

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 5, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Isaac Neuman, Temple Judah, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, our God, humbly a survivor of Auschwitz stands in Thy presence amid the chosen servants of a great people, a generous people, who opened their gates to homeless victims of totalitarianism.

All of us here assembled thank Thee for this blessed land dressed in the garments of spring.

We raise our voices in gratitude to Thee that on this day 25 years ago, the prisoners were freed from Nazi concentration camps.

Grateful are we that this Nation has fought valiantly against the forces of tyranny and brought the torch of liberty to millions of slaves under the Nazi yoke.

O Sovereign of the World, may this our land remain the fortress of liberty forever.

Strengthen in Thy law the endeavors of these lawmakers and the hands of all those who labor for peace, for justice, and for freedom, at home and abroad.

Praised art Thou O Lord our God who freest the captives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14705, FEDERAL - STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1037)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out.

Page 2, line 5, of the House engrossed bill strike out "\$800" and insert "\$1,500".

Page 2, line 17, of the House engrossed bill strike out "\$800" and insert "\$1,500".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(4) in a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of—

"(A) rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, or

"(B) providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired physical or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market, by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 108. COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF HOSPITALS AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION OPERATED BY POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF STATES

"(a) Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by sections 104, 121(a), and 206 of this Act) is further amended by adding after paragraph (1) (as added by section 206 of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"(12) each political subdivision of the State shall have the right to elect to have compensation payable to employees thereof (whose services are not otherwise subject to such law) based on service performed by such employees in the hospitals and institutions of higher education (as defined in section 3309(d)) operated by such political subdivision; and, if any such political subdivision does elect to have compensation payable to such employees thereof (A) the political subdivision shall pay into the State unemployment fund, with respect to the service of such employees, payments (in lieu of contributions), and (B) such employees will be entitled to receive, on the basis of such service, compensation payable on the same basis, in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as compensation which is payable on the basis of similar service for the State which is subject to such law;"

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to certification of State laws for 1972 and subsequent years; except that section 3304(a)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by subsection (a)) shall not be a requirement for the State law of any State prior to July 1, 1972, if the legislature of such State does not meet in a regular session which closes during the calendar year 1971, or prior to January 1, 1975, if compliance with such requirement would necessitate a change in the constitution of such State."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following: "with first attention to agricultural labor;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 401. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS FROM REGISTRATION, ETC., REQUIREMENTS

"(a) Section 3(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c) (relating to exempted securities) is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following: 'or any security which is an industrial development bond (as defined in section 103(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) the interest on which is excludable from gross income under section 103(a)(1) of such Code if, by reason of the application of paragraph (4) or (6) of section 103(c) of such Code (determined as if paragraphs (4)(A), (5), and (7) were not included in such section 103(c)), paragraph (1) of such section 103(c) does not apply to such security;'.

"(b) Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c) (relating to exempted securities) is amended by inserting after 'any municipal corporate instrumentality of one or more States,' in paragraph (12) the following: 'or any security which is an industrial development bond (as defined in section 103(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) the interest on which is excludable from gross income under section 103(a)(1) of such Code if, by reason of the application of paragraph (4) or (6) of section 103(c) of such Code (determined as if paragraphs (4)(A), (5), and (7) were not included in such section 103(c)), paragraph (1) of such section 103(c) does not apply to such security;'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to securities sold after January 1, 1970."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON E. BETTS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL LONG,
ALBERT GORE,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41: These amendments make technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes. With respect to each of these amendments, either the House recedes or the Senate recedes in conformity with other action of the committee of conference.

Amendment No. 3: Under existing law the Federal Unemployment Tax Act applies to employers who employ 4 or more individuals on each of some 20 days during the taxable year or the preceding taxable year, each day being in a different calendar week. Under the bill as passed the House, the 4 or more employee requirement is reduced to at least one employee on each of some 20 days during the taxable year or the preceding taxable year, each day being in a different calendar

week, and the Act would also apply if the employer paid wages of \$800 or more during any calendar quarter in the taxable year or the preceding taxable year. The Senate amendment retains existing law. The conference agreement accepts the House provisions except that the \$800 amount is increased to \$1,500.

Amendment No. 9: Existing law excludes agricultural labor from coverage under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Under the Senate amendment, coverage would be extended to agricultural labor if performed by individuals (other than certain aliens) in the employ of a person who during the calendar year or preceding calendar year had 8 or more individuals in his employ to perform agricultural labor during each of at least 26 calendar weeks. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 11: The bill as passed the House and Senate provides coverage of certain services for nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education. Under the bill as passed the House, the State law may provide the extent to which unemployment compensation based on service for an institution of higher education shall not be payable for the period from the end of the regular spring semester, quarter, or other term until the beginning of the next regular fall semester, quarter, or other term. The Senate amendment substitutes for this provision a requirement that with respect to service in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity for an institution of higher education, unemployment compensation shall not be payable based on such service for any week between successive academic years (or between two regular but not successive terms) if the individual has a contract to perform services in any such capacity for both of such years or terms. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: In extending coverage to service for an institution of higher education, the bill as passed the House excludes service performed by an individual employed in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity. Under the Senate amendment and the conference agreement, such service is covered.

In extending coverage to certain services for nonprofit organizations, the bill as passed the House excludes service performed in a facility ("sheltered workshop") conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired physical or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market if the service is performed by an individual receiving such remunerative work. Under the Senate amendment, such service would be covered. The conference agreement restores the exclusion provided by the bill as passed the House.

Amendment Nos. 16, 20, and 29: In general, amendments made by the bill which relate to requirements for certification of State law apply for 1972 and subsequent years. Senate amendments numbered 16, 20, and 29 provide that the new provisions shall not be requirements for the State law of any State prior to July 1, 1972, if the legislature of such State does not meet in a regular session which closes during the calendar year 1971. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: The bill as passed the House and Senate would extend coverage to service performed outside the United States by a citizen of the United States for an American employer, other than service performed in a contiguous country with which the United States has an agreement relating to unemployment compensation. The Senate amendment also excludes from this extension of coverage service performed in the Virgin Islands. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This amendment would require States to permit political subdivisions to elect coverage for employees in hospitals and institutions of higher educa-

tion operated by them under an agreement to make payments in lieu of taxes. This provision would apply after 1971 except that it would not apply before January 1, 1975, if compliance with the requirement would necessitate a change in the constitution of the State. The House recedes with an amendment which makes clarifying and conforming changes.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment eliminates a requirement that the program of research, to be established by the Secretary of Labor to develop information as to the effect and impact of extending unemployment compensation coverage to excluded groups, give first attention to domestic workers in private households. Under the conference agreement, first attention under the research program is to be given to agricultural labor.

Amendments Nos. 22, 24, and 25: The bill as passed by the House and Senate provides for programs for research and personnel training and for a Federal Advisory Council to review the Federal State program of unemployment compensation. The bill as passed the House authorizes appropriations for these purposes beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. The Senate amendments authorize appropriations for these purposes beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: The bill as passed the House requires the Secretary of Labor to provide training programs and courses for persons occupying or preparing to occupy positions in the administration of the unemployment compensation program. Under the Senate amendment the Secretary is to provide programs and courses designed to train individuals to prepare them, or improve their qualifications, for service in the administration of the unemployment compensation program.

The House recedes. Under the conference agreement, the programs and courses may include programs and courses designed to train individuals who are not employees but who are preparing to occupy positions in the administration of the unemployment compensation program. However, this provision is not intended to cover programs and courses of a kind designed to raise the general educational level of individuals not employed in the unemployment compensation program.

Amendment No. 31: The bill as passed the House and Senate in effect increases the net Federal unemployment tax from 0.4 percent to 0.5 percent of wages effective with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1969. Senate amendment numbered 31 adds a new provision under which the 0.4 percent rate is to continue to apply for purposes of determining the amount payable under section 6157 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payment of tax on quarterly or other time period basis) with respect to wages paid in any quarter in 1970 ending before the date of the enactment of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 42: This amendment relates to the maturity and investment yield of retirement and savings bonds issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act and the maximum in maturity value of such bonds issued in any one year which may be held by any one person at any one time. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 43: This amendment adds a new section to the bill amending section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 3(a)(12) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide, in effect, that industrial development bonds the interest on which is excluded from gross income under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are to be exempted securities. Under the conference agreement, the House recedes with an amendment which makes technical and clarifying changes and excludes from

the application of the amendment any industrial development bond issued as part of an issue substantially all of the proceeds of which are to be used to provide residential real property for family units or for the acquisition or development of land as the site for an industrial park, unless such bond would qualify under section 103(c)(6) of the Code (relating to exemption for certain small issues) if section 103(c) of such Code did not include paragraphs (4)(A), (5), and (7) thereof.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON E. BETTS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

THE INCIDENT AT KENT

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is shocked by the massacre at Kent. One of the kids, Jeffery Glenn Miller, who, from reports, was killed while watching the violence from a nearby hillside, lived near my district on Long Island.

Student violence cannot be condoned. It is inexcusable. However, have we, as Americans, fallen so low in our regard for human life that we lash out indiscriminately and shoot to kill unarmed kids as an answer to their quest for a redress of their grievances?

We were horrified at Mylai and callously pointed a finger at those who pulled the triggers.

The guilty, those who have created a climate of violence in our country, go unpunished.

Mylai and Kent are just products of that violence.

This incident at Kent must not go by without all who are responsible being brought to account for their crimes.

I have asked for a complete investigation, and I intend to follow closely the progress of that investigation.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I wonder if we address ourselves, though, to the protests of the soldiers themselves. From the reports I have read, there were shots at the soldiers, there were rocks being thrown at the soldiers, and there were canisters of tear gas being thrown back at the soldiers.

Mr. WOLFF. According to the report on the ticker right now the Ohio Patrol has stated there is no record of any sniper fire:

Kent, Ohio.—An official of the Ohio Highway Patrol today disputed reports from the Ohio National Guard that a sniper was spotted by police helicopter before guardsmen shot four Kent State University students to death Monday during the antiwar demonstration.

The university, ordered evacuated after the shooting, was virtually deserted this morning and under heavy police and military guard.

Earlier, fire destroyed a barn and several farm tractors in one corner of the campus, and fire officials said they believed the blaze was deliberately set.

Sgt. Michael Delaney of the Guard public relations staff said after the shootings that, "At the approximate time of the firing on the campus, the Ohio Highway Patrol—via a helicopter—spotted a sniper on a nearby building."

Today, a Patrol official, Maj. D. E. Manly, said, "There is nothing on the log of the sighting." Manly said if patrolmen in the helicopter circling the campus had seen a gunman it would have been recorded.

THE INCIDENT AT KENT

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we all are saddened by the tragedy at Kent State University, part of which campus is in my district, and the main campus of which is in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

I would urge the Members of the House to refrain from charges of massacre and other charges against the situation until a complete investigation has been made.

I conferred today with the Attorney General, John Mitchell, and personnel of the Justice Department have gone to Kent State, including members of the FBI. Investigations will be made as to the possibility of a violation of the Cramer Act, the burning of the ROTC Armory which was Government property, and other possible violations of law.

It would seem to me in that it would be in the interests of everyone if we did not make snap judgments and if we awaited a full and complete investigation.

PRESIDENT NIXON TAKES RESPONSIBLE ACTION

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by President Nixon is assisting the South Vietnamese to clean out the Communist sanctuaries along the Cambodian border will allow the successful continuation of our Vietnamization program and continued withdrawal of U.S. troops from Southeast Asia. The destruction of the Communist encampments and confiscation of their supplies will be completed in 6 to 8 weeks, just ahead of the rainy season, and it will be at least 5 or 6 months before the Communists can start resupplying and re-

building their efforts. This will give the South Vietnamese the additional time needed to continue the development of their capability to defend South Vietnam—the goal of our South Vietnamization program. This action is not to extend the war into Cambodia—it is to shorten the war in South Vietnam, and more particularly, to expedite an early honorable end to U.S. participation.

I have confidence in the ability of President Nixon to responsibly and decisively direct our operations to expedite an honorable end to the war . . . as compared to the previous administration's 8 years of indecision, vacillation, and misdirection that committed 550,000 Americans to a stalemated ground war in Southeast Asia.

I support President Nixon's assistance to the South Vietnamese raids into Cambodia to clear out the Communists from sanctuaries where they prepare assaults on American troops in South Vietnam. Destruction of these Communist camps should hasten the end of the war.

While I respect the sincerity of some of President Nixon's congressional critics, I am inclined to believe they know about as much about directing military operations to successfully conclude a war as they do about managing the domestic economy to achieve a balanced budget—most of these people have successfully demonstrated their total ineptitude at both.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI NEUMAN

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and a personal privilege for me to be able to make a few remarks about Rabbi Isaac Neuman of Temple Judah in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. I am particularly pleased to do so on this the 25th anniversary of his liberation by the American troops from the concentration camp at Ebensee, Germany. At that time, he was 22 years old and suffering from typhoid fever, tuberculosis, two bullet wounds received in an escape attempt, and malnutrition after 4 years at Auschwitz and required almost 3 years of hospitalization for recovery.

Now, as a U.S. citizen, Rabbi Neuman today has expressed his gratitude before the U.S. House of Representatives both for the successful efforts of the American Armed Forces during World War II and for the subsequent attitude of the American people who opened the doors of their country to the homeless refugees of that war.

At a time when there is increasing and almost incessant criticism of both our country and its institutions, Rabbi Neuman reminds us that, as Americans, we, indeed, have much for which to be grateful and proud. But, at the same time, and perhaps more importantly, he reminds us that we have an important heritage of seeking to promote and preserve liberty, justice, freedom, and peace. Our greatness in the past has been based on our unequivocal dedication to these principles. Our future will only be a proud one if we strengthen

our devotion to these ideals and strive to make our actions as consistent with our principles as they must be.

PRECEDENT EXISTS FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S ACTION IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat interested in statements being made by Members of the other body that the President has no right to go into Cambodia. Now, personally I believe the President should have enlisted the support of our allies in SEATO and other organizations to make our venture in Cambodia a joint operation. I said here on the floor last week that the American people have a right to know why the United States must assume the major share of the risks. I would have preferred to have the President seek help from our SEATO allies or from the U.N. in Cambodia. I said I believe it is a mistake for us to go into Cambodia alone. But the die has been cast and the Commander in Chief has made his decision. Now that our troops are committed, we must stand together as Americans.

As President Johnson said in Chicago last Friday, there can be only one President making decisions and he deserves our support even though we may personally disagree, as I do. The Communists would make a serious mistake if they interpreted our present disagreement as a division of our total commitment to victory in Southeast Asia.

But as far as precedents are concerned, I believe the President has ample precedent for the action he has taken in Cambodia:

President Truman made the decision to go into Korea without the consent of the Congress. We have the precedent of President Kennedy threatening to send 50,000 troops into Cuba if the Soviet Union did not withdraw their missiles from Cuba.

President Johnson sent troops into the Dominican Republic without an act of Congress, and he sent troops to Elizabethville in the Congo without authorization by Congress.

It is folly to suggest that the President, as Commander in Chief, does not have the authority to use whatever means are necessary to protect our troops and our interests in whatever part of the world it may be. I believe President Nixon has all he needs to take the action he took. We can now only pray that his decision is right, and that it will indeed destroy the sanctuaries of the enemy in Cambodia and bring our boys home as quickly as possible.

PLEASED THAT THE PRESIDENT INVITES COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE TO DISCUSS SOUTHEAST ASIAN SITUATION AT THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was very

much pleased to see the President extend an invitation to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to participate in the critical deliberations relative to the future role of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the Committee on Foreign Relations in the other body for 12 of my 14 years there, and I have great respect for that committee, but I also have profound admiration for the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

When I was a Member of the other body, and a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I introduced a resolution, which I have since introduced here in the House, that in modern times not the Senate alone, but the Congress as a whole should have the responsibility for agreeing to treaties and executive agreements binding the United States.

You cannot implement any agreement on the part of our country today without the concurrence of this House.

I invite support for my resolution.

I am sure our able Committee on Foreign Affairs will acquit itself well in conference on the critical matters to be discussed today at the White House.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN CAMBODIA

(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, I was one of those privileged this morning to attend the breakfast at the White House where the President explained to us in some detail, as members of the House Committee on Armed Services and of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, action that had been taken recently in Cambodia.

A little over a year ago, I was also with a special subcommittee that went to Vietnam, the defense preparedness subcommittee. At that time we were very much concerned and alarmed, and as a result of our trip and investigation, we recommended at that time that sanctuaries not be allowed to exist along the periphery of Vietnam to go over into Cambodia and into Laos where incursions and raids could be conducted at will by the North Vietnamese who would cross the border, make their raids, kill American soldiers, and throw missiles and rocks into Saigon, which is only 33 miles away, and then go back to these sanctuaries.

It was the suggestion and the strong recommendation of this subcommittee at that time that sanctuaries not be allowed to exist.

The President this morning told us that in a very brief time some American troops, mostly South Vietnamese troops, will go in and clean out these nests and these honeycombs and sanctuaries which have been used for over 4 years by the North Vietnamese, and in doing so this will shorten the tenures and the stay of American servicemen in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a wise decision and a courageous decision. I certainly support the President in it.

VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join all of the others who have spoken on the floor this morning, indicating their belief that the meeting at the White House this morning between the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Members of the House and the Senate was constructive and meaningful. The evidence presented there this morning indicates that we are already getting a payoff from the action taken by the President in combining U.S. troops with South Vietnamese forces to attack and destroy the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia. The payoff thus far is in the discovery and destruction of military hardware of the enemy and the discovery and destruction of vast amounts of foodstuffs that the enemy has stockpiled for the purpose of supplying troops in the months ahead.

The payoff is that we have discovered some, not all, of the important communication centers and headquarters of the enemy just across the Cambodian line, the sanctuary from which the enemy has operated for a number of years.

These are meaningful payoffs, resulting from the affirmative action taken by the President. But the most important benefit that will result from this action is that we will be able to continue—I hope at an accelerated rate—the withdrawal of all U.S. ground combat forces from Vietnam.

The payoff will also be in instilling in the South Vietnamese forces the belief that they can protect their country. That responsibility will be solely theirs after we have withdrawn our forces as the President has promised.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

FRANZ CHARLES FELDMIEIER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 614) for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeier.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MICHEL M. GOUTMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Michel M. Goutmann.

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

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

There was no objection.

JOSE LUIS CALLEJA-PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1747) for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez.

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

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

GLORIA JARA HAASE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12959) for the relief of Gloria Jara Haase.

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

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

KIMBALL BROS. LUMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13740) for the relief of Kimball Bros. Lumber Co.

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

H.R. 13740

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Kimball Brothers Lumber Company, of Dexter, Oregon, a partnership composed of Clyde K. Kimball, Clayton Kimball, Kendall V. Kimball, Edgar Dowdy, and Arthur Lindley, the sum of \$14,774.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such partnership against the United States for certain expenses incurred by it under a timber sale contract numbered 18-997 entered into between such partnership and the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, on November 23, 1965, one of the terms of which required such partnership to construct a permanent road through the lands to be timbered, the cost of such road to be offset against the price charged for the timber in accordance with a formula prescribed in the contract, such contract having been subsequently canceled by the mutual consent of both parties after fire destroyed most of the timber before it was removed, but after the road had been constructed by such partnership at its own expense.

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike "\$14,774.22" and insert "\$13,726.62".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. ANTHONY S. MASTRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15760) for the relief of Dr. Anthony S. Mastrian.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 101]

Adair	Feighan	Meskill
Andrews, Ala.	Flowers	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	Foley	Minshall
Ayres	Ford,	Mollohan
Baring	William D.	Monagan
Berry	Fraser	Moorhead
Bevill	Gallifanakis	Morton
Biaggi	Gallagher	Nichols
Boggs	Garmatz	Nix
Boland	Gettys	Ottinger
Brademas	Giaino	Passman
Brock	Gibbons	Poage
Brooks	Gubser	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Harrington	Pryor, Ark.
Byrne, Pa.	Harsha	Purcell
Caffery	Hays	Rallsback
Camp	Hogan	Rostenkowski
Carey	Hungate	Roth
Celler	Jacobs	Roudebush
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Saylor
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Schadeberg
Conyers	Kee	Scherle
Daddario	Kirwan	Schuetter
Davis, Ga.	Koch	Schneebeli
Dawson	Kuykendall	Slack
Dennis	Landgrebe	Stokes
Dent	Landrum	Taft
Diggs	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	Leggett	Tiernan
Dowdy	Lennon	Tunney
Dulski	Lowenstein	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala.	Lukens	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy	Welcker
Edwards, La.	McMillan	Wyder
Esch	Madden	Yates
Eshleman	Mathias	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic deaths of four students on the Kent State University campus yesterday has shocked America.

To the parents of these students I extend my deepest and prayerful sympathy. No words or actions that any person can make will bring them back. It is a grievous event that will remain in our minds and hearts for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, Kent State University is located in my congressional district in northeastern Ohio. That this nightmare should occur at Kent State University where its president, Robert I. White, has built a well-earned reputation as one of

the State's more progressive college presidents, is almost unbelievable. It behooves all of us in public life to examine thoroughly, completely, and as quickly as possible the events that led to this horrible violence.

This morning I discussed at some length the situation at Kent State University with its distinguished president, Robert White. At Dr. White's suggestion and my full concurrence, I contacted President Nixon's office with the request that the highest possible level of investigation be undertaken as quickly as possible. It is Dr. White's suggestion and my hope that the President will immediately establish an investigating commission to examine the events at Kent State over the last 4 days.

The answers to our Nation's problems do not lie in blind force, but in tolerance, flexibility, patience, and courage.

If this tragedy passes without teaching us a great lesson and if we fail to learn from its mistakes, we then will not have accepted the full responsibility that our office demands.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10105, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10105) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if copies of the conference report and statement of the managers on the part of this body are available? I have not been able to obtain them at any of the Clerk's desks.

Mr. STAGGERS. They are available. I will see that the gentleman gets a copy.

Mr. HALL. Under those circumstances, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 20, 1970.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, there were not many significant differences between H.R. 10105 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate. We did have one item of disagreement which should be resolved after we have acted on the agreed conference report. You have heard the statement of managers. I believe that it fully explains the conference. I might mention the most difficult amendment for us to resolve was amendment No. 16. On the House side with the cooperation of the Committee on Public Works, we had provided for the

planning, designing, and construction of facilities for research, development, compliance, and testing of traffic safety. This affects both the jurisdiction and responsibilities of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senate version did not recognize the distinction between motor vehicle legislation and highway legislation and the interests of the Committee on Public Works on this point. I am happy to report that we were able to sustain the House version. Thus, the Department of Transportation, before it gets any appropriation over \$100,000 for research and test facilities must submit its plans to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Public Works of both the House and the Senate. I want to say to my friends that this was no easy task, but with the able support of Mr. SPRINGER and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. Moss, and the other House conferees, we were able to maintain our position on this point without changing even a comma, and thus completely carry out our agreement with the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the committee of conference was not able to agree on amendment numbered 2 which struck the authorization contained in the House bill of \$35 million for fiscal year 1972. We insisted on a 3-year program rather than the 2-year program authorized by the Senate. We receded from our \$35 million figure for the second year and agreed to the Senate's figure of \$40 million. A \$40 million figure for the third year would be beyond the scope of the conference.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that this bill is higher in spending than it was when it left the House?

Mr. STAGGERS. By \$5 million, and the reason for that, I tell my colleagues from Iowa, is the fact that the House version of the bill contained an authorization for 3 years. We did not want to come back in 2 years with this bill. The Senate bill contained an authorization for only 2 years. They authorized \$23 million for the first year and \$40 million for the second year. We had \$35 million for the second year and \$35 million for the third year. I would say to the gentleman it is actually \$10 million, \$5 million for each year, over what it was when it left here.

Mr. GROSS. So this then is a 3-year bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is a 3-year bill, yes, sir; instead of coming back every year for 3 years and asking for an extension.

Mr. GROSS. And the total is what—three times \$40 million?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir; it is \$103 million.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$123 million then?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir; \$23 million for fiscal 1970, \$40 million for 1971, and \$40 million for 1972.

Mr. GROSS. That is for fiscal year 1970?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is ending in July of this year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman must mean 1971.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am sorry. It is 1970. But that is the amount of money authorized.

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

M. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman has explained the differences between the House and the Senate and the compromises agreed on.

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 having now been in operation for 3 years has produced safety standards on many components of the motor vehicle and on some items of safety equipment. Being a new program it understandably has not accomplished as much as we would all like. Now that organization of the traffic safety agency is complete and groundwork has been laid in the more important safety areas, I feel that the agency can influence motor vehicle safety to a far greater degree.

The purpose of the act which is here in the form of a conference report today is basically to renew and extend the authority of the traffic safety agency. The committees of both the House and the Senate made some changes which were felt to better the program. The House saw fit to authorize funds for 3 years starting with the present fiscal year in the sum of \$23 million for 1970 and \$35 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years. Senate action on the 1970 authorization was exactly the same as ours. For 1971, however, the other body authorized \$40 million and included no authorization for 1972. The conference agreed on a \$40 million authorization for the fiscal years 1971 and 1972. Since there was no 1972 Senate figure to compromise, it was necessary that that item be reported in disagreement, and an amendment will be offered to include funds for the fiscal year 1972 in the amount of \$40 million.

When the bill was before the House it included provision for setting of standards for helmets to be used by motorcycle riders. The other body made provision for standards to be set for practically anything that might be thought of as motor vehicle equipment. Your conferees felt that the broadening of the authority to set standards in this area was proper and could well include more than helmets but that the Senate version went too far. To resolve this issue the conference agreed upon the very broad definitions of equipment but did limit it to devices for use exclusively to safeguard motor vehicle drivers, passengers, and other highway users.

The House bill dealt with the problem of notification of tire defects. It provided that tire manufacturers should keep records and notify the original purchaser of tires when a defect was discovered and a recall campaign was in order. This left completely open the question of the responsibility of distributors and dealers in

this regard. The other version of the bill gave the Secretary of Transportation authority to require distributors and dealers to supply records to manufacturers. This seemed to the conferees to be the better approach. Only a dealer will know who the first purchaser is, and the manufacturer can only carry out his responsibilities if he obtains this information from this source. The Senate language was therefore agreed upon.

One issue revolved around a provision of the other bill which would require compulsory recall and repair without charge of defective cars and equipment. This would, of course, include tires.

