function of the operating airport.

ACCESS TO AIRPORT

D/FW has been designed for ease of access to and from the airport, which is accessible from both the north and south. The passenger arriving in his own car will drive along International Parkway, a multilane, high-speed roadway. Passenger traffic will use a separate roadway from trucks and other service vehicles to eliminate confusion and keep traffic flowing.

Concise, easy-to-read signs provide the necessary information on the use of the airport. Large pylons, bearing logos of the various airlines, will be mounted in the median areas of International Parkway adjacent to the terminals serving those airlines. Further signs will indicate which airline terminals are coming up so that drivers will have ample time to turn off into the terminal areas. Signs on the roadways will direct the passenger to the enplaning area, where he will be able to leave his bag with a skycap and drive to a convenient parking location. Boarding areas will be denoted by graphics at the entrances to the terminals.

The terminal roadway system has two road levels. The lower level allows enplaning passengers to drive close to the aircraft gate. The elevated level permits deplaning passengers to get into departing transportation also adjacent to their aircraft gate.

AIRTRANS PEOPLE-MOVERS

Movement within the airport will be as fluid as travel to and from. The decentralized design of Dallas/Fort Worth created the need for a mobile link among its various parts. The solution was found in AIRTRANS, a people-mover system that uses electrically-powered and guided vehicles to move passengers, baggage, mail, and refuse throughout the airport complex.

Basically, two factors were involved in designing the AIRTRANS system: some passengers will come in on one airline and leave on another; and some will leave from one terminal and return to another while their automobile remains at the first terminal.

Initially, the system will use a total of 68 vehicles. Fifty-one of these will be passenger models with a capacity of 40 persons. Seventeen utility vehicles—similar in appearance to a railroad flat-car—will carry baggage, mail, supplies, and trash. The cars are rubber-wheeled and constructed of a fiberglass shell mounted on a chassis equipped with commercially available components. Traveling mainly in pairs, they will move through 13 miles of U-shaped, concrete guideways, connecting terminals with remote parking areas, the on-site hotel, FAA control facilities, and a support area containing an air mail facility and three commissaries. There will be 53 stations.

A central control console system will monitor AIRTRANS movements. There will be 13 predetermined routes and the routing of each car will be controlled by on-board logic. This, however, will be subject to modification by inputs from the central controller to change vehicle routing. Route flexibility is made possible by advance switch design, which allows

cars to branch off and reenter the main guideway path, bringing service where it is needed without breaking the flow of straight-through traffic. With a maximum speed of 17 miles an hour, AIRTRANS will have an average ride time of 10 minutes from any one point in the airport to any other. The cars could be adapted for higher-speed operations outside the airport. The system will have a total handling capacity of 9,000 passengers, 6,000 pieces of luggage, and 70,000 pounds of mail and supplies each hour.

CARGO HANDLING

When Dallas/Fort Worth is completed, it will likely be handling more freight than a seaport. Manufacturers in the area already use air freight service extensively. Forty percent of these firms now ship at least a portion of their products by air. Hundreds more, within easy driving time of the airport, could make use of air freight.

Projections indicate that air cargo traffic will total some 100,000 tons in 1975, increase to 160,000 tons by 1980, and rise to 410,000 tons by 1985. Initially, the freight will be channeled through facilities the airlines have constructed in, or in close proximity to, terminal areas. However, D/FW has in its master plan the eventual development of two cargo cities, one at the north and one at the south end of the airport. Each area could be developed to hold up to 100 gates, with each gate large enough to facilitate loading and unloading jumbo jet aircraft. Full development of the facilities could make D/FW the rival of any seaport.

A NEW AIR AGE

The impact of Dallas/Fort Worth Airport on North Texas is expected to be staggering. Projections call for the employment of 18,000 people on-site by 1975, with a like number of jobs being created off-site because of the airport's existence. Daily population figures, including passengers, employees, and visitors, will skyrocket from just under 90,000 in the first year of operation to nearly 220,000 by 1985. Every community in the area will see tremendous growth. Estimates are that 100,000 people will be moving into the area annually for at least 10 years. Economically, the facility is expected to contribute almost \$267 million in direct purchases of goods and services in North Central Texas in its first year of operation. An additional \$360 million will be spent indirectly in support of airport operations in the area.

Dallas/Fort Worth will be America's first jumbo jetport built for the 21st century. It might also be more than that. In time, it will provide North Texas with direct air links to all parts of the world. It could do for that section of the country what the intersection of railroad lines did for Chicago in the early 1900s. It could, in effect, be the first step in rearrangement of the country's geographic pivots. A new Air Age may be upon us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN), for October 22 through October 30, on account of church convention.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from September 18, on account of official business as U.S. Delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. MOSHER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through November 5, 1973, on account of Ditchley Foundation Conference on World Energy Resources and Requirements and Their Effect on International Relations.

Mr. KETCHUM, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIEGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, for his remarks to appear immediately following rollcall No. 544, in the House, on Tuesday, October 23, 1973, in permanent RECORD.

Mr. MILFORD, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$470.25.

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

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. DICKINSON in two instances.

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. HEINZ in two instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. BAUMAN in three instances.

Mr. KEMP.

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

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. LEHMAN in three instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. ALEXANDER in 10 instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. REID.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5943. An act to amend the law authorizing the President to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 23, 1973, present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6691. Making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 25, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1476. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a work plan for the Nutwood Watershed project, Illinois, which involves no single structure providing more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1477. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on disbursements made from the appropriation for "Contingencies, Defense" during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to Public Law 92-570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1478. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Marine Corps Reserve, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1479. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the first annual report on arms, ammunition, and implements of war exported under license to all foreign countries and international organizations, covering fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 657 (a) (3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1480. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 93-60 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Com-

mission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 655. Resolution providing for the consideration of HR 10956. A bill, Emergency Medical Services Systems Act of 1973 (Rept. No. 93-606). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 656. Resolution providing for the consideration of HR 9456. A bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years (Rept. No. 93-607). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 657. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10710. A bill to promote the development of an open, nondiscriminatory, and fair world economic system, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-608). 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. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NIX, Mr. STARK, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11074. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to provide for the regulation of the export of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 11075. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor to investigate and prosecute any offense arising out of campaign activities with respect to the election in 1972 for the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. PODELL, Mr. GINN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 11076. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated 5-year research program to determine the causes of and cure for cancer, to develop cancer preventative vaccines or other preventatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11077. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 11078. A bill to protect trade and commerce against the unlawful restraints and

monopoly of organized baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 11079. A bill to authorize an independent study of the civil nuclear power functions and special industrial operations of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FROELICH:

H.R. 11080. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Health within the Department of Health Education, and Welfare, and to assist in the development and demonstration of rural health care delivery models and components; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11081. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor to investigate and prosecute any offense with respect to the election in 1972 for the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 11082. A bill to establish a loan program to assist industry and businesses in areas of substantial unemployment to meet pollution control requirements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDRUM (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 11083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 11084. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to guarantee the constitutional right to vote and to provide uniform procedures for absentee voting in Federal elections in the case of citizens who are residing or domiciled outside the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 11085. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to dietary supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11086. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for regular physical examinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 11087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H.R. 11088. A bill to provide emergency security assistance authorizations for Israel and Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Ms. HOLZEMAN):

H.R. 11089. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 11090. A bill to provide a tax credit for expenditures made in the exploration and development of new reserves of oil and gas in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11091. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require the use of forms and documents printed in languages other than English, in appropriate cases, under the various Federal-State public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 11092. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to grant additional authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding conglomerate holding companies involving carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission and noncarriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11093. A bill to regulate Federal election campaign financing by establishing a Federal Election Campaign Bank and by establishing a Board of Elections and Ethics; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 11094. A bill to extend the protection of the mechanic's lien law of the District of Columbia to subcontractors beyond the first tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 11095. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Health within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to assist in the development and demonstration of rural health care delivery models and components; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 11096. A bill authorizing the extension of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (for himself and Mr. VYSEY):

H.R. 11098. A bill to clear title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. HUBER):

H.R. 11099. A bill to provide for the control of imported fire ants by permitting the judicious use of Mirex in coastal counties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 11100. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to maintain and extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 11101. A bill establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 791. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should reappoint Archibald Cox as special prosecutor, and renominate Elliot Richardson as Attorney General, and renominate William Ruckelshaus as Deputy At-

torney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H. Res. 650. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Res. 651. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and investigate whether grounds exist for the

impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MINK:

H. Res. 652. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. BADILLO):

H. Res. 653. Resolution to express the sense of the House that there will be no action on the nomination for Vice President until such time as the President has complied with the final decision of the court system as it relates to the White House tapes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 654. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and

investigate whether grounds exist for the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 11102. A bill for the relief of Tze Tsun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 11103. A bill for the relief of Lella M. Eitz (Dieu Thi Minh Nguyet); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WALTER HARNISCHFEGER: A
GREAT AMERICAN PASSES

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1973, the United States lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the death in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, of Walter Harnischfeger at the age 77. Free men everywhere are poorer for his passing.

Walter Harnischfeger's long and distinguished career as one of this country's most enterprising industrialists spanned a period of more than 60 years from the time he began work as an apprentice at 10 cents an hour until his retirement as chairman of the board of the Harnischfeger Corp., one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of construction equipment.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have known this great American over a period of years and I can say without hesitation that his friendship was one of my most valued possessions.

He was tireless in his advocacy of the sound principle that fiscal sanity must be practiced by government, just as it must be practiced by prudent individuals everywhere.

For those whose lives were not directly enriched by Walter Harnischfeger, I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point a brief biography:

BIOGRAPHY OF WALTER HARNISCHFEGER

Walter Harnischfeger was born in 1895, the son of Henry Harnischfeger, one of the two co-founders of the Harnischfeger Corporation.

He began his business career in his father's firm as a ten-cent-an-hour apprentice at the age of 16. After serving several years as an apprentice in the shop, engineering, estimating, and service departments, he became a salesman and began a series of assignments requiring extensive travel throughout the United States and abroad. From that time on, Walter Harnischfeger was a ceaseless world traveler and a perceptive student of industry and politics in many quarters of the globe.

Largely self-educated, Harnischfeger acquired some formal education by attending night school during his apprentice years. This led to an interest in "learn-while-working" educational institutions, such as the Mil-

waukee School of Engineering. Harnischfeger took a deep interest in this school and eventually became Chairman of its Board of Regents. For many years his generosity and enthusiasm were keystones in the school's steady growth.

Upon the death of his father in 1930, Walter Harnischfeger became President of the firm and in 1959 became Chairman of the Board.

For many years, Harnischfeger conducted a tireless campaign seeking to encourage a sound fiscal operation in the government. He argued that the public pocket was not bottomless and that even the government had to conduct its affairs in a business-like manner within its income. He declared "give-away" programs, yet he encouraged aid to the underprivileged countries of the world through sound investment programs which enabled the people in those countries to help themselves. As a result of this attitude, the Harnischfeger Corporation became international in operation with eight overseas manufacturing plants making substantial contributions to the economies and welfare of communities in Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, Chile and Brazil.

Mr. Harnischfeger has long been recognized for his intense interest in people, places and current events. He was a world traveler and an avid champion and believer in the rights and dignity of the individual.

HIS ACTIVITIES INCLUDED

Member of the Board of Trustees of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Board of Directors of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, Phoenix, Arizona.

Member of the Board of the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Tustee of America's Future, Inc., New Rochelle, New York.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Boys' Clubs of America, New York, New York.

Former National Chairman and Honorary Chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Advisory Board of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee on Federal Expenditures.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry, Inc., New York, New York.

Member of the Greater Milwaukee Committee for Community Development.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Ex-

cutive Committee of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc., West Branch, Iowa.

Member of the Advisory Board of Leader Dogs for the Blind, Rochester, Michigan.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Governors of the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.

Honorary Chairman of the Board of Regents of the Milwaukee School of Engineering. Formerly Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Member of the Finance Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. Former Director.

Director of National Economic Council, Inc., New York, New York.

Member of the Executive Committee of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, Formerly Vice Chairman.

Member of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Member of Omicron Delta Alpha.

Trustee of the Pestalozzi Foundation of America, Inc., New York, New York.

Trustee of the United States Inter-American Council and Member of the Executive Committee, New York, New York.

Former Member of the Advisory Committee of the Federal Reserve Bank—7th District, Chicago, Illinois.

Former Director and Chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

Former member of the National Defense Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Former Director of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Harnischfeger served as a Delegate to the Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce at Lisbon, Portugal; Vienna, Austria; Naples, Italy; and Copenhagen, Denmark.

Mr. Speaker, one who knew him well, Mr. Eugene F. Rinta, executive director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, wrote as follows to members of the Council on Mr. Harnischfeger's death:

STATEMENT OF MR. EUGENE F. RINTA

Many of you knew "W. H." as an active member of the Council's Federal Finance Committee and a regular attendee at the Council's annual meetings until just a few years ago when his health began to fail. A few of you know that he was the first Chairman of our Federal Expenditures Subcommittee and that, ever since the Council became active in national affairs after World War II, he was one of the most active and loyal participants and supporters that the Council has ever had.

I, personally, have had the privilege of association and friendship with Walter Harnischfeger for almost 25 years, not only