

Judiciary (Mr. EASTLAND) and the able Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I so move.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were concurred in.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the previous order provides for the Senate to convene in the morning at 11 o'clock and that, upon disposition of the reading of the Journal, the able Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for a period of not to exceed 30 minutes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that fol-

lowing the statement of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a limitation of 3 minutes on speeches made during that period.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of routine morning business on tomorrow, the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that

the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1970, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate on May 19, 1970:

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the terms indicated: For the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1972:

Horton Guyford Stever, of Pennsylvania.
For a term expiring May 10, 1976:
Herbert E. Carter, of Illinois.
Robert Alan Charpie, of Massachusetts.
Lloyd Miller Cooke, of Illinois.
Robert Henry Dicke, of New Jersey.
David Murray Gates, of Missouri.
Roger W. Heyns, of California.
Frank Press, of Massachusetts.
Frederick P. Thieme, of Colorado.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 19, 1970

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

The peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and your minds.—Philippians 4: 7.

O God and Father of us all, Thou hast made us to live in faith with Thee and in love with one another, yet our world is worried by war, our Nation divided, and our own lives troubled. We confess our faults, our lack of faith, and our failure to love. Forgive us, we pray, and help us from this day forward to be more responsive to Thee and more ready to react affirmatively to the needs of our fellow men.

Bless our Nation, our President, our National and State leaders. Particularly do we pray for the Members of this House of Representatives, our Speaker, and all who work with them. May they take time to listen to Thee and, in so doing, be given insight to see clearly the way to take, courage to walk in that way, and patience to persist in pursuing peace at home and abroad. May they be channels through which justice and freedom and good will can come to greater life in our Nation and in our world.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 13, 1970:

H.R. 15945. An act to authorize appropri-

tions for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

On May 14, 1970:

H.R. 515. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3479. An act to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

RESIGNATION OF AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEEE ON H.R. 16516, NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation of a conferee:

MAY 19, 1970.

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the fact that I shall be absent on official business within my district, it will be impossible for me to serve as a Conferee on the NASA Authorization Bill, H.R. 16516.

I, therefore, tender my resignation as one of the Conferees.

With warm regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints to the committee of conference the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment by the Speaker.

THE FUTURE OF OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the great divisions which today rend our Nation. But I would hope that there is one issue upon which there is no division and upon which we could gain wholehearted support from all Members of this body as well as the general public—and that is the matter of the future of the American prisoners now held in camps of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Recently, our President announced the proposed withdrawal of an additional 150,000 American troops from Vietnam. We are all encouraged that our strength is such that he can propose such a withdrawal.

But, if we are going to put any pressure on the leaders of Hanoi, we should advise them that it is the intention of the American people that American prisoners will not be abandoned.

I am introducing today a resolution which would make necessary some agreement from the North Vietnamese for the exchange of prisoners before we withdraw any further American troops. I would suggest that if we do not make the withdrawal of troops contingent upon the release of our prisoners, we will find ourselves abandoning many fine young Americans who followed in the finest tradition of the American military in a time of combat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Congressmen to join me in cosponsorship of this resolution.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

FRANZ CHARLES FELDMEIERS

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.

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

S. 1934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michel M. Goutmann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 7, 1956.

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

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.

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

H.R. 12959

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Jara Haase may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Sergeant and Mrs. Russell Haase, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided, That the natural parents, brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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.

MRS. MARGARET M. McNELLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8573) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis.

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.

ATKINSON, HASERICK & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10534) for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick & Co., Inc.

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.

WILLIAM HEIDMAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12128) for the relief of William Heidman, Jr.

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.

MRS. FRANCINE M. WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12173) for the relief of Mrs. Francine M. Welch.

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.

LT. ROBERT J. SCANLON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12621) for the relief of Lt. Robert J. Scanlon.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay, out of current appropriations available for the payment of severance pay, to Lieutenant Robert J. Scanlon, Supply Corps, United States Navy, at the time of his discharge from the Navy, in addition to any amounts payable to him under other

provisions of law, an amount equal to the difference between (1) the amount of severance pay to which he would have been entitled, if the computation of such severance pay was based upon his total commissioned service in the United States Navy and (2) the amount of severance pay to which he is entitled under title 10, United States Code.

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 Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13676) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

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.

CLAUDE G. HANSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13807) for the relief of Claude G. Hansen.

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.

LT. COL. ROBERT L. POEHLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13810) for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein.

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.

S. SGT. LAWRENCE F. PAYNE, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14619) for the relief of S. Sgt. Lawrence F. Payne, U.S. Army (retired).

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

H.R. 14619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Staff Sergeant Lawrence F. Payne, United States Army (retired), of Hagerstown, Maryland, is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$2,033.26, representing the amount of overpayment of retired pay he received from November 1, 1958, through February 28, 1969, as the result of

an error in the computation of the retired pay to which the said Staff Sergeant Lawrence F. Payne was entitled. In the audit and settlement of the accounting of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Staff Sergeant Lawrence F. Payne, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$2,033.26" and insert "\$2,032.65".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

COLIE LANCE JOHNSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16997) for the relief of Colie Lance Johnson, Jr.

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

H.R. 16997

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 Colie Lance Johnson, Junior, the amounts certified by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the amounts that the said Colie Lance Johnson, Junior, would have been paid as the dependent son of the late Colie Lance Johnson, Senior (Veterans' Administration claim number XC-3-601-401), under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, had timely applications or claims been filed in the son's behalf at the earliest possible date following his father's death in action in the Southwest Pacific on May 19, 1944. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DONOHUE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONOHUE: Page 1, line 10: Strike "XC-3-601-401" and insert "XC-3-610-401".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TO REIMBURSE CERTAIN PERSONS FOR AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 19) to reimburse certain persons for amounts contributed to the Department of the Interior.

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

S. 19

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad, New Mexico, the sum of \$3,300 as reimbursement for amounts contributed on or after December 15, 1968, to the Department of the Interior for the purpose of employing personnel necessary to keep Carlsbad Caverns National Park, New Mexico, open to the public every day of the week for the period of December 24, 1968, through May 1, 1969.

(b) The Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad, New Mexico, shall identify any person who contributed for this purpose, determine the amount so contributed, and reimburse said individual in such amount so far as possible from funds authorized by this Act.

(c) The Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad, New Mexico, shall furnish to the Department of the Interior a report showing the disbursements of the appropriation herein provided for within six months after the enactment of this Act.

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

JAMES HARRY MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1786) for the relief of James Harry Martin.

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.

MRS. ELEANOR D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9497) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan.

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.

JOHN R. GOSNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13469) for the relief of John R. Gosnell.

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.

EUGENE M. SIMS, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14449) for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr.

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

H.R. 14449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the claim of Eugene M. Sims, Senior, based upon the loss of personal property while on active duty in the United States Army in Korea in 1950 is to be held and considered as a claim cognizable under section 241 of title 31 of the United States Code; and the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to consider, settle, and if found meritorious, pay a claim based upon the said loss, if filed by the said Eugene M. Sims, Senior, within one year of the date of approval of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

RELIEF OF JAMES M. BUSTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4983) for the relief of James M. Buster.

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

H.R. 4983

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James M. Buster, of Arlington, Virginia, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$422.07, representing overpayments (made due to administrative error) of compensation paid to Mr. Buster during 1967 in connection with his employment at the United States Government Printing Office in Washington, District of Columbia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike "\$422.07" and insert "\$396.51".

Page 2, strike all of lines 3 through 18.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-339)

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

To the Congress of the United States:
Pursuant to Public Law 89-794 I have the honor to transmit herewith the third annual report of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1970.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON MANGANESE ORE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 14720) to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore—including ferruginous ore—and related products, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so only so the chairman of the committee might give a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, is to continue for a 3-year period, through June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore—including ferruginous ore—and related products.

The principal use of manganese ore is for metallurgical purposes in the production of steel. Much smaller amounts are consumed in the production of dry-cell batteries and in the manufacture of manganese chemicals. Consumers of manganese ore in the United States are principally producers of manganese ferroalloys, primarily ferromanganese, and to a lesser extent silicomanganese.

In recent years, domestic ore has accounted for less than 1 percent of the manganese ore consumed in the United States. Thus the preponderant share of domestic consumption of manganese ore is supplied by imports principally from

Brazil, Gabon, Congo, Ghana, India, and the Union of South Africa. The duty on imports of manganese ores has been suspended since June 30, 1964, by virtue of successive enactments of temporary suspensions, and in the absence of legislation the suspension will expire on June 30, 1970. The existing suspended trade agreement rate of duty of 0.17 cents per pound under item 601.27 of the Tariff Schedule of the United States is subject to further reduction of 0.12 cents per pound on January 1, 1972, as a result of the Kennedy round.

The pending bill does not apply to ore importations from Communist or Communist-controlled or dominated countries specified in general headnote 3(d) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. Ore from such countries would still be subject to the full rate of 1 cent per pound on manganese content as provided in item 601.27 of the TSUS.

The Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that the continued suspension of duty on manganese ore provided in H.R. 14720 is fully justified and warranted. In addition to the fact that there is little production of manganese ore in the United States, in many respects the characteristics of the ore that is mined domestically render it noncompetitive with imported ore. The Committee also believes that enactment of the bill is desirable from the standpoint of domestic producers of ferromanganese and other manganese alloys. Continued suspension of the duty on the basic raw materials will aid in reducing costs to these processors and in enhancing the competitive position of domestically produced alloys in the market.

Favorable reports on the bill were received from the interested Federal departments and agencies, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission, and no information was received by the Committee on Ways and Means which would indicate any opposition to the legislation. The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14720, a bill to continue for 3 years—through June 30, 1973—the existing suspension of duties on certain manganese ores.

Although the major domestic use of manganese ore is in steelmaking, another important use is in the production of dry-cell batteries. The present suspension of duties is based upon the fact that very little manganese ore is produced domestically. The suspension does not harm U.S. manufacturers, but it does put processors in the home market in a better competitive position with those in other countries.

The committee has been informed by interested and appropriate agencies of the Government that the manganese situation has not changed, and that continued suspension of duties remains necessary. In this light, the measure was reported unanimously by the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) item 911.07 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "6/30/70" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/73".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouses, for consumption, after June 30, 1970.

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

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CERTAIN FORMS OF COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 17241) to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I do not intend to object, but I reserve the right in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas—I ask the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 17241, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, is to continue through June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on imports of unwrought copper—except nickel silver—copper waste and scrap, and copper articles imported to be used in remanufacture by smelting. In the absence of legislation, the existing suspension would expire on June 30, 1970. The bill would also extend for the same period the existing suspension of duties applicable to the copper content of certain copper-bearing ores and materials. The duties that would remain suspended would, in each case, amount to 1.1 cents per pound of pure copper which may be commercially obtained from the imported articles, except that in the case of nickel silver waste and scrap, the current rate is 1.1 cents per pound of the commercially recoverable copper content plus 7 percent ad valorem.

Copper is a metal that is of vital importance to the Nation's defense and nondefense needs. It is used in the electrical industry in the manufacture of generators, motors, locomotives, telephone and telegraph equipment, light and power transmission lines, and numerous other items. It is consumed by the copper-base alloy industry in the manufacture of products used in building construction, principally plumbing and roofing materials, and in the manufacture of automobiles and trucks, in shipbuilding, in the production of ammunition, and for a wide variety of other purposes.

The existing suspension of duty and

previous suspensions of duty on copper were enacted to relieve the tight copper situation. During 1967 and 1968 imports of copper were temporarily increased as a result of an extended strike in the copper industry. Imports subsequently declined, but the short supply situation continues to exist. Although direct defense requirements—215,000 tons for the year—have been falling since the first quarter of 1969 and are estimated to be lower for 1970 by approximately 10,000 tons, copper is expected to continue in tight supply in the United States and worldwide for some time to come. The United States must import, in normal market conditions, about 10 percent of its copper supply, but imported as much as 27 percent in 1967, as a result of the domestic copper industry strike. The economic conditions which led to the current suspension of duty are expected to continue.