Recall campaigns are already required under the act. Repairs have, as a matter of practice, been carried out without charge by automobile companies. The recall of tires is a more complicated and difficult problem, but recall campaigns are being carried out under terms which appear to be fair to tire purchasers. In order to avoid what appeared to be complications in perfecting such a provision and in view of the fact that the Secretary presently has broad authority in this area, the provision was deleted.

It was expected that the most difficult issue to resolve would be that concerning the design and construction of a research and test facility which would cover all of the activities of the Traffic Safety Bureau. Highway safety, as well as motor vehicle safety, would be involved. This meant that the Public Works Committee of the House and the Senate had a very direct interest in the facility. In order to assure that the final design and construction was satisfactory for all purposes, our version of the bill required the Department to report to all four of the committees mentioned when it contemplated proceeding with such a project in any amount over \$100,000. I think it is sufficient to say that upon explanation of our reasons for this somewhat unusual arrangement, the Senate receded, and the issue was easily resolved.

These were the major points involved in the conference. We feel that the resulting bill is workable and probably somewhat better than either version in original form. We recommend the approval of the conference report by the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Public Works Committee (Mr. FALLON).

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the conference report now pending before us on H.R. 10105, to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. I particularly wish to express my thanks and the thanks of the Committee on Public Works to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its most able chairman, Mr. STAGGERS; the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MOSS; the ranking member, Mr. SPRINGER; and the other conferees, for their insistence in conference that the House position be main-

tained in so far as research and development facilities are concerned. The conference report provides an unlimited authorization for the Secretary of Transportation to plan, design, and construct facilities suitable to conduct research, development, and compliance, and other testing in traffic safety. Under this proposal approval of these facilities must be granted by the Committees on Commerce of the Senate and House and the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House, based on appropriate prospectus to be submitted by the Secretary of Transportation covering design and construction plans for these facilities.

This procedure insures that all four committees will have an opportunity to review these plans, to be certain that they will effectively contribute to achievement of legislative intent in the fields of highway and vehicular safety. It carries forward the very fine agreement that was worked out in 1966 between these committees when the landmark legislation in the field of highway safety and motor vehicle safety became law.

The original version of the bill as recommended by the administration and contained in H.R. 10105, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee would have left the approval of these facilities exclusively to the Commerce Committees of both bodies. The expertise and background of the Senate and House Public Works Committees in the field of highway safety as it concerns these facilities would have been omitted. In my opinion, this would have been a substantial loss to development of the highway and vehicular safety program of our Nation. In addition, it would have had a serious effect on the jurisdiction of the Senate and House Public Works Committees in this particular field. The chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, by his insistence on the House position, has assured a continuing safety program which will provide for the American people the best qualified legislative approval from all of the four committees who are so vitally concerned with this essential effort.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 2:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "1971, and \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert: "1971. Of the sums appropriated for fiscal year 1970 pursuant to the preceding sentence, \$2,800,000 shall be available only for the employment of additional personnel for service in the National Highway Safety Bureau to carry out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of

the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment insert the following: "1971, and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972".

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the motion was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED OFFICER RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 943 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 943

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. 10138) to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 10138, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2452, and it shall then be in order to consider the said Senate bill in the House.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 943 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10138 to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits

provided for other officers in the uniformed services. The resolution also provides that after passage of H.R. 10138, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 2452 and it shall be in order to consider the Senate bill in the House.

The purpose of H.R. 10138 is to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit, in the computation of retired pay the inclusion of all service performed before June 1, 1958, whether active or inactive, which was creditable on May 31, 1958, in the computation of basic pay, with an offset for years of active service in order to avoid dual crediting of the same period of service.

The bill would correct an inadvertent inequity by providing increased retirement benefits for approximately 101 Public Health Service officers out of the 834 officers presently on the retired list. Approximately 20 officers per year will retire in the immediate future who will benefit by the bill. And in view of the fact that the bill applies only to service rendered before June 1, 1958, the number of officers affected will steadily decline in the future. This would bring them in line with the computation of retired pay of commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The cost of the legislation is estimated at \$181,809 annually for officers retired prior to the effective date, and this amount will decrease annually as officers leave the retired rolls. The estimated cost of future retirements, assuming a level of 20 officers per year, will be approximately \$38,000 annually.

The estimated total cost for fiscal year 1971 would be \$259,400; for 1972, \$298,200; for 1973, \$337,000; and for 1974, \$375,800.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 943 in order that H.R. 10138 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to permit officers of the commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, like all other uniformed services of the U.S. Government, to include in the computations of retired pay any inactive service performed before June 1, 1958, which is credited to them in computing basic pay.

The bill would provide increased retirement benefits for about 101 Public Health Service officers out of 834 officers presently on the retired list. About 20 officers per year will retire in the immediate future who will benefit by this legislation. Because the bill only applies to service performed prior to June 1, 1958, the number of officers affected by its provisions will steadily decline in the future.

All other uniformed services now are covered by legislation similar to what is proposed by the bill.

The estimated cost of the bill is \$259,400 for fiscal 1971; \$298,200 for 1972; \$337,000 for 1973, and, \$375,800 for fiscal 1974.

The administration supports the bill.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10138) to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

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. 10138, with Mr. CULVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is identical to a bill which passed the Senate unanimously last year, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was unanimous in ordering it reported to the House. It provides for a minor revision in the method of computation of retired pay of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

In computing retired pay, commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may count all service in the Reserves performed before June 1, 1958, but commissioned officers of the Public Health Service are not granted this benefit.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and all other executive agencies have recommended elimination of this inequity, which has an adverse effect on morale of Public Health Service officers.

It is estimated that the bill will affect 101 commissioned officers presently on the retired rolls, and approximately 20 officers retiring per year hereafter with the number affected steadily diminishing, since the creditable service must have been performed before June 1, 1958.

The costs will begin at about one-quarter of a million dollars a year, and will increase to a level of about \$400,000 a year, diminishing thereafter as officers affected by the bill die.

As I mentioned, the bill was unanimously reported from the committee, and we urge its passage.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yielding to me. I know that he appreciates my interest in the commissioned corps of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Mr. STAGGERS. I do indeed.

Mr. HALL. We have engaged in colloquy on the floor here before about the importance of this commissioned corps. I for one do not want to see them fragmented or dispersed or their activities taken over by other than the professionals who now control the corps. I wonder if the gentleman could advise if this does allow "recomputation" on the part of the commissioned officers as well as the equity that he so well portrays in comparison with other uniformed services.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes. All of those that are on the rolls will have a recomputation as well as those that will retire in the future.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

I also wonder if it involves or if the committee envisions any chance of establishing a commissioner officers reserve corps with rights, privileges, and attainments, including pay, that might go along as do the reserve corps of other commissioned corps such as the military.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to my colleague from Missouri that today there is already a reserve corps. There is no proposal at this time to make any change in that. There might be consideration of improving that program in the future, I might say to my colleague. This might come up.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I hope he will keep this open in his mind and in the committee, because this is the oldest commissioned Corps in service in the Federal Government. There is the greatest opportunity for these officers of the Public Health Service, especially at times like this, to render a real service not only in the old-fashioned concept of quarantine, which may not be quite as out of date between a family of nations of the world as some think it is; but, in many other areas involving the better use of environment, ecology, and the effect man has on the world in which we live. There is no other more dedicated group since 1798 than this Corps of professional officers for aiding and abetting this. Indeed that is why past Congresses have made the Surgeon General of the United States by definition the head of this Corps and the Surgeon General of the United States, through an act of Congress. I certainly hope that the commissioned Corps and the principal civilian medical service which serves us all, including the armed military services, will not be integrated or allowed to deteriorate or be fragmented in its purpose and intent.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for bringing this bill to the floor of the House in the interest of justice and equity to those who serve.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank my colleague from Missouri for his remarks.

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

Mr. Chairman, public health has been a concern of the Federal Government since the founding of the Republic. Somewhere in the Federal Establishment there has always been an organization responsible for promoting and protecting national health and fighting disease. For many years that organization has been known as the Public Health Service. Much of the work is necessarily what could be described as dirty work. By that I mean hard work in out-of-the-way places and things such as quarantines and work with communicable diseases. It requires dedication and assignment to the ends of the earth.

In order to have the kind of professional skills needed and to have the flexibility which such a service must have, the commissioned corps was organized in 1889. It was patterned along the lines of the commissioned corps of the armed services and became one of the country's uniformed services with grades and pay corresponding to those of the military. As might be expected the retirement system for these officers was also patterned after the military. In fact it was thought that the retirement systems were identical but as is often the case in Government, something funny happened on the way to the lawbook. A change was made in military retirement which affected the number of years of reserve duty which might be counted in figuring retirement pay. Everyone still thought that the two systems were identical but last year the Comptroller General said not so.

The purpose of this bill is to set the law straight again and make it do what we always thought was being done. Without the technicalities, this bill will bring the retirement system for Public Health officers into line with that of the military on this question of figuring what time counts. It will also, in all justice, allow a refiguring for those who have been done in by the decision.

In the case of already retired officers the bill is only partial justice in that it will begin payments under the refigured entitlements only from enactment of this legislation. But even this correction will presently cost an additional \$182,000 annually. As those now on the retired rolls leave this amount will go down. New retirees will take up another \$38,000. Altogether the change will cost \$259,400 in fiscal year 1971, \$298,200 in fiscal year 1972, \$337,000 for fiscal year 1973, and \$375,000 for fiscal year 1974.

There is no argument here as to what was meant to be done or what was thought to be the law. Either someone a long time ago slipped in the first place or there is merely a difference in interpretation which requires clarification and correction. It is in great part a matter of justice. I recommend the legislation to my colleagues.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

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 paragraph (4) of section 211(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 212(a)(4)) is amended by inserting the word "plus" after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii), and by adding after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) the number of years of service with which he was entitled to be credited for purposes of basic pay on May 31, 1958, or (if higher) on any date prior thereto, reduced by any such year included under clause (i) and further reduced by any such year with which he was entitled to be credited under paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 205(a) of title 37, United States Code, on any date before June 1, 1958;"

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply in the case of retired pay for any period after the month in which this Act is enacted.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULVER, 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. 10138) to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services, pursuant to House Resolution 943, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 943, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2452) to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2452

An act to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That paragraph (4) of section 211(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 212(a)(4)) is amended by inserting the word "plus" after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii), and by adding after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) the number of years of service with which he was entitled to be credited for purposes of basic pay on May 31, 1958, or (if higher) on any date prior thereto, reduced by any such year included under clause (i) and further reduced by any such year with which he was entitled to be credited under paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 205(a) of title 37, United States Code, on any date before June 1, 1958;".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply in the case of retired pay for any period after the month in which this Act is enacted.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 10138) was laid on the table.

CAMBODIA

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, while it is my intention to seek classified briefings from the Departments of State and Defense so that I may be acquainted with new factors about which I may not presently be aware, my immediate reaction to the President's statement of April 30 disclosing introduction of American ground combat troops into Cambodia is one of dismay and apprehension.

It is my belief that at a purely military consideration North Vietnam has been able for some years to conquer Cambodia. I feel that this could have been done within a very short space of time and at very little loss of men and material. Believing thusly, one must then ask himself why they have not done so. It appears to me that the reasons are at least threefold:

First, such an invasion and conquest would have been in clear violation of the Geneva Accords of July 20, 1954. Such action would clearly have placed North Vietnam at a diplomatic and political disadvantage and would have additionally place Russia in a tenuous position.

Second, while there is every reason to believe that the conquest of Cambodia would not have presented an insurmountable problem to the North Vietnamese, the logistics of retention of such a vast territory would have been substantial. This is particularly so in the past two years since the Tet offensive when it is clear that there have been substantial drains upon North Vietnam men and material.

Third, while Prince Sihanouk was the head of the Cambodian state he appears

to have given tacit consent to the locating of North Vietnamese and Vietcong personnel and supplies in enclave sanctuaries within the Cambodian border fronting on Vietnam.

Thus it was unnecessary, and would have been undiplomatic and costly for the North Vietnamese to attempt to conquer Cambodia.

With the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk and the assertion of power by the Lon Lol group and their almost immediate pressure for withdrawal of North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops from these border sanctuaries, one of the above three deterrents was removed.

With our overt intrusion of American ground combat troops on April 30 the second, and what I believe to be the major, deterrent to conquest by North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops has been removed. While it is true that North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops have been violating the Geneva accords by their stationing of troops on Cambodian soil, this has been a sub rosa operation and has never drawn the world's attention that our intrusion is bound to draw. Thus, we are now overtly in violation of the Geneva accords and it seems to me, with little effort, the North Vietnamese can exploit this violation by further and more significant violations of their own. I feel such violations may now include conquest of all of Cambodia. And now such conquest does not have all of the bad diplomatic and political tones which it would have had in the absence of our intrusion.

Further, from a military standpoint it appears to me that our frontal attack on at least two of these border enclave sanctuaries will have the effect of pushing the Vietnamese and Vietcong in these enclaves eastward and dispersing them throughout all of Cambodia. Thus we have resolved for them, at least for the time, the difficult decision they might once have had to make with regard to logistic support of any sustained operation in Cambodia. Now they have no choice. It is either provide such support or perish.

The presence of Prince Norodim Sihanouk in his present posture provides for the North Vietnamese, Vietcong, and Chinese a golden opportunity to use this dispersion as a de facto conquest after which Sihanouk can be installed as the legitimate head of a Cambodian state which will then, for all intents and purposes, be a complete puppet of the North Vietnamese.

In short, it appears to me that our move could not have been better planned for the North Vietnamese if they had instigated it themselves.

APPEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 1, 1970, I had the honor to attend one of the most meaningful and deeply moving convocations ever held in the United States.

Summoned from across the Nation, the families of American servicemen held prisoner by the North Vietnamese assembled in Constitution Hall to call attention to the cruel and inhuman treatment their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers have endured at the hands of the Communist enemy.

About 1,100 close relatives of prisoners or servicemen listed as "missing in action" attended to participate in an "Appeal for International Justice." They were there to arouse the National sense of outrage and to protest the gross violations of international law relating to POW treatment that have been perpetrated by the North Vietnamese behind their bamboo curtain.

Senators and Representatives in Congress joined Vice President SPIRO T. ACNEW, Astronaut James Lovell, Citizen H. Ross Perot, thousands of concerned Americans and the family members in reaffirming a truly national concern for those who have fallen into the hands of the enemy.

At Constitution Hall last Friday night, the families of these prisoners joined the leadership of this land in a common declaration: The POW's will not be forgotten. Their voices are stilled behind prison walls but our voices are not stilled. We as Americans must speak throughout the world in their behalf. America will not rest until our servicemen are accorded their rights under the Geneva conventions and other accepted standards of international law.

That was the message of this "Appeal for International Justice."

SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. Speaker, if this appeal is heard, if men of honor are moved to action in behalf of about 1,500 American prisoners of war—the families of these unfortunate servicemen and the entire American people will be forever in the debt of Senator BOB DOLE. He made the "Appeal for International Justice" possible.

Most of us know BOB personally. He served in this body for 8 years before becoming the junior Senator from Kansas. In less than 18 months, BOB has become an acknowledged leader in the Senate and a champion to those disadvantaged Americans without a high-powered lobby of their own.

While much has been said recently about the "silent majority," Senator DOLE has not forgotten the "voiceless minorities" that suffer anonymously in pockets of neglect throughout the land.

It was entirely characteristic of BOB to make his maiden Senate speech on the plight of physically and mentally handicapped Americans—citizens denied opportunities that a compassionate nation should have guaranteed to them long ago.

Senator DOLE's compassion for the American prisoners of war and for the agony of their families, is typical of his concern for those in need of moral and active support.

"I'LL FILL THIS HALL IN 90 DAYS"

On February 21 of this year, Senator DOLE met with some relatives of American POW's in Constitution Hall. Only about 300 persons attended that publicized meeting. Senator DOLE sensed

the hopelessness of the wives and parents present and made a pledge,

I'll fill this Hall with concerned Americans in 90 days.

On May 1, BOB DOLE made good his commitment.

I am confident that his "Appeal for International Justice" will become a "mandate" for international justice or perhaps even an "ultimatum" for international justice.

A nation that could ignore the plight of its prisoners of war, languishing in bamboo prisons half a world away, could ignore other violations of common decency in other places at other crucial times.

Perhaps we learned a little about the inherent strength of character of the American people last Friday night at Constitution Hall. Americans will not forget, they will not ignore, they will not rationalize injustice.

But they need leaders to give them a forum for expression of outrage at injustice.

By providing that forum on the prisoner-of-war issue, Senator DOLE has performed a distinguished act of public service.

THE BASIC CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF DISCRIMINATION AS IT AFFECTS THE CHINESE CITIZENS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam Chinn, of Salinas, Calif., a very wise and able friend of mine, was invited to participate in the seminar on civil rights sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture at Portland, Oreg., on May 5, 1970.

His dissertation on "The Basic Causes and Effects of Discrimination as It Affects the Chinese Citizens" is worth the reading and thoughtful reflection of every person who has been the object of discrimination or a discriminator.

All of us who live in California are well aware of discrimination, de jure and de facto, affecting the Chinese as well as other groups of persons. We are very proud of the contribution of the Chinese to our Nation, our business, our industry, our community—and to our understanding and relationships with each other.

Mr. Chinn pays eloquent tribute to the Chinese in their handling of the problems of discrimination. Their techniques and attitudes could be useful and satisfying examples for all of us.

I heartily urge each of my colleagues to read this beautiful story about how the Chinese met and solved the evil of discrimination for themselves and their discriminators.

I include Mr. Chinn's speech in the RECORD.

THE BASIC CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF DISCRIMINATION AS IT AFFECTS THE CHINESE CITIZENS

(By Sam Chinn, Portland, Oreg., May 5, 1970)

In order to better understand the Chinese and how they feel about discrimination, you must know and understand some of the

strong characteristics of the oriental mind and their basic philosophy.

The Chinese have a fierce pride in their accomplishments. They will defend their honor with their life if necessary, but at the same time they are humble and respectful of their elders and fellow man. They practice the wisdom of the wise old man of China, Confucius, who says, "One must cherish the old in order to understand and appreciate the new".

The era of the Chinese in America began in the middle 1800's during the Gold Rush Days. The opportunity to get rich quickly in the gold fields depleted the manpower resources of the West. Recruitments and shanghaiing (in effect slave trading) turned to the Far East across the Pacific Ocean where there were plenty of laborers. The Chinese were small, but strong, wiry, dependable, clean, and quiet. They filled a definite need for domestics and workers in the gold fields.

A decade or so later, the race to build the Transcontinental Railroad began. Santa Fe and Union Pacific recruited big strong Irish, Swedes, and Germans and began building from the East. Leland Stanford and the Southern Pacific were to build from the West. The prize was that for every mile built, the U.S. Government would deed three miles right of way, so the incentive was very strong. Once again the West had a manpower shortage, and Leland Stanford recruited thousands of Chinese from across the Pacific to do the job.

At first, there was great apprehension that these people of small stature could match the strength and endurance of the Europeans, but they reasoned, if these people can build the Great Wall of China, they can build a railroad.

They were put to a crucial test immediately after work began in Sacramento heading East. They had to lay tracks through the high Sierra Nevada Mountains in the dead of winter. These mountains were high, steep, treacherous and snow covered and the task of building a railroad through seemed impossible.

It was here that the very often used phrase "There isn't a Chinaman's chance originated. The Chinese pride turned this into a challenge, and history has recorded that where machinery failed, human integrity, courage, and endurance prevailed and where snow was a constant problem, snow sheds and tunnels were built to conquer the elements. After passing through the mountains, the Chinese crews of Southern Pacific laid more miles of track per day than the crews from the East. This track laying record has never been broken even in these days of modern equipment. To this day, after over 100 years of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad, recognition has always been credited to the Chinese for their contribution to help build the West.

Immediately after the Gold Rush and the completion of the railroad, the need for these thousands and thousands of orientals was over. Even though a great number returned to their native land, many stayed for a new life in the "Golden Hills of Opportunity" as the Chinese called America. The non-oriental people looked upon them as the "yellow peril" who infringed on their political and economical haven. Because of this fear, the Chinese were abused, threatened, beaten, and their homes often destroyed. With this background of misunderstanding, prejudice began against the Chinese. Bills were passed and laws adopted to discriminate and suppress them.

Some of the laws were: A person of Chinese descent could not vote, could not own property, could not get a license to do business, could not bring their wives into this country; Chinese testimony was not acceptable in court, and a very small quota

could immigrate into the U.S. annually. This limited these people to hold jobs of a servitude nature, such as cooks, house boys, laundry workers, laborer of all types, and other lower classes of occupations.

In this turmoil and frustration, the wisdom of the wise old men of China prevailed. They fully realized and understood that racial discrimination is a social disease. It is created, festered, thrived, and spread in the minds of individuals. What is more important they realized in order to cure or eradicate this disease, the solution must take the same channel from which it was created and no threats, intimidations, or violence can be medicine.

With these thoughts, two organizations began for the purpose of improving the Chinese status in America.

The Chinese Six Company, as it translated in English, has as its members Chinese from the six different villages of Canton that were predominantly here. It was organized to self regulate its own people. It had its own rules and court hearings and law enforcements. Although Chinese punishment for breaking some of the American laws thus bringing disgrace to the Chinese race were very drastic by today's standards, it was very effective. Because of the watchdog tactics of this organization, the crime rate committed by Chinese is very small. Their social behavior is beyond reproach and no Chinese need be on welfare.

The Six Company organization provides a basis in which ancient and sound traditions still serve as an authoritative guide to good personal conduct. It is through this good personal conduct that the wise men hoped discrimination would be healed and their people slowly and firmly accepted.

The other organization is the Chinese American Citizens Alliance comprising as its members American Citizens of Chinese ancestry. It was organized 75 years ago and has the longest history and is the largest citizen's group in the country today. Its purpose and objective are: to form a more perfect body; to inculcate the principles of charity, justice, brotherly love and fidelity among its members; to promote the general welfare and happiness of its members; to quicken the spirit of American Patriotism; to secure the legal rights of its members; and to secure equal economical and political opportunities for all American citizens.

This organization, as its objectives imply, encouraged its members to be outstanding citizens and take the battle to repeal these discriminatory laws in the courts, to the legislature, and to the U.S. Congress. The achievements of this organization's taking this route is history and the results are very self evident. Both organizations have achieved their goals, one through the mind and heart of the people and the other through the democratic process.

Today after 40 years since all these discriminatory laws were repealed, there is no resentment nor do the Chinese hold any malice toward the people who tormented them. We have long ago understood and believed that discrimination works both ways. We remembered that our ancestors brought with them many different and unusual habits, traits, customs, and religion. Their unwillingness to immediately accept the customs of their adopted country could be construed as part of the reason for discrimination and their nonacceptance.

Confucius once said, "It is very easy to blame others for our troubles, but difficult to blame ourselves". There is a lot of wisdom in this proverb.

Today, there may be isolated and individual cases of non-acceptance. This is not regarded as racial discrimination. The Chinese feel there will always be discrimination, be it by class, by financial, by sex, by age, by religion, or others. We believe it is our American sovereign right to choose our own

friends, associates, and neighbors, and no one should impose themselves where they are not welcome.

Today, the Chinese feel it is almost just as embarrassing to discriminate for, as it is against. We strongly wish to emphasize we do not ask for, nor expect, any special privileges than anyone else because of our race or ancestry.

We deplore the practice of employment based on race, ancestry or other reasons than ability. This unfair and dangerous practice has already caused rebellious reaction of some minority groups and much unrest in the well-qualified person regardless of race or color. Misguided government and industry will have to take the responsibility for starting and abetting of this reverse discrimination plus the lowering of the workmanship standards in the 19th century.

We feel that the unrest of the youth today is an excellent opportunity for the minority races to take a strong initiative for their sons and daughters to excel in higher education. In four or five years of a lifetime, they in turn could be the leading citizens of the country. It will take patience, courage, and perseverance to achieve this goal, but rewards are great because no one can begrudge these youths of their own achievement.

In conclusion, the Chinese feel they have been as great a victim of discrimination and suppression as any other people in America. We have proven to our own satisfaction and great pride, that from humble origin, by hard work and perseverance in schools, colleges, and universities, we have developed among us outstanding doctors, lawyers, judges, scientists, professional men of all types, as well as owners of all types of businesses.

We regard ourselves as the living proof of the reality of the American dream of opportunity for every man, regardless of race, color or creed. Anyone who is willing to recognize, to work, and to grasp the opportunities that are available to him in America can succeed.

We have proved to our own satisfaction that from the personal efforts of our parents and of ourselves, we have won the respect and esteem of our Caucasian neighbors and at no time, I repeat, at no time, have we ever had to resort to violence to achieve the status which we now enjoy.

KENT, OHIO, DISTURBANCE

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I, like many other Members of this body, was saddened and shocked to read this morning in the newspapers about what took place yesterday at Kent State University in Ohio.

I think this House should not make a snap judgment on this sad incident. It deserves a full and complete investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice, by the Ohio State authorities, and by the local law-enforcement agencies.

We owe this to the students, to the Ohio National Guard, to the university administration, to ourselves, and the people we represent.

I know that some of the incidents of recent weeks have disturbed people very much. One incident was a speech made on the Kent campus by Jerry Rubin on April 11. I include in these remarks the text of an Associated Press report published by the Huntington, W. Va., Herald Dispatch and Advertiser of that date: "KILL YOUR PARENTS," KENT CROWD ADVISED

KENT, OHIO.—"We have to disrupt every institution, break every law, we've got to all

become criminals," Youth International Party (Yippee) leader Jerry Rubin told about 1,000 Kent State University students Friday.

Rubin, one of the defendants in the recent Chicago trial for inciting to riot during the 1968 Democratic National Convention, called on his audience that sat on the grass around him on the university's front campus oval, to "kill your parents."

He said America's youth is a persecuted class that is indoctrinated by parents, teachers, schools and the government.

"You work until you become 65 so you can retire," he said. "You're born retired. Work is a dirty word. I don't work. Work is doing something for money and that's why so many people out in American society are unhappy, because they don't do anything that they enjoy, they're just interested in money."

Rubin, who called for a revolution to overthrow the government and change the system, said that a baby is trained to join the system of working for money through "discipline, control . . . and by sending him to school."

As he spoke, four supporters passed through the audience, which included plain-clothes police, and collected donations for court fines owed by four members of the Kent State Students For A Democratic Society.

The four were arrested last April for allegedly inciting to riot at the university and are presently in the Portage County jail in Ravenna.

Several members of the audience spoke following Rubin. All were applauded except one young man who asked everyone there to help a cleanup project in the city of Kent this weekend.

A number of people of my district took exception to this man coming onto the campus of a university dedicated to the education of our young people. And they wrote to me about it, letting me know in detail how they felt.

Upon receipt of such letters, I took the matter up with the Attorney General of the United States.

For the information of the Members of this House, I append herewith the detailed correspondence between my office and the Department of Justice: APRIL 16, 1970.

HON. JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MITCHELL: Several residents of my area have sent me copies of an Associated Press dispatch from Kent State University in Ohio, reporting on the appearance of Mr. Jerry Rubin.

I thought you would be interested in their comments on this matter.

Best wishes always.
Sincerely,
CARL D. PERKINS,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1970.

Re Jerry Rubin.
HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: This acknowledges your communication of April 16, 1970. It has been referred for appropriate action and a reply may be expected in the near future.

If you have any questions regarding your communication before receipt of a formal reply, please contact Mr. Harry Kulick, of my office on code 187, extension 3128.

Sincerely,
L. M. PELLERZI,
Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, April 30, 1970.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of April 16, 1970 enclosing correspondence from several of your constituents regarding a recent talk given by Yippee leader, Jerry Rubin, at Kent State University in Ohio.

You may wish to advise your constituents that I share their indignation at the shocking speech made by Mr. Rubin at Kent State University. As you may know, Rubin has been convicted of crossing state lines to incite a riot in Chicago and has also been held in contempt of court by Judge Julius Hoffman. Rubin is presently appealing his conviction.

Furthermore, we are aware of the activities of Jerry Rubin and in the event sufficient evidence is developed to establish a violation of any additional Federal law, including the Smith Act (Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2385) prohibiting the advocacy of the violent overthrow of the Government, your constituents may be assured that this Department will take immediate and effective steps to enforce the applicable statutes.

I hope that we have been of assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely,
J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

THE PRESIDENT'S BRAVE DECISION

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 30, 1970, during debate on the military procurement authorization bill, I attempted to explain to the membership the circumstances which required the President to make his eventful decision concerning Cambodia.

Since that time, there has been a great deal of discussion, some of it well informed, and, unfortunately, some of it distorted.

Reduced to its simplest element, the decision of the President to eliminate the sanctuaries used by Communist troops in Cambodia was designed to save American lives and bring an earlier conclusion to the unfortunate war in Vietnam.

Certainly no one in this body could dissent from this objective of the President. Yet, in the confusion of oratory and passion which surrounds a decision of this kind, we often find the objectives of the President so obfuscated that it is almost impossible to discuss intelligently the issues involved.

The President, as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, is no less concerned with the lives of our men in uniform than any of us here today. The anguish and torture that he must have experienced in reaching his decision on Cambodia is something that few of us can comprehend, and probably none of us will ever be required to face.

It was a problem which demanded immediate resolution and, as politicians, each of us in our own hearts, must know how great the temptation must have been to attempt to sidestep the issue and avoid the decision. However, our President in the great tradition of his forebears, "elected to bite the bullet" and make a decision which was designed to

save American lives at the risk of the President's political future.

I emphasize these circumstances since we cannot and should not attribute any other purpose to the President's action. His decision was forthright and courageous—make no mistake about that.

Let me review some of the basic facts which led to this presidential decision. As I explained to the Members of the House on April 30, the Communists have, in the past, used sanctuaries in Cambodia for their forays into South Vietnam. They have used these sanctuaries as a safe haven from pursuit by South Vietnamese and American forces, and in addition—and most importantly—they have used these sanctuaries as a source of supply to continue the war in South Vietnam with weapons and ammunition provided by the Hanoi government.

The Cambodia supply lines have therefore become, in truth, lifelines for the Vietcong operating out of Cambodia.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, though loudly protesting a neutral attitude, accepted the presence of the Vietcong in his country and for years permitted this deadly use of these bases in Cambodia. This reality made it possible for the North Vietnamese elements in the III Corps area and the Delta to maintain, without disruption, their capability to inflict serious losses on our forces in South Vietnam.

The importance of this lifeline, and it can be called nothing else, to the North Vietnamese forces became all too apparent when with the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk, the Vietcong units located in the sanctuary base areas moved out to gain control of as much of Cambodia and the neighboring rice land as they could, while other forces of North Vietnam elements were sent forward to threaten Phnom Penh itself.

These events made it crystal clear that the North Vietnamese units were desperately attempting to insure the future availability of their sanctuaries in Cambodia and their utilization of Cambodia as a source of supply by attempting to bring the existing Cambodian Government to its knees.

Like Napoleon's foray into Russia, the North Vietnamese recognize full well that if their supply lines are destroyed, they are dead.

On the other hand, the North Vietnamese also know that if they can insure the availability of these supply lines and the use of Cambodia as a sanctuary, they can continue the war almost indefinitely.

These crucial events therefore demanded action by the President and he was not found wanting.

The President can not ignore the fact that Hanoi has largely sustained most of the war in South Vietnam with weapons and ammunition brought in through supply lines from Cambodia.

These are the weapons that are killing your sons as well as the people of South Vietnam whose only plea is to be given an opportunity to determine for themselves their own future as a nation.

I wholeheartedly endorse the action taken by the President and urge that in this time of crisis, and make no mistake about it—it is a time of crisis—we must

forget our political differences, subdue our passions, and firm our determination to support our President who is no less dedicated to the principles which you and I espouse.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an excellent article by Joseph Alsop concerning the President's Cambodian decision. I hope each Member will have an opportunity to read Mr. Alsop's very fine comments on this crucial matter before the debate resumes tomorrow on the military procurement authorization bill.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1970]
NIXON'S CAMBODIAN DECISION IS BRAVE, AND
MAY BE LUCKY

(By Joseph Alsop)

President Nixon has now proved that he is a very brave man. Even the opponents of his Cambodian decision have been forced to grant that much.

It remains to be seen whether he is also a lucky man—which is just as important for a successful political leader. But if he is even reasonably lucky, it should be noted that he has made a good gamble in Cambodia.

What makes it a good gamble is the simple fact that (which no U.S. senator ever seems to understand) that no troops can fight, or even continue to exist, without supply. For years, Hanoi has not only used sanctuary-bases area in Cambodia.

In addition, Hanoi has fed the troops in the sanctuary-base areas with Cambodian fish and rice; and Hanoi has nourished the war in two-thirds of South Vietnam with weapons and ammunition brought in through Cambodia. Thus the Cambodian supply lines have also been life-lines. And these life-lines have now been cut by the Cambodian Nationalist government.

The importance of those life-lines to Hanoi could be seen in the initial responses to the Nationalist triumph in Phnom Penh. On the one hand, the units in the sanctuary-base areas moved out, to gain control of as much of Cambodia's neighboring rice land as they could. On the other hand, and more important, North Vietnamese elements were sent far forward, to threaten Phnom Penh itself.

The threat to Phnom Penh was either intended to force the Nationalist government to make a deal with Hanoi, thus restoring the old supply arrangements. Or perhaps it was ultimately aimed to carry Prince Norodom Sihanouk, now an open stooge of Hanoi's, back to Phnom Penh on top of a tank. It was this threat to Phnom Penh, in any case, which finally forced President Nixon's hand.

The Cambodian army, alone and unassisted, was simply not strong enough to cope with the North Vietnamese. Some kind of collapse was ominously imminent when President Nixon acted.

The immediate aim of his action was to remove the threat to Phnom Penh by taking the enemy in the rear. In all but the northern corner of Cambodia, in fact, the North Vietnamese divisions should now be caught between the devil and deep blue sea—the deep blue sea being the Cambodian army and the hostile Cambodia population, and the devil being the South Vietnamese and American forces now attacking across the border.

The key to the situation, for the long pull, is again the problem of supply. For the long pull, obviously, most of the North Vietnamese units in Cambodia simply cannot survive there, without supply lines of any sort. Those in the northeast corner can do so, by getting their supply over the Laos trails. But with any luck, all the more important sanctuary-base areas should become untenable in the end.

Furthermore, if the President's gamble meets with this kind of success, there will

be an extra dividend of inestimable importance. Here, once again, supply is the key, for remember that all the weapons and all the ammunition for all the enemy forces in nearly two-thirds of South Vietnam formerly came through Sihanoukville or over the Cambodian beaches.

This year Hanoi has made a great effort to expand the capacity of the Laos trails. Supplies brought through Laos may therefore replace supplies from Cambodia in lower II Corps, and even, perhaps, in the empty provinces of north III Corps. But in most of III Corps and all of the Delta, the enemy units, from guerilla platoon up to North Vietnamese regiment, must eventually lose the means to fight if their Cambodian life-line is not restored.

That means, in turn, that substantial redeployments to the more vulnerable northern areas will eventually become possible. Consider the Delta, for instance. Here North Vietnamese regiments had to be sent in, as a desperate measure to bolster the Viet Cong structure, which was in danger of collapse.

Now both the North Vietnamese regiments and the Viet Cong troops must probably look forward to a grim moment when their ammunition will begin to run out. When that moment comes three or four South Vietnamese brigades should be enough to hold the Delta, instead of three regiments, as at present.

If the same thing happens in most of III Corps, that will mean more troops set free. Thus the enemy will finally have to face forces in II Corps and I Corps that will be nearly double in strength the forces that now defend those areas. And that should be enough to break Hanoi's teeth.

In sum, President Nixon's gamble has its grave risks, as any wartime move always has. But if his luck holds, the pay-off will be huge.

THE "CHICAGO 7" SHOULD HAVE THEIR BONDS REVOKED

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasingly volatile situation on the Nation's college campuses and here in the Nation's Capital, it is little more than a mockery of the legal process that persons who stand convicted of crossing State lines to incite riots be permitted to continue to play active roles in organizing demonstrations which may result in riots and disorders.

In recent days members of the so-called "Chicago 7," who are free under bond following their trial and conviction and pending appeal have appeared at various crisis points around the country—at New Haven last weekend and here in Washington this week.

One of these, Rennie Davis, who spoke yesterday to an assembly at one local university and called for what he termed "a national liberation brigade" to come to Washington to "liberate this country." This is similar, of course, to the appeal made by Mr. Davis and other convicted members of the "Chicago 7" which led to the mob demonstrations in Chicago in 1968—the very acts which led to their trial and conviction.

I believe, therefore, that the time has arrived—if it is not long overdue—for judicial authorities in Chicago to take action to review the condition of bond granted the "Chicago 7" either to impose

limitations on their movements as provided by law or if necessary, to revoke said bonds.

I am therefore writing Attorney General John Mitchell today asking that he instigate through the Justice Department appropriate measures to bring Rennie Davis and his fellow-convicted defendants back into court in Chicago, posthaste, for a hearing on this matter so important to the peace and security of this Nation's Capital and the country as a whole.

CAMBODIA

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, after long and careful consideration, and with great disquietude, I have come to the conclusion that I must publicly express my strong disagreement with the action of President Nixon in sending American troops into Cambodia.

For a number of years I have supported the policies of the Government of the United States with regard to Southeast Asia, in the belief that our national goal there was to assure the freedom, including their right to self-determination, of the people of South Vietnam and out of the view that this national goal was being served by the military endeavors of the United States in that area.

Further, I have given my full support to the policies and actions of both the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration which were aimed at securing an honorable negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam.

The actions of President Johnson in deescalating the level of military activity in Vietnam and in commencing negotiations in Paris had my support, as did President Nixon's moves to reduce the size of the American contingent in South Vietnam while continuing negotiations.

As late as April 20, 1970, President Nixon addressed the American people on television and radio to assure them that the level of American involvement would continue to be reduced.

President Nixon's promise of a further phased withdrawal of some 150,000 men over the next 12 months gave the American people the hope that the President had taken effective steps to implement the yet unrevealed plan for conclusion of the Vietnam war to which he alluded during the presidential campaign of 1968.

The events of the last week—highlighted by President Nixon's announcement on April 30 that American troops were being deployed into Cambodia—lead me to the conclusion, sadly, that the President at no time had a firm plan to bring the Vietnam conflict to an honorable negotiated conclusion. If he did have such a plan, recent events make it clear that he has abandoned it out of stress, panic or plain folly.

Our military operations in Cambodia, as publicly defined by the President, offer the most minimal tactical or strategic military benefits.

The news reports indicate that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces generally have faded away from the base

areas which President Nixon said were the objective of our forces and the forces of the Government of South Vietnam. Apparently only nominal amounts of supplies have come into the hands of our forces. Thus, the immediate tactical advantage is of small order—the enemy forces remain and will return the moment our troops are withdrawn.

Insofar as strategic advantage is concerned, it would appear that such can be gained only if we and the South Vietnamese are prepared to continue and expand activities within Cambodia for the indefinite future.

Despite his solemn promise to the American people that such would not be the case, it becomes clear that the actions of President Nixon with regard to Cambodia are calculated to bring a substantial escalation of the level of the conflict in Southeast Asia through a significant expansion of the geographical boundaries. Recent history indicates that we will not easily withdraw from Cambodia, particularly if it finally develops that our incursion has not led to the expected tactical gain. In fact, if logic demanded that our forces seek out the Vietcong and North Vietnamese in their sanctuaries in eastern Cambodia, cannot it be assumed that the same logic will demand our seeking out such forces in central Cambodia, in Laos, in Thailand, and perhaps in North Vietnam.

The actions in Cambodia, particularly when coupled with renewed bombing of North Vietnam, may well lead to the complete collapse of the negotiations in Paris. In such event, the pressure to maintain and expand our military endeavors in Southeast Asia would be heightened. Instead of the withdrawal of 150,000 American men over the next 12 months, the policy of the President could lead to the infusion of additional American troops. Instead of declining casualty totals, casualties would then rise. Instead of lessening demands for military funding, budgetary strictures would increase, with a totally unacceptable impact upon our vital domestic programs. Social unrest at home could become substantially more intense. These are costs we cannot afford and should not undertake.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today I have had the pleasure, along with a number of our congressional delegation, to be briefed by President Richard M. Nixon on the Cambodian situation. As a result of this meeting, which lasted over 2 hours, I am convinced that the President is attempting to win and also to get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible. While at first I had some apprehension as to the wisdom of the Cambodian venture, it now appears quite clear that this is not an invasion in any sense of the word. The President made it quite clear that all troops now in Cambodia are busily en-

gaged in destroying the enemy sanctuaries and facilities that have for a number of years been a thorn in the side of the South Vietnamese and American troops.

The operation was designed to neutralize the enemy sanctuaries from which they emanated and mounted attacks on South Vietnamese cities and also American installations causing a number of casualties among our troops. I firmly believe that the action now underway will deprive the Vietcong and North Vietnamese of that capability and will be instrumental in the saving of many American and other lives. With the destruction of the sanctuary facilities, the supplies contained therein, the military equipment of Communist origin captured and destroyed, and with the coming of the monsoon season, it will be well into 1971 before the enemy can again maintain such an operation as they have been from their headquarters on the Cambodian border.

This operation will add impetus to the already announced orderly withdrawal of 150,000 more American troops from Vietnam during the coming year. I am likewise convinced that it will save many American lives in our armed services. It is estimated now that the operation will be completed within 5 weeks; in fact, many units will begin withdrawal after their completed mission the first part of next week. The President has emphasized that he does not seek to widen or extend the war but the enemy has never taken that stand.

It now becomes necessary for me to support President Nixon. I do so not in blind allegiance but rather because I am convinced that as the Commander in Chief he has carefully weighed the options and he has concluded that this limited Cambodian action will permit him to keep his promise of such withdrawal as is consistent with the protection of our troops.

We are all frustrated by the rage of this bitter conflict and all of us seek to contribute to its earliest possible termination. We must, however, be realists and support the Commander in Chief in his determination to end the war in Vietnam. I am convinced he is not seeking a total military victory at this time but rather to attain an objective whereby the South Vietnamese can take over their country totally and maintain their own independent form of government.

THE CAMBODIAN "PAYOFF"

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in sending American ground troops into Cambodia is a most serious constitutional matter. I do not understand how any of the gentlemen who have spoken previously could contend that this military action is not an invasion, that it does not violate the territorial integrity of what has been regarded up to now as a neutral nation. The President neither sought nor received congressional approval for this unilateral action. He does not even pre-

tend that Cambodia requested United States ground forces. He has repudiated his own campaign pledges and his own promises to the American people that he was going to bring this war to an end.

It is a curious twist of logic which makes it possible to rationalize extending the war into Cambodia and bombing North Vietnam with promised troop withdrawals.

The minority leader's approval of the President's actions with regard to Cambodia, which were taken without either consultation with, or the concurrence of, the Congress, is in sharp contrast to his views expressed at a news conference on January 9, 1968, when he reacted to reports that the Johnson administration was considering hot pursuit across the Cambodian border from Vietnam. At that time the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) said:

It is important that they (the Administration) come to Congress, present the problem, and get our concurrence, before they adopt a new policy of hot pursuit. This would be a drastic change.

The minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) just spoke of a beneficial payoff from the President's decision.

The payoff is clear. The payoff is further polarization of our society, further alienation of our young people, a further deepening of our domestic crisis, further estrangement from our allies.

The administration is unwilling to accept the proposition that there is only one solution to the war in Vietnam, and that is a political solution.

As long as the President persists in believing that what is essentially a political issue can be settled by military means, we shall be bogged down in Southeast Asia for years and years to come. I believe it is essential that the Congress assert its authority and make clear to the President of the United States its disapproval of his action in Cambodia and make clear our determination to bring home from Vietnam as rapidly as possible all American forces.

THE NEED FOR REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as America approaches its 200th birthday, my colleague from Minnesota, Congressman MACGREGOR and I think the time is ripe to fulfill the Republican pledge to provide voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. The reason for this step was summed up in a sentence in President Nixon's message almost a year ago:

It should offend the democratic senses of this Nation that the 850,000 citizens of its capital comprising a population larger than eleven of its states have no voice in Congress.

This year, the cause of voting representation in Congress for the District has a strong ally in the League of Women

Voters of the United States. The league is celebrating half a century of service to better government and has made its 50th anniversary the "Year of the Voter." Taking as its slogan, "D.C.—Last Colony," the league has been gathering signatures from citizens of all 50 of our States on petitions urging voting representation for District residents. These petitions will be presented to Members of Congress during the league's national convention, now in progress. Because of the low political visibility of this injustice, the league is to be highly commended for their vigorous efforts to bring it to the attention of American citizens in all of our States.

I am confident that the great majority of Americans favor extending the right to vote for congressional representation to their compatriots in the District of Columbia. Their disenfranchisement is an accident of history, one of the few matters overlooked by the Founding Fathers who wrote our Constitution.

The Constitution provides that Members of Congress shall be chosen by the people of the several States—article I, section 2—and the District is not a State. That the effect of this provision disenfranchised the District by accident is clear from James Madison's statement in the *Federalist*, No. 43, that the residents of the new Federal City should "of course have their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them."

Madison's observation is no less true today, when Congress not only legislates for the District as part of the Nation but is directly responsible for the affairs of the city. There is no justification for our continued failure to remedy this situation. District citizens pay taxes and answer draft calls but they have no voice in the legislative decisions that require them to do so. They encounter problems with the Internal Revenue Service or the Veterans' Administration, but there is no representative in Congress to whom they can turn for help. All of us who serve on the District Committee know that District citizens have views to express and problems to discuss like everyone else, and we do what we can to give them a hearing. But as the League of Women Voters has put it—

No U.S. Senator or U.S. Representative can or should have the interests of the District as his prime concern. The District needs its own voice and vote.

I believe that we Republicans have a special opportunity and responsibility to advance the President's program for the District of Columbia. The first resolution proposing a constitutional amendment giving District citizens the vote was introduced by a Republican in 1877, and I would like to see the last such resolution approved by this Congress and ratified by the States before another century slips by. Resolutions have been proposed and extensive hearings held in many Congresses, including the last. But time is fast running out on the 91st.

In a letter to our Republican colleagues, Congressman MACGREGOR and I asked support of voting representation measures for the District, and we have re-

ceived strong backing from 30 of our colleagues. Most of the 30 are cosponsoring bills granting several types of voting representation and 11 more Republicans have already introduced legislation on voting representation. We ask the Judiciary Committee to expedite consideration of these measures so that the House can act within the year.

We also need simultaneous and prompt action on the President's proposal for a nonvoting delegate to represent the District pending final ratification of an amendment for voting representation. The nonvoting delegate bill passed the Senate last year, and only awaits a favorable report from the District Committee. It is up to us as Republicans to help the President deliver on this part of his program, too. As he reminded us:

The District is a federal city, but it should not be a federal colony. Nearly 200 years ago, the people of America confronted the question of taxation without representation. It was not acceptable then; it hardly is justifiable today.

I am honored to join today with 30 of my Republican colleagues in support of a remedy for a historic injustice:

Mr. JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois.
Mr. EDWARD BIESTER, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DONALD BROTZMAN, of Colorado.
Mr. DANIEL BUTTON, of New York.
Mr. DON CLAUSEN, of California.
Mr. BARBER CONABLE, of New York.
Mr. JOHN DELLENBACK, of Oregon.
Mr. MARVIN ESCH, of Michigan.
Mr. EDWIN ESHLEMAN, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. JOHN ERLBORN, of Illinois.
Mr. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.
Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.
Mr. JAMES HASTINGS, of New York.
Mrs. MARGARET HECKLER, of Massachusetts.
Mr. LAWRENCE HOGAN, of Maryland.
Mr. ROBERT McCLODY, of Illinois.
Mr. PAUL McCLOSKEY, of California.
Mr. JOSEPH McDADE, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.
Mr. CHARLES MOSHER, of Ohio.
Mr. HOWARD POLLOCK, of Alaska.
Mr. ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota.
Mr. OGDEN REID, of New York.
Mr. DONALD REIGLE, of Michigan.
Mr. HOWARD ROBISON, of New York.
Mr. DONALD RIEGLE, of Michigan.
Mr. FRED SCHWENDEL, of Iowa.
Mr. ROBERT STAFFORD, of Vermont.
Mr. WILLIAM STEIGER, of Wisconsin.
Mr. GUY VANDER JAGT, of Michigan.
The following Republican Members have previously introduced bills to provide voting representation:
Mr. JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama.
Mr. JOEL BROYHILL, of Virginia.
Mr. WILLIAM COWGER, of Kentucky.
Mr. GILBERT GUDE, of Maryland.
Mr. FRANK HORTON, of New York.
Mr. JAMES McCLURE, of Idaho.
Mr. ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota.
Mr. ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin.
Mr. CHARLES WIGGINS, of California.
Mr. LARRY WINN, of Kansas.
Mr. JOHN ZWACH, of Minnesota.
Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to

associate myself with the gentleman now in the well and with my colleague, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, in this effort.

It is something that should have long since been accomplished. It seems that the objective has always been so close and yet so elusive.

This session of the Congress should not go by without the submission of this measure.

Also, I want to commend the League of Women Voters on their 50th anniversary, and I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman. As has been said, this is an elusive resolution to have enacted in the Congress. However, I believe that we can take hope in the fact that the people of the District of Columbia did receive the right to vote in presidential elections, after years of effort.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the spirit is here and with the good firm support of the League of Women Voters, I am looking forward to the reporting of this resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that it should be necessary for the House of Representatives, supposedly the embodiment of the democratic system, to set aside time to defend the right of democracy in the Nation's Capital. It is ironic that the city which is known throughout the world as the symbol of freedom for all citizens to participate in their Government should be the only city in the Nation whose citizens have no right to elect their government.

Our democratic heritage is the birthright of every American citizen—except for the 850,000 residents of the Nation's Capital city. There are more American citizens in the District of Columbia than in 11 of the States, but these citizens have no representation in the House and in the Senate.

Citizens of the District bear all the responsibilities of citizenship in the United States—they serve in the Armed Forces, they pay taxes. We should not have to remind the United States that "taxation without representation is tyranny."

I am proud to join in this special order to indicate my continuing strong support for immediate passage of a constitutional amendment guaranteeing for once and for all the right of every American citizen to representation in the House and in the Senate of the United States. Over the past few years the Congress has taken broad action to assure that no American citizen shall be discriminated against on the basis of sex, color, race, or creed. It is time that we add "residence" to that list.

I want also to indicate my strong support for proposals which would provide self-government for the District of Columbia. As President Nixon said:

Good government, in the case of a city, must be local government.

The Congress simply has neither the time nor the interest to manage this city effectively and efficiently. The result of our failures has been confusion and a breakdown in responsible government.

The present city council-mayor system is certainly preferable to the previous administrations, but cannot in any way serve as an alternate to a city government elected by the people which it serves.

Each of these issues is important. It is imperative that this Congress act on each of them. It is essential, however, that they not be confused. While there is room for legitimate debate on the type of local governmental system which should be adopted for the District of Columbia, there should be no debate about the right of American citizens to be represented in the Congress. We can no longer tolerate this deprivation of American rights. We can no longer pretend to be a representative body when 850,000 of our citizens are brazenly denied representation.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend from my neighboring district in Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

It is hard for me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that in 1800 our predecessors in the sixth Congress of the United States stood in this Chamber and debated national representation for District of Columbia residents—the very issue that we are discussing here today, 170 years later.

I am also amazed that, since 1789, nearly 100 resolutions have been introduced calling for some form of national representation for these citizens of the United States, and that this body, and the other body, have been unresponsive to these efforts. How can it take 170 years to decide so basic an issue as franchise for American citizens and taxpayers?

Tomorrow, coinciding with the presentation by the League of Women Voters of a nationwide petition calling for full representation, I will introduce a resolution to provide for a Constitutional amendment to give full representation to District of Columbia residents. This resolution offers no more and no less than what is accorded every other American citizen—the representation of two Senators and the number of Members of Congress to which District of Columbia residents would be entitled as a body of 850,000 citizens.

I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is going too far, too fast. The attitude seems to prevail that we should give District of Columbia residents token representation and see how that works before going all the way. But has anyone thought about the 170 years it may take before a followup amendment extending full rights and privileges is approved by the Congress and the State legislatures?

For the benefit of those who link national representation with home rule for the District of Columbia, I would emphasize that there is no causal relationship between these two proposals. I am as much concerned as any other American who views the Nation's Capital as his second home that a Federal enclave be maintained. But voting representation has no relation to the District's unique position as the seat of the Federal Government. We are the only nation in the

world, Mr. Speaker, which does not bestow on the residents of its capital city this time-honored privilege and constitutionally guaranteed right of suffrage.

The people of the District must obey national laws, which they do not participate in making. They must pay national taxes without representation in the body which imposes and distributes these taxes. They send their sons to war without the voice of other Americans in deciding whether there shall be war. In short, they are governed without their consent and taxed without legislative representation.

As a member of the House District of Columbia Committee, I am daily made aware of the control which this committee, and its counterpart in the other body, have over the affairs of the Capital city. And this is as it should be if we adhere to the principle of a Federal enclave. But for specifically this reason the people of the District have even more of a right to be represented in Congress. The Congress is the real "city council" and "State legislature" of the District, yet the people of the District are denied any participation in the making of most of their local laws.

I think we have had ample proof of the necessity for maintaining a neutral, Federal enclave for conducting Government business. I would like to reiterate my strong feelings on the importance of this concept while taking this opportunity to discuss the bills which are pending before the District of Columbia Committee relating to local representation.

One of these bills, providing for a non-voting delegate to sit in the House of Representatives, is an interim measure to compensate for the full representation which can only be achieved through ratification of the constitutional amendment which I am proposing.

Two other measures are also pending before the committee: First, to establish a Charter Commission to study the type and form of government that is best suited to the District of Columbia as a Federal City and yet is still responsive to the needs of local residents; and, second, a "little Hoover Commission" to study the operations and efficiency of the District of Columbia government and the problems of conflicting and overlapping agencies and departments within that government.

President Nixon himself has said:

It should offend the democratic senses of this nation that the 850,000 citizens of its Capital, comprising a population larger than eleven of its states, have no voice in the Congress.

I urge the support of my colleagues to make it possible to negate that statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress a year ago, President Nixon said:

It should offend the democratic senses of this nation that the 850,000 citizens of its Capital, comprising a population larger than eleven of its states, have no voice in the Congress.

As a Member of the House whose democratic senses are indeed offended by this

situation, I have joined with several of my colleagues today in sponsoring resolutions that would provide representation for the citizens of our National Capital in the Congress. It is long past time to take this action and to make the full "rights and privileges" of citizenship a reality for those Americans who live in the District of Columbia.

The Constitution itself made no provision regarding a government for the Nation's Capital, aside from assigning responsibility for it to the Congress. Little thought was given, however, to the people who might live in that Capital or to what their citizenship status would be. Thus, where the Constitution makes reference to representation in the Congress, it speaks of "the States." Since the District is not a State, it has been excluded.

The Constitution does, however, make guarantees of the rights of citizenship. The very roots of our national beginnings are found in a strong commitment to one principle—that governments shall derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. One of the major immediate circumstances which fostered the Revolutionary War was taxation without representation. And yet, almost 200 years later we permit the continuation of governmental structures which govern without consent and which tax without representation.

There is nothing in the Constitution itself which indicates that the Founding Fathers intended that the residents of the Nation's Capital should not be represented in the Nation's Legislature. As our distinguished colleague from New York, Chairman **CELLER** of the Judiciary Committee, pointed out in a statement at the opening of hearings on the 23d amendment to the Constitution;

The denial (of representation and electoral voting) stems, apparently, from an oversight or omission on their part, for nowhere in our fundamental instrument is there an express prohibition against voting by residents of the District; it is just that the Constitution simply does not provide for the right.

Chairman **CELLER** further quoted James Madison who wrote in *The Federalist*, No. 43, that the residents of the new Federal city should "of course have their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them."

But that, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, has not been the case. While residents of the District were at one time able to vote for officials in their city government, that right was taken away when, in 1871, a territorial government was created for the District. That right has never been restored. And, while the 23d amendment has extended the right to vote in presidential elections to District inhabitants, they have never, since Congress first made provision for local government in Washington, D.C., in 1801, been accorded representation in the National Legislature. Today, since the Congress has the constitutional responsibility to establish a government for the city, and to enact the laws which govern it, this means that District residents are denied participation in electing both

those who represent them as national legislators, and those who represent them as local officials.

There is simply no argument which can satisfactorily justify or rationalize the continuation of this circumstance. There are many arguments—moral, constitutional, and otherwise—which justify, indeed which demand, action to rectify this circumstance.

Residents of the District have all the responsibilities of citizenship. They must obey national laws, pay national and local taxes, and serve in the Armed Forces. But, with the exception of the recently won right to vote in presidential elections, they do not have this most important privilege of American citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I personally favor a constitutional amendment which would accord the District of Columbia the full representation in both Senate and House to which it would be entitled if it were a State. But I feel that, more important than any one of the several specific proposals which have been made over the last several years and introduced here today, is a commitment on the part of the Congress to provide some kind of representation to the District's residents. I urge the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on these proposals at the earliest possible date. And I implore my colleagues to join in making a congressional commitment to action in this matter. At a time when all of our national institutions are being questioned and criticized throughout the country, the Congress could do more to ameliorate the legitimate concerns of citizens—especially those who live in the District. But we certainly cannot do less.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **GUDE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **CULVER**). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE THREAT TO WORLD PEACE IS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **CULVER**). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. **FISH**) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **FISH**. Mr. Speaker, a year ago in this Chamber I questioned our lack of response to terrorist actions and the guerrilla warfare waged against the State of Israel from bases in neighboring Arab States. I questioned a policy of training Arab military personnel at U.S. bases at the same time that we are selling jets to Israel and training Israel military personnel because of the obvious mounting Soviet threat in the Middle East.

A clear majority of the Congress, with which I joined 1 year ago on the occasion of Israel's 21st birthday, expressed traditional U.S. friendship for Israel. In a declaration in support of peace in the Middle East, the Congress reaffirmed its

conviction that peace could come only through direct Arab-Israel negotiations. We said:

The United States should oppose all pressures upon Israel to withdraw prematurely and unconditionally from any of the territories which Israel now administers.

Firmness in our friendship to Israel is thought by many of us to be basic to a resolution of the dispute between Israel and the Arab nations. A firmness which would encourage Islamic moderates, a firmness that would be a caution light to the Soviet Union. However, starting a few months ago, American diplomatic initiatives have raised doubts over the firmness of our friendship for Israel. These doubts were first felt by the Israeli themselves, and those of us who thought our objectives for Middle East peace were straight forward. Today it must be clear these doubts are shared by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, what has changed in the last year to warrant any deviation from the traditional American policy toward Israel? Arab intransigence and adherence to a myth that Israel does not exist is unchanged. Open support of terrorist bans by Arab States providing sanctuaries continues. As before, the Soviet Union stands to gain from the subjugation of Israel, the realization of a century-old dream of the czarist regimes of a sphere of influence in North Africa, the Middle East, and a gateway to the Indian Ocean.

The bipartisan majority of this body is unchanged in its support for the State of Israel. The declaration in support of peace in the Middle East" signed by 208 Members of the House of Representatives on January 19, 1970, clearly shows this. Reiterating that a lasting peace will come only by "direct, unhampered negotiations" between the parties of the conflict, the declaration continues:

It is not in the interest of the United States or in the service of world peace to create the impression that Israel will be left defenseless in the face of the continuing flow of sophisticated offensive armaments to the Arab Nations supplied by the Soviet Union and other sources. We thus adhere to the principle that the deterrent strength of Israel must not be impaired. This is essential to prevent full-scale war in the Middle East.

Developments that have occurred in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker, have not been in the interest of Israel, the United States, or the cause of peace. Violations of the cease-fire have multiplied. Red China has attempted to exploit the conflict, and France to profit by it. We have turned over Wheelus Air Force Base to the leftist regime of Libya. The Middle East fighting is entering a new phase. Egyptian troops, armed with the latest Russian equipment and backed by Russian technicians, are now carrying on a major offensive. New SAM missile systems have been deployed in Egypt, manned by a reported 1,500 technicians.

I have, in every way open to me on the floor of this Chamber and by direct communication with the executive branch, attempted to make clear my conviction that if Washington did not act, the danger of aggression would grow. Most important of all, an apparent lack

of firm support of Israel could lead to a Soviet Union miscalculation of American intentions in the Middle East. This would be a catastrophic error that could bring about a direct confrontation between the superpowers. For, despite a policy that lacks the firmness I advocate, I am confident the American people would not tolerate the extinction of the State of Israel.

A new—and in my opinion—a deeply disturbing event is taking place in the Middle East. There are persistent and apparently accurate reports of Soviet pilots flying Egyptian fighter planes over Egypt. Although I term this action "new" it is new only in the sense of being one more step in the chain of events which have been building steadily over the years and months.

It has been, and continues to be, my conviction that in the shell game of international politics, America has been gulled into keeping its attention riveted upon the empty shell of Vietnam, while the shell with the pea under it is in the Middle East.

During the years while we have poured our blood and treasure into the steaming jungles of Vietnam, the Soviet Union has placed its bet on the Middle East. While we have concentrated on Hue and Saigon and debated the honesty or corruption of the Thieu regime, the Soviet Union has placed a major fleet in the Mediterranean for the first time in its history and has developed major bases in Egypt. We have seen aggressive Arab nations become increasingly mortgaged to the Soviet Union—increasingly under Soviet influence.

The question of additional arms sales to Israel remains under active study. This is not good enough. Over the months it has remained my conviction that new contracts must be negotiated at once. The Phantom is a very complicated aircraft built to special Israel technical and electronic specifications. Time must elapse between placement of the order and the manufacturing of the planes. Instant armament does not exist. Advanced planning is essential in defense. It takes time, and time has not been on our side or on the side of Israel. While the Russians armed their allies, we have been evenhanded.

For while our policy seemed to be an attempt to placate the Arab nations—Russia was arming them. I have continually urged the backing of Israel as there has not been one single indication of Russia withholding arms from their radical Arab clients. On the contrary, while we vacillate there has been mounting evidence of a dangerous escalation in which the Soviet Union has deployed Russian missile battalions in Egypt to man new batteries of the latest SAM-3 ground-to-air missiles.

One thing was clearly obvious from the time of the announcement of the air lift of these new sophisticated SAM-3 missiles to Egypt. With these weapons, manned by Russian technicians, to guard Egyptian territory, Egyptian troops would be freed for attack on Israel forces and Israel cities. It also poses a dilemma for Israel. That, of course, is

the prospect—the probability of confronting Russian military forces manning these latest Soviet weapons systems.

It was an obvious possibility then—it is a reality today. Now, to this reality a new dimension of danger has been added with reports of Russian pilots actually flying missions over Egypt.

Israel's call for arms sale squarely meets the test of the Nixon doctrine of supplying arms for a nation fighting for its survival against Soviet supported aggressors—a nation, the existence of which is in the vital interest of the United States.

I will continue to press for approval of additional arms sought by Israel and for suitable credit terms to cover defense purchases. But the hour is late. In this 11th hour action must occur. Our friends must be reassured. Our enemies cannot be permitted to miscalculate. The empty stance of evenhandedness which has only assisted our enemies and disconcerted our friends must have an end, and an end very soon.

I urge that we demonstrate our friendship in a linkage between the United States and Israel. First conceived within the Republican leadership of Congress and presently under consideration, the plan involves establishment of a telephone "hotline" between Washington and Jerusalem. This would enable Prime Minister Golda Meir and President Nixon to clarify any misunderstandings directly and promptly, as friends should. It would be vital when new factors suddenly intrude into the conflict. In an emergency, the President could act instantaneously. The existence of such a hotline would reassure Israel and deter those who would drive a wedge between Israel and the United States.

This month we plan to commemorate the 22d anniversary of Israel's birth as a nation. It would be very fitting if on that occasion we would move forward in cementing the friendly relations of the two countries by the authorization of the telephone hotline.

We should make no mistake: the Soviet Union is moving in a very determined manner to penetrate the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Israel is a vital barrier to Russian ambitions to turn the Mediterranean into a Red Sea. Israel has not asked for a single American soldier. But she has asked to purchase arms for her own defense. We must, as I see it, move at once to maintain continuity in our commitment.

The threatening Soviet presence revealed now in Egypt should be met with an early affirmative response for the sale of additional aircraft to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the confusion caused by Vietnam, let us as a nation realize that firm adherence to our traditional friendship for Israel is the surest road to peace in the Middle East. Let us remain constant in our determination to work for direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict. Let us be fully aware that the Soviet Union is responsible for radicalizing the area, never losing a sense of history that tells us of the age-old Russian dream of expansion and domination of the Middle East.

America, as the free world's leader should be ever mindful that there is one truly democratic state in the Middle East. Israel is the bulwark preventing total Soviet and radical Arab domination of the area.

Israel is the target because Israel is an outpost of freedom. The prospect of defeat and subjugation of Israel, unconscionable as it is, must be faced. Defeat would undermine all American position in the Mediterranean and open Africa to Soviet colonization.

THE CAMBODIAN TRAGEDY

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has widened the war in Southeast Asia. Instead of confining it to South Vietnam and seeking to disengage, he has extended it to Cambodia and has attempted to justify this action with the curious logic that the way to withdraw our troops is by ordering them to invade an area which until April 20 has been outside the ambit of U.S. combat.

The President, without congressional sanction, authorized the invasion of American ground troops in Cambodia. Prior to that he provided logistical support and advisors for South Vietnamese forces which have crossed the border into Cambodia.

The extension of the war to Cambodia shows that the administration seeks not a negotiated settlement, but a military victory. The violation of the neutrality of Cambodia is contrary to international law, and to the principles of the United Nations, which has been disregarded throughout the Vietnam war.

What is more, the President's actions signal a basic misunderstanding of what is happening in America. The internal fabric of our society is becoming increasingly strained as the war continues and expands to all of Indochina. There is abundant evidence that the American people are opposed to continuing the war. Even many of those who may have believed at one time that a military solution was the answer have by now forsworn their earlier views. This evolution has several bases.

The escalating number of young Americans killed in the war—now totaling more than 41,000 slain in combat—has made the war steadily more intolerable.

In addition, the public has become increasingly aware that a war which has been labeled as an effort to save South Vietnam has in actuality virtually destroyed the fabric of South Vietnamese society. The infusion of American money, materiel, and personnel has wrenched a peasant society into the 20th century with a vengeance, leaving no time for those war weary people to learn to assimilate into their society the values and technology of ours—assuming they would even want to do so, given the opportunity to make a choice.

In physical terms, the countryside of South Vietnam has been ravaged. Vil-

lages stand deserted and destroyed; fields lie fallow and scorched.

Furthermore, the gap between rhetoric and reality has grown so great that even the most fatuous have become troubled. We are, we are told, fighting for democracy. We are fighting for a chance for the South Vietnamese people to choose their own way of life and government. Yet, the repressive rule of the Thieu-Ky regime flies in the face of the ideals we are supposedly protecting.

Still another source of the public's evolution to disavowal of military adventurism in Southeast Asia lies in the now increasingly perceived correlation between the crisis in our domestic society and the war in Vietnam. The expenditure of the human, physical, and monetary resources necessary to fight a massive, unending war abroad prevents undertaking the needed action at home to deal with urban decay, declining air and water quality, unremitting poverty, inadequate health services, and second-rate educational facilities.

What is more, the war has traumatized the Nation psychologically. Violence seems to be becoming endemic, reflecting the violence which has been exalted to national policy. Distrust is the response to dissent, and dissent does not breed dialog, but only sullen rejection by the administration. A crisis of the spirit pervades this Nation, and the war and repression nurture the crisis.

These are the results, then, that the war in Vietnam has achieved. Not victory, but defeat: defeat of the mind, defeat of the spirit, defeat of the proper processes of government, and defeat of the hopes and ideals of those who have had a vision of a better world—a vision destroyed by an obsession with automatic military response to mythical dangers and misperceived realities.

And now the President of a nation torn and divided has launched us on further warfare. All the ironies and tragedies and duplicities thus far experienced can only be multiplied by this action.

Perhaps the most telling revelation of the gap between administration view and the vision of those who oppose this unending war in Indochina is this statement from the President's April 30 address announcing the invasion of Cambodia:

I would rather be a one-term President and do what I think is right than to be a two-term President at the cost of seeing America become a second-rate power and see this nation accept the first defeat in its proud 190-year history.

Clearly the President is committed to military might and the exercise of that might as the gage of national greatness. Yet, have we not seen enough of killing; have we not sent enough young men off to fight a war created and directed, but not fought, by their elders, to realize that first rate and second rate are slogans of generals and that the real route to national greatness lies in peace? Have we not the humility, the greatness, and above all the wisdom to recognize and admit that we have made a mistake?

The President has justified his actions on the grounds that the incursion into Cambodia would protect American lives

which had been endangered by "increased enemy activity" in Cambodia and that it would "guarantee the continued success of our withdrawal and Vietnamization programs."

For months now the White House and the Pentagon have touted Vietnamization as the solution to the war in Vietnam. The theory is that, as the South Vietnamese become capable of taking over the war themselves, American troops will be taken out of Vietnam. Supposedly, the American troops which have already been withdrawn have been replaced by equally able South Vietnamese, without any diminution in the strength of the South Vietnam Government to withstand attack.

Therefore, there should be no increased danger from the Cambodia sanctuaries, which have existed for at least 5 years without an American invasion.

Only two conclusions can be drawn. Either the South Vietnamese replacements are not as capable as the troops they have replaced, or any increase in North Vietnam forces in the future will require the reentry of U.S. troops. If the former conclusion is correct, then Vietnamization is a sham. If the latter conclusion is correct, then there will be an unending U.S. presence in Vietnam. So the Cambodian invasion illustrates that Vietnamization is no answer, and that only a political settlement can resolve the war.

I want also to address the role of the Congress. Thus far, at least it can be said to Congress credit that it had little to say about the President's latest moves. I say "credit" because up until now the Congress has not acquiesced in the Cambodian venture, and thus does not yet bear the onus of responsibility.

That the Congress has had very little part in this latest military venture re-ounds only very slightly to its credit, however. The real test will be what action the Congress now takes to disavow and halt the latest escalation of the war.

But, before fully turning to the responsibilities of Congress, I want to address the fact which now more than ever emphasizes what role it should play—that is that the President's unilateral, unsanctioned action constitutes a fundamental crisis for our system of government. The Executive has clearly demonstrated its unresponsiveness to, and disregard for, the Congress. It is clear that Congress was not consulted and its sanction not sought.

Although the Constitution charges the Congress with the responsibility of declaring war, the Executive has undertaken to send American troops into a neutral country—not in an emergency situation where there is no time for consultation—but in circumstances clearly of gradual evolution. The war has exposed the relationship between the executive and legislative branches to the most severe stresses, and yet, the President has exacerbated them, rather than alleviated them.

However, in truth, Congress must in part bear the responsibility for the war in Vietnam, and the circumstances which have allowed us to come to this harrowing time. No matter how much some may de-

claim against the President's failure to obtain a declaration of war from the Congress in regard to our involvement in Vietnam, the fact is that Congress has acquiesced and appropriated whatever funds Presidents have requested for the war despite the opposition of a few of us.

Congress bears a share of the blame. And it thereby has demonstrated an unresponsiveness to the public comparable in kind, if not in degree, to that demonstrated by the Executive. More than being unresponsive, Congress has abdicated its powers. Congress does not act. It reacts. Congress has not put the Executive to the test of explaining its ventures. Instead it has acquiesced to the cant that "the President has all the facts" and that "the President knows what he is doing and must be supported."

The time has come when Congress has to—it must—reassert its authority. If the American precept of democracy is to prevail, if the people are to choose their future, if we are to have a chance to seek a better world, the Congress must say: "Enough." The Congress has compromised and acquiesced enough. The obligation is ours to act now and to end the tragedy in Southeast Asia.

PROFESSOR BLACKWELL'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker I was not able to be present when my distinguished friend, Prof. Lloyd P. Blackwell, addressed the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture recently when it was considering the McIntire-Stennis program, but I have obtained a copy of his address and would like to share it with you. As you will see, he has presented a learned, but brief, case for adequate funding of this important program. I would hope that each of you will take a moment to read his address in full. It is well worth your attention.

The address follows:

STATEMENT OF LOUISIANA FORESTRY ASSOCIATION SUBMITTED BY PROF. LLOYD P. BLACKWELL, OF LOUISIANA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Gentlemen, although I am head of the forestry department at Louisiana Polytechnic Institute and serve as Chairman of the South Central Region of the Association of State College and University Forestry Research Organizations, this Association. I was fortunate in being a charter member of that 2,000 member organization and have served as parliamentarian and a member of its board since its inception twenty-three years ago.

In this brief statement, I shall try to convey to you the interest of the Louisiana Forestry Association in adequate funding of the McIntire-Stennis Program, and why this resource based organization feels this program is vital to the future welfare of our country.

In recent weeks a great deal has been said about a factual report that was made by the Southern Forest Resource Analysis Committee. This report includes not only a history of the forest industry in the South but precise projections of the demands that will be

made on forestry by the year 2,000. The U.S. population is expected to exceed 310 million; the Gross National Product may well be more than \$2 trillion dollars; and the estimated per capita Gross National Product then, \$6450, implies a living standard which will demand more and better wood products.

National per capita consumption of paper and paper board is expected to reach 584 pounds per person by the end of this year. Although the U.S. presently uses more paper than any other nation, by the year 2000 it is estimated that our annual per capita consumption may approach 1000 pounds. Compared to our phenomenal consumption, Sweden and Canada have an annual per capita consumption of over 300 pounds. Russia uses about 45 pounds per person. As for China, where it all began with the discovery of the elementary papermaking process in the first century, the average consumption is estimated at no more than six pounds of paper per person each year.

Based on these estimates of per capita use and population growth, domestic requirements for pulpwood in the year 2000 may be as much as 172 million cords. Of this, it is estimated that 112 million cords will be produced in the South—three times as much as in 1968.

For the sake of brevity I shall not attempt to cite the parallel growth in demand for lumber, plywood and other wood products, but suffice it to say that the demand for homes cannot and will not be met without a tremendous increase in the availability of raw materials. Total timber cut in the South must be 2.3 times more than that harvested in 1968, and 5% less forest land area. And since the growth drain ratio in 1968 was dangerously close to balanced, it is obvious that the future resource supply depends largely on research developments and improved techniques. A continuation of existing practices, at the present pace, will be grossly insufficient.

In order to provide the needs of the nation, the forest industry must have the best technical information possible. More information must be provided by research scientists on tree genetics, tree improvement, site preparation, greater utilization of each tree, fire, insects and disease. Not only growth, but production and harvesting must be maximized. And while giving proper consideration to these subjects, we must maintain our constant vigil over forest recreation, wildlife and natural beauty.

Without federal assistance it would be futile to even consider an undertaking of this magnitude. Many federal programs will be called upon to provide the leadership and funding necessary, if we are to meet the challenges of the future. One such program, that may well play a vital role, is the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Federal-State Forestry Research Program.

This program, completing its sixth year of existence in 1969, is actively engaged in training our best young minds to conduct research. Through the first five years of this program, 442 graduate students were partially or entirely subsidized by the McIntire-Stennis fund. This number can be considered a significant contribution toward the number of future forest scientists needed to satisfy the demand of universities, public agencies and private industry.

An assessment made to estimate the number of students who have worked on McIntire-Stennis projects and who have graduated or otherwise reached the employment market, shows that almost 70 percent of these former students are involved in scientific endeavors. This, in itself, is evidence of the value of research to the graduate learning experience.

Universities and various Federal agencies are the largest employers of McIntire-Stennis

students. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior are the largest employers among the federal agencies. An impressive number of these students continue their academic experience at a more advanced graduate level.

As head of the forestry school at one of the colleges participating in this program, I can tell you that many of our colleges would be unable to attract instructors holding PHD degrees, if it were not for the availability of McIntire-Stennis Funds. Simply stated, we would not be able to offer the calibre of instruction essential to training research scientists that will provide technological information necessary for the forest industry to meet the demands of the nation in the year 2000, without adequate funding of the McIntire-Stennis program.

A number of imaginative and fruitful projects, pertinent to the time and to the problems, have begun to emerge from this program. The sustaining nature of the funds has permitted the universities to take a "program approach" to forestry problems that coincides with the appearance of program-oriented national plans for agricultural and forestry research. Thus, many McIntire-Stennis research projects are materially contributing important portions of larger research programs.

The administration's budget contains \$4,412,000 for McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Federal-State Forestry Research Program—an increase of \$627,000 above the previous year's budget. Believing this proposal is in the best interest of the nation, as well as that of the forest industry, the Louisiana Forestry Association hereby expresses its support of the Administration's proposal, and urges favorable consideration of it.

Thank you for allowing us to submit this statement.

HONORING OUR OBLIGATION TO PHILIPPINE VETERANS

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we acted on yesterday, H.R. 16739, will extend for 10 more years the authority of the Veterans' Administration to maintain offices in the Philippines. I heartily supported this legislation, and I am pleased it had the overwhelming support of this House. Not too long ago, I had the opportunity to visit the Republic of the Philippines and to observe some of the activities carried on there by the Veterans' Administration. From what I could see, the VA facilities in the Philippines provide the same efficient service for those entitled to benefits under our veterans' laws as that agency provides for our veterans here. This legislation is essential if that efficient service is to continue.

It is somewhat out of the ordinary for a U.S. agency other than the military or the State Department to maintain offices in foreign nations, but the relationship between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines is also somewhat out of the ordinary. For nearly 50 years, from 1898 to 1946, the Philippines were under our control. Just a few years before they were to be given the independence they had so long desired, the bombing of Pearl Harbor brought us—and the Philippines along with us—into World War II.

The important role the Philippines played in that war is well known. Our inability to defend them from the onslaught of the enemy was the occasion of one of the briefest, most famous, and best honored promises of all time: Gen. Douglas MacArthur's "I shall return." And in that war, many brave Philippine soldiers fought and suffered along with us. Quite properly, then, we have brought them and their dependents under the coverage of many of our veterans' benefit laws. To administer these benefits in a sensible and efficient manner, it is necessary for the Veterans' Administration to have offices in the Philippines. They have such offices there now, and this bill will permit those offices to stay in operation.

H.R. 16739 is temporary legislation granting authority for only 10 years. This is so because the Philippines are now an independent nation, and it is very likely that someday the number of VA beneficiaries there will cease to be large enough to justify continued Veterans' Administration presence. At present, however, there are in the Philippines an estimated 314,000 veterans of service recognized by our benefit laws. There are some 53,000 veterans or dependents of veterans in the Philippines who are now getting compensation or pension from the Veterans' Administration. VA expenditures in the Philippines this year will total over \$63 million which represents better than 60 percent of Veterans' Administration expenditures to all foreign countries. Clearly, it would be false economy to try to run an operation of this size without on-the-spot offices.

I am delighted with the enactment of H.R. 16739. It is merely a "housekeeping" bill—and a good one—but it is also a bill which is necessary for the proper fulfillment of a debt of honor to our Philippine veterans.

WESTERN STATES ANGUS FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, I take great pleasure to present this speech to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This speech is by Mr. J. C. Holbert, Bettendorf, Iowa. Mr. Holbert is a former educator from the Iowa State University and today is a very successful farmer and one of the largest beef producers in the country. He is presently vice president of the Angus Association, and has been on the executive committee of the Livestock Association for 15 years of this association. Mr. Holbert is a highly respectable citizen of my district, a very successful farmer, and has been one who has had a broad viewpoint and has had great faith in making America great. He is a citizen who never shuns his responsibility of making America what it is today.

His speech, given before the Western States Angus Forum, is worthy of thought and pondering and I, therefore, place it in the RECORD with the hope that everyone will take the time to read this superb speech:

WESTERN STATES ANGUS FORUM

The productivity of free men in the field of agriculture is a vivid example that agriculture cannot be harnessed. From U.S. News and World Report, April 20, 1970 I quote, "Russia's standard of living is one of the lowest among industrialized countries. The Soviet Union ranks 21st in per capita gross national product—the same position the country held 50 years ago. Collectivization of agriculture has resulted in one of the world's most inefficient farming systems—dramatized this past winter by acute shortages of meat and even flour." This same issue points out that 45% of the Russian people are on the farms. Compare this with the 5% who live on farms in the United States. To say that the Russians have not been successful in many scientific fields would be ridiculous. Their success in space programs and their military advances in jets and submarines perhaps equal ours or in some respects surpass us. Agriculture production has been and will continue to be the weakest spot in communism. Let's take a hard look at our own agriculture. What commodities are the most in trouble? Wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco. All are subsidized.

We Angus breeders like to devote our energy and time trying to raise a better calf, build a better herd, acquire more land, or build a finer home. We don't want to spend our time in politics or government. We'd rather let the other fellow do it. That day is over if we intend to maintain free agriculture. We will have to fight for what we believe and fight logically. The Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has submitted a report to the full Committee recommending regulation of the beef cattle industry like a public utility and jeopardizing the Meat Import Act of 1964. The Subcommittee's report, entitled "Federal Responsibility For Retail Price Increases For Beef," is a result of the hearing conducted Oct. 7-9, 1969.

There are many people in government who would like to regulate the production and distribution of food in the United States. They would like to see a statutory step taken toward the complete regulation of the cattle and beef industry. Why does beef seem to come under the quickest and most severe criticism of any food product? First, it is the favorite food of Americans. It is almost a necessity for the pleasure and well-being of the American people. Over 60% of the meals ordered by people dining out are beef. Second, it is a free enterprise and consciously or unconsciously it is the envy of the bureaucratic system.

There are those in government and out of government who would destroy our beef industry by throwing wide open the door to beef imports. We have been very liberal with other countries while the American producers, processors and merchandizers have worked to increase beef consumption by building a better product. The consumption of beef in the United States has increased in the last twenty years from 63 lbs. to 113 lbs. per capita. We are sharing this increased consumption with our neighbors because their import quotas go up as our consumption goes up. Countries who export meat to the United States have not increased their per capita consumption as consistently as we have yet they continue to want more of our market. Is it not fair for us to say, "Feed your own first?" The wages paid for farm labor in the United States are four or five times those paid by the countries who export meat to us. Foreign countries I have visited have no tax on cattle while we have five or six dollars on every head over a year old in Iowa. The beef cattle industry under free enterprise has paid its bills and provided the American people with high quality product at reasonable prices.

The other subject which I would like to discuss with you is beef grading. Last fall the White House Conference panel on "Food Quality" made the following recommendations concerning grading:

1. "Meat grading standards should reflect the nutritional value of food."

2. Present USDA meat grades should be modified "to re-establish finish as a quality factor, and carcasses which are excessively fat should be down-graded."

3. Meat grading standards should be modified "to remove conformation as a quality grading factor, and the standards should allow leaner animals to qualify for higher grades."

If the number one recommendation was put into effect, in my opinion it would destroy the present federal grading system. Grading beef on its nutritional value is not practical or workable. Certainly we have not come to the position of trying to govern the eating habits or pleasure of our people. Are we to say that General Motors should manufacture only Chevrolets? Should Ford manufacture only Fords or Chrysler only Plymouths? The second recommendation I assume means to continue to down-grade U.S. Choice and to eliminate marbling. The third recommendation has two parts. One, to remove conformation and the other, to allow leaner animals to qualify for higher grades which is practically a duplication of number two.

At this point I think it is important to raise the question, "Who would like to see the present system of federal grading changed?"

First, the crusaders who find it advantageous from the standpoint of publicity to try to make changes on the basis of protecting the American consumer. This is one of the favorite present-day gimmicks of some politicians who join with the crusaders. I would like to ask this group, "Why not tell the American consumer when he is buying imported fresh meat?" The consumer knows when he buys French perfume, Scotch whiskey, Swiss watches and other commodities when it is advantageous to the country exporting the product. If fresh foreign meat was labeled as such, in my opinion the consumption of it would drop fifty percent because it comes from carcasses which under our system of grading would not grade over standard.

Second, the producers of a large, heavy-boned type of animal which will not grade U.S. Choice under the present system without excess finish, excess weight and a long period of feeding.

Third, people who produce young cattle and market them at light weights. Many times these animals will not grade U.S. Choice because of lack of marbling unless fed a concentrated ration from calf weight. Such a feeding method is not economical or practical in Iowa and I doubt if it is in Texas or California.

Fourth, foreign exporters of beef to the United States would like to bring our quality down to their standards.

Five years ago we had a change by which the standards were lowered and the grade widened for U.S. Choice. In my opinion that spread is too great but the change has been fairly well accepted. To change the qualifications of U.S. Choice again would be detrimental to the beef trade. The increase in consumption proves that the product is accepted and to down-grade it would be unfair to the consumer and unfair to the man who produces quality cattle. *We will never sell more of a product by producing an inferior product.* If we continue to down-grade our beef the doors will open wider for imports which are much inferior to our beef. By dropping our standards we will also open the door for meat substitutes. *If one does away with*

the flavor, the juiciness and the tenderness of beef much will be done to destroy its market. These factors are found only in well-marbled, reasonably finished beef. We must face up to this fact. Beef is not a tender meat when it is not finished. The muscle of a beef is tougher than any other domestic animal unless it is finished. We are not advocating overly-finished cattle. We need a small percent of prime cattle to take care of hotel and restaurant trade for people demanding a superior product and this fact in itself points up that beef is the number one choice of those who demand the best and have the money to pay for it.

If USDA lowers marbling requirements and disregards conformation for U.S. Choice I would strongly favor discontinuing government grading of beef. Let the packer buy the kind of cattle he can sell. Let him put his own grade on them. Let the chain stores develop their own beef specialists and put their own house brand in the counter. The Angus Breed accepts this challenge. We are not afraid. Quality beef will be in greater demand because competition will be in the open. The people who want to produce extra large, heavy-boned, big type cattle or young-aged cattle will have an equal chance in the market place. What more should be asked of a free enterprise system? Some will holler, "Chaos". May I point out that there has never been any federal grading of pork. Who will say the pork producer does a poorer job of marketing his hogs than we do our finished cattle? Have you ever asked yourself why we have federal grading of beef? I've often wondered. Who benefits most from it?

I am proud of the beef industry because of its fiber and spirit. I am proud of our country where we can express different opinions and still be friends and still be free.

MAJOR IMMIGRATION REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are four major problem areas in the Immigration and Nationality Act which demand immediate attention. On April 30, I introduced H.R. 17370, a bill to offer practical solutions to these problems and to bring the Immigration and Nationality Act into line with our avowed immigration policy objectives. These objectives—reuniting families and preference for aliens with skills—were set forth in the progressive 1965 amendments to the act.

The 1965 amendments were the product of an executive communication presented to the Congress in 1964 which contained safety features to insure a reasonable and fair transition from the old national origins system to the new system. However, some of these safety features were compromised out of existence and the result has frustrated our aim at a fair and equitable immigration policy.

My bill has four principal features: First, a worldwide quota on immigration excepting Mexico and Canada; two, flexible provisions for refugees; three, a realistic preference system; and four, elimination of the backlog in the fifth preference for brothers and sisters.

The present law sets a limit of 120,000 on the number of immigrants who may enter the United States from the independent countries of the Western Hemi-

sphere. This ceiling is a naked ceiling with no provision for a preference system to reunite families or to welcome aliens with much needed skills and there is no distribution of numbers among the several countries. Furthermore, the lack of an orderly procedure for visa issuance tends to impair our relationship with contiguous countries—Canada and Mexico. In recognition of the command undefended borders we share with these countries, it is only logical that we, in the spirit of cooperation and understanding, accord Canada and Mexico a special status, in other words, a nonquota status.

My bill establishes an annual ceiling of 250,000 immigrants on a worldwide basis, excepting only our neighbors Canada and Mexico, and other defined special immigrants who have enjoyed a nonquota status. Each foreign country will be allowed to send up to 25,000 qualified immigrants to the United States annually rather than 20,000 as prescribed under present law.

The next problem area involves the admission of refugees. Since World War II, the Congress has enacted several major statutes authorizing the admission of refugees, but it was not until the 1965 amendments that a refugee provision became part of the permanent law. Although this provision was laudable, a few moments after it became effective it was obvious that this provision was inadequate. Present law provides for the annual admission of up to 10,200 refugees from Communist-controlled areas and refugees uprooted by natural calamity or military action. The position of the United States as a world leader demands that we, with other countries of the free world, be in a position to offer asylum to the oppressed. We must be able to take quick, effective, and affirmative action to permit the orderly entry into the United States of a fair share of refugees seeking freedom. We must uphold America's tradition as an asylum for the oppressed.

Before this current fiscal year was half over, the 10,200 numbers set forth in the law for refugees were exhausted mainly because of tragic happenings in Czechoslovakia and an expulsion policy in Poland. Many of us, members of the Committee on the Judiciary, joined with Chairman EMANUEL CELLER in imploring the Attorney General to exercise his parole authority in the Immigration and Nationality Act to keep the doors for asylum open to refugees. In agreeing with this request, the Attorney General advised the committee that legislation in the refugee field was urgently needed and that the general parole authority would be invoked for refugees only temporarily. The refugee provisions in H.R. 17370 are not new. They are similar to provisions contained in H.R. 9112, by Chairman CELLER, which I and other Members cosponsored last year and also similar to provisions supported by previous administrations.

My bill amends section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new section which authorizes the Attorney General to parole into the United States refugees physically present in a country which is not Commu-

nist-dominated or Communist-occupied without geographical or numerical limitation. Provision is also made for the adjustment of status to that of permanent resident for such refugees. The definition of "refugee" covers persons fleeing from any Communist-controlled country or area or from any other country due to persecution or fear thereof and who are unwilling because of such persecution or fear to return to their country or area. Persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations whether within their own country or otherwise are covered.

This global authority in the absence of restrictions as to the number of refugees who could be accepted would provide maximum flexibility in the pursuit of humanitarian and foreign policy objectives. The United States would be better able to cope with any arising emergency or other type of refugee problems in a manner consistent with broader objectives.

The parole of refugees, under this amendment, is conditioned upon a determination by the Attorney General after consultation with the Secretary of State, that such parole would promote U.S. interests. This is consistent with the terms of U.S. legislation governing the use of funds for assistance in behalf of various categories of refugees—Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-510).

The current preference system for immigrants presents the third major problem area. The percentage of numbers available under each preference is based upon the average number of immigrants admitted under each preference over the years preceding the 1965 amendments. But demand fluctuates and patterns of immigration frequently change. Consequently, the existing rigid system of percentage is not in focus with the need for visas to serve the best interests of the United States. The third preference category—members of the professions or persons of exceptional ability in the sciences and arts—is oversubscribed and only those beneficiaries of third preference petitions filed prior to July 8, 1968, are being considered for visa issuance. Likewise, the sixth preference—skilled or unskilled workers in short supply—is oversubscribed back to October 1969. The use of numbers for the higher preferences exhausts any possibility for nonpreference or new seed immigrants to get visas to this country.

H.R. 17370 revises the order of preferences and establishes four new preferences. The first preference provides 62,500 visas for the spouse, or unmarried son or daughter of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence or to any qualified immigrant who is the married son or daughter of a citizen of the United States, or the unmarried brother or sister of a citizen of the United States.

The second preference provides that up to 62,500 visas shall be available to members of the professions or persons of exceptional ability in the sciences and arts. To insure fair distribution, not more than 5,000 visas will be available to any one country under this preference.

The third preference provides up to

62,500 visas, plus unused visas from the first and second preference, for skilled workers whose skills are needed in the United States.

The fourth preference allocates 37,500 visas, plus any numbers left over from the first three preferences, for religious workers, aliens who will not seek employment in the United States or who do not have to earn a living, and investors.

Then, 25,000 visas, plus any unused visas from the first four preferences, are reserved for nonpreference immigrants. Of these available numbers, 25 percent are reserved for persons under 25 years of age—the new seed immigrants.

In order to give this new system a chance to work, I have also provided that any beneficiary of a current fifth preference petition, brothers and sisters of a U.S. citizen, which was filed prior to July 1, 1970, shall be considered as a special immigrant and thus not subject to any numerical limitation.

I must point out at this time that the transition from the national origins concept to the first-come, first-served concept was predicated upon a reasonable phaseout period which was intended to alleviate backlogs then existing in certain preferences. Unfortunately, this just did not happen and the fifth preference particularly has continued to be oversubscribed. The continuation of this oversubscription has unfavorably affected the sixth preference and in some countries, such as Italy, sixth preference numbers will never become available without remedial legislation.

This proposed preference system offers flexibility and is in concert with an equitable immigration policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress over the years has taken giant steps to advance fairness and reasonableness in our immigration policy. The 1965 repeal of the national origins concept for selecting immigrants was a magnificent advancement. However, we are obligated to seek ways to perfect the law so that the best interests of the United States in foreign policy and domestic policy can be served.

A section-by-section analysis of H.R. 17370 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 17370—AMENDMENT TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Section 1. "Immediate Relatives" are reclassified as "special immigrants" and unmarried sons or daughters of United States citizens are included in this nonquota category.

Natives of countries contiguous to the United States and the spouse and child of such alien are accorded special immigrant classification.

Other subsections of 101(a)(27) are renumbered accordingly.

Section 2. A worldwide ceiling on immigration of 250,000 is established exclusive of natives of Mexico and Canada and other defined "special immigrants."

Section 3. The total number of immigrant visas available to any single foreign state shall not exceed 25,000 in any fiscal year (present limit is 20,000).

Section 4. The number of immigrant visas available to a dependent area of a foreign state shall not exceed two percent (500) of per-country limitation (present law is one percent or 200).

Section 5. New preference system is created:

1st Preference: 25% of 250,000 visas shall be available to the spouse, unmarried son or daughter of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or the married son or daughter of a United States citizen or the unmarried brother or sister of a United States citizen.

2nd Preference: 25% of the 250,000 visas shall be available to qualified members of the professions, or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or arts, provided that commencing July 1, 1970, the total number of immigrant visas available under this preference to natives of any single foreign state shall not exceed 5,000 in any fiscal year, and provides that no person qualified for admission under this preference shall be eligible for any other preference except by reason of relationship to a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

3rd Preference: 25% of the 250,000 visas plus any visas not required for preferences 1 and 2 shall be available to qualified immigrants who by training and experience are capable of performing skilled labor not of a temporary or seasonal nature for which there is a shortage in the United States.

4th Preference: 15% of the 250,000 plus any visas not required for the first three preferences are available to (a) aliens who have at least two years preceding application for a visa been employed principally by religious organizations and are seeking entry to the United States to continue such employment; (b) aliens who establish that they will not seek employment in the United States or will not have to earn a living; (c) aliens who seek to enter the United States to invest capital, services, or techniques.

Nonpreference: 10% of the 250,000 visas plus any unused numbers from the first four preference categories are reserved for any other applicants who are not able to qualify for a preference. In addition, 25% of whatever is available to this category is reserved for persons under 25 years of age who would be exempt from a labor certification.

Section 6. The petition procedure to accord preference status and special immigrant status is amended to conform with amendments in this bill.

Section 7. The Attorney General is given discretion to admit an alien to the United States who, through no fault on his part, arrives at a port of entry with an erroneous visa classification.

Section 8. Technical amendments to conform section 212(a)(14) to the new preference system.

Section 9. A new refugee system is created without a numerical limitation, but which can be discontinued by a resolution of either body of Congress. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of State and in order to promote United States interests, is authorized to parole certain defined refugees into the United States. After two years, the amendment provides for retroactive adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident. Applicability of the section is directed at refugees from Communism, refugees from persecution, and those victims of natural calamity or military operations. Furthermore, the Attorney General must report to the Congress semi-annually on the progress of this authority.

Section 10. Present law provides a waiver of exclusion for mental retardation if the alien is the spouse, unmarried son or daughter, minor unmarried adopted child of a United States citizen or lawfully admitted permanent resident. This amendment includes aliens who have a mental defect within the waiver possibility.

Section 11. Section 245 is amended to permit adjustment of status in the United States for all qualified aliens except aliens

from countries contiguous to the United States and from adjacent islands.

Section 12. Obsolete sections of the Act of October 3, 1965 are repealed.

Section 13. Any alien eligible for fifth preference status on the basis of a petition filed prior to July 1, 1970, and who has retained the status accorded by the petition, and the spouse and children of such alien, shall be documented as special immigrants.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The availability of books in America is often taken for granted. In 1966 there were 27 new titles published per million people, compared with the world figure of 137 per million.

OPPOSITION TO ACTION IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, earlier I advised the House of my strong disagreement with the action of President Nixon in sending American troops into Cambodia.

A reading of several news reports in the press has added to my conviction that the President is pursuing a grossly improper course. Not only has the President embarked on a course which is likely to lead to greatly increased American casualties and to the disruption of the negotiations in Paris, but he also has placed American forces in a situation which is leading to the commission of new outrages against civilians in many sections of Cambodia.

The President's action I am afraid will inevitably lead to the further disenchantment of the people of Southeast Asia with the Government of the United States. The outrages of warfare will drive the people of Cambodia into the hands of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Communists.

The news items to which I refer substantiate my concerns. In an Associated Press report it is stated:

American ground troops who in Vietnam had trouble separating friend from foe among the civilian population now have a whole new set of problems in sorting out Cambodians. U.S. air strikes have partially destroyed the plantation town of Mimot. Villages are being burned. Thousands of civilians are fleeing for their lives.

Later in the same report it is stated:

The pattern of Vietnam is being repeated. The American troops are putting the torch to homes because they may be useful to the Communists. Livestocks are shot for the same reason. Palls of smoke rose over the region yesterday. Clusters of homes smoldered.

"I had orders to burn everything," said one young tank commander whose force had just driven through two hamlets and burned both of them.

Later in the same report it is stated:

The scores of thousands of people in the operational area are caught between the Americans on one side and the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese on the other. Another factor is the Khmer Rouge, the Cambodian equivalent of the Viet Cong.

"All this action could drive the Vietnamese population of the rubber plantations into the ranks of the Viet Cong and the Cambodian people into the arms of the Khmer Rouge, unless we take special care," commented one knowledgeable observer.

Mr. Speaker, there is little if any indication that the American forces or the South Vietnamese forces are taking "special care."

I submit the text of four news items from the Washington Star of May 4, 1970, for inclusion at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RAIN AND CIVILIANS: TWO DILEMMAS FACE DRIVE INTO CAMBODIA

(By Peter Arnett)

WITH TASK FORCE SHOEMAKER, CAMBODIA.—After only five days in the new war theater of Cambodia, American troop commanders are faced with two major dilemmas.

One of them is military: Premature monsoon rains have washed out an important forward airstrip, and the hundreds of armored vehicles spearheading the American thrust are starting to bog down in some places.

The other is political: American ground troops who in Vietnam had trouble separating friend from foe among the civilian population now have a whole new set of problems in sorting out the Cambodians. U.S. air strikes have partially destroyed the plantation town of Mimot. Villages are being burned. Thousands of civilians are fleeing for their lives.

TWO INCHES OF RAIN FALL

The imminence of the monsoon rains is of great worry to the operational commanders. Tactical planners apparently hoped for another six weeks of cloudless skies, but 2 inches of rain fell yesterday just over the border in South Vietnam's War Zone C, turning the red clay to instant mud.

"The people who advised President Nixon to start something like this at this time of the year must be the same ones who advised him on candidates for the Supreme Court," said one U.S. divisional planning officer. "Our problems mount every time another drop falls."

A few minutes later the clouds burst, and the rain came down in sheets for four hours.

The armored force of more than 700 tanks and tracked vehicles constitutes most of the American effort inside Cambodia. Vietnam's mud has been a more formidable obstacle to American armor than the Viet Cong, and possibly because of the impending monsoon, American forces are dashing rapidly through the Cambodian countryside.

Too rapidly, some observers think. "Some of these tank commanders are still fighting World War II," complained a supply officer who has to get gasoline and spare parts up to them. "They are so busy reaching their objectives, they must be passing everything by."

This rapid movement is one reason why the civilian population has become involved. The Fishhook region, which the Americans entered because they thought it contained the headquarters for all Communist activities in South Vietnam, is only lightly populated. Then the Americans pushed north to Route 7 and beyond, and now they are among rubber plantation hamlets and farms.

The pattern of Vietnam is being repeated. The American troops are putting the torch to homes because they may be useful to the

Communists. Livestock are shot for the same reason. Palls of smoke rose over the region yesterday. Clusters of houses smoldered.

"I had orders to burn everything," said one young tank commander whose force had just driven through two hamlets and burned both of them.

Less deliberate destruction is visible in the heavier populated area around the Mimot Plantation, up to a week ago the largest functioning rubber plantation in Indochina.

But the inevitable has happened to the sprawling town of Mimot. U.S. air strikes were ordered on the town because North Vietnamese troops were reported inside.

"The whole place is blown away," said a helicopter pilot as he flew over it.

American ground troops may be ordered to take the town, and this would mean more destruction.

American commanders have blocked Route 7 in two places. One is at Firebase North, which the Americans set up about 12 miles up the road from Mimot. American troops riding helicopters range 20 miles farther into the country on reconnaissance forays.

The scores of thousands of people in the operational area are caught between the Americans on one side and the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese on the other. Another factor is the Khmer Rouge, the Cambodian equivalent of the Viet Cong.

"All this action could drive the Vietnamese population of the rubber plantations into the ranks of the Viet Cong and the Cambodian people into the arms of the Khmer Rouge, unless we take special care," commented one knowledgeable observer.

Special teams of public affairs experts were formed to operate in Cambodia, but they were given low priority for transportation. One such team said yesterday it had been waiting on the helicopter strip at Quan Loi for two days; ammunition was going first.

Major problems of identifying and feeding refugees can be expected to shape up in the near future as U.S. forces push farther into Cambodia. More American forces are reported ready to go into other border areas, and they will encounter thousands more Cambodians.

More destruction can be expected particularly if the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese continue to occupy Cambodian towns on the major highways running near Vietnam. The American and Vietnamese troops intend to make full use of their vast firepower.

"When we move, we move with everything, and the artillery and air come along with us," said one armored officer proudly.

The Vietnamese troops are eager to push deeper into Cambodia. When Lt. Gen. Do Cao Tri, commander of the biggest Vietnamese task force, linked up with the Cambodian army at Svay Rieng, he offered to push on through to Phnom Penh 100 miles away. The offer was not accepted.

TANKS LEADING CAMBODIAN DRIVE

SAIGON.—Scores of American tanks and armored personnel carriers continued the U.S. drive into Cambodia today, uprooting trees on the biggest rubber plantation in Indochina and destroying villages to deny them to the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

U.S. planes bombed the town of Mimot yesterday after an American helicopter was fired on. An officer who flew over after the raid said the town was "pretty well blown away."

There was no way to tell how many civilian casualties there have been, but nearly 1,000 Cambodian refugees have fled into South Vietnam.

Associated Press photographer Charles Ryan reported that the area through which the U.S. 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment is driving, apparently was bombed months ago despite previous insistence by the U.S. Command in Saigon that American bombers have

never made offensive attacks in Cambodia until last week.

"Many areas were either bombed or shelled and burned out long ago," Ryan said. "In some areas grass has started growing back over the scarred earth."

SOME 109 REDS KILLED

Spokesmen for the U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division said today that 109 North Vietnamese troops were killed in Operation Fishhook during the past 24 hours, 104 of them by bombers and rocket-firing helicopter gunships.

Ten Americans were reported killed and 38 wounded. The American troops continued to uncover large caches. Spokesmen said air cavalrymen yesterday found 5,000 new SKS and AK47 rifles, 750 gallons of gasoline in drums, 121,000 pounds of rice, 23 supply trucks, 200 bicycle tires, 150 truck tires and 450 gallons of oil.

Operation Fishhook and the companion South Vietnamese drive into the Parrot's Beak area of Cambodia to the south have resulted in 1,897 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong killed and 347 captured, according to the U.S. and South Vietnamese commands. Allied casualties so far are 14 Americans and 151 South Vietnamese killed, and 47 Americans and 598 South Vietnamese wounded.

The U.S. Command added two battalions of air cavalrymen—about 800 men—to the sweep in the Fishhook region about 80 miles northwest of Saigon. This raised the total ground force to nearly 11,000 men, including 8,800 Americans, about 2,000 South Vietnamese and a company of Cambodian mercenaries recruited in South Vietnam and trained by the Americans.

The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong struck back in South Vietnam with a new "highpoint," a sharp increase in shelling and ground attacks. There were 90 reported Saturday night and 54 last night. One American was reported killed and 31 wounded.

One of the heaviest attacks hit Chu Lai, the headquarters of the Americal Division on the coast 50 miles south of Da Nang. Fifty-seven rockets slammed into the installation, the biggest rocket barrage against a major U.S. base in more than a year. The U.S. Command said several Americans were wounded and damage was light.

Thirty-five miles southwest of Da Nang, fighting around Hiep Duc slackened somewhat, but North Vietnamese troops still held a small section of the town of 6,000 which they partially overran April 30.

CAMBODIA UNSURE OF EFFECTS OF ALLIED DRIVE AGAINST REDS

(By David Van Phaagh)

PHNOM PENH.—Confronted with what is described as a "human wave" of attacking Vietnamese Communist 37 miles away, this still calm eye in a spreading hurricane of war appeared unsure today whether the U.S.-South Vietnamese operation in Cambodia will help or hurt the new government.

A Cambodian military spokesman reported two "human waves" roughly estimated at 1,000 North Vietnamese regulars captured the village of Neuk Loeng on the east bank of the Mekong after a night of fighting yesterday against Cambodian troops.

Sporadic fighting was reported continuing. The government claimed the ferry across the broad river still was in its hands and there was no Communist attempt to cross the Mekong to route 1 southeast of the capital.

It was unclear whether the Communists are driving westward to Phnom Penh after leaving their supply bases in Svay Rieng the Parrot's Beak and regrouping, and if all three large modern ferry boats at the river key crossing were saved.

A few miles north of the ferry crossing,

Banam was attacked and its bridge over a Mekong tributary was destroyed.

The regime of Gen. Lon Nol reiterated in the official press today its neutrality and need for aid.

Informed sources here believe, on the basis of reports they have received, that most of the Communist forces escaped from their traditional sanctuaries after giving up their established supply and rest areas on the border.

The question starting to bother the government, according to qualified sources, is whether the Communists are moving north toward Laos or west in a possible bid to endanger this quiet capital.

If the Communist forces succeed in crossing the Mekong, informed quarters here believe the whole military picture would change drastically and raise the possibility that the U.S.-South Vietnamese intervention will reach as far as Phnom Penh.

ATTACKS CALLED RETALIATORY

The Nixon administration maintains that new air raids against North Vietnam, like the attack by U.S. ground forces into Cambodia, are not an escalation of the war in Southeast Asia.

Officials said the weekend sorties across the demilitarized zone were limited to retaliatory bombing of air defense sites that had fired on unarmed U.S. reconnaissance planes.

"Protective reaction" is the way Vice President Spiro T. Agnew called the action yesterday.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers, saying much the same thing, called the bombing "suppressive fire."

Although some nearby supply dumps may have been hit in the air raids, the officials said, there has been no major change in the policy set in 1968 when U.S. bombings north of the DMZ were halted.

"UNDERSTANDING" CITED

According to the administration, an "understanding" reached with Hanoi when the bombing was stopped provided that American reconnaissance flights would continue over North Vietnam without fear of ground fire.

Agnew denied the air attacks and the Cambodia incursion were efforts to increase war pressure on the North Vietnamese and Viet-Cong in an effort to force them to negotiate for peace.

Rather, Agnew said, the moves are designed to protect the security of American units in South Vietnam—the position set by President Nixon Thursday in disclosing the U.S. incursion into Cambodia.

But North Vietnam said today that U.S. air raids on North Vietnam during the weekend violated the American commitment to stop bombing North Vietnam which led to the Paris peace talks.

North Vietnamese spokesman Nguyen Thanh Lo, however, would not say at a news conference in Paris whether his government would break off the talks or whether his delegation would attend the session of the conference scheduled for Wednesday.

Thursday is the usual meeting day, but this Thursday is Ascension Day, a holiday in France.

"In escalating a further step by bombarding many populous areas of North Vietnam," he said, "the Nixon administration has violated the U.S. government's own commitment to stop completely the bombing of North Vietnam. The Nixon administration must shoulder the entire responsibility for the consequences deriving from its acts."

"These new acts of aggression seriously affect the Paris conference on Vietnam." But he would go no further than that.

Agnew maintained yesterday that the enemy was attempting to extend its supply

and sanctuary areas used by its troops fighting in South Vietnam to the Gulf of Siam which seriously threatens the security of American forces and the President's policy of withdrawing U.S. troops from the war zone.

"We know we can't win a land war in Southeast Asia, that's perfectly obvious," he said in explaining the limited objectives of the Cambodian action.

"We also know that Vietnamization is the proper course to pursue to disinvolve American fighting men from this war while at the same time preventing the continuing incursions of the Communists into areas where the people don't want them," Agnew said on the CBS program "Face the Nation."

In a later statement, he said the Cambodian drive was not an effort to destroy the enemy elements. "I don't think it is a knockout blow at all, it's simply to provide for the orderly progress of the Vietnamization program."

O'BRIEN CRITICAL

The political ramifications of Nixon's policy change continue to mount.

Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien said yesterday the U.S. position "means, in effect, that the American policy of disengagement has ended."

Agnew made it clear, O'Brien said, "that the administration intends to consolidate its territorial gains. This means the establishment of a new front in Cambodia in the prolonged ground war which the vice president himself admitted we cannot win."

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was called into session today "to determine the members'" wishes concerning Nixon's invitation for a White House meeting tomorrow on the situation.

The committee, headed by Arkansas Democrat J. William Fulbright, had asked for a rare face-to-face meeting with Nixon, who responded by inviting the panel to join with the House Foreign Affairs Committee in a session with him.

Some Senate committee members, including Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield and the panel's senior GOP member, indicated they wouldn't attend such a joint meeting.

GORE TO ATTEND

But as the committee session began, Sen. Albert Gore, D-Tenn., said he plans to attend the meeting.

"He's the only President we have. Our country is at war. I shall be there," Gore said. He noted, though, that the committee "had hoped for a quiet, consultative exchange with the President" rather than a larger gathering.

Gore asserted that the "invasion" of Cambodia indicated that the administration "realizes that Vietnamization has failed."

"If it had involved mutual withdrawal, it possibly could have succeeded," he said. But, Gore said, "a unilateral withdrawal" by the United States, while enemy forces were building up in and near South Vietnam, "could (only) mean an end to Vietnamization."

Sen. George D. Aiken, R-Vt., said, "You can hardly have a conference with 50 people, especially when 35 of them are not involved in the constitutional prerogatives."

Aiken, a backer of Nixon's previous Vietnam policies, set the tone for the administration's political problems arising from the Cambodian involvement when he said the Republicans will have hard going at the polls as a result.

CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1970, I wrote to each of the Governors of the various States and to the chief executives of the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands to request information on the funding needs of their respective jurisdictions for their water pollution control and abatement programs under the coverage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. The text of my letter was as follows:

As you probably know, the construction grant program of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 has one more year to run with \$1.25 billion being authorized for fiscal year 1971.

For fiscal year 1970 the President requested \$214 million, instead of the \$1 billion authorized. Congress appropriated \$800 million.

President Nixon has not requested an appropriation for the construction grant program. Instead he has proposed a new program involving \$4 billion in Federal funds and \$6 billion in State and local funds to be expended over a five-year period.

While I am sure that the Committee on Public Works of the House and Senate will proceed in the most expeditious manner possible to consider the President's proposal, there is a distinct possibility that the legislation will not be approved until late this year and it might be put over until the next Congress. Thus, if the momentum gained by reason of the 1970 appropriation of \$800 million is to be sustained, it is imperative that Congress fully fund the program for fiscal year 1971.

I would appreciate your providing me with information on the funding needs of the water pollution control and abatement program of your State. If it is possible the information should be in such form and detail that it can be readily made available to other Members of the House.

I and several other Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, have again joined in an effort to secure full funding of the Act for fiscal year 1971. At this writing, 131 Members of the House (now 183) have committed themselves to full funding and I believe that the information I have requested will be helpful in securing additional support.

As of this morning, May 6, 1970, I have received some 30 responses to my inquiry. Almost without exception, the Governors and other chief executives indicate support for full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

So that my colleagues and other interested persons may have an opportunity to know of the views of the Governors and other chief executives on the funding of water pollution control and abatement activities, I include the text of the responses to my letter following my remarks. I anticipate receiving additional responses and I shall place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when they are received.

The texts of the letters follow:

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, April 8, 1970.

Re Sewage Treatment Plant.
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Representative, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In response to your recent inquiry, I am pleased to provide information on sewage treatment plant needs in Alaska.

On April 1, the Alaska State Senate passed a bill containing my proposal for 25 per cent State participation in treatment of

municipal wastes. As you know, enactment of such a measure, which now appears probable, will increase the entitlement of Alaskan municipalities from 30 to 50 per cent funding by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Our Fiscal Year 71 needs for Federal funding, based on a 50 or 55 per cent Federal contribution, are approximately as follows for Alaska's major cities:

	[In millions]
Anchorage	\$4.5
Fairbanks	4.0
Juneau	6.0
Ketchikan	4.0

Inasmuch as Alaska's Federal allocation from the present \$800 million appropriation is about \$1.6 million annually, it is apparent that considerably increased Federal participation would be desirable. Not listed above are at least 100 smaller communities which would be eligible for Federal funding of from a few thousand dollars to a few hundred thousand dollars each.

Thank you for your interest. I appreciate your efforts at obtaining full funding of this important program.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

KEITH H. MILLER,
Governor.

ARKANSAS POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION,

Little Rock, Ark., March 24, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In response to your letter to Governor Rockefeller, we are enclosing a listing of all Public Law 660 construction grant applications we now have on hand, or pending review in the Regional Office of FWPCA. As you will note, these requests total over \$4.5 million. As of this time, Arkansas has received a PL660 grant allotment of \$8,599,200, which has to be obligated prior to December 31, 1970; needless to say, this is an impossibility since these are only 30% and it is now extremely difficult for the various municipalities to come up with the necessary matching funds.

In our opinion, there are four solutions to the current problem:

1. Extend the time limit for the Commission to obligate these funds.
2. Reallocate the amounts over \$6 million to other States, or
3. Revise the existing laws to provide for at least 50% basic Federal participation in these projects.
4. Provide more funding to those agencies who handle the bulk of loan funds for public facilities, i.e. HUD, Farmers Home Administration, and EDA.

I hope that this data will provide you with the information you need, however, please feel free to contact us.

Yours very truly,

A. R. SACREY, JR.,
Project Consultant.

Public Law 660 Grant applications on hand Mar. 19, 1970

	Grant request
Hot Springs	\$1,962,180
Little Rock	1,075,800
Dardanelle	161,345
Ozark	155,550
Gurdon	28,500
Pine Bluff	25,148
Yellville	87,900
North Little Rock	256,134
Thornton	10,500
Portland	14,507
Austin	15,000

Lavaca	\$19,900
Perry	26,000
Grady	41,400
Emerson	24,378
Hickory Ridge	14,000
West Fork	39,200
Keiser	29,300
Cherry Valley	20,000
Girls Training School	14,931
Center Hill	41,430
Gosnell	22,500
White Hall	15,900
Mississippi County School District No. 57	14,000
Monticello	48,100
Mitchellville	23,190
Sherwood-Sylvan Hills	331,650
Amity	13,500
Bradley	23,000
Total	4,544,943

THE RESOURCES AGENCY OF CALIFORNIA.
Sacramento, Calif., April 10, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Governor Reagan has asked me to reply to your letter of March 12, 1970, requesting information on the funding needs of California water pollution control and abatement programs.

The State Water Resources Control Board has estimated that construction costs for wastewater treatment plants, interceptors, and outfalls for the next five years will total \$888 million (1970 dollars). The yearly breakdown on this total is estimated at: 1970-71, \$120 million; 1971-72, \$160 million; 1972-73, \$200 million; 1973-74, \$200 million; and 1974-75, \$208 million. Attached is a table which compares the anticipated costs to federal, state, and local entities, with and without state participation.

The State Board has received 255 applications requesting grants totaling over \$100 million for projects costing in excess of \$330 million for fiscal year 1970-71. Some of these projects may not be eligible and others may not be constructed this year. Nevertheless the actual construction costs may be in excess of \$200 million, which is the level of construction we anticipate in fiscal year 1972-73.

Assembly Bill 1456, currently before the Legislature, provides for state grants for construction of sewerage facilities. The Administration favors this measure.

Based upon the estimates of the State Board, the stepped-up enforcement policies of the State Board and the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards, the proposed state grant program, and the current level of grant applications, we estimate that approximately \$100 million will be needed in fiscal year 1970-71 by California for the federal share of construction grants.

Sincerely,

N. B. LIVERMORE, JR.,
Secretary for Resources.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION, COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,

Denver, Colo., March 27, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of March 12, 1970, addressed to Governor John A. Love of Colorado, has been referred to this office for reply.

Colorado is in a unique position with regard to domestic waste treatment in that approximately 99% of the population of the State presently served by a sewer system is provided with secondary treatment. Al-

though, in the past, Colorado has been able to utilize all of its construction grant moneys and has even taken advantage of some reallocated funds, there is some doubt in our mind as to whether or not Colorado will be able to utilize all of the additional funds authorized for this fiscal year.

However, in discussing this matter with my counterparts from states in the east, I find that, due to the high density of population and industry in the east, many of our states have over expended themselves with regard to state funds in the hopes that the Federal government would be able to reimburse them at a later date. This was done in order to keep the water pollution program in these states from becoming stalemated because of the lack of adequate Federal funding. Therefore, even though at the moment I do not see where such additional funds would materially assist Colorado, I feel that Congress should appropriate such funds to help the states that are in need of additional Federal financing.

On the other hand, we are finding that, due to the high interest rates being asked at present, many of our smaller communities are unable to provide their share of financing for the completion of sewage treatment facilities. We, therefore, wholeheartedly support the administration's proposal for an environmental financing authority to help cities and states finance their share of this program.

FRANK J. ROZICH, P. E.,
Technical Secretary, Water Pollution Control Commission.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, April 6, 1970.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your recent letter concerning Connecticut's funding requirements for water pollution control. I welcome this opportunity to re-emphasize my concern over Federal Government action in contributing to the solution of this most serious national problem.

In an effort to pursue a comprehensive problem of the pollution of Connecticut's waters, this State, on my recommendation, authorized \$250 million in bond authorizations to initiate construction of all waste treatment works projects by 1972.

This amount was required not only to meet our State's share of the cost of these projects, but to make up for a reduced Federal share due to limited Federal appropriations. To date, Connecticut has pre-financed in excess of \$60 million of the Federal share of such projects, in accordance with the pre-funding provisions of the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act.

It was gratifying to hear President Nixon, in his speech to the recent National Governors' Conference, announce that efforts would be made to provide reimbursement to those states who had taken the initiative and had pre-financed water pollution projects. Appropriation by the Congress of the entire 1971 authorization included in the Clean Water Restoration Act, would be an appropriate extension of this effort to meet what we consider a Federal commitment to this problem. I join in this effort to secure full funding of this program.

Attached for your information is a schedule which sets forth the financial aspects of Connecticut's Water Pollution Control Program.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

CONNECTICUT ESTIMATED COSTS OF POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES, 1967-72

	Program based on full Federal funding 53 percent (average)	Program based on actual and/or estimated Federal allocations to Connecticut
Estimated cost of eligible projects	\$350,000,000	\$350,000,000
Federal share	185,500,000	136,400,000
State share:		
a. Regular State share		
30 percent	105,000,000	105,000,000
b. To meet reduced Federal share		149,100,000
Total State contribution	105,000,000	254,100,000
Municipal share 17 percent (average)	59,500,000	59,500,000
Total	350,000,000	350,000,000
Additional State cost of retroactive obligations (no Federal reimbursement)	20,000,000	20,000,000

¹Includes \$17,400,000—estimated Connecticut's share if \$1,250,000,000 1971 authorization is appropriated by the Congress.

STATE OF DELAWARE, WATER AND AIR RESOURCES COMMISSION,
Dover, Del., April 16, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Peterson has asked me to reply to your letter requesting information on funding needs for water pollution control programs in Delaware. The State of Delaware is quite proud of the fact that almost no untreated wastes enter its streams. All municipal and industrial systems provide at least primary treatment.

When the Water Quality Standards were adopted by the State, we took a very serious attitude regarding the implementation plan. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration had set a 5 year period as a goal for achieving the standards. We anticipate being the first state to comply by 1973. Our projected needs for the next six years are as follows:

Summary of statewide needs of capital outlay for municipal water pollution control facilities 1970-75

[In millions]	
County:	
New Castle	\$28
Kent	23
Sussex	31
Total	82

Systems under design take into consideration assimilative capacity available in the streams as well as regional needs. Instead of constructing a large number of secondary and tertiary treatment plants, we have attempted to consolidate treatment with a few large waste treatments units. Governor Peterson recently supported a comprehensive State Aid program under which the local governments will receive 25% of the eligible cost from the State. According to the amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, (PL 89-753), the local government will be eligible to receive 50%-55% of the eligible costs from the Federal Government (Department of Interior, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration). The attached table shows a summary of the funding needs. Also enclosed are some charts showing the progress already achieved in Delaware. Projections for 1973 are based on projects under design or construction now.

Chart No. 5 shows the effect of anticipated regionalization of treatment plants. Since growth of population and industry introduce other unknown variables, treatment requirements must be re-examined periodically.

We certainly feel the Federal Government has not lived up to its financial commitment. As you can see, even a small state like Delaware will need substantial Federal assistance

GRANTS-IN-AID AVAILABLE FOR MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES, 1970-75

[In millions]

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	Total
Total State needs.....	\$8.0	\$12.0	\$21.0	\$21.0	\$12.0	\$3.0	\$32.0
Total eligible costs.....	7.2	10.8	16.8	16.8	10.8	7.2	69.6
State aid for matching purposes.....	1.80	2.70	4.20	4.20	2.70	1.80	17.4
Federal share (according to Public Law 89-753).....	3.6	5.4	8.4	8.4	5.4	3.6	34.8
Federal appropriation ¹	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	17.0
Deficit in Federal funds.....	1.1	2.7	5.6	5.5	2.4	.5	17.3

¹ Approximate estimate.

² Based on premise that Federal appropriations will amount to \$1,000,000,000 per year estimated share of Delaware based on 1970 allocation formula.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D.C., April 17, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in response to your letter of March 12, 1970, requesting information on the funding needs of the Water Pollution Control Program of the District of Columbia.

In April 1969, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration held a conference under the enforcement provisions of P.L. 84-660. That conference approved our plan to upgrade our secondary treatment facilities and also recommended that tertiary treatment be provided. The total costs of such a program will be over \$300 million. We have pointed out that in order for the District of Columbia to proceed with a program of this magnitude, it will be necessary for the Department of the Interior and the Congress to provide substantial special funding.

As you undoubtedly know, the District's program has recently been the subject of considerable discussion. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia has recently held hearings on water pollution control in the Washington metropolitan area, and has set another hearing on or about June 25, 1970, to discuss planning for the District water pollution control facility, including financing. A prospectus of the District's plans will be presented at that time. Although new approaches in waste treatment methods may be made other than the above conference plan, nevertheless, the general magnitude of funds needed will be of the same order of \$300 million mentioned above.

In spite of the fact that there are some major unresolved problems surrounding the waste treatment program in the District we are proceeding with grant applications to FWPCA on items basic to early plant expansion with a total grant eligibility of \$49,870,196. In addition, \$437,284 is eligible for reimbursement by FWPCA. This gives us a total grant eligibility of \$50,304,480. We may have to revise these applications as our planning progresses. However, the need for money will not lessen.

The inadequacies of the present grant program are highlighted when it is realized that the District's allotment of the \$800 million national appropriation in FY 1970 is \$3.78 million. If the full \$1.25 billion is appropriated in FY 1971 as authorized, the District's share will be \$5.64 million.

I regret that a more detailed financial program is not now available because of the present uncertain situation. Suffice it to say that the magnitude of the District's problem is such that funds from every available

source will be needed to cope with its solution. We shall be glad to furnish further details as our planning proceeds.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BRYSON,
Acting Director Division of Environmental Control.

source will be needed to cope with its solution. We shall be glad to furnish further details as our planning proceeds.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Mayor.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, March 26, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for the opportunity to again express to you and other members of Congress the needs of the State of Georgia in the area of construction grants for water pollution control facilities. We are grateful to you for your diligent efforts related to the current appropriation of \$800 million for fiscal year 1970.

As expressed to you last year, our needs for FY 1970 alone were over \$35 million. This figure was reduced by \$17.3 million as a result of the appropriation. We are still receiving applications for FY 1971 and will

STATE OF HAWAII PROJECT STATUS OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES FOR 1969-70

Project	Status	Federal share	Total
Kaunakakai STP, Maui, Hawaii.....	Construction ready.....	\$292,500	\$585,000
Nanakuli interceptor sewer, Oahu, Hawaii.....	Construction started.....	1,340,000	2,680,000
Kailua-Kona STP, phase II, Hawaii, Hawaii.....	Plans drawn.....	820,000	1,640,000
Wailua resort STP, Kauai, Hawaii.....	do.....	161,000	322,000
Lanai City STP, Lanai, Hawaii.....	No plans yet.....	200,000	400,000
Kealahou STP, Hawaii, Hawaii.....	do.....	150,000	300,000
Total.....		2,963,500	5,927,000

¹ Old estimates; new costs anticipated to be higher.

Note: Total construction grant funds appropriated for 1969-70 to Hawaii, \$3,398,000.

STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, March 23, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I appreciate receiving your comments on funding for the Federal Water Pollution Control programs. I share your concern for this national problem and am pleased to report that the State of Idaho has established and funded a new system for Idaho that provides for State sub-grants to local units of government to match Federal funds available for water pollution control and abatement.

In your letter to me you asked for details about the State's water pollution control and abatement program. As I point out, the legislature just adopted and I've just signed a new program into law.

continue to do so until May 15, 1970, which is the established deadline. We anticipate by May 15, we will have applications totaling \$25 to 30 million.

It will be extremely regrettable if Congress does not make an appropriation early in FY 1971 of the same magnitude as FY 1970. We have begun to move forward again and another delay would take a lot of steam of our program.

Again, let me thank you for your effort and the opportunity to comment and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LESTER MADDOX,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, April 1, 1970.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your letter in which you express concern for the funding needs of the nation's water pollution control construction programs.

As is probably true with many other states, we in Hawaii have scheduled projects for this fiscal year so that all of the federal monies appropriated to us will be used. Attached is a detailed breakdown of the project's status as well as their cost. Two of these are still estimates since plans for them have not been drawn as yet.

Insofar as construction grant funds for fiscal year 1971 are concerned, the allocations have not yet been finalized. However, my administration has recommended to the present session of our legislature that it continue to set aside State funds for the State contribution to water pollution control facilities in order to provide added impetus to our pollution control program. This will take full advantage of federal appropriations.

I am most happy to learn of your continuing concern for our water pollution control needs.

With warm personal regards, May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

JOHN BURNS,
Governor.

I am asking the State Department of Health, Environmental Division, to supply you with further details about this program.

Sincerely,

DON SAMUELSON,
Governor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
SANITARY WATER BOARD,
Springfield, March 23, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of March 12, 1970 to Governor Richard B. Ogilvie has been referred to this office for reply. We are in full accord with the need for Congressional appropriation of the \$1.25 billion for fiscal year 1971 as authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

We are enclosing a copy of a recent news

release which points up the needs in Illinois to meet the 1972 deadline for compliance with the Federal-State water quality standards, and a projection of the ten-year needs for expansion and construction of new sewage treatment works. Within the next two weeks, we expect to have a booklet listing all the communities and their construction needs as outlined in this news release.

During the current fiscal year, this office evaluated 217 grant applications exclusive of the metropolitan Chicago area. The total grant request was for \$37 million, based on 30 percent of the projected cost. Even with the \$800 million appropriated by Congress for this fiscal year, the Illinois allocation will be sufficient for only 25 to 30 downstate projects. This will result in a backlog of about 190 applications to carry over into fiscal year 1971. In addition, we anticipate at least 100 new applications will be received before June 1st of this year. The backlog of 190 applications on file currently will require \$25 million, which we have projected to a minimum of \$35 million when new applications are included.

A Congressional appropriation in fiscal year 1971 of \$1.25 billion would result in an allocation to Illinois of \$67 million. Half of this sum is allocated to the metropolitan Chicago area which has 50 percent of the State population and a large backlog of work to meet the water quality standards for the Illinois waterways. Thus, about \$33.5 million would be available for downstate projects. As indicated above, it would take all of this to meet the requests for Federal grants based on the 190 applications on hand and the anticipated new applications which will be received before June 1, 1970.

We appreciate your personal interest in the pollution control program and for your communication to Governor Ogilvie.

Very truly yours,

C. W. KLASSEN,
Technical Secretary.

NEWS RELEASE

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., February 20.—Satisfying public demand for cleaner streams in Illinois could cost more than \$5 billion by 1980, Clarence W. Klassen, technical secretary of the state Sanitary Water Board, estimated today.

Klassen said \$350 million will be needed to upgrade present sewage treatment plants just to meet the 1972 deadline for compliance with federal-state stream standards. He said this involves 675 Illinois municipalities and sanitary districts.

During the next ten years, he said, \$2.3 billion will be needed to enlarge and construct new treatment facilities to serve the increase in population and the property not now connected to sewer systems.

Construction of sewers to collect the waste from new growth areas and serve the population now depending upon septic tanks, cesspools and other private facilities will cost \$1.8 billion during the next 10 years, Klassen said. The estimates for Cook County do not include projects for sewer separation or treatment for combined sewer overflows in the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago where, he said, estimates of up to \$1.5 billion have been discussed.

The estimates for needed sewers and treatment facilities by 1980, totaling approximately \$4.1 billion, do not include expenditures industry must make to solve industrial waste problems. Klassen said this could add more than another billion dollars to the cost of clean streams and bring the total to more than \$5 billion by 1980.

He said the new cost estimates by the Sanitary Water Board do not include the separation of combined sewers but do include treatment capacity for flows from such sewers reaching the plant site.

Since previous estimates were made in

1967, Klassen said, there has been an annual increase of 10 per cent in construction costs and it is anticipated that the cost increases will continue. He said they result from increases in labor, materials and financing costs. The previous estimates through 1980 were \$1.5 billion for treatment plants and \$1.2 billion for sewers.

Klassen said a detailed report being prepared by the board's technical staff will include estimates of construction expenditures for the next ten years by counties and a listing of 675 municipalities and sanitary districts with immediate improvements necessary, the estimated cost and the deadline for the start of construction.

The money to pay for cleaner streams must come from the taxpayers through local, state and federal financing programs, Klassen said.

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, March 24, 1970.

Re Construction Grant Needs, Indiana.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of March 12, 1970, to the Hon. Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor, relative to subject matter has been referred to this office for reply.

In all the years of the Federal construction grant program under Public Law 84-660, as amended, the Federal grant funds allotted to Indiana have not been sufficient to provide funds for all applications filed by Indiana municipalities. Indiana was allotted \$20,042,500 from the \$800 million Federal appropriation for fiscal year 1970, whereas grant, applications, based on 50 percent Federal grants totaled over \$44 million.

The final date for submission of applications for grant funds for fiscal year 1971 is April 15, 1970; therefore, we cannot provide a final figure on grant requests at this time. However, considering applications already received and applications that are expected to be filed, it appears that requests for fiscal 1971, based on 50 percent Federal grants, will be from 45 to 50 million dollars. We understand that Indiana's allocation would be \$31.6 million from a \$1.25 billion Federal appropriation.

It is agreed that efforts should be made to obtain an appropriation based on the existing authorization pending finalization of proposed new programs.

Very truly yours,

B. A. POOLE, Technical Secretary.

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH

New Orleans, La., April 17, 1970.

Re: Clean Water Restoration Act Construction Grants Funding Needs.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your recent letter to Governor John J. McKeithen was referred to us for reply. You requested information on the municipal funding needs of the water pollution control and abatement program in our state.

In fiscal 1968 and 1969 our municipalities utilized about \$4 million/year of these construction grants; our full allotments were utilized. Our estimate for 1970 however, is about \$6.5 million (out of our \$14.5 million allotment). On the other hand, in 1971 our municipalities are able to claim as much as about \$8.7 million in grants, our entire backlog (as listed under our State Plan with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration) will be cleared up!

Under present law, our municipalities must put up 67-70% of a project cost, and this difficulty, together with presently high interest rates, is a major reason why a lack of projects in fiscal 70 will probably cause us to lose out on close to \$8 million in Fed-

eral funds. Although some 21 states have been able to take advantage of the provision whereby the municipality's share is reduced to 20-22% if the state puts up 25% (with the Federal grant correspondingly increased), our state is not a wealthy one, and new sources of revenue are hard to find at the state level. If the 30-33% basic grant could be increased, pollution abatement programs would undoubtedly be accelerated, and more communities would be able to afford public sewerage.

The backlog we mentioned attempts to offer a realistic basis for estimating future grant fund needs. In a given town, house spacing is an important factor, insofar as it affects not only the seriousness of septic tank pollution in ditches, but also the feasibility of some sewer systems. Our list includes many towns of under 500 people. The F.W.P.C.A. offers no guidelines as to what communities are shown, but a subjective element in the evaluation appears inevitable.

There must be many states like ours, with a rural population in excess of a million. Perhaps the grant law should give more attention to the problems of such states, because if we can improve the quality of life in our smaller towns, there could be less pressure for migration to our overcrowded cities.

Your letter mentioned the momentum gained by Congress' past appropriations. This is important. Officials in some towns work for years to bring a project into being, and what is done in one town over a period of years affects what is done by its neighbors. Public Opinion in our state is making water pollution an increasingly high priority item and if Congress continues in its good work on this legislation we are optimistic about the future.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. TRYGG,
Director, Bureau of Environmental Health.

STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, Maine, April 22, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Curtis has supplied this agency with a copy of your letter to him dated March 12, 1970, and has requested that we furnish information relative to funding needs for the State's pollution abatement and control program.

At the time of passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, the State of Maine in its implementation plan proposed a nine year program for clean up. This program was based on the following assumptions:

1. The Federal Act would be fully funded through FY 71 and continued for an additional 5 years at the highest authorized level (1.25 billion dollars per year through 1976).

2. The Federal-State program was principally to aid municipal projects. The municipal costs were estimated at 130 million dollars of program eligible work at that time.

3. The Federal grant generally would not exceed 50% of project cost. This assumption was based upon the fact that strict interpretation of the bonus provisions, Section 8f Metropolitan planning, made only two areas in the State eligible.

4. The cost spiral would be moderate as it had been in the past. A simple 4% per year was used for the program period.

Contrary to the above assumptions, the following has taken place:

1. The Federal Act was 45% funded in FY 68, 30% in FY 69 and 80% in FY 70.

2. The Federal-State program has opened up to include a significant segment of industry. It appears that a good deal of the encouragement for industries to join with their municipalities and thus avail themselves to Federal grant-in-aid programs has come from the Congressional level.

This item together with an extraordinary

cost spiral has now caused the State's program cost estimates to be revised upwards. The new estimates range from 170 to 320 million dollars depending upon the percentage of industry joining with their municipalities.

3. The work that can be accomplished with any given year's funds has been reduced due to the fact that nearly all projects now qualify for 55% funds instead of the 50% assumed in item 3 above.

4. The cost spiral instead of being 4% per year as assumed in item 4 above has consistently been quoted as 1% per month or 12% per year in this area.

With the above for background, the enclosed table of needs has been worked out. It is assumed that 1976 is the deadline as this has been established in State Statutes and in the Federal-State plan. A yearly cost increase of 10% has been used instead of the 12% above noted.

The 800 million appropriated for the program for Fiscal Year 1970 is the first encouraging note for some time. However, the enclosed tabulations certainly indicate that even this amount of funding is grossly inadequate to do the job. The 800 million produced a 5 million allocation to the State of Maine. Five million at 55% grants would support only 9 million dollars worth of work a year. Comparing this with the work to be

done, it would take a minimum of 26 years and a maximum of 50 years to complete Maine's program as it is now envisioned. Funding in our estimation would have to be at least triple the Fiscal Year 71 level in order for the State to come close to meeting its schedules and obligations.

The State of Maine has utilized prefunding for the last several years to make up part of the deficits in Federal appropriations. The people of the State have expressed their concern for clean water by their favorable action on two bond issues in the amounts of 25 million and 50 million dollars. These bonds not only support a 30% State grant program, but also support paying an additional 30% grant as prefunding of part of the Federal share.

This agency wishes to express its appreciation to you and other members of the Congress who are taking the initiative and time to find out the magnitude of this problem which is of concern to so many. We sincerely hope the information provided will be of help to you and your committees. If we can be of further assistance in the future, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,
Dr. DONALDSON KOONS,
Chairman,
Environmental Improvement Commission.

water pollution control and if additional information or support can be put to this cause, I will be most willing to participate.

Sincerely,
FRANCIS W. SARGENT,
Governor.

AIR & WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION,
Jackson, Mississippi, April 6, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of March 12, 1970, to Governor Williams which requested information regarding funding requirements for water pollution in the State of Mississippi for fiscal year 1971.

Mississippi's share of the 1970 appropriation of \$800 million is \$10.3 million, and this amount is fully adequate for this fiscal year. We do not anticipate any greater need in construction grant funds for fiscal year 1971.

We trust this information is sufficient for your needs.

Yours very truly,
GLEN WOOD, JR.,
Acting Executive Secretary.

MISSOURI WATER POLLUTION BOARD,
Jefferson City, Mo., March 20, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter to Governor Warren E. Hearnes dated March 12, 1970 has been forwarded to me for reply. We have surveyed the needs of Missouri Municipalities and we estimate that the total pollution abatement project needs eligible for state and federal grants will be in the range of \$55-60 million per year for the next five years. In Fiscal Year 1969 and in Fiscal Year 1970 the Missouri Legislature has fully matched all federal funds available to Missouri Municipalities for the construction of pollution abatement works. If we are to move ahead in the pollution abatement, it is essential that state and federal funds be increased. In order to support a program of \$55-60 million per year, federal funds in the amount of \$29.3 million, and state funds in the amount of \$13.3 million will be needed. Some of the larger projects in Missouri scheduled for the next five years are as follows: Kansas City, \$110 million; Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, \$66.25 million; St. Joseph, \$18 million; Springfield, \$20 million; Little Blue Sewer District, Jackson County, \$100 million; North Kansas City, \$3 million; Hannibal, \$4 million; St. Charles, \$2.2 million; Jefferson City, \$1 million; Independence, \$2 million; Cape Girardeau, \$1 million; Joplin, \$4 million and Columbia, \$5 million. In addition to these projects there are several very large projects the cost of which has not yet been estimated in St. Charles, St. Louis, and Jefferson County.

Secondary treatment is required for the discharge of all municipal and industrial waste into the Missouri streams, including the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. In some areas tertiary treatment is required. In other areas no discharge is permitted regardless of the degree of treatment. This applies to some recreational streams in the state and in streams in urban areas that are too small to assimilate the waste from the large population living in the watershed, for example, Little Blue River in Jackson County.

Yours truly,
JACK K. SMITH,
Executive Secretary.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, Nev., April 10, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In reply to your request for information on the needs

STATE OF MAINE POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAM COSTS

Year	Estimated costs 1970 (millions)	Cost per year for completion 1976 (millions) ¹	Cost per year to offset 10 percent spiral (millions)	Cost per year including spiral (millions)	Federal grant 55 percent of cost (millions)	State grant 30 percent of cost (millions)	National program requirements (billions)
1970	170-320	24-46	17-32	41-78	23-43	12-23	4.4-8.4
1971	146-274	24-46	14-27	38-73	21-40	11-22	4.0-7.8
1972	122-228	24-46	12-23	36-69	20-38	11-21	3.8-7.4
1973	98-182	24-46	10-18	34-64	19-35	10-19	3.6-6.8
1974	74-136	24-46	7-14	31-60	17-33	9-18	3.2-6.4
1975	50-90	24-46	5-9	29-55	16-30	9-16	3.0-5.8
1976	26-44	24-46	3-4	27-50	15-27	8-15	2.8-5.2
Total				236-449			

¹ The range in all columns represents municipal projects as now envisioned (some industry included) to municipal projects including all industry.
² Using current formula Maine receives about 1/200 of national appropriation on all funds over and beyond the first 100,000,000.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, April 21, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am most appreciative of receiving your letter regarding financing needs for water pollution control facilities in Massachusetts in the next few years. We are, of course, encouraged by the Congressional appropriation of \$800 million this year and the President's proposal for a new and expanded program for the next five years.

Massachusetts needs for the next five years are presently estimated in the \$500-\$550 million range of which approximately 50 percent or \$250-\$262 should be from Federal sources. It is not anticipated that the President's programs will provide the necessary amounts on time to fund eight major projects in the State in conformance with implementation schedules adopted by the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission and approved by the Secretary of Interior in August of 1968. These projects and their expected costs are as follows:

[In millions]

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Worcester	() \$29			\$15	
Lowell	()		\$20		\$17
Lawrence	()		25		10
Fitchburg	()	23			
South Essex	()	12	25		21
Haverhill	()		10		10
Boston	()			46	
Springfield	()		20		28
Total		64	100	61	86

¹ From existing \$150,000,000 bond issue.

NOTE: Cost figures are from approved Consulting Engineering Reports with projected engineering cost index increases of 7½% per year beyond the July 1969 base figures.

Presently the Commonwealth provides grants and pre-financing of the Federal share from a \$150 million bond issue. Pending State legislation would provide an additional \$250 million bond issue with continuation of the State's pre-financing authority to fund the major projects listed previously. This has been deemed necessary due to the consistently poor record of previous administrations in appropriations of the congressionally authorized amounts. In summary, I wish to make three major recommendations to you and your committees in improving the Federal position in the field of Water Pollution Control:

1. Authorization and appropriations of sufficient funds to meet the commitments of the States as required by the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965.

2. Establish a separate reimbursable funding authorization with adequate appropriations for reimbursement to States (Massachusetts) that pre-finance in anticipation of future Federal reimbursements.

3. Most importantly a viable Federal program must be undertaken with financial support to solve the most demanding, technical and financial problem of all; the combined sewer problem which plagues almost every old major metropolitan area in the country. The present problem for the City of Boston and surrounding communities is estimated at one-half to \$1 billion to correct with no provisions for Federal aid under current policies and regulations.

Thank you for your interest in our Commonwealth's financial situation in regard to

for funding of water pollution control facilities in the State of Nevada for fiscal year 1971, there are currently thirteen applications on file or being processed for submittal for funding for the remainder of fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971.

The total costs of these projects eligible for participating funds under PL660 is estimated at \$11,473,560. The grant amount that could be made available under PL660 is, of course, \$3,824,520.

There is approximately \$840,000 of unallocated funds remaining in Nevada's fiscal year allocation of \$1,800,000. If funding is to be provided at the present level for fiscal year 1971, this would provide only \$2,640,000 to meet these requests, or there will be a shortage of approximately \$1,200,000.

It should be pointed out that the projects referred to are projects necessary only to meet the needs of population growth. Nevada is now on the threshold of advanced waste treatment facilities to maintain the high quality of the surface waters.

The first project providing advanced waste treatment is scheduled to be under construction in 1972. The first phase cost of this project is estimated at \$18,616,000 and scheduled for completion in 1973. The second phase, to be completed by 1980, is estimated at \$101,018,000.

While these are comparatively insignificant costs nationwide, they do represent a major tax burden to Nevada's small population.

If the efforts to maintain our vital water supplies are to be successful, certainly additional funding will have to be provided; the current funding would appear to be minimal.

If we can provide you with additional information, do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

PAUL LAXALT,
Governor of Nevada.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, March 25, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In reply to your recent request for information on the funding needs for water pollution control projects in New Hampshire, we are very glad to present the following status report:

1. Federal funds available for allocation (includes New Hampshire's increase under the \$800 million appropriation)—All available funds have either been allocated to projects, or are in the process of allocation.

2. Projects eligible for Federal 50% grants, now being refinanced on the state or local level—Sixteen projects are being refinanced in this manner, with estimated eligible costs of \$34,000,000. To finance these projects with 50% Federal grants, New Hampshire will need an additional \$17,000,000.

3. Projects scheduled for construction in accordance with New Hampshire Water Quality Standards, and others on intrastate streams now under orders. Total projects—49; Estimated total costs—\$177 million; Estimated eligible costs—\$150 million; Estimated 50% Federal grants \$75 million.

To summarize New Hampshire's needs for water pollution control projects, our pre-financed programs and other scheduled work could use an additional \$92 million of Federal aid in the next few years. Although the President's proposed new program would greatly assist the New Hampshire pollution control effort, it is obvious that even this additional funding will fall far short of our needs.

With best regards, I am,

Most sincerely,

WALTER PETERSON.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

Santa Fe, March 19, 1970.

Re Funding Levels for Construction Grants Program for Water Pollution Control (P.L. 660 Funds).

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I will take this opportunity to boast a bit about New Mexico's water pollution control program. One hundred percent of all sewerage communities within the state have secondary sewage treatment. We do admit, however, that many of these facilities are improperly operated and poorly maintained. An additional problem in the State of New Mexico are communities that have no sewage collection system and the growth of many rural communities and subdivisions throughout the state.

The 1970 State Legislature of New Mexico passed a \$1,000,000 bond issue to participate in the cost of municipal waste water treatment facilities. The Health and Social Services Department has advised that the construction schedule which is realistic for the State of New Mexico for water pollution control facilities will utilize approximately \$1,000,000 (\$2,000,000 Federal funds) between July 1, 1970 and June 30, 1971.

There is, of course, a possibility that communities will wish to upgrade their waste water treatment facilities in the immediate future as a result of the state-federal funding programs which will amount to 75 or 80 percent grant money to communities.

I would say that in all probability, the State of New Mexico will require approximately \$2,000,000 of Federal funds between July 1, 1970 and June 30, 1971 and possibly twice this number or \$4,000,000 between July 1, 1970 and June 30, 1972.

The funding level discussed above is somewhat less than the present Federal funding level for 1970.

I hope this information is what you require. If you need additional details, please contact Mr. John R. Wright, Executive Secretary of the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission, P.O. Box 2348, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

Sincerely,

DAVID F. CARGO,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 21, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in reply to your recent letter concerning the funding needs of New York's Pure Waters program.

During the next Federal fiscal year, sewage treatment projects having an estimated cost of \$473,501,674 are expected to reach the grant application stage and be eligible for \$260,425,920 in Federal funding. This does not include additional funds New York and its local municipalities have provided because of the failure of the Federal Government to provide its 55 per cent share.

Under the State's Pure Waters program, in order to limit the local municipal costs to 40 per cent of eligible project costs, the State may prefinance the Federal share up to 30 per cent, in addition to its own 30 per cent grant. Because Federal participation has averaged only 7 per cent, New York has prefinanced \$555,973,631 of the Federal share.

Because of rising construction costs and the lag in Federal financing, New York State can no longer continue to prefinance the Federal share from its \$1 billion Pure Waters Bond Issue, but must use it for providing its 30 per cent grants.

To meet this situation, the State Legislature at my request has just authorized a

\$750 million first instance appropriation so that we may continue to prefinance a portion of the Federal share and thus insure the uninterrupted continuation of New York's pacesetter program.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, March 23, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: North Dakota has made full use of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration grant program since its inception in 1956. Our State is not a populous state with our largest city about 50,000. We receive and process a number of grant applications each year, even though the total grant moneys involved are not large. As a result, we have not been able to use all the Federal Water Pollution Control grant moneys allocated to the State over the past few years and the excess has been re-allocated to other states with an unmet need.

Below is listed the grant moneys expended and the Federal moneys allotted to our State for the past five years:

Year	Grant funds used	Federal moneys allocated to North Dakota
1965	\$121,222	\$1,161,700
1966	626,553	1,267,870
1967	505,828	1,238,850
1968	194,307	1,482,400
1969	404,249	1,594,000

We are enclosing a pamphlet showing 15 years of progress in water pollution control in North Dakota.

North Dakota recognizes that we are one of the very few states that are not able to use all their federal fund allocation. We also recognize and are fully aware of the needs of the many states that do not receive adequate Federal funds to meet the yearly demands of their water pollution control programs. We realize that the rate of progress toward the control of pollution in other states does affect the Nation, including North Dakota. For this reason, we urge full funding of construction grant money as authorized under the provisions of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

FIFTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL IN NORTH DAKOTA—JANUARY 1, 1954, TO JANUARY 1, 1969

THE STATE PICTURE

Municipal sewage systems, Jan. 1, 1954	
Secondary treatment plants	39
Imhoff tanks	50
Septic tanks	24
No treatment	19
Total	132
Municipal sewage systems, Jan. 1, 1969	
Secondary treatment plants	204
Imhoff tanks	17
Septic tanks	6
No treatment	5
Total	232

THE RIVER BASINS

There are five drainage basins within the State, as shown on the cover map. A large portion of the State's population and industry lie in the Red River Basin. This river also forms the boundary between Minnesota and North Dakota. It flows northward into

Canada and discharges into the Hudson Bay. The Missouri River flows through North Dakota, entering west of Williston and going into South Dakota below Ft. Yates. The James River originates in North Dakota west of New Rockford, flows south and enters South Dakota below Ludden. The Souris originates in Canada, enters North Dakota in Renville County, loops down into the State and returns to Canada near Westhope. The Devils Lake Basin is a closed basin. It is characterized by generally poor drainage.

RED RIVER BASIN

	Jan. 1, 1954	Jan. 1, 1969
Population served by municipal systems (by treatment):		
Secondary plants.....	73,832	159,415
Imhoff tanks.....	32,266	2,044
Septic tanks.....	9,970	1,817
No treatment.....	7,957	0
Total.....	125,025	163,276
Treatment facilities:		
Secondary plants.....	15	74
Imhoff tanks.....	7	3
Septic tanks.....	11	5
No treatment.....	6	0
Total.....	39	82

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

	Jan. 1, 1954	Jan. 1, 1969
Population served by municipal systems (by treatment):		
Secondary plants.....	17,727	108,697
Imhoff tanks.....	27,151	5,006
Septic tanks.....	6,432	319
No treatment.....	37,000	1,402
Total.....	88,310	115,424
Treatment facilities:		
Secondary plants.....	13	70
Imhoff tanks.....	32	9
Septic tanks.....	5	1
No treatment.....	7	2
Total.....	57	82

SOURIS RIVER BASIN

	Jan. 1, 1954	Jan. 1, 1969
Population served by municipal systems (by treatment):		
Secondary plants.....	22,740	58,153
Imhoff tanks.....	5,050	1,697
Septic tanks.....	3,593	0
No treatment.....	4,412	3,974
Total.....	35,795	63,824
Treatment facilities:		
Secondary plants.....	3	29
Imhoff tanks.....	6	3
Septic tanks.....	3	0
No treatment.....	4	3
Total.....	16	35

JAMES RIVER BASIN

	Jan. 1, 1954	Jan. 1, 1969
Population served by municipal systems (by treatment):		
Secondary plants.....	16,215	30,366
Imhoff tanks.....	2,705	1,87
Septic tanks.....	3,944	0
No treatment.....	2,784	0
Total.....	25,648	31,553
Treatment facilities:		
Secondary plants.....	4	16
Imhoff tanks.....	4	2
Septic tanks.....	2	0
No treatment.....	2	0
Total.....	12	18

DEVILS LAKE BASIN

	Jan. 1, 1954	Jan. 1, 1969
Population served by municipal systems (by treatment):		
Secondary plants.....	4,790	16,969
Imhoff tanks.....	778	0
Septic tanks.....	9,133	0
No treatment.....	0	0
Total.....	14,701	16,969
Treatment facilities:		
Secondary plants.....	4	15
Imhoff tanks.....	1	0
Septic tanks.....	3	0
No treatment.....	0	0
Total.....	8	15

During these 15 years:

1. Thirty-three cities have replaced inadequate Imhoff tanks with satisfactory facilities.
2. Eighteen cities have replaced inadequate septic tanks with satisfactory facilities.
3. Fourteen cities, previously discharging raw sewage to the streams, now have satisfactory treatment.
4. Fifteen cities, with secondary treatment, have added to or replaced their facilities to further improve the treatment of their wastes.
5. One hundred new cities installed sewage collection systems with adequate treatment facilities.
6. The total population of the State served by municipalities with modern sewerage facilities rose from 289,479 to 391,046—this represents a rise of 47% to 62% of the total State's population.
7. North Dakota cities have spent a total of approximately \$11,500,000 of local moneys on sewage treatment facilities during this period.

THE CONTROL OF WATER POLLUTION

Two of the major sources of pollution entering the rivers and streams in North Dakota are domestic wastes from communities and the wastes from industries. This folder covers only progress made in these fields. However, other pollutants such as organic materials and chemicals used by agriculture which are carried into streams by runoff, salt, heated waste discharges, etc., are also important factors which are considered in the State's water pollution control program.

Certainly excellent progress has been made in the State toward providing satisfactory and approved waste treatment facilities by communities and industry. Much of the credit for this progress must go to the development of the waste stabilization lagoon method of waste treatment. North Dakota pioneered in the development of this type of treatment. Properly designed and operated waste stabilization lagoons provide treatment efficiencies equal or better than conventional secondary treatment.

Another factor which has aided the State's progress in water pollution control was the enactment of the Federal Grant Program in 1956 which provides grants to communities to help pay the cost of construction of sewage treatment facilities.

OHIO WATER DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 23, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of March 12 to Governor James A. Rhodes concerning Ohio's needs for FWPCA funding has been referred to me for reply.

We are also concerned about federal fund-

ing during fiscal year 1971 since it is our understanding that the federal act proposed (S-3472) only provides for committing funds after June 30, 1971.

The Ohio Water Development Authority pre-finances the federal 30% grant on sewerage treatment plants and interceptors and also loans the remaining 70% of project cost to political sub-divisions. Ohio will have \$172,874,000 in eligible projects under construction in fiscal year 1970 with a need of federal funds in the amount of \$51,862,000.

In fiscal year 1971, an additional \$134,126,000 of eligible projects will be placed under construction with a need of federal funding in the amount of \$40,237,800. A total of \$92,099,800 of federal funds will be needed in fiscal year 1970 and 1971. Ohio has been allocated \$40.8 million in 1970 leaving an additional \$51,299,800 necessary in federal funds for fiscal year 1971.

If more detail is needed on listing specific projects, please contact me.

Sincerely,

NED E. WILLIAMS,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, March 31, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in reply to your request of March 12, 1970, for information on the funding needs for fiscal year 1971 of Oregon's Water Pollution Control Program.

I am enclosing a list of fifty-two projects for fiscal year 1971 representing total costs eligible for grant participation in excess of \$60 million. Applications for federal funds under Public Law 84-660 have either already been filed for these projects or will be filed prior to June 1, 1970, with our Department of Environmental Quality. We anticipate a similar requirement for fiscal year 1972.

Under the present formula for distributing P.L. 660 funds to the various states, Oregon's allotment is approximately one percent of the federal appropriation. Even by limiting federal grants to 30% and covering additional projects with state funds, we have immediate needs for our full share of the \$1.25 billion authorized for fiscal year 1971.

We will be following with great interest the activities of yourself and other members of Congress in support of funding the full \$1.25 billion authorization.

Sincerely,

TOM McCALL,
Governor.

STATE OF OREGON, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—AN ESTIMATE OF PUBLIC LAW 660 GRANT REQUIREMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

Project	Estimated eligible cost	Estimated grant 30 percent or 33 percent
Arlington.....	\$200,000	\$60,000
Astoria.....	4,908,000	1,619,600
Bay City.....	262,000	78,600
Bear Creek V.S.A.....	6,000,000	2,000,000
Brookings.....	300,000	99,000
Bunker Hill S.D.....	200,000	66,000
Cloverdale S.D.....	140,000	42,000
Coos Bay.....	500,000	165,000
Coos Bay-Empire.....	200,000	66,000
Coquille.....	400,000	132,000
Eastside.....	150,000	49,500
Echo.....	150,000	49,500
Florence.....	225,000	74,200
Gardiner S.D.....	252,000	75,000
Garibaldi.....	300,000	90,000
Gold Beach.....	142,000	42,600
Grants Pass.....	1,850,000	610,500
Gresham.....	750,000	247,500
Hammond.....	250,000	82,500
Hillsboro.....	1,140,000	342,000
Hood River (Indian Cr. Int.).....	180,000	54,000

POTENTIAL CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROJECTS FOR NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

Project	Estimated eligible cost	Estimated grant 30 percent or 33 percent
Hood River (S.T.P.)	\$1,000,000	\$330,000
Josephine County (Redwood)	914,000	301,600
Lexington	100,000	30,000
Madras	206,000	67,900
Mosier	50,000	15,000
Mount Vernon	180,000	54,000
Myrtle Point	350,000	105,000
Nearctic-Oceanside	350,000	105,000
North Bend	750,000	247,500
Nyssa	250,000	82,500
Pendleton (Mt. Hebron)	75,000	24,700
Philomath	507,000	167,300
Portland S.T.P.	13,523,000	4,462,600
Portland (S.T.P. outfall)	1,086,000	358,300
Rockaway	122,000	36,600
Sandy	350,000	115,500
Scappoose	784,000	235,200
Seaside	75,000	24,700
Siletz	90,000	27,000
Silverton	12,000	3,600
St. Helens	2,419,000	798,200
Stayton	180,000	59,400
Sublimity	110,000	36,300
The Dalles	910,000	300,300
Umatilla	200,000	66,000
Unified Sewerage Agency	17,900,000	5,900,000
Vernonia	160,000	48,000
Waldport	200,000	66,000
Wilsonville	400,000	132,000
Woodburn	147,000	48,500
Yachats	218,000	71,900
Total	62,117,000	18,566,000

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Harrisburg, April 6, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DINGELL: Your letter of March 12, 1970, to Governor Shafer has been referred to me for reply. I am pleased to learn that so many Congressmen have joined in an effort to secure full funding under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 for the fiscal year 1971.

Seventy (70) municipalities have applied for financial assistance from fiscal year 1971 funds. Under our policies, we have ascertained that these are ready to proceed. Based on a total eligible construction cost of \$90 million, Pennsylvania would need \$49,500,000 in Federal funds for that period. Pennsylvania has also pre-financed the Federal share of grants in the last three years in the amount of \$17,890,000, and local government pre-financed \$6 million. The total need in Pennsylvania for fiscal year 1971 therefore is \$73,390,000.

With the growing concern over the pollution of our environment, I cannot too strongly urge that adequate funding be made available to the states for accelerating the water pollution control program.

If there is any further information needed, please let me know.

Sincerely,
ELLSWORTH R. BROWNELER, M.D.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, Pierre, March 25, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Responding to your inquiry of March 12, there is attached a tabulation of the potential construction grant projects for South Dakota. The estimated grant funds requested are based on a 30 percent grant.

South Dakota is giving consideration to initiation of a State construction grant program and if this is successful the estimated Federal grant funds requested will be approximately double those figures tabulated.

Most sincerely,
FRANK L. FARRAR, Governor.

Community	Estimated total project cost	Estimated grant funds requested
Arlington	\$74,000	\$22,200
Alcester	25,000	7,500
Ashton	20,000	6,000
Astoria	44,119	13,235
Aurora	18,000	5,400
Bradley	50,000	15,000
Blunt	34,000	10,200
Carthage	27,000	8,100
Claire City	18,000	5,400
Chamberlain	100,000	30,000
Castlewood	20,000	6,000
Columbia	10,500	3,150
Corona	28,000	8,400
Corson	7,000	2,100
Custer	232,000	69,600
Crooks Sanitary District	21,750	6,525
Dell Rapids	37,000	11,100
DeSmet	69,000	20,700
Dupree	21,000	6,100
Eden	14,000	4,200
Elkton	51,000	15,300
Ethan	67,300	20,190
Egan	60,000	18,000
Gary	34,000	10,200
Garden City	30,000	9,000
Harrisburg	22,000	6,600
Hill City	100,000	30,000
Herreid	37,000	11,100
Hot Springs	674,400	218,400
Hoven	85,930	25,779
Hudson	61,000	18,300
Iroquois	42,000	12,600
Kenstone-Mount Rushmore Sanitary District	1,200,000	360,000
Lead-Deadwood Sanitary District	5,000,000	1,500,000
Lesterville	25,750	7,725
Lewis and Clark Sanitary District	116,000	34,800
Menno	41,000	12,300
Midland	16,000	4,800
Mitchell	139,000	41,700
Mobridge	120,000	36,000
Nisland	22,000	6,600
North Sioux City	124,515	41,090
Oacoma	41,000	12,300
Olivet	15,600	4,700
Pierre	300,000	90,000
Platte	82,600	24,780
Ramona	24,000	7,200
Raymond	30,000	9,000
Spearfish	210,000	63,000
Spearfish Valley Sanitary District	40,000	12,000
St. Lawrence	31,000	9,300
Sioux Falls	950,000	285,000
Timber Lake	31,000	9,300
Trent	25,000	7,500
Vivian	34,200	10,260
Volin	17,500	5,250
Wakonda	26,400	7,920
Waubay	60,000	18,000
Wentworth	30,000	9,000
Wolley	41,000	12,300
Willow Lake	44,000	13,200
Wessington	58,000	17,400
White	21,000	6,300
Watertown	120,000	36,000
Yankton	400,000	120,000
Custer State Park Stockade Campground	25,000	7,500
Custer State Park Legion Lake	10,000	3,000
Total	11,606,564	3,501,604

TENNESSEE EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, Nashville, April 9, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I appreciate your letter of March 12 in which you request information on the funding needs of the water pollution control and abatement program in Tennessee.

Our Stream Pollution Control Board received 23 applications for fiscal year 1970 grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. The eligible cost of these projects is \$70,575,000 and since Tennessee will now provide 25 per cent matching grants for these projects, the 55 per cent Federal grant would be \$38,820,000.

Tennessee was allocated \$15,815,700 from the \$800 million appropriated for fiscal year 1970. We will, therefore, carry forward to the fiscal year 1971 priority list projects with an eligible cost of \$41,820,000 that are applying for 55 per cent grants of about \$23,000,000.

We will receive the new applications for fiscal year 1971 by April 15, 1970, so the exact number of applications and their eligible cost will not be known until that date. Based on the number of requested forms, we anticipate new applications having an eligible cost exceeding \$70,000,000.

A conservative estimate of fiscal year 1971 needs is:

	Eligible cost	55 percent Federal grants
Applications received	\$41,820,000	\$23,000,000
New applications expected	70,000,000	38,500,000
Total for 1971 fiscal year	111,820,000	61,500,000

We strongly urge full funding of this vital program if we are to have meaningful and orderly progress in our fight against water pollution.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of this important legislation.

Sincerely,
BUFORD ELLINGTON.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, Olympia, March 27, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your inquiry of March 12, 1970 concerning Washington state's anticipated construction grant program needs for Fiscal Year 1971.

Washington has established water quality standards for interstate, intrastate and coastal waters. In addition, the Water Pollution Control Commission has established a plan of implementation and enforcement which sets forth construction necessary to implement those water quality standards and construction schedules.

Exhibit A, attached, lists those projects which will be eligible for a construction grant during Fiscal Year 1971 and cost projections of those projects. Exhibit B specifically lists those projects which are necessary to be constructed in Fiscal Year 1971 to implement adopted water quality standards.

With a participation rate of 30% of eligible construction costs, it is projected that Washington State's construction grant program funding needs will be approximately \$19,725,750. An appropriation of \$800 million to the Construction Grants Program would find the State of Washington at a level of \$12.5 million. The full appropriation of \$1.25 billion would fund the state at a level of \$19.5 million. The full appropriation is needed to continue to implement the adopted federal and state water quality standards. In any event I heartily support a continuing resolution for \$800 million to be issued in June 1970 to preclude unanticipated delays in funding needed for eligible projects.

Should further information be requested, please contact this office at your convenience.

Sincerely,
DANIEL J. EVANS, Governor.

EXHIBIT A
WASHINGTON STATE GRANT ELIGIBLE PROJECTS ANTICIPATED
Total cost for project—Fiscal year 1971, Public Law 84-660

Projects necessary to implement water quality standards ¹	\$37,957,500
Metro	13,530,000
Vancouver	4,265,000
Other anticipated projects	10,000,000
Total	65,752,500

¹ Listed in Exhibit B.

Grant impact based on 30% participation: \$19,725,750.

EXHIBIT B

WASHINGTON STATE GRANT ELIGIBLE
PROJECTS—FISCAL YEAR 1971

Total eligible costs for projects required
for compliance with water quality stand-
ards—Public Law 84-660

City of Bellingham	\$13,038,000
Blaine	55,000
Burlington	150,000
Anacortes	267,900
Annapolis S. D.	60,000
Coupeville	29,800
Edmonds	944,500
Kitsap County S. D. No. 6	295,000
Marysville	15,000
Mukilteo	51,300
Skagit County S. D. No. 1	80,000
Snohomish	75,600
Stanwood	25,000
Rainier Vista S. D.	1,000,000
Aberdeen	1,230,400
Cosmopolis	43,500
Hoquiam	50,000
Port of Vancouver	1,000,000
Okanogan	5,000
Palouse	5,000
Bremerton	1,410,800
Burlington	109,300
Concrete	414,000
Langley	18,750
Mt. Vernon	252,400
Sedro Woolley	160,000
Suquamish	340,000
Winslow	112,700
Seattle	1,000,000
Vashon Island, S.D.	47,000
Gig Harbor	1,700,000
Olympia	940,000
Tacoma No. 1	1,600,000
Raymond	69,600
South Bend	5,100
Toledo	5,000
Vader	2,000
Winlock	5,000
White Salmon	115,000
Asotin	69,000
Cashmere	5,000
Chelan	5,000
Deer Park	5,000
Ephrata	10,000
Lakeland Village	5,000
Oroville	165,000
Pullman	10,000
Tonasket	30,000
Sumas	69,000
Lynden	106,200
Poulsbo	86,500
Seattle City Light	74,000
Auburn	3,250,000
Montesano	974,000
Sumner	117,300
Battleground	5,000
Centralia	134,900
Morton	92,000
Pe Ell	270,000
Cle Elum	20,000
Goldendale	10,000
Grandview	153,000
Kennewick	575,000
Naches	23,250
Prosser (Dom.)	5,000
Roslyn	69,000
Selah	205,000
Sunnyside	250,000
Terrace Heights, S.D.	85,000
Small Suburbs	50,000
Spokane	4,146,700
Wilbur	155,000

Total 37,957,500

Grant impact based on 30% participation:
\$11,387,250.

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Charleston, April 21, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: We in the
areas of State government share your concern

with the possibility of a loss in momentum
in the construction program for municipal
waste water treatment facilities. Since the
implementation programs provided to the In-
terior Department by the States is based on a
Federally assisted construction program, it is
of utmost importance that the funding be
carried out at a rate that will expedite con-
struction of waste water treatment plants.

The State of West Virginia has special con-
cern in its program in that while West Vir-
ginia is the only State located totally within
Appalachia, it is governed by the same cri-
teria in the construction grants program as
all other States in the Union. This fact,
coupled with the fact that all of our larger
towns have provided treatment facilities,
leaves the State with the task of providing
treatment for its smaller towns and villages
ranging from 100 to 2,000 in population. For
this reason I am seriously concerned with the
funding capabilities of these areas and intend
to request that West Virginia be allowed to
increase its matching rate under Public Law
660 to 50 percent of the eligible costs. We re-
quest no additional funds, but would request
the increase in the matching aspect so as to
lower the local burden to these small com-
munities.

The opportunity to comment on this most
important matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

ARCH A. MOORE, Jr.,
Governor.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, March 30, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I have frequently ex-
pressed my displeasure over the failure of the
Congress to match the authorizations of the
Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 with the
necessary appropriations.

While the \$800 million construction grant
program approved in Fiscal Year 1970 was ex-
tremely helpful, it may still be inadequate
to meet Wisconsin's needs.

Officials of the Wisconsin Department of
Natural Resources inform me that unless the
\$17,130,900 allocation to Wisconsin for 1970
is increased in 1971, as many as 50 pollution
abatement projects which are now preparing
to proceed to construction will lack federal
funding.

This becomes especially critical since Wis-
consin has undertaken a state bonding pro-
gram to ensure that state commitments to
the pollution abatement program will be met.
While we have built a feature into our law
which will permit state advances of federal
funds, we are extremely hesitant about uti-
lizing this method in the face of a possibility
that the reimbursement provisions may be
stricken from the federal program.

My office has not received sufficient expla-
nation of the Administration's current fi-
nancing proposal to evaluate its impact on
the Wisconsin program. I would be extremely
concerned, however, if the federal program
were to be changed—or short-changed—in
any way which would upset the momentum
which has finally been achieved in this vital
environmental protection effort.

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CHEYENNE, March 27, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in fol-
lowup to our letter of March 19 with the
information that you requested relative to
the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

The construction grant funds provided to
the State of Wyoming under P.L. 660 and

amendments have been entirely adequate to
meet the needs of the state. The annual
amounts available to the state since the pas-
sage of P.L. 660 have varied from \$440,375 in
FY 1957 to \$2,240,300 for FY 1970. Only in
FY 1957 were all of the available funds uti-
lized. In all other years we have had surplus
funds returned to the federal agency.

Since the inception of this program in
FY 1957, this department has processed 78
applications for construction grants. As of
November 1969, 64 projects were completed
or under construction, having a total eligible
cost of \$7,975,748 and involved federal par-
ticipation to the amount of \$2,389,710.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

JACK SPEIGHT,
Administrative Assistant.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas,
March 24, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am writing
in reply to your letter of March 12, 1970, con-
cerning the funding needs of the water pollu-
tion control and abatement program of the
Virgin Islands.

You may be interested to know that I have
secured the services of Professor Morton S.
Hilbert who is a resident of Dearborn, Michi-
gan, and Chairman of the Department of
Environmental and Industrial Health at the
University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. For a
period of six months, Professor Hilbert is de-
voting his efforts to assist me in securing
widespread environmental improvements in
the Virgin Islands. One of his major assign-
ments is to expedite the program of pollu-
tion control which I feel is so vitally impor-
tant to the health and economy of our people.

We have a current plan for eliminating
harbor and beach pollution on the island of
St. Thomas which should be ready to go on
bid in June of 1970. The cost of this program
is estimated at \$3,517,000.

We also have a plan for the island of St.
Croix which will provide a sewerage system
and eliminate current pollution problems
and should be ready for bid by September
of 1970 at an estimated cost of \$3,276,000.

In the past week, we have submitted an
application to the Water Pollution Control
Agency for planning the elimination of pol-
lution in Cruz Bay, St. John. The estimated
cost of this corrective program is in the
neighborhood of \$200,000.

We have developed plans for pollution con-
trol over a five-year period for the three U.S.
Virgin Islands which have estimated costs as
follows:

1971	\$4,074,000
1972	3,123,000
1973	3,294,000
1974	2,934,000
1975	2,814,000

Although our islands are relatively small,
we have a tremendously large tourist busi-
ness attracting over a million tourists each
year. The islands are growing at a rate which
exceeds all other parts of the nation.

It is important that we take immediate
action to correct existing pollution problems
and that we provide adequate facilities to
handle the rapidly expanding development so
that we may prevent pollution problems of
the future.

I wish to express my appreciation for your
interest in the problems of pollution, and I
will be happy to be of every possible assist-
ance to you and your Committee in this im-
portant area of governmental concern.

Sincerely,

MELVIN H. EVANS,
Governor.

IT IS TIME FOR AMERICA TO ACT
IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, since March, the United States has silently watched the series of escalatory steps that have taken place in the Middle East. No sooner did President Nixon and Secretary of State William Rogers announce that the United States would not be selling the promised Phantoms and Hawks to Israel, then there was the public announcement of the movement of Soviet troops and Sam III missiles into Egypt.

Last week, the situation reached crisis proportion with the entrance of Soviet pilots into an active role against Israel. The ominous signs have then become reality. A new and dangerous level has been reached in the Middle East and immediate American reaction is required.

On April 2, 1970, there were reports that Russian pilots flying for Egypt had been shot down. It has taken the United States a full month to react to the new situation.

The outpouring of American foreign policy these days seems quite like the patient whose knee is hit to test his reflexes. It is said that the foreign policy of this Nation seems little more than a series of reflex actions with little, if any, thought involved. Also, in this case, the patient seems to be rather spastic; he is responding at the wrong time and with the wrong reaction.

Somewhere, a nerve of the Nixon administration was tapped, and it responded with thousands of troops and air support in Cambodia without even informing that government of its decision.

Our past mistakes in Southeast Asia have made curiously little impression on the patient. It is as if the events of past 5 years have made absolutely no impression. Rather, the United States seems intent upon making the same costly mistakes as it did in 1965.

Yet, when the series of Russian advances in the Middle East were learned about, the United States acted as if it had been anesthetized—there was no reaction at all.

Israel is not asking for American men. Rather, as a proven and loyal ally of the United States in the Middle East, she is asking only that the United States sell her the arms she was promised. America sells billions of dollars in arms each year to nations throughout the globe. Yet, she has refused Israel.

Israel's demonstrated strength and capability can again be built up and can be used as a proxy for American strength in that area. The Russians are supplying arms and men in an effort to engage Israel in a war of attrition; yet, all Israel asks is the right to defend herself and the right to exist as a free and democratic state.

Israel's supply of arms and men is growing smaller daily; many of the planes she flies are archaic and outdated. The promise of American planes brought new hope that she might effectively defend and protect her security. But, in-

stead the United States has adopted the policy of watchful waiting; we have watched the other side become increasingly strong and capable, and we have waited with any decision. Time is fading quickly, and a decision is called for.

Israel cannot protect her hard-won independence if she is refused again. She is asking for equipment and nothing more. Russia has taken direct advantage of American indecisiveness in this area.

In 1968, Mr. Nixon said:

We support Israel because it is threatened by Soviet Imperialism and we support Israel because it offers hope in the Middle East. . . . Israel cannot lose even once.

Mr. Speaker, these words ring truer today than they ever did before. It is therefore time for the United States to act and to sell Israel the promised jets.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. YATRON (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), on account of illness.

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. RUTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MEEDS and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.

Mr. BUSH in five instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. GUBSER in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOGAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. KYROS.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MOSS in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HAWKINS in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. WOLFF in six instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. DOWNING.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 6, 1970, 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:

2018. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash., and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2019. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the status of the Northeast Corridor Transportation project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report on grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to non-profit institutions during calendar year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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. MILLS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 14705 (Rept. No. 91-1037). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5981. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that Madison County, Fla., shall be included in the northern judicial district of Florida (Rept. No. 91-1038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House resolution 969. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 746, to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payments by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. (Rept. No. 91-1051). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 970. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 88, to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States. (Rept. No. 91-1052). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 971. Resolution for consideration of House Resolution 796, amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure. (Rept. No. 91-1053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 972. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 17399, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1054). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8573. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10534. A bill for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick and Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 91-1040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 12128. A bill for the relief of William Heidman, Jr., with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12173. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francine M. Welch; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12621. A bill for the relief of Lt. Robert L. Scanlon (Rept. No. 91-1043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13676. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13807. A bill for the relief of Claude G. Hansen; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13810. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAILSBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14619. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Lawrence F. Payne, U.S. Army (retired); with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 16997. A bill for the relief of Colie Lance Johnson, Jr. (Rept. No. 91-1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 19. An act to reimburse certain persons for amounts contributed to the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 91-1049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1786. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin (Rept. No. 91-1050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17432. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 17433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 17434. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 17435. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KARTH, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDEZI, Mr. PELLY, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 17436. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, to provide for a National Environmental Data Bank; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 17437. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to provide for the elimination of automotive air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17438. A bill to impose an excise tax on automobiles based on their horsepower and emission of pollutants, for the purpose of financing programs for research in, and Federal procurement of, low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17439. A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of paying additional costs incurred by such State in purchasing low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 17440. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 17441. A bill to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 17442. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve the judicial administration of State criminal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 17443. A bill to repeal section 5532 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reductions in the retired or retirement pay of

retired officers of regular components of the uniformed services who are employed in civilian offices or positions in the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 17444. A bill to provide for thorough health and sanitation inspection of all livestock products imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, and Mr. McCARTHY):

H.R. 17445. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 17446. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17447. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 17448. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide for grants to local public housing agencies to assist in financing security arrangements designed to prevent crimes and otherwise insure the safety and well-being of low-rent housing tenants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 17449. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 17450. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 17451. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates and income limitations relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 17452. A bill to authorize the emergency issuance of 2,000 special immigrant visas to nationals of Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 1210. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 1211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. MELCHER):

H.J. Res. 1212. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY (for himself and Mr. REES):

H.J. Res. 1213. Joint resolution rescinding and prohibiting appropriations and contract authorizations for military operations in Cambodia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 1214. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of

May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **LOWENSTEIN** (for himself, Mr. **ADDABBO**, Mr. **ANDERSON** of California, Mr. **BINGHAM**, Mrs. **CHISHOLM**, Mr. **DIGGS**, Mr. **EDWARDS** of California, Mr. **FARBSTEIN**, Mr. **HALPERN**, Mr. **HARRINGTON**, Mr. **LEGGETT**, Mr. **MIKVA**, Mr. **MOORHEAD**, Mr. **POLLOCK**, Mr. **POWELL**, Mr. **REES**, Mr. **REID** of New York, and Mr. **ROSENTHAL**):

H. Con. Res. 593. Concurrent resolution; State of the Federal Judiciary Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **PEPPER**:

H. Con. Res. 594. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in op-

position to the high interest rate policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. **LOWENSTEIN** introduced a bill (H.R. 17453) for the relief of Seikan Hasegawa also known as Katsumi Hasegawa, which was referred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 or rule XXII,

377. The **SPEAKER** presented a memorial

of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to retention of the existing ticket tax exemption afforded State and local employees traveling on official business, which was referred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

472. The **SPEAKER** presented a petition of the 32d Convention of the International Good Neighbor Council, Monterey, N.L., Mexico, relative to the United States-Mexico border industrialization program, which was referred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AL DERR: HE DID IT HIS OWN WAY

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1970

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, on April 1, a remarkable individual—Alfred M. Derr—died in Boise. Mr. Derr, the Democratic candidate for Governor of Idaho in 1958, was an educator, farmer, and distinguished public servant throughout his long and varied career.

In this month's edition of the Idaho Democrat of Boise, Al's character was well summed up in these words:

Whatever Al Derr did was motivated from a firm inner conviction of what he believed was right regardless of any pressures that might be put upon him from the outside.

Al Derr was a fine man, and my State is the poorer for his loss.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Idaho Democrat be printed in the **RECORD**.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the **RECORD**, as follows:

[From the Idaho Democrat, Apr. 1970]

HE DID IT HIS WAY

When the song "I Did It My Way" was sung for Alfred M. Derr, who died in Boise on April 1, it gave the key note to the character of a man who came closest to winning the governorship of Idaho on the Democratic ticket in recent years.

Whatever Al Derr did was motivated from a firm inner conviction of what he believed was right regardless of any pressures that might be put upon him from the outside.

Al was born in the classic background, of those of pioneer stock, in a log cabin in Clark's Fork 86 years ago. He was educated in public schools and received his bachelor's degree from the University of Idaho in 1925.

When he returned back to his home in Idaho's far north, he developed his farm and worked nights at a Clark's Fork mine as assayer and mill superintendent. Later he became science instructor at the former Farragut College. Later he became interested in the sawmill and logging business.

In all of these activities Derr showed striking individuality in his approach. This became more apparent when he entered politics in 1937 to be elected state senator from Bonner County. He served five terms.

After he lost the governorship in 1958 he returned to his greatest interest, that of

teaching. In 1966 he retired from this profession because of ill health and moved to Boise with his devoted wife and friend Hattie, a distinguished Idaho Democrat, who served as State Senator and State Receptionist. She survives him as do his three sons, Navy Cmdr. John P. Derr, Norfolk, Va.; Allen R. Derr and James Derr, Boise attorneys, and two daughters, Mrs. Elmer Shields of Clark's Fork, and Mrs. Janie Betts, Weiser.

Al Derr did it his way and it was a good way.

ESCALATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1970

Mr. **COHELAN**. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation is subject to the startling disclosures of the resumption of the bombing above the DMZ, the actions of the Nixon administration form a painfully familiar pattern: Search and destroy, cut off supplies, and bomb in an attempt to force Hanoi to negotiate. A person does not have to believe in historical determinism to see the fallacious assumptions underlying these decisions. This latest escalation has driven the United States further into the Vietnam quagmire. It has confirmed my deepest fears: Behind all the talk about Vietnamization, the desire for an American victory will dictate the President's actions.

Two recent articles, "Further Into the Quagmire," by Tom Wicker, and "Cambodia a Trap Nixon Evaded in 1967" by Josiah Lee Auspitz illustrate some of my concerns on this latest turn of events in Southeast Asia. I insert these articles into the **RECORD** at this point. I recommend the reading of these articles to my colleagues and the readers of the **RECORD**:

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1970]

IN THE NATION: FURTHER INTO THE QUAGMIRE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—The invasion of Cambodia ordered by President Nixon makes it clear that he does not have and never has had a "plan to end the war." For this is another of those escalations of the Southeast Asian war that in every previous case had to be extended further than expected and still accomplished nothing.

Every such escalation by three Presidents has succeeded only in sucking the United States further into the quagmire, and all of

them notably the bombing of the North—have had to be abandoned; what, in fact, is the President's so-called Vietnamization policy, if it is taken at face value, but the slowest and most reluctant form of abandonment of Lyndon Johnson's military build-up?

CAMBODIAN SANCTUARIES

Since the Cambodian sanctuaries have existed for five years, for instance, it has to be asked why their strategic importance was not assessed before the Vietnamization policy was launched. These sanctuaries become the kind of wholesale, threat to American lives upon which Mr. Nixon insisted—if they do at all—only as overwhelming American troop strength declines through piecemeal withdrawals. Vietnamization, therefore, so far from being "a plan to end the war," bore within itself, from the start, the seeds of this escalation.

Even Mr. Nixon's description of the escalation as a temporary and limited effort is refuted by his own testimony. He described North Vietnam as being now engaged in "invading" Cambodia and said that if the attack succeeded "Cambodia would become a vast enemy staging area and a springboard for attacks on South Vietnam along 600 miles of frontier." If such an invasion is in fact taking place, and if its success would pose the stated threat, then a quick one-shot sweep through the border sanctuaries would hardly prove a sufficient defense.

Nothing, moreover, distinguishes these new search-and-destroy sweeps into Cambodia from all the other bloody, useless, innumerable search-and-destroy sweeps of this war—into the Ashau Valley, the Iron Triangle, the demilitarized zone, into all those other "strongholds" from which the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have been so often swept, only to reappear still fighting when the "victorious" Americans have departed brandishing their inflated body counts. Such a bitter history gives scant assurance that even if the invaders sweep through the Cambodian sanctuaries in a few weeks the sanctuaries will stay swept, the Americans will be able to go away for good, and the troop withdrawals can proceed undisturbed.

It is implicit in Mr. Nixon's remarks, therefore, and despite his references to Cambodia's alleged neutrality, that a great deal more may be involved than a quick, effective thrust—that, in fact, the tottering Cambodian regime of Lon Nol, like the South Vietnamese regime of Nguyen Van Thieu, is now being sustained on the battlefield by American troops, since neither could long sustain itself without them.

Why, then, did Mr. Nixon take such a fateful step and explain it with such cunning words and inverted logic (reminiscent of President Johnson) as, "We take this action not for the purpose of expanding the war into Cambodia but for the purpose of ending the war in Vietnam and winning the just peace we all desire"?