The suspensions of duty provided under the pending bill would be inapplicable during any period in which the price of electrolytic copper in standard shapes and sizes, delivered Connecticut Valley, is below 36 cents per pound as determined pursuant to headnote 5, subpart 2C, schedule 6, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

No indication of opposition to the extension of this duty suspension was received by the Committee on Ways and Means, and the executive departments favored its enactment. The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 17241, a bill to continue through June 30, 1972, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

The items affected by this measure are unwrought copper, except for nickel silver; copper waste and scrap; copper articles to be used in remanufacture by smelting, and the copper content of certain copper-bearing ores and materials.

As we all know, copper remains of great importance to our national defense. The existing suspension and previous suspensions of duty were enacted to relieve a tight copper situation which has not yet eased. Copper is expected to continue in short supply, as a matter of fact, for an undetermined period in the future.

Because of this shortage, and because there has been no stated opposition to the bill, the committee was unanimous in reporting it favorably.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That items 911.10 (relating to copper waste and scrap), 911.11 (relating to articles of copper), 911.13 (relating to copper bearing ores and materials), 911.14 (relating to cement copper and copper precipitates), 911.15 (relating to black copper, blister copper, and anode copper), and 911.16 (relating to other unwrought copper) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are each amended by

striking out "6/30/70" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/72".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after June 30, 1970.

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

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ELECTRODES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16940) to extend until December 31, 1972, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for an explanation of the bill. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 16940, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable RICHARD FULTON of Tennessee, is to continue until the close of December 31, 1972, the suspension of duties on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum.

Under the permanent provisions of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, electrodes of the kind covered by the bill are currently dutiable under item 517.61 at 8½ percent ad valorem, the third stage of a five-stage reduction from 12½ to 6 percent ad valorem agreed to in the Kennedy round. However, the duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum has been suspended since October 7, 1965, by virtue of successive enactments of temporary duty suspensions, and in the absence of further legislation the suspension would expire on December 31, 1970.

The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that the electrodes of the type covered by the bill usually are manufactured by aluminum companies themselves at the site where they are to be used in the electrolysis of alumina into aluminum. These electrodes generally of carbon or graphite are consumed in great quantities in the electrolysis process. A number of small aluminum plants have been importing electrodes due to an insufficient volume of aluminum production to permit efficient manufacture of electrodes at their plants, and due to the difficulty of purchasing such electrodes commercially from domestic producers.

The Committee on Ways and Means received no information which would indicate opposition to the legislation, and the executive departments had no objection to its enactment. The Committee on Ways and Means believes that an extension of the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum for a 2-year period, as provided in the pending bill, is warranted,

and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16940, a bill to continue until December 31, 1972, the temporary suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum.

Electrodes of the type covered by this bill are manufactured for the most part by aluminum companies on the same site at which aluminum itself is produced. The committee has been informed that consumption of these electrodes is heavy.

The committee also has been told that a number of small aluminum plants have been importing these items because electrode manufacturing cannot be justified by their relatively light production of primary aluminum, and because of difficulty in purchasing the commodity domestically.

The committee was not informed of any opposition to this measure, and was unanimous in reporting it favorably.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the matter appearing in the effective period column for item 909.25 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "12/31/70" and inserting in lieu thereof "12/31/72".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16199), to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I believe we should have a brief explanation of the bill I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. I am grateful to my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to establish a working capital fund to provide an improved method of financing, managing, and accounting for certain administrative service operations provided by the Department of the Treasury to its bureaus and offices.

At the present time the Department of the Treasury is performing through its "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, on a reimbursable basis, various centralized services which benefit a number of Treasury bureaus financed by separate appropriations. The working capital fund established by this bill would consolidate these operations, place them on a more systematic and businesslike basis, and assist the Department in presenting a more accurate cost-based budget. This method of managing, financing, and accounting could be used whenever a consolidated services operation exists or is needed in that Department.

The working capital fund method of financing for centralized services is used by a number of other agencies of the Government, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Labor, and State, and the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the experience of these Departments with the working capital fund method of financing has demonstrated the value of this method of managing and financing for certain services.

The working capital fund would be a revolving fund of working capital employed to finance administrative service operations servicing more than one appropriation or activity. The fund would finance the central buying of materials, supplies, labor, and other services; the holding and issuing of materials and supplies; and the processing of materials into other forms for use. The supplies, materials, and services would be sold on order to customer activities on the basis of actual cost and the fund reimbursed. The working capital fund would provide a means for accumulating reserves to cover the cost of repairing and replacing equipment and the stocking of supplies under the most advantageous conditions.

The centralized services initially proposed by the Department of the Treasury include printing and duplicating, procurement of supplies, materials and equipment, and telecommunication services. Other services would be added as specifically determined by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. All such services must meet the test of being more advantageous and economically performed as central services.

Under the bill a limitation of \$1 million is placed on the capital in the working fund which will be made up of inventories and equipment and other assets, including any appropriations which may be made for this purpose. The fund is expected to revolve several times during a fiscal year.

H.R. 16199 is identical with H.R. 11158 of the 89th Congress and H.R. 4890 of the 90th Congress, which were unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me say that this bill, together with the bills that have already been passed in this series and the two remaining bills

to follow which will be called up, were reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16199, a bill to establish a working capital fund for the Treasury Department.

The aim is to provide an improved method of financing, managing, and accounting for certain administrative service operations which the Department offers to its bureau and offices.

The committee was informed that the working capital fund method of financing for centralized services is used by a number of other governmental agencies, with marked success. The fund finances the central buying of materials, supplies, labor, and other services; the holding and issuing of materials and supplies; and the processing of materials into other forms for use.

The supplies, materials and services can be sold on the basis on actual cost and the fund can then be reimbursed. The fund would provide a means for accumulating reserves to cover equipment repair and replacement costs, and the stocking of supplies under the most favorable conditions.

With these factors in mind, the committee unanimously recommended enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16199

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, which shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operation of such administrative services as the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall not exceed \$1,000,000 and shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary of the Treasury may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of the Treasury, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will recover the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON L-DOPA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8512) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I only do so for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8512, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to suspend for a period of 2 years the duties on imports of L-Dopa.

L-Dopa is an investigational new drug used in the treatment of Parkinson's disease. It has not been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for general use. L-Dopa may be produced synthetically from benzenoid intermediates, by extraction from certain species of beans, or from naturally occurring plant or animal materials. It is dutiable under four separate provisions of the Tariff Schedules, depending upon the method of production and whether or not it is determined to be a drug. During the past several years, imports of L-Dopa are known to have entered under at least three of the four provisions of the Tariff Schedules mentioned above. At the present time, however, it is believed that L-Dopa is being classified by customs as a drug and would therefore enter either under item 407.85 or under item 439.50, depending on the method of manufacture.

Usage of L-Dopa in the United States is limited at this time since the drug has not been approved for general use. Domestic production is limited, although a number of firms have expressed an interest in marketing the drug either by producing it domestically or importing the drug from abroad once FDA approval has been obtained. Most of the imports come from Japan and supplies are limited.

The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that a small domestic chemical firm is producing the drug and that such production is not expected to be sufficient to meet current domestic requirements until the drug is approved for general use. In view of plans for commercial production of L-Dopa, the bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable GEORGE BUSH, has been amended by the committee to provide for a 2-year suspension of duty rather than for 3 years as provided in the bill as introduced.

Favorable reports were received on H.R. 8512 from the Departments of Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, State, and the special representative for trade negotiations, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. The Committee on Ways and Means be-

lieves that under the circumstances, a temporary suspension of this duty could result in a reduction in the cost of L-Dopa to patients, and it unanimously recommends enactment of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8512, a bill to suspend for 2 years the duties on imports of L-Dopa, a new drug used in treatment of Parkinson's disease.

The committee learned that the drug is produced synthetically from benzenoid intermediates, often by extraction from certain bean species. The committee also was informed that most of the imports come from Japan and that supplies are limited.

A small domestic chemical firm is producing the drug, but the committee understands this production is not expected to be large enough to meet domestic requirements in some considerable time.

Four executive departments supported this bill, as did the Tariff Commission and the special representative for trade negotiations.

In giving this measure its unanimous approval, the committee gave consideration to the indication that suspension of duty could result in a reduction of cost to patients using the drug.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8512

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting immediately after item 907.30 the following new item:

L-Dopa, however, provided for in schedule 4.	Free	No change.	The 3-year period beginning day after enactment of this item.
--	------	------------	---

With the following committee amendment: Strike out the matter appearing on page 1 after line 6 and insert:

"L-Dopa, however, provided for in schedule 4.	Free	No change.	The 2-year period beginning day after enactment of this item."
---	------	------------	--

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF PEAL OF EIGHT BELLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6854) to provide for the free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for use of Smith College, Northampton, Mass., which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, for the purpose of a brief explanation of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE, is to provide for the duty-free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for the use of Smith College, Northampton, Mass. The bill further provides that, if liquidation of the entry has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty made.

The Committee on Ways and Means was informed that the peal of eight bells for the use of Smith College was entered and was subject to a duty of 9 percent ad valorem under item 725.34 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. The committee was further advised that the peal of eight bells desired by Smith College was not available from domestic producers. The appropriate agencies of the Government, including the Tariff Commission, have informed the Committee on Ways and Means, in its favorable consideration of similar bills in the past, that such bells are not produced in the United States. The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 6854.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6854, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The committee was informed that the bells which Smith College wanted were not available from a supplier in the United States, and were not, in fact, produced domestically.

It was largely in view of this that the committee unanimously reported the bill favorably, and I urge the House to give it favorable consideration now.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6854

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 admit free of duty a peal of eight bells and fittings for the use of Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

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

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. SISK. 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 California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONABLE. 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. 126]

Abernethy	Flynt	Pepper
Anderson, Tenn.	Frelinghuysen	Pollock
Andrews, Ala.	Gallagher	Powell
Baring	Gaydos	Rivers
Barrett	Giaino	Rogers, Colo.
Biester	Goldwater	Rooney, N.Y.
Bingham	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Rostenkowski
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Roudebush
Brock	Gubser	Ruppe
Broomfield	Hansen, Idaho	Scheuer
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Schneebell
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Sebellius
Bush	Hogan	Smith, Iowa
Byrne, Pa.	Kirwan	Springer
Chappell	Lowenstein	Stokes
Clark	McCarthy	Stratton
Clay	McFall	Stubblefield
Colmer	McMillan	Talcott
Conyers	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	Meskill	Tunney
Coughlin	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Daddario	Moorhead	Watkins
Dawson	Morgan	Whalen
Dent	Morse	Whalley
Dickinson	Morton	Williams
Dorn	Mosher	Wilson, Bob
Elberg	Nix	Wold
Fish	O'Neal, Ga.	Yatron
Flood	Ottinger	
	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 952, PROVIDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 952) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 14, 1970.)

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 952, the omnibus judgeship bill, substantially adopts the bill as approved by the House. The differences between the House-approved measure and the substitute agreed in the conference essentially consist of the addition of four new judgeships as follows:

Florida, Middle District.....	1
District of Maryland.....	1
District of Nebraska.....	1
West Virginia, Southern District.....	1

The addition of these judgeships raises the total of new permanent judgeships authorized by this legislation to 58. The conference report is still below the figure of 67 authorized new permanent judgeships as originally contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary recognizes that the burgeoning Federal caseload and backlog in many districts require additional judicial manpower. However, it is not under any illusion that merely additional judges will cure or totally solve these problems. Several other innovative ways in assisting the courts in effectively coping with their caseloads have been recently enacted by the Congress. These include the Federal Magistrates Act—Public Law 90-578—and the Federal Judicial Center Act—Public Law 90-219. The Magistrates Act was designed to provide the courts with professional judicial officers at the first echelon who could be helpful in relieving the courts of minor criminal cases and in screening the flood of post-conviction petitions.

The Federal Judicial Center was designed to provide the Federal judiciary a research and development agency. Its purposes are to assist in the reorganization of court calendars, to consider the possible ways of computerizing dockets, and generally to improve the administrative procedures of the Federal courts.

The committee believes that these enactments will help to relieve the need for periodic increases in the number of Federal judges. The committee has carefully reviewed how these statutes will affect the present and future ability of the Federal courts to cope with its growing business.

The conference report on S. 952 promises needed increases in the number of Federal district judges in district courts throughout the Nation where the number of cases pending, the volume of new filings, and the delays from issue to trial have reached serious proportion. It is essential that in a society which is governed by law that the law is dispensed with efficiency, wisdom and dispatch. Adoption of the conference report will, in

large measure, furnish the judicial manpower needed to meet the challenge that now exists in our Federal courts.

I urge my colleagues to give their approval to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has told of the important provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 952 is essentially the House bill with the addition of four judgeships for the following district courts: one for Florida, middle; Maryland; Nebraska; and West Virginia, southern. S. 952, as reported by the conferees, provides for 58 permanent district judgeships plus three temporary judgeships.

Although this number is three less than the Judicial Conference's recommendation, I am of the opinion that it is a fair compromise notwithstanding the fact that some of my colleagues will be disappointed. I have found it impossible, having considered a number of such bills down through the years, to meet the request or needs of every district. I can only say that these four additional judgeships were arrived at after long and careful discussion. The impartially marshaled facts show that at least this many judgeships are clearly required if the quality of process is to continue to be the hallmark of the Federal judicial system.

In making its recommendation for judgeships to the Congress in September, 1968, the Judicial Conference projected its need through 1972. Twenty months have elapsed since their request was made. Final enactment of this legislation, it is hoped, will be completed this week.

There will also be some time expended in filling these judgeships. The failure to fill with reasonable promptness the new judgeships which we create here today or to fill vacancies that have existed by reason of retirement or death of judges has been a serious problem for many years. Presently, there exist 16 vacancies in our Federal courts. Many of these vacancies have been permitted to lie dormant, but it is not only this administration, but politics in general, that is responsible for this condition.

In hearings before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Judge Biggs testified that from July 1, 1958, to March 31, 1969, the delays in filling vacancies in U.S. district courts, the trial courts of this country, if you please, exceeded 143 judge-years.

The record shows that it takes from 6 to 18 months to nominate and have confirmed a judge for the Federal trial court. I am of the opinion that such delay in many cases is inexcusable. I said as much in committee at hearings on S. 952 and that a much shorter time is expected to be used in the future, if we are to have swift justice. I must caution, that such a delay in filling these judgeships will effectively, in part, thwart the

intent and purpose of this legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must strenuously urge that appointments to the Federal judiciary be removed from the category of pure party politics.

I earnestly urge President Nixon, as I did former Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, to take the opportunity afforded by the passage of S. 952 to make a real effort to advance the ideal of a balanced, truly nonpolitical judiciary. Thus the image of the Federal courts and the public confidence in them will be accordingly brightened.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF).

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use the 10 minutes. I rise principally to announce my support as one of the conferees of the report agreed upon after very diligent study and negotiation by the conferees on both sides.

To recapitulate briefly, the bill as it left the other body originally authorized the creation of 67 permanent new judgeships. As the bill passed the House, it authorized the creation of 54 new judgeships. The conference report recommends the creation of 58 new judgeships. In summary, this means that the House yielded on four positions, and the other body yielded on nine positions, so that if we are measuring the work product of the conference committee by our own rule of success, then I think it must be said that the House succeeded in major part.

With respect to nonjudge other provisions in the original bill, as it left the other body, it was agreed not to include them in this legislative package but rather to consider them separately at a later date.

This, I think was a wise decision.

I think it is also accurate to denominate the legislation which is about to be sent to the President's desk as the first major crime control legislation of the 91st Congress, because in all truth it is that.

The backlog of caseloads in the district courts throughout the United States, particularly on the criminal docket is cause for deep concern. The passage of this legislation and the filling of the new vacancies created will help to relieve that problem.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has spoken of the backlog of cases on the docket. I am not an attorney, but I understand that some of these judges work only 4 or 5 hours a day and 3 days a week.

I am not too much in favor of the legislation right at the present time, but can the gentleman tell me what their actual working time is and how much time they spend in court?

Mr. POFF. There are no such statistics compiled on each of the district courts of the United States and I doubt that it is possible accurately to take a

cross section, or to cite the figures, to illustrate the so-called typical district court.

It is simply too complicated to attempt. I do believe, however, that it is fair to say that the average district judge spends more time in the performance of his duties than does any other jurist in the United States.

Mr. DULSKI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, the conferees added to the House bill one Federal judge for the middle district of Florida, which was not in the House bill as a compromise and that the Senate bill had two for the middle district. In addition to two for the southern district.

I asked the conferees to consider additional judges for the middle district.

The conference report contains one for the middle district and two for the southern district; is that correct?

Mr. POFF. The gentleman is correct. I might say the gentleman from Florida was very assiduous in pressing his viewpoint on this subject.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I am becoming a recent authority on judges.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I was surprised to hear the gentleman from Ohio say that there are 16 Federal judge vacancies, and he indicated that some of these vacancies have been outstanding for some period of time. That, to me, indicates two things. First of all, it would seem to shatter the old saying that additional judges are needed because justice delayed is justice denied. Second, it casts doubt upon the necessity for some 50-odd more Federal judges, if there are 16 judgeship vacancies that have been outstanding for some time.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to comment on that fact. I had intended to comment rather fully on it when I first spoke.

I think it is regrettable that there are that many unfilled judgeships in America. It is not alone the fault of the nominating authority. It is the fault, mainly, of politics, and we have not been able to escape the effects of politics in the nominations of Federal judges anytime in the history of this country. I am hopeful that this administration would move promptly to nominate qualified men to fill not only these vacancies but others.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McClory).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I note in the conference report and in the action which I believe the House will take today, that we ignore the recommendations of the Judicial Conference with regard to six new Federal judgeships. I also note that in 1961 and 1965 we respected their recommendations and

added all the judges that they recommended plus additional judges. It seems to me it is a mistake to depart from that practice. I think we should give the utmost respect to the recommendations which come to us from the Judicial Conference itself.

I want also to call attention to the fact that the Judicial Conference additionally recommended that we adopt a system of court executives. We have in the past, adopted such a system with regard to the District of Columbia and the recommendation was made this year that the 11 circuits and also the districts which have six or more judges should also have this new administrative facility.

I believe the reason for the huge backlog of cases in our Federal courts is not just the need for more judges but also the antiquated machinery under which the courts operate. Certainly the intention of the recommendation for court executives is to provide a new management system for the courts and to provide for the expedition of the administration of justice. While this conference report does not include court executives, I have cosponsored separate legislation to provide authority for this new administrative facility. I hope that we can have an early hearing on that legislation since we ignored the recommendation in this bill, and that following such hearing we can have action for a court executive at this session.

I want to point out, however, that the court executive proposal was recommended and was originally a part of the legislation we approve today as it came to us from the Senate. We dropped it in the House and it has not been included in the conference report. I think it is unfortunate, and I hope that that vacuum can be filled at a very early date.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would hope to clarify one point. As I understand, the House bill made no provision for one additional judge for the western district of Missouri. I understand that the Senate version of the bill did contain a provision for one additional judge. I ask the chairman whether the conference report adopted the House version, and there is none for the western district of Missouri.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. RANDALL. I supported the House version passed in March of this year, even though I felt that the western district of Missouri, including the Greater Kansas City area, should have been accorded an additional judge. The House Members who represent the general area were assured the Senate will stand fast for an additional judge. We felt the House-passed bill would serve as a vehicle for the conference committee to consider the Senate version of S. 952. The failure of the conferees to add the additional judge to western Missouri makes it impossible to support the conference report.

Of course we knew that the Judicial Conference did not recommend this judgeship. Yet almost the entire Missouri

bar that practices in western Missouri have expressed the need for an additional judge. All local public officials and civic leaders have joined in the suggestion that the statistics provided by the Judicial Conference were either erroneous, or invalid conclusions had been drawn from these statistics before the recommendation was made by the conference. It should be recalled that the eastern district of Missouri barely qualified under the conference recommendations.

To oppose an omnibus judge bill providing for the appointment of additional district judges on the grounds that one's home area has been treated unfairly will, of course, be said to be provincial.

No one could deny that the fast-growing areas of Florida and California were quite rightly accorded some docket relief by providing additional judges. However, a brief look at the conference report will show areas quite similar to western Missouri that were included by the conferees, such as Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado.

When the constituents of all of us discover that it costs \$244,000 a year for each of these judgeships and, moreover, ponder the fact that this means a cost of about \$1,000,000 every 4 years for each judgeship, they will then demand of their Representative in Congress strict proof that these judgeships were assigned where there was a real need without any other considerations involved. This will be particularly true when our constituents come to understand that the annual cost of what we are doing today will be \$14,000,000. That means next year, and every year from now on. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this conference report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 20, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—334

Abbott	Bell, Calif.	Broyhill, Va.
Adams	Bennett	Buchanan
Addabbo	Betts	Burke, Fla.
Albert	Biaggi	Burke, Mass.
Alexander	Blackburn	Burleson, Tex.
Anderson,	Blanton	Burlison, Mo.
Calif.	Blatnik	Burton, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Boland	Burton, Utah
Andrews,	Bolling	Button
N. Dak.	Bow	Byrnes, Wis.
Annuzio	Brademas	Cabell
Arends	Brasco	Caffery
Ashbrook	Bray	Carey
Ashley	Brooks	Carter
Aspinall	Broomfield	Casey
Ayres	Brotzman	Cedersberg
Beall, Md.	Brown, Ohio	Celler
Belcher	Broyhill, N.C.	Chamberlain

Chappell	Hawkins	Pickle
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Pirnie
Clausen,	Helstoski	Podell
Don H.	Hicks	Poff
Clawson, Del	Hollifield	Preyer, N.C.
Clay	Horton	Price, Ill.
Cleveland	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Cohelan	Howard	Pryor, Ark.
Collier	Hungate	Pucinski
Collins	Hunt	Purcell
Conable	Hutchinson	Quie
Conte	Ichord	Quillen
Corman	Jacobs	Railsback
Cowger	Jarman	Rees
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, Ill.
Crane	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Culver	Jonas	Reifel
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Daniel, Va.	Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes
Daniels, N.J.	Karth	Riegle
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Rivers
Davis, Wis.	Kazen	Roberts
de la Garza	Kee	Robison
Delaney	Keith	Rodino
Dellenback	King	Roe
Denney	Kleppe	Rogers, Fla.
Dennis	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Derwinski	Koch	Roth
Devine	Kuykendall	Roybal
Diggs	Kyl	Ruth
Dingell	Kyros	Ryan
Donohue	Landgrebe	St Germain
Dorn	Landrum	Sandman
Dowdy	Langen	Satterfield
Downing	Latta	Saylor
Dulski	Leggett	Scheuer
Duncan	Lennon	Schwengel
Dwyer	Lloyd	Scott
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Shipley
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Shrivers
Edwards, Ala.	Lujan	Sikes
Edwards, Calif.	Lukens	Sisk
Edwards, La.	McClory	Skubitz
Esch	McCloskey	Slack
Erlenborn	McClure	Smith, N.Y.
Esch	McCulloch	Snyder
Eshleman	McDade	Springer
Evans, Colo.	McDonald,	Stafford
Evins, Tenn.	Mich.	Staggers
Fallon	McEwen	Stanton
Farbstein	McKneally	Steed
Fascell	Macdonald,	Steiger, Ariz.
Feighan	Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Findley	MacGregor	Stevens
Fish	Madden	Stuckey
Fisher	Mahon	Sullivan
Flowers	Mailliard	Symington
Foley	Mann	Taft
Ford, Gerald R.	Marsh	Taylor
Ford,	Martin	Teague, Calif.
William D.	Mathias	Thompson, Ga.
Foreman	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Fountain	May	Thomson, Wis.
Fraser	Mayne	Tiernan
Frey	Meeds	Udall
Friedel	Melcher	Ullman
Fulton, Pa.	Michel	Van Derlin
Fulton, Tenn.	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Fuqua	Miller, Calif.	Vigorito
Gallifanakis	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Gallagher	Mills	Waldie
Garmatz	Minish	Wampler
Gettys	Mink	Watson
Gibbons	Minshall	Watts
Gilbert	Mize	Weicker
Goldwater	Mizell	White
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Whitehurst
Goodling	Monagan	Whitten
Gray	Montgomery	Widnall
Griffiths	Morton	Wiggins
Grover	Moss	Wilson, Bob
Gude	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson,
Hagan	Myers	Charles H.
Haley	Natcher	Winn
Halpern	Nedzi	Wolf
Hamilton	Nelsen	Wright
Hammer-	Obey	Wyatt
schmidt	O'Hara	Wydler
Hanley	Olsen	Wylie
Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.	Wyman
Hansen, Wash.	Patman	Yates
Harrington	Pelly	Young
Harsha	Perkins	Zablocki
Harvey	Pettis	Zion
Hastings	Philbin	Zwach
Hathaway		

NAYS—20

Adair	Hall	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Henderson	Powell
Bevill	Hull	Randall
Brinkley	Jones, N.C.	Rarick
Colmer	Nichols	Schaddeberg
Griffin	O'Konski	Scherle
Gross	Passman	

NOT VOTING—75

Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Pollock
Anderson,	Gaydos	Rogers, Colo.
Tenn.	Gialmo	Rooney, N.Y.
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, Pa.
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Berry	Gubser	Roudebush
Blester	Hansen, Idaho	Ruppe
Bingham	Hays	Schneebeil
Boggs	Hébert	Sebelius
Brock	Hogan	Smith, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Brown, Mich.	Lowenstein	Stokes
Bush	McCarthy	Stratton
Byrne, Pa.	McFall	Stubblefield
Camp	McMillan	Talcott
Clark	Meskill	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	Moorhead	Tunney
Corbett	Morgan	Vanik
Coughlin	Morse	Watkins
Daddario	Mosher	Whalen
Dawson	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalley
Dent	Nix	Williams
Dickinson	O'Neal, Ga.	Wold
Eilberg	Ottinger	Yatron
Flood	Patten	
Flynt	Pepper	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Whalen.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Schneebeil.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Biester.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Mosher.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. Patten of New Jersey with Mr. Wold.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Yatron.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Lowenstein.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. 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. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

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. 17619, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois 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 unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I bring you the appropriations bill on the Department of Interior and related agencies. Before I present the details of this bill, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to the members of my subcommittee who have so faithfully participated in our committee activities, and may I also point out that to the sorrow of every Member of this Congress, this is the last year my very distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Congressman BEN REIFEL, will serve in the House of Representatives and the last year he will participate in one of our bills.

The gentleman from South Dakota has been one of this Nation's outstanding Members, contributing not only to the knowledge of our committee, but to the support of programs financed by this committee across the Nation. I am proud to have had the privilege and opportunity to serve with him and I deeply regret his leaving us. It is not only the gentleman's competence and ability but his deep and abiding love for humanity which have been daily reflected in the activities of this Congress. He has always been in the forefront of those who care about people and programs meaningful to the United States. It is his kind of America which will keep this country from burning. May I say on behalf of all our subcommittee: "We are sorry you are leaving. May you send someone in your place as conscientious as yourself, who loves humanity as deeply as you do."

I am grateful to each Member of this House who took the time and effort to appear before the subcommittee for hearings and talked with me and members of our committee relative to funding for the bill and the impact of that funding on our total economy.

May I recommend to each and every Member of the House that he or she read our five volumes of hearings. A careful analysis and innumerable details relative to the operation of each department and bureau are in these hearings and can give you an excellent and factual summary of the management of our American land.

May I also add it would be impossible to present this report today without the exhaustive labors of the hard-working staff of my Appropriations Subcommittee, and Paul Wilson of the full committee.

The size of this bill dollarwise is not perhaps as significant as other appropriations bills offered during the year. However, it covers a wide diversity of activities with funding for 25 different agencies and provides management funds for the preservation of our natural resources, pollution abatement, the welfare and education of approximately 600,000 American Indians, and 230,000 inhabitants of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

SUMMARY OF BILL

The summary of the bill is as follows:

Item	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1971	Recommended in bill	Comparison
Title I, Department of the Interior:			
New Budget (obligational) authority	\$1,149,703,600	\$1,145,504,000	-\$4,199,600
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	71,000,000	71,000,000	
Title II, Related Agencies:			
New budget (obligational) authority	461,054,000	464,895,700	+3,841,700
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	123,897,000	120,200,000	-3,697,000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority	1,805,554,600	1,811,599,700	-4,054,900

SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Because time is limited, I am listing now briefly a summary by activities of major increases and decreases in funding for 1971 fiscal year, compared to fiscal year 1970:

Major increases (+):	
Education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indians	\$49,948,000
Land and water conservation fund	44,500,000
Conservation and development of natural resources	38,861,700
Conservation and development of mineral resources, including health and safety	35,093,000
Management, protection, and maintenance of national parks	25,918,000
Geologic surveys, investigations, and research	11,602,000
Smithsonian Institution and related activities	9,968,000
Construction of roads	8,930,000
Water research	5,525,000
Preservation of historic properties	5,201,000

Administration of territories, Offices of Secretary and Solicitor, Interior	\$4,316,000
	2,834,300
Subtotal, major increases	242,697,600
Major decreases (-):	
Helium fund	24,000,000
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	7,500,000
Subtotal, major decreases	31,500,000
Other increases and decreases (net)	-462,200
Net total increase over fiscal year 1970	+210,735,400

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

As the committee has carefully measured each expenditure dollar requested in this budget, it also kept in mind revenue generated by agencies in this bill. Listed below is a chart indicating to you our appropriations and receipts for fiscal year 1969 and 1970 with the anticipated 1971 fiscal year.

Item	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
Appropriations	\$1,552,430,779	\$1,606,654,300	\$1,801,599,700
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	807,129,733	709,362,553	1,404,940,073
Forest Service	321,253,830	324,557,000	378,902,000
Total receipts	1,128,383,563	1,033,919,553	1,783,842,073

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN BILL

What are the breadth and scope of activities funded in this bill? Why is it important? Again I list for you selected items, although not covering the entire bill but indicative of the extent of our activities:

Management of public lands:	Acres
Bureau of Land Management	452,669,413
U.S. Forest Service	186,632,152
Bureau of Indian Affairs	55,350,883
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	30,567,008
National Park Service	28,459,701
Total acres	753,679,157

	Current inventory	1971 construction
Road construction (miles):		
Bureau of Land Management	50,000	418
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19,595	412
National Park Service	9,997	23
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	6,015	
U.S. Forest Service	199,042	7,729
Total miles	284,649	8,582
Recreation visitations (millions):		
National Park Service	157	189
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	18	23
Bureau of Land Management	65	98
U.S. Forest Service	163	180
Total visitations	403	487

TIMBER PRODUCTION

Forest Service: An estimated harvest of 13.4 billion board feet is anticipated for 1971, with receipts from sales of approximately \$362 million. The timber harvest provides the raw material base for over 1 million jobs, \$11.5 billion in gross national product, and \$2.4 billion in returns to the Treasury under the present tax rates. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber and 35 percent of the softwood timber cut for industrial purposes annually, and is equivalent to the construction of about 1 million average-sized homes.

Bureau of Land Management: Administers the sale of over 1.5 billion board feet of timber annually. Timber receipts are estimated to be \$78.1 million in 1971.

SOIL AND WATERSHED CONSERVATION

Forest Service: The National Forests of the West—about 20 percent of the area—produce about 50 percent of the water, conservatively estimated at a value of over \$1 billion annually.

Bureau of Land Management: Administers an active program of soil stabilization practices on 160 million acres of public lands covering about 1,300 watersheds. Practices are designed to conserve and develop public land soil and water resources and include construction of small water control structures, contouring and cultivation, revegetation, protective fencing, and water developments.

GRAZING

Bureau of Land Management: Administers grazing of more than 11.5 million head of livestock and 2.7 million big game animals. Grazing receipts are estimated to be \$6.8 million in 1971.

Forest Service: Administers the grazing of 7.3 million head of livestock. This provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by 18,200 family-sized ranch units. In addition, an estimated 4.3 million big game animals graze on National Forest lands.

INDIAN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools, 58,000; Indian children in public schools, 84,000; Indians provided with welfare guidance services, 40,000; operation and maintenance of 300 Indian irrigation systems.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Bureau of Land Management: Administers mining and mineral leasing on approximately 760 million acres of land in the continental United States and more than 515 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf. Mineral receipts are estimated to be \$1.1 billion in 1971.

Geological Survey: Provides the basic scientific and engineering data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of production on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is \$2.9 billion, with royalties accruing to the Government of \$411 million. Bonuses from lease sales this fiscal year will approximate \$808 million.

FISHERY RESOURCES

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Produces in excess of 5 million

pounds of fish a year. The accumulative effect is estimated to support approximately 44 million fisherman-days annually. In addition, this Bureau's refuges accommodate about 1.5 billion waterfowl-use-days, not including Alaska. These refuges also support almost 3 million hunter-use-days.

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The Department of the Interior is responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, American Samoa, and Guam. This involves the management of about 985 square miles of land with a total native population of approximately 230,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PARKS AND ZOOS

I think I should point out to our committee that our total appropriation figures may appear somewhat misleading. Although we exceed the 1970 appropriation by \$210,735,400, actually there are factors which indicate that this increase is not that great. H.R. 17399, the second supplemental bill now pending before Congress, includes \$109,258,000 for workload increases and pay costs. In addition, the bill before you includes the National Park Service's assumption of responsibility for funding of certain park areas within the District of Columbia formerly funded in the District of Columbia bill. Included here is \$3.5 million for this purpose. Another major item of increase is \$2,919,000 for operation and maintenance of the National Zoological Park formerly funded by the District of Columbia appropriation.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the committee did not include funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities since existing legislation authorizing this activity expires June 30, 1970.

New legislation which would authorize the continuance of this activity in fiscal year 1971 has not yet been considered by either House.

In the absence of authorizing legislation for this activity in 1971, the committee has decided to pass over this item without prejudice since the program involves diverse activity; the amount of funding is sizable, and the budget estimate represents a major increase over the 1970 appropriation. The 1970 appropriation enacted to date and the budget estimate for 1971, which for comparability are omitted from report totals, are as follows:

	1970 appropriation	Budget estimate, 1971
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:		
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,490,000	\$2,400,000
Endowment for the Arts.....	7,250,000	16,300,000
Endowment for the Humanities.....	7,050,000	16,300,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	15,790,000	35,000,000

As I noted earlier, a major portion of activities funded in this bill are engaged directly with protection of our environment, ranging from corrective action to

mitigate stream pollution, from mine acid drainage to the development of more efficient and practical methods of solid waste disposal. Within this wide diversity are the reduction of damage resulting from oil spills: The decrease of sulfurous emissions resulting from the use of coal; purification of water supplies by improvement of watersheds; and supervision of the construction of the Trans-Alaska pipeline over the fragile terrain of Alaska.

In recent months, the protection of our environment from various pollutants has become a national movement. The Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee has been closely associated with these problems for several years and has vigorously espoused the conservation of our natural resources and the safeguarding of our environment.

As you review the printed hearings on the 1971 budget estimates you will see the deficiencies in a number of budget proposals. In this connection funding is severely limited in many categories and as I will note later, funds appropriated for the 1970 fiscal year and specifically earmarked for the abatement of pollution such as sanitation facilities at various Federal installations, were placed in reserve and could not be expended.

Two of our very basic objectives on the provisions of this bill are: First, to provide adequate funding for the conservation and development of our replaceable and nonreplaceable resources, and second, to provide adequate funding toward a meaningful program to attack the various sources of pollution which threaten our environment. There are many subscribers to the general idea of pollution abatement, but it is evident to the committee few realize what the financial costs will be to achieve this objective, and probably there are fewer yet willing to make the necessary expenditures to accomplish it.

It is with these basic objectives in mind that the committee considered these appropriations and ordinarily it is the custom of subcommittee chairmen when presenting a bill to the floor to assert that this is a "good bill." If I am to be absolutely frank, I cannot make that total assertion today for a wide variety of reasons including the need for fiscal restraint during a period of high expenditures by our Federal Government. Dollars must be expended for defense and war, foreign operations, transportation, education, and many other items which preclude the proper funding amounts for this bill. I can only say, therefore, that this is the best bill under all current circumstances which can be presented. However, I do want to warn this Committee today that deficiencies of funding carried through the years can have no result other than an adverse reflection on this land of ours. Money is needed to correct and direct necessary programs of national improvement.

The Director of the Bureau of Land Management when questioned in my hearings, "Do you think the budget you propose this year will take care of your 36 million visitor days?" said:

No, this budget will provide 2 to 3 percent in developed sites.

The Forest Service presented similar testimony. Recreation facilities in the national forests are overcrowded and yet we know that if recreation sites are not adequately prepared and marked, there can be an increase of forest fires and forest depredations far more costly to taxpayers than our original dollar investments for protection.

We are also aware of the fact that housing is needed to solve some of the most difficult social problems America faces. Yet in my hearings when I asked the Forest Service for a comparison between housing starts in Japan and the United States, we were told on page 53, volume 4 of our hearings that in Japan an increase in housing starts to 1.3 million units is planned commencing in 1971. There are 100 million Japanese. In the United States, with 202 million Americans, the housing starts for 1971 will also be 1.3 million.

We had testimony on page 92, volume 4, that the National Forests of the United States need reforestation on 4,788,254 acres. We also have 9,122,746 acres of overstocked young timber that needs timber stand improvement treatment if we are going to do a forest management job.

On page 93, volume 4, the Forest Service told us that if there were planting, and thinning commensurate with the needs, it would result in 1,154,000,000 cubic feet of timber, or approximately 5.8 billion board feet annually to the production of lumber for the United States, and may I point out that not only is the U.S. Forest Service important to the production of timber, but it has a major responsibility in the protection of our watersheds in the development of knowledge on the kind of ecology to sustain surface water needed in the total inventory of water available to this Nation.

We must also face the fact that visitations to our national recreation area lands will increase from 403 million visitations in 1969 to approximately 487 million in fiscal year 1971.

As you review the information developed in our hearings, I think the numerous instances of deficiencies in funding will startle you. An additional billion dollars could be put to wise and efficient use by the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Office of Coal Research, and other agencies funded in this bill responsible for conservation of our natural resources and protection of our ecology.

In a moment I shall refer to some of the problems within the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service which if given additional and sufficient funding could update and bring our Indian people into the full context of 20th-century American citizenship.

I have long been bewildered by our ever-increasing desire to spread our funds abroad, when 50 percent of the Navajo people who live on a reservation which is larger than the State of West Virginia are unemployed and the average relief check per person is \$39 a month. Measure this, if you please, against some of our assistance funds to other nations.

However, it would not be fair if I did not point out to the Committee some of the areas where we have made genuine progress and where we are evincing an honest concern for America and its ecology.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

For example, the Trans-Alaska pipeline. In the 1971 fiscal year budget, the trans-Alaska pipeline involving the shipment of oil some 800 miles through a 48-inch pipeline from Prudhoe Bay in northern Alaska to Valdez on the southern coast of Alaska is receiving a great deal of attention. Engineeringwise, this is one of the most difficult construction projects to be attempted on this continent and yet I am sure that a nation which has the know-how to go to the moon can solve this problem. However, there are involved intricate land claims by the Alaska natives which must be resolved before construction gets underway.

Second, and of equal importance is the urgent necessity to safeguard the fragile ecology of the area to be traversed by this proposed pipeline. The project involves pumping hot oil through a pipeline submerged through a major section of permafrost in Alaska. Unless adequate precaution is taken and unless there is complete recognition of earthquake danger, irreparable damage can result to the terrain, and severe injury to the environment could occur as a result of oil spills from ruptures of this pipeline.

The Department of Interior through its agencies—the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, and the Geological Survey—have appeared before the committee and discussed at length the safeguards. I am confident that the Department, the Secretary, and those companies involved in this problem are as determined as the committee to make this an ecologically safe operation.

I think also it is well to bear in mind the Secretary of Interior's statement in our opening hearings that in spite of the danger on the overland pipeline, the greatest danger to the world at large is with maritime oil spills.

In this bill before you, please note that our committee has taken cognizance of damage which could occur to marine life and asks that money be expended to determine the impact of oil spills on whales and fish and seeks answers relative to precautions which must be taken on oil spills regardless of any source.

You will note in the bill that there is \$3,750,000 divided as follows: Bureau of Land Management, \$2,000,000; Geological Survey, \$1,300,000; Sport Fish, \$225,000; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, \$225,000.

The solicitor of the Department of Interior has indicated to the committee that those costs directly related to construction of the pipeline and under agreement between the Department of Interior and the oil companies can have these costs recoverable from the oil companies. It has been interesting to note that there is a separate breakdown throughout the committee hearings between those costs which were attributa-

ble to the regular management of the terrain in Alaska and to those costs which are part of TAPS.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Many in this House have talked with me and have appeared before the committee relative to the deficiency of funding provided in budget estimates for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This year, the 1971 budget provided \$37,309,000, a decrease of \$5,700,000 below appropriations of \$42,316,000 enacted for 1970.

Fishing has been part and parcel of our national economy and I trust it will continue in spite of the Bureau of the Budget. However, budgetary restrictions for the past several years have reflected a tendency toward wishful thinking that this department would go away. I am not sure whether the Bureau of the Budget wants commercial fisheries to cease and we hand over the high seas to the Russians or not.

I cannot be critical of the Secretary of Interior. He, like myself, comes from a fishing State and is deeply concerned with this trend. He is concerned with the survival of a proud American industry but, unfortunately, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor I can convince the Bureau of the Budget that we should not forget fish.

On page 297, volume 2 of our hearings, there is a table which indicates that the United States is sixth among the leading nations of the world in the commercial harvest of fish and shellfish. Preliminary data for 1969 indicates the United States may have surpassed Norway and would actually be fifth.

On page 308, volume 2, in the United States the use of fishery products has more than doubled from 5.6 billion pounds in 1948 to 17.3 billion pounds in 1968. Landings of fish and shellfish in the United States, however, have remained relatively stable over the same period, varying between 5.3 billion pounds and 6.6 billion pounds. In 1948, the U.S. share of the world landings was 12 percent and our fishermen supplied 80 percent of domestic utilization. By 1968, these declined to 3.8 percent and 33 percent respectively. Imports during this period increased from 1.1 billion pounds to 8.6 billion pounds—an increase of about 680 percent.

We have been very busy giving our fish away, and principally to the Soviet Union. It would seem to me that the development of a stable and successful fishing industry is just as necessary to international strength as the production of guns.

MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES, BCF

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$28,168,000, an increase of \$1,012,000 over the budget estimate.

The increase over the budget estimate includes:

Plus \$337,000 for continued operation of the Milford Laboratory in Connecticut;

Plus \$400,000 for continued operation of the Ann Arbor Laboratory complex in Michigan;

Plus \$75,000 for evaluation study of vessels and laboratories; and

Plus \$200,000 for general evaluation studies on oil spills, atomic waste, steelhead, and additional Columbia River dams.

The \$75,000 which the committee has added for an evaluation study of vessels and laboratories is for a thorough review of the adequacy and potential for various laboratories and vessels of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The study group performing this review should include representatives from the commercial fishing industry and persons closely associated with the maritime and oceanographic activities.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Management.....	\$626,000	
Marketing and technology.....	8,930,000	+120,000
Research.....	14,108,000	+792,000
Research on fish migration over dams.....	1,410,000	+100,000
Fishing vessel mortgage insurance.....	59,000	
Columbia River fishery development.....	3,035,000	
Total, management and investigations of resources.....	28,168,000	+1,012,000

It is recommended by the committee that insofar as possible, there be no major layoffs of vessels utilized by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The committee endorses the proposal for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to participate in the fisheries research conducted at the Ann Arbor laboratory, with a proportionate share of the total cost being funded by each Bureau.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,000, the budget estimate, to continue the research program conducted in foreign countries with excess foreign currencies.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS (BCF)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$200,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

The amount provided in the bill is for administrative costs associated with contracts based on subsidy applications received prior to June 30, 1969.

FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (BCF)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,040,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

Of the total amount provided, \$3,800,000 is for aid to States, and \$240,000 is for program administration.

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION (BCF)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,168,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

Of the total amount provided, \$2,000,000 is for payment to cooperators; and \$168,000 is for program administration.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS
(APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,774,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

These funds are derived from the sale of fur skins and other wildlife products of the islands and are used to provide schooling, medical attention, and other services to the natives of the islands, for operation and maintenance of facilities, and management of the Alaska fur-seal herd.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND (BCF)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

The Fishermen's Protective Act—Public Law 90-482—authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to indemnify the owners and crews of American fishing vessels seized or detained by a foreign country under certain conditions.

As noted above, the bill we present provides an increase of \$1,012,000 over the 1971 budget estimate. This increased funding provides \$400,000 for continued operation at the 1970 level of the Ann Arbor, Mich., Laboratory complex, and \$337,000 for continued operation of the laboratory at Milford, Conn.

In addition, the committee provides \$75,000 for a general evaluation study and review of all commercial fisheries laboratories and ships. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the operation of various laboratories and ships by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and provide information for future program development in this connection before there is any further closing of facilities with the excuse, "they are not efficiently productive and the addition of facilities, either vessel or laboratory do not materially contribute to the improvement of our commercial fisheries program."

In this same category of desire for knowledge, I would remind you again that the committee has asked the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to complete research on the consequences and relationship of oil spills to fish, what the results of atomic wastes are in our rivers and on our bays to fish, to recommend improvement of our steelhead fishing resources and give you a report on what additional Columbia River dams may or may not do to the fish resources of the United States. We have many opinions but little specific and reputable information available on the extent of the effects of these various programs. Therefore, we say the time is now to come up with some answers. Go to the Atomic Energy Commission, to the U.S. Army Engineers, to the sportsmen, and the commercial fishing people. Get the answers, and come back to us.

Relative to decreases, the amount in the bill is \$3,995,000 below the \$42,316,000 appropriated for this activity in 1970. This is related largely to construction. There was \$700,000 provided in the 1970 appropriation for the fish protein concentrate demonstration plant and \$1,625,000 for the Willamette Falls fishway project. Both projects are completed.

Also, and I would like to emphasize this, another item of decrease is \$2.8 million for construction of fishing ves-

sels; \$3 million was provided in the 1970 appropriation for this activity, but the 1971 bill provides only \$200,000 for administration of the program in view of the fact that legislative authorization for this activity has not been enacted to continue the program in the 1971 fiscal year.

Our total reduction also includes a decrease of \$550,000 in Federal aid for Commercial Fisheries research and development which also relates to construction projects funded in the 1970 program which have been completed.

Therefore, in reviewing total decreases and increases, the severity of impact of this budget is actually in the fact that we are now facing the future and exploring to the utmost where we may develop and modernize our fishing industry. It should not be an era of cutbacks or holding the line. It should be an era of looking ahead and establishing new updated criteria if we are to match our fishing industry with that of the sophisticated industry developed by the Soviet Union.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Another item of major interest is the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife with the increases and decreases as noted below:

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$56,356,000, an increase of \$130,000 over the budget estimate for this activity.

The net increase of \$130,000 includes the following:

Decreases: —\$74,000 for preservation of steamboat *Bertrand*; —\$10,000 for improved service to wildlife refuge visitors; and —\$11,000 for operation and maintenance of new wildlife refuges.

Increases: +\$60,000 for co-op wildlife research unit, Oregon State University; +\$60,000 for co-op fishery unit, Wisconsin State University; +\$75,000 for fishery management project, northwest Florida; and +\$30,000 for fishery management, western Pennsylvania, Kinzua Dam.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Fish hatcheries.....	\$10,958,000	
Wildlife refuges.....	17,863,000	—\$95,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	741,000	
Management and enforcement.....	4,470,000	
Fishery research.....	4,674,000	
Wildlife research.....	8,962,000	+60,000
Fishery services.....	2,374,000	+165,000
Wildlife services.....	3,742,000	
River basin studies.....	2,019,000	
Pesticides registration.....	553,000	
Total, management and investigations of resources.....	56,356,000	+130,000

CONSTRUCTION (SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,175,000, an increase of \$1,556,000 over the budget estimate for this activity. Additional funding is provided for the following projects:

Plus \$25,000 for Meridian National Fish Hatchery, Mississippi, planning;

Plus \$250,000 for San Marcos National Fish Hatchery, Texas;

Plus \$241,000 for Allegheny National Fish Hatchery, Pennsylvania;

Plus \$295,000 for Warm Springs National Fish Hatchery, Oregon;

Plus \$30,000 for fishery station, Valentine, Nebr., planning;

Plus \$90,000 for water supply intake, Quinault Fish Hatchery, Washington; and

Plus \$700,000 for support facilities, Western Gulf Marine Laboratory, Port Aransas, Tex.

The amount provided includes \$100,000 for construction of interpretive facilities at Great Swamp, N.J., a decrease of \$75,000 below the budget estimate.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT (SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,500,000, the budget estimate, for this activity. This is an increase of \$1,700,000 over appropriations enacted to date for fiscal year 1970.

The recommended amount, together with an estimated \$5 million to be available in receipts from Federal hunting stamps, will provide a total in the migratory bird conservation fund of \$12,500,000 for fiscal year 1971 to continue the expanded wetlands acquisition program authorized by Public Law 90-205.

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION (SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,311,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

The purpose of this program is to preserve, develop, and enhance anadromous fisheries resources within the several States and in the Great Lakes.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES (SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE) (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

The budget estimate included a request of \$100,000 for management and investigations of resources—special foreign currency program.

The bill provides no funds for this activity.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection: The committee recommends an appropriation of \$57,670,000, a decrease of \$351,000 below the budget estimate.

The reduction includes the following decreases: —\$54,000 to initiate the volunteers-in-parks program. Authorization has not been enacted for this activity; —\$25,000 for promotion of domestic travel; —\$240,000 for master planning; —\$7,000 for national park system plan; and —\$25,000 for increased pay cost adjustment.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Management of park and other areas.....	\$51,246,600	—\$104,000
Forestry and fire control.....	2,347,300	
Park and recreation programs.....	4,076,100	—247,000
Total, management and protection.....	57,670,000	—351,000

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES (NATIONAL PARK SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,500,000, a reduction of \$263,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction is for application against the total requested increase of \$2,647,200 for operation and maintenance of existing park areas.

CONSTRUCTION (NATIONAL PARK SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,385,000, a reduction of \$500,000 below the budget estimate.

The net reduction of \$500,000 includes a decrease of \$776,000 for anticipated slippage in the construction program and the following increases:

Plus \$185,000 for restoration of facilities at Fort Scott National Historic Site, Kans.

Plus \$91,000 for administrative headquarters, Redwood National Park, Calif.

Included in this appropriation item is \$1,425,000 for construction of buildings and utilities at Independence National Historic Park, Pa. It is the express desire of the committee that the construction work as proposed in the budget estimate proceed during fiscal year 1971 with the least possible delay.

PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY) (NATIONAL PARK)

While the committee recommends the appropriation of the total budget estimate of \$16,000,000 for this activity, it directs that:

First. Of \$1,600,000 available for advance planning, \$255,000 shall be earmarked for engineer-planning of section 3-C of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

Second. Within available funds, the National Park Service give high priority to construction of that section of the Big Horn Canyon Highway between Horse-shoe Bend, Wyo., and Devil's Overlook, Mont.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES (NATIONAL PARK SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,801,000, a reduction of \$149,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction includes decreases of \$139,000 for grants-in-aid to States and \$10,000 for adjusted pay increase costs.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (NATIONAL PARK SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,580,000, a reduction of \$25,000 below the budget estimate. This decrease is related to adjusted pay increase costs.

There are few Americans who do not share some portion of our National Park opportunities during a year. The committee is particularly proud of the program which it began, known as "Summer in the Parks," now referred to as "Parks for All Seasons." Particularly do these parks bring to urban citizens an opportunity to share outdoor living and we are sure that through programs offered, our young people will be encouraged to love and build our country rather than to destroy it.

LITTER AND CLEANUP

As we move through the discussion of the Park Service and recreational op-

portunities, I cannot resist again calling attention to the cost of "messy Americans."

A great many million dollars per year could be expended in useful construction and maintenance or expansion of our services if huge sums of money were not required to clean up after the litter of careless individuals who not only clutter but burn our national recreation areas.

This continues to be a significant problem for the bureaus responsible for the administration of national recreation areas. During the hearings we had testimony that \$21,623,000 of scarce funds in the 1971 budget will be used for the litter cleanup.

An example of destruction was brought to the committee's attention by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife relative to a refuge in Alaska. A careless camper in a few minutes, because of failure to put out a campfire, destroyed \$15 million worth of timber and cost the Bureau more than a million dollars to put out the fire.

It is well to note that the entire Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife budget in refuges was only \$17,863,000. How selfish can we be through our carelessness! Wouldn't it be far better for Americans to use the same caution on the property that belongs to all of us that they would use on their own, and save "clutter dollars" to spend on additional boat docks, sanitation facilities, picnic tables, and trails which would contribute to the enjoyment of a day outdoors? Perhaps our national TV industry and press with their great potential for influencing American activities can give more attention to these clean-up problems with spot announcements and thus encourage respect for our American landscape.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$45,122,000, an increase of \$150,000 over the budget estimate.

The net increase of \$150,000 over the budget estimate includes the following:

Increases: +\$1,000,000 for resource development, anthracite. On numerous occasions the committee has emphasized the urgent necessity for combating the culm bank fires in Pennsylvania which have destroyed life and property in that area for many years. To date, action producing tangible results has been negligible. It is the very strong recommendation of this committee that immediate action be taken for development of a demonstration program that will produce a meaningful solution to this critical situation that has existed much too long.

Plus \$150,000 for metallurgy research. Sampling and characterization of incinerator residues and raw refuse.

Decrease: -\$1,000,000 for metallurgy research.

It is the recommendation of the committee that \$300,000 of petroleum research funds be earmarked for continued research efforts at the laboratory of Bartlesville, Okla.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the estimate for 1971 by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Research:		
Coal.....	\$8,468,000	
Petroleum.....	2,295,000	
Oil shale.....	2,413,000	
Metallurgy.....	11,385,000	-\$850,000
Mining.....	7,691,000	
Marine mineral mining.....	925,000	
Explosives.....	663,000	
Resource development:		
Statistics.....	2,091,000	
Economic analysis.....	520,000	
Bituminous coal.....	934,000	
Anthracite.....	1,746,000	+1,000,000
Petroleum.....	839,000	
Minerals.....	4,494,000	
International activities.....	658,000	
Total, conservation and development of mineral resources.....	45,122,000	+150,000

HEALTH AND SAFETY (BOM)

The committee has recommended the total amount of the budget estimate, \$54,395,000 for health and safety activities of the Bureau of Mines. This is an increase of \$28,063,000 over the \$26,332,000 appropriated to date for fiscal year 1970. The major portion of this increase is to provide funding for activities prescribed in the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969—Public Law 91-173—enacted December 30, 1969.

As a result of information it has received through its budget hearings and otherwise, the committee is quite concerned that administration of the mine health and safety program is not proceeding as expeditiously and effectively as the Congress intended in its enactment of the new mine health and safety legislation.

While the committee appreciates this is a greatly expanded and intricate program, it is also conscious of the seriousness of loss of life in mine disasters. The committee directs the Department of Interior to give this phase of its operation its most concerted effort and attention so that a viable program can be in effect with the least possible delay.

HELIUM FUND (BOM)

While the 1971 budget estimate did not contain a request for additional borrowing authorization for the helium program, the committee had occasion in several instances to review the operations of the program. For the last several years the helium program has experienced numerous difficulties for various reasons. This committee frequently has expressed its concern with the operation of the program. The situation continues to become more acute and until very recently the committee has been unable to discern any specific action by those responsible for the administration of the program to resolve the problem.

When the Director of the Bureau of Mines appeared before this committee on Tuesday, February 25, 1969, he advised the committee that the Department was making a thorough review of the helium program which in his opinion was overdue. He stated that preliminary reviews were sufficient to indicate that

the Department had some questions that required very careful exploration, particularly with regard to the demand estimates which were the predicate of the helium program and with regard to the share of the U.S. helium market that is supplied by the Bureau of Mines.

On September 10, 1969, the Comptroller General issued a report—B-114-812—that was quite critical of the helium program operations.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, it was not until Thursday, May 7, 1970, the committee received informal information that the Department of the Interior had finally arrived at a decision in this connection and was initiating action for revision of the helium procurement program.

In the meantime, the Government has been procuring billions of cubic feet of helium per year under existing contracts with no specific idea of what the eventual utilization will be, and interest costs have been accruing on delinquent payments for the purchase of the helium.

Recently, rather precipitous action was taken to close the helium research center at Amarillo, Tex. The committee is unaware of all the considerations that led to this action. It is the very urgent recommendation of the committee that the Bureau of Mines continue the operation of the helium research center at Amarillo, Tex., until adequate contacts can be made with the various universities which might be interested in the assumption of this research work, and an equitable contract can be formulated for the assumption by a university of the research program.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH (SALARIES AND EXPENSES) BOM

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,200,000, the budget estimate, for the Office of Coal Research.

While no change has been made in the total amount requested in the budget estimate, the committee recommends the following revisions in fund application:

Increases: +\$620,000 for solid electrolyte high temperature fuel cell; +\$180,000 for multicell coal-fired fluidized bed boiler project; +\$200,000 for magneto hydrodynamics process; and +\$100,000 for Hydrocarbon Research, Inc., project.

Decreases: —\$1,000,000 for Project Gasoline; and —\$100,000 for electrofluidic coal processing.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS (SALARIES AND EXPENSES) BOM

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,181,000, a reduction of \$14,000 below the budget estimate for the Office of Oil and Gas.

The reduction includes a decrease of \$10,000 for Coordination of Oil and Gas Activities, and \$4,000 for the Oil Import Appeals Board.

The reduction in funding recommended by the committee will have no effect on the proposed employment of four additional inspectors to monitor the oil import program.

Relative to the program of the Bureau of Mines, I would like to note for the members of this committee that the workforce available for mining is substantially decreasing year by year yet coal remains one of the greatest unused

sources of American energy. At a time when we are depleting other sources of energy far faster than we can afford to, coal remains a great and constant factor. It would seem to me that we should not allow this work force to disappear before full utilization of the resource.

The committee also deeply regrets that we did not have more funds to provide additional dollars for increased coal research data. For example, the committee has noted that contracts are now being signed between several foreign nations and certain areas of Canada for coal. U.S. coal could prove just as competitive in world markets and in domestic consumption if fly ash, a basic ingredient of pollution were removed. Projects are underway which would guarantee this better pollution control. However, insufficient funding is available.

POLLUTION CONTROL

While I am on the subject of pollution control, I would like to remind the members of this committee that the President of the United States by proclamation stated that by December 31, 1972, all pollution on Federal installations must cease and yet the Interior Subcommittee to its dismay discovered numerous examples of pollution abatement items funded but budgetarily curtailed.

For example, the U.S. Forest Service's present inventory shows that \$34,098,000 is necessary to correct the recreation facilities to take care of water pollution problems. In addition, they have water pollution abatement problems. Some of these are under the budget line item for fire and general purpose construction. The cost to correct them is \$8.5 million. At research stations the cost is \$434,000. At civilian conservation centers, \$610,000.

In response to my question as to the needs in the next 2 fiscal years, the Forest Service advises that between \$18 and \$20 million in each year is necessary to meet the requirements of the Executive order on cleaning up water pollution.

In the National Park Service, to our dismay, we discovered that placed in reserve for fiscal year 1970, some \$25.5 million was subject to cutback and over \$2 million of this was pollution control abatement items including \$134,000 for the Statue of Liberty sewage system. It seems rather strange that we invite people to visit the symbol of our liberty and then tell them we do not have the facilities to take care of their sewage.

Item by item I could go through funding placed in reserve but it would take far too long. I merely want to say to the Bureau of the Budget, "You cannot possibly carry out the mandate of the President of the United States by December 31, 1972, on pollution abatement unless you stop freezing pollution abatement construction funds and spend them to do exactly what they were appropriated for. Let us not have a credibility gap."

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,350,000, a reduction of \$59,600 below the budget request.

The proposed reduction of \$59,600 is for application to general administrative costs of the Washington headquarters office.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$50 million, a reduction of \$10 million below the budget estimate.

Authorizing legislation to increase annual appropriations for this activity by \$10 million has not been enacted.

The reduction of \$10 million shall be distributed to various projects in accordance with the schedule of reductions listed on pages 730 to 732, part 1, of the 1971 House appropriations hearings.

You will note we have funded the trust territories for the authorization allowed. I may say again that I would like to commend the Secretary of the Interior for the work that is going on there. They are doing, I believe, an excellent job, at least of programing, planning, and small job coordination. Consideration is being given to sewage, water, and health programs. Educational institutions are rebuilt. And I want to particularly commend this Department for beginning a plan to equalize wages. This is a mandatory correction of an evil which should never have existed.

I should like to add for the information of this committee that it has been customary since I have been chairman of the Interior Subcommittee to have present during our hearings members from the Congresses of Micronesia, Samoa, and Guam. This has established an excellent rapport and understanding between parliamentary bodies and is a people-to-people approach necessary to the conduct of American neighborliness.

MINERAL RESOURCES

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$108,057,000, an increase of \$2,300,000 over the budget estimate.

The increase of \$2,300,000 over the budget estimate includes the following: +\$2,000,000 for resource management, marine minerals—the increased funding will provide for approximately 37 additional inspectors to improve the surveillance over the drilling and production phases of the Outer Continental Shelf program. Improved inspection capability in these critical areas is essential to detect and prevent pollution of adjacent water; and +\$300,000 for development of a central data reception facility for project EROS to be located at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

The total amount recommended by the committee as compared with the estimate for 1971 by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Special resource and environmental projects	\$1,500,000	
Alaska pipeline related investigations	1,300,000	
Topographic surveys and mapping	28,903,000	
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping	29,200,000	
Minerals discovery loan program	253,000	
Water resources investigations	32,542,000	
Conservation of lands and minerals	9,855,000	+\$2,000,000
Earth resources observation satellite (EROS)	1,900,000	+300,000
General administration	2,604,000	
Total, Geological Survey	108,057,000	+2,300,000

In noting the importance of our Geological Survey and in further explanation of my remarks earlier that this is not an adequate bill, I would refer all of you to page 975, volume 1, when we had Dr. Pecora, the Director of the Geological Survey before us. I asked him:

Please equate the total budget for your Bureau with the value of the land and resources in the United States you administer.

Dr. Pecora responded that their budget presented to us was \$106 million, then added the following:

The total area of the United States on land itself is in excess of 3½ million square miles. The Continental Shelf is an additional 1.2 million square miles. Roughly, the total area is more than 4 million square miles. The interesting statistic here is that half of that total area is in the public domain; that is, belongs to all of the people of the United States and is not in private ownership. The area offshore is about equal to that in the public domain on land. It is very interesting also to analyze the geologic potential of basic resources that occur in this public domain. For example, more than 50 percent of our U.S. total potential energy resources—oil, gas, and coal—are in the public domain.

I then asked Dr. Pecora what he estimated that value would be. He replied that total U.S. resources, from the geological point of view, is in the order of 530 billion barrels of liquid petroleum with the current average price of crude oil throughout the country at \$3 per barrel. Therefore, the oil potential of the entire country is in excess of 500 billion barrels; 52 percent of this, with a gross value in the ground of approximately

\$825 billion, is within public domain lands, onshore and offshore.

The gross value of natural gas in the ground on the public domain—52 percent of the national resources—at December prices was estimated to be about \$215 billion; 39 percent of the Nation's coal is on public domain. Of the total production of coal in the United States today, somewhere in the order of 2 to 3 percent is produced from public lands. Therefore, the big reserve of coal available as an energy resource for the United States is in public lands for future development.

In giving the total value of this resource, Dr. Pecora said that 39 percent of the Nation's unmined coal resources which are estimated to be on public domain land has a gross value of \$1,400 billion. Dr. Pecora went on to emphasize the importance of the classification of our lands. To me the single most important recommendation I can make to this Nation is that right now, at this point in time, we classify our resources in the lands where they lie; prepare, if you please, an inventory of the Nation's future.

On oil shale, Dr. Pecora went on to tell us that 75 percent of oil which can be derived from oil shale in the Western States is in the public domain, and his estimate is that 80 billion barrels of oil can possibly be recovered by some procedure in the future.

In further reviewing our mineral resources, Dr. Pecora said in the area of uranium, 40 percent of our reserve potential rests within the public domain.

On page 978 of our hearings, volume 1, you will note that the Geological Survey alone in its supervision and management of public lands both onshore and offshore, has collected something in the order of \$350 million this past year. Measure this against the proposed budget of \$106 million, or this bill's allowance of \$108,057,000.

Dr. Pecora also emphasized to the committee the necessity for having more inspectors for the oil developments on the leased areas of the Continental Shelf. This is the reason that we recommend the increase of \$2 million which will provide 37 additional inspectors to improve surveillance of the Outer Continental Shelf.

We are also recommending \$300,000 for the development of a central data reception center for Project Eros. Eros is readily related to our resources management and the committee unhesitatingly recommends that the future of resources, pollution control, exploration for water resources, management of our fish, are inextricably linked with the Eros satellite.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$168,500,000, the budget estimate, for the land and water conservation fund. The committee has deleted the request of \$1,000,000 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation emergency fund and has transferred this amount for additional grants to States.

The following table reflects the action recommended by the committee on the budget request:

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1971	Change	Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1971	Change
1. Assistance to States.....	\$62,500,000	\$63,500,000	+\$1,000,000	Forest Service:			
2. Federal land acquisition program:				National recreation areas.....	\$1,327,200	\$1,327,200	
National Park Service:				National wild and scenic rivers.....	917,000	917,000	
Biscayne National Monument, Fla.....	12,000,000	12,000,000		General recreation lands.....	11,505,800	11,505,800	
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pennsylvania-New Jersey.....	10,231,743	10,231,743		Total, Forest Service.....	13,750,000	13,750,000	
Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.....	2,082,800	2,082,800		Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:			
Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.....	116,000	116,000		Endangered species.....	1,196,000	1,196,000	
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.....	4,900,000	4,900,000		Recreation areas.....	345,000	345,000	
North Cascades National Park, Wash.....	1,935,000	1,935,000		Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	1,541,000	1,541,000	
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Mich.....	1,700,000	1,700,000		Bureau of Land Management: National wild and scenic rivers.....	250,000	250,000	
Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif.....	2,037,773	2,037,773		Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:			
San Juan Island National Historic Park, Wash.....	65,700	65,700		Administration.....	3,459,000	3,459,000	
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Calif.....	2,500,000	2,500,000		Emergency fund.....	1,000,000	—\$1,000,000	
National wild and scenic rivers.....	6,680,984	6,680,984		Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	4,459,000	3,459,000	—1,000,000
National trails system.....	250,000	250,000		Liquidation of 1970 advance contract authority.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Inholdings.....	10,000,000	10,000,000		Total, Federal program.....	106,000,000	105,000,000	—1,000,000
Deficiencies.....	1,500,000	1,500,000		Grand total, 1971.....	168,500,000	168,500,000	
Total, National Park Service.....	56,000,000	56,000,000					

Since nearly every Member of this House is concerned with this Land and Water Conservation Fund, I am sure you will be pleased that the budget of \$168,500,000 was recommended and that we placed \$1 million from the emergency fund of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation into increased assistance for States. Also, on May 13, a revised budget from the Secretary of the Interior has apprised the committee of a proposed additional \$188.9 million for expenditure this year which will allow full funding in this category.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The committee recommends under this heading a total appropriation of \$284,022,700, an increase of \$5,442,700 above the budget estimate.

The following is a summary of action taken on the programs included under this appropriation.

FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$213,412,700, an increase of \$1,837,700 above the budget estimate.

The additional funding provided includes the following increases:

Plus \$700,000 for Cave Run Reservoir recreation facilities, Kentucky.

Plus \$123,000 for sewer and water systems, June Lake, Inyo National Forest, Calif.;

Plus \$763,000 for sewer system, South Lake Tahoe, Eldorado National Forest, Calif.;

Plus \$100,000 for Council Bluffs Reservoir, Clark National Forest, Mo.;

Plus \$101,700 for construction of maintenance building, Timberline Lodge, Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg; and

Plus \$50,000 for Kerr Arboretum and Nature Center, Okla.

The committee recommends that none of the funds contained in this bill be used for development of facilities and roads in the Lincoln-Scapegoat Back-Country in the national forests in Montana.

Reclamation of lands damaged by strip-mining activities is becoming a matter of major concern to many individuals interested in the improvement of our environment. It is therefore recommended that, within available funds, the Forest Service conduct a pilot study with Berea College during fiscal year 1971 with a view toward recommending to this committee in general terms, the most practical and efficient approach that might be taken for the rehabilitation of these areas.

The committee directs the Forest Service to complete planning and any necessary hearings in fiscal year 1971 for the Diamond Crossing Road on the Tahoe National Forest so that construction of this road will not be delayed.

The total amount recommended by the committee as compared with the estimate for 1971 by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Forest land management:		
National forest protection and management:		
Timber resource management:		
Sales administration and management	\$52,324,000	
Reforestation and stand improvement	19,412,000	
Recreation-public use	44,062,700	+\$1,837,700
Wildlife habitat management	4,642,000	
Range resource management:		
Management	6,571,000	
Revegetation	3,252,000	
Improvements	4,378,000	
Soil and water management	6,317,000	
Mineral claims, leases, and special uses	4,633,000	
Land classification, adjustments, and surveys	6,769,000	
Forest fire protection	29,210,000	
Construction and maintenance of improvements for fire and general purposes (including communications)	10,056,000	
Payments to employees' compensation fund	1,456,000	
Subtotal	193,082,700	+1,837,700
Amount advanced from cooperative range improvements	-700,000	
Subtotal, national forest protection and management	\$192,382,700	+\$1,837,700
Water resource development related activities	4,109,000	
Fighting forest fires	4,275,000	
Insect and disease control	11,346,000	
Acquisition of lands, Weeks Act	1,300,000	
Total, forest land management	213,412,700	+1,837,700

¹ Includes \$14,000 contained in budget amendment listed in H. Doc. 91-305.

FOREST RESEARCH

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$46,671,000, an increase of \$1,605,000 over the budget estimate.

CXVI—1017—Part 12

The additional funding provided includes the following increases:

Plus \$325,000 for urban forestry, University of Massachusetts and other universities of the Northeast;

Plus \$140,000 for planning funds, Southern Forest Fire Laboratory, Macon, Ga.;

Plus \$500,000 for construction of additional facilities at the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Corvallis, Oreg.;

Plus \$150,000 for conversion of central heating plant, Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis.;

Plus \$490,000 for construction of Institute of Forest Genetics, Rhinelander, Wis.

The amount recommended by the committee in comparison with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Forest Research:		
Forest and range management research:		
Timber management research	\$10,469,000	+\$150,000
Watershed management research	4,416,000	
Range Management research	1,420,000	
Wildlife habitat research	1,338,000	+100,000
Forest recreation research	979,000	+75,000
Subtotal, Forest and range management research	18,622,000	+325,000
Forest protection research:		
Forest fire research	3,821,000	
Forest insect research	4,783,000	
Forest disease research	2,810,000	
Subtotal, Forest protection research	11,414,000	
Forest products and engineering research:		
Forest products utilization research	8,227,000	
Forest engineering research	1,080,000	
Subtotal, Forest products and engineering research	9,307,000	
Forest resource economics research:		
Forest survey	3,115,000	
Forest products marketing research	1,664,000	
Forest economics research	1,269,000	
Subtotal, Forest resource economics research	6,048,000	
Forest research construction	1,280,000	+1,280,000
Total Forest Research	46,671,000	+1,605,000

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$23,939,000, an increase of \$2 million over the budget estimate.

The increase of \$2 million over the budget estimate is for cooperation in forest fire control to provide an additional amount for grants to States for firefighting as authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act.

Each year when I present the budget of the U.S. Forest Service, I bring to you some of the necessities that the United States must face in providing proper funding not only for the management of

lands which produce timber but for management of lands for multiple-purpose use. An exciting item which we have added this year is that for urban forestry.

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES**

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$58,940,000, the budget estimate, for this activity.

The amounts recommended by the committee for the various subactivities included in this appropriation item are as follows:

	Committee bill, 1971
Realty and mineral leasing services:	
Title, lease, and records service	\$6,832,000
Records improvement	827,000
Resource management conservation and protection:	
Land classification and mineral examination	5,788,000
Range management	5,879,000
Forestry	7,316,000
Soil and watershed conservation	13,407,000
Fire protection	4,657,000
Recreation and wildlife	3,182,000
Alaska pipeline inspection	2,000,000
Cadastral survey:	
Alaska	2,124,000
Other States	3,579,000
Firefighting and rehabilitation	1,000,000
General administration	2,349,000
Total, management of lands and resources	58,940,000

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE (BLM)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,215,000, the budget estimate for this appropriation item. The amount provided includes \$300,000 for the Boise Interagency Fire Center; \$640,000 for recreation facilities; \$265,000 for maintenance of buildings; \$985,000 for operation and maintenance of recreation facilities; and \$1,025,000 for maintenance of roads.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT, ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY) BLM

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,500,000, the budget estimate, for this activity. The amount provided in the bill will continue this activity at the same level of funding as was available in fiscal year 1970.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS (BLM)

The bill continues the indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products, representing one-third of the 75 percent of the revenues due the Oregon and California counties.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS (BLM)

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of \$1,841,000, the budget estimate, to be derived from public lands and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements.

**BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES**

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$218,645,000, an increase of \$150,000 over the budget request.

The amount recommended by the committee by activity compared with the 1971 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Educational assistance, facilities, and service	\$138,172,000	+\$1,050,000
Welfare and guidance services	35,217,000	
Relocation and adult vocational training	39,717,000	-1,000,000
Maintaining law and order	5,539,000	+100,000
Total, education and welfare service	218,645,000	+150,000

The net increase of \$150,000 includes a decrease of \$1,000,000 below the budget estimate for vocational training and the following increases: +\$1,000,000 for additional scholarships for Indian youths attending colleges or universities. +\$50,000 for provision of higher educational services for the Navahos; and +\$100,000 for maintenance of law and order, Omaha, Nebr.

It is the recommendation of the committee that in future allocations of educational funds for impacted area aid, additional factors other than a mere "head-count" of Indian children attending public schools should be considered in the allocation of funds to areas with large Indian populations.

The attendance of Indian children at public schools places a much heavier burden on the public schools than is otherwise encountered by the attendance of the average student. Because of the privation many Indian children experience on the reservations, the educational gap for these children is much more critical and involves the problem of teaching English as a second language. Therefore impacted area funds should provide for these additional educational services.

The committee also recommends that the Bureau of Indian Affairs exert strenuous effort in its relations with the State of Alaska with regard to providing educational facilities for Indian children and do everything possible to accelerate the construction of new schools which native Alaskans and Indians will attend in accordance with the existing agreement between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the State of Alaska.

The Bureau should also give priority to analyzing the ramifications involved with the attendance of Indian children at the McKinley County School District, and arrive at a reasonable solution at the earliest possible date.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (BIA)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$65,690,000, a net decrease of \$527,000 below the budget estimate.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Forest and range lands	\$7,338,000	+\$600,000
Fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation	140,000	
Agricultural and industrial assistance	12,246,000	
Soil and moisture conservation	6,425,000	+400,000
Maintenance of roads	5,129,000	
Development of Indian arts and crafts	614,000	
Management of Indian trust property	9,105,000	
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities	19,889,000	
Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems	1,404,000	
Tribal development	3,400,000	-1,527,000
Total, resources management	65,690,000	-527,000

The net decrease of \$527,000 consists of the following:

Decrease: Minus \$1,527,000 for initiation of a program to be used by tribes for commercial economic development programs.

Increases: Plus \$600,000 for forestry development; and plus \$400,000 for soil and moisture conservation.

Total funds available for this appropriation item in the accompanying bill in the amount of \$65,690,000 represent an increase of \$10,448,000 over the \$55,242,000 appropriated to date for fiscal year 1970.

In connection with the development and management of Indian housing programs, the committee directs that priority be given regardless of region to that housing construction considered mandatory for the health and safety of American Indians.

The committee directs the Bureau of Indian Affairs to conduct a survey of the general economic situation of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin and to submit a report of its findings to this committee and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee not later than March 31, 1972.

CONSTRUCTION (BIA)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$18,935,000 a net increase of \$4,669,000 over the budget estimate.

The net increase consists of a reduction of \$66,000 below the budget estimate for project design drawings, bureauwide; and the following increases: +\$585,000 for boys' dormitory, Eufaula Indian Boarding School, Oklahoma; +\$150,000 for planning funds for the Yankton-Wagner School, Wagner, S. Dak.; and +\$4,000,000 for construction of the Navajo irrigation project.

Prior to the submission of the 1972 budget estimate, the committee directs the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide it with a detailed inventory of BIA boarding facilities and possible public school programming so that construction needs of the future may be considered on the basis of priority needs and equal opportunity for all Indian students to attend schools will be available.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (BIA)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,600,000, a reduction of

\$26,000 below the budget estimate for general administrative expenses.

I do want to report to the committee that although there are many things we see wrong with life in the Indian world, there has been some outstanding progress. For example, I think it is well to note that this year there are 58,000 children in our Federal day and boarding schools—3,000 more than last year; 84,000 Indian children in public schools—last year there were 75,000. We have 1,000 more Indians provided with welfare guidance services.

KINDERGARTENS (BIA)

Just 3 years ago there were no kindergartens for our Indian children, and yet today with the funding in 1971 budget we are almost doubling the opportunities for kindergarten attendance which is a major step forward.

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

	1970 number		1971 number	
	Units	Pupils	Units	Pupils
Federal kindergartens	69	1,566	124	2,726
Non-Federal kindergartens	181	2,515	255	3,713

This year's budget provides \$1 million additional for scholarships. The committee discovered that many young Indian people were accepting vocational scholarships rather than college scholarships in spite of their academic ability because of the size of these vocational grants. This we hope to equalize.

You will note that we have added \$4 million for the Navajo Indian irrigation project. As I noted earlier, the Navajo Indian Reservation is larger than West Virginia and over 50 percent of its people are unemployed, on welfare grants of \$39 per month, yet our country is dragging its feet in providing funds for the completion of the irrigation project.

Last year we provided money and it was poked in the "deep freeze." This year we are providing more and, interestingly enough, the revised budget of the President also has suggested \$4 million for additional work. Our committee insists that funds provided be excluded from the fund freeze for never will we solve the problems of welfare, adequate nutrition, and jobs for the Navajos until they are basically self-supporting and this can only be accomplished through revitalization of their land and resources and the creation of new industries.

I would like to remind the Bureau of Indian Affairs that we are expecting and anticipating an orderly review of the school situation before we can do the kind of construction job which provides maximum education to our Indian young people and yet makes wise use of our limited dollars.

We should have an orderly appraisal of the Indian school needs. For example, where shall we build dormitories to supply living space for youngsters who, because of difficulties of travel and distances from their homes, must attend

schools yet who may well be able to participate in a public school if a district is willing and financially able to coordinate with the BIA for a good educational program rather than through the customary boarding schools? In many other instances the committee is aware that boarding schools are a necessity, but they should continue to be minimized in number and upgraded in the opportunities they provide.

The committee wants to reiterate that we would far rather provide schooling than pay travel expense from area to area not only because of the money involved but because every child is entitled to a home and family life to the fullest degree possible.

Relative to the continual upgrading of our Indian schools, may I say that I think it is no longer enough to provide our young Indians with the bare "reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic," for an entire cultural vacuum must be filled with adequate counseling, adequate sports, and recreation. Our young Indian people can take a great deal of credit for one single fact which emerged during our hearings. In none of their schools across the country is there a major problem with drugs. This is a singular tribute to those fine young people. But how long will they remain untroubled if we do not provide for them recreation facilities such as swimming pools and tennis courts so their lives in the bare and dusty, or cold and frozen, lands where they must live can be as rich as those of children in other areas of the country. These are not frills. They are necessities.

I do want to say that through the committee's action last year, additional counselors have been provided in specified schools and have proved to be a most successful step in counteracting problems arising from lonely youngsters in a large school far from home. The committee is again providing funds this year for stepping this program up.

We are also continuing the work-learn program so successfully participated in by the Makahs and Quinaults. Summer programs are also provided and Congress, which is continuously criticized, can take credit for another positive approach for it inaugurated this program.

We have a motto—"Keep our young people busy building our world and they will not burn it." Perhaps the rest of America needs to take some advice from our programs.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES (HEW, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$114,692,000, an increase of \$1,475,000 over the budget estimate.

The additional funding provided includes the following increases: +\$1,245,000 for additional staff for hospitals or clinics; +\$30,000 for Quinault dental services; and +\$200,000 for community health representatives.

The amount recommended by the committee in comparison with the 1971 budget estimate by activity is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Committee bill, 1971	Bill compared with estimate, 1971
Patient medical care.....	\$83,440,000	+\$1,245,000
Field health services.....	29,114,000	+230,000
Administration.....	2,138,000	
Total, Indian health activities.....	114,692,000	+1,475,00

The committee directs that there shall be no diversion of funds appropriated for medicine and other medical supplies for other purposes.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES (HEW, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,950,000, the budget estimate, for this activity. This is a decrease of \$3,002,000 below the \$20,952,000 appropriated to date for fiscal year 1970. As of March 31, 1970, unobligated construction funds amounted to \$21,983,913.

Total funds provided in the bill for this activity are for construction of sanitation facilities and include \$16,500,000 for construction of sanitation facilities to serve an estimated 7,100 housing units; \$1 million urgently needed to provide water supply and waste disposal facilities for Indian residents of rancherias, reservations, and land allotments in California; and \$450,000 for special projects.

In the Indian health field, we are not ashamed of progress made, yet much remains to be done. Many Members who, like myself, have visited the Indian country, have seen overworked doctors and nurses in hospitals and clinics. This is due to budgetary restrictions and personnel ceilings. Last year \$957,000 of Indian Health Service medicine money was put in the freeze. This was the money which determined whether Indians would be well or ill. Are we in the position in America where we deliberately say to our own citizens, "Enjoy your pain, for we cannot provide you with aspirin tablets?" I think it is time for us to take stock of where our benefits are going. It is time for us to measure what we stand for, what we believe in, and if we cannot afford to help 354,000 people on our reservations, something is completely wrong.

In passing, I may note that to my knowledge no foreign aid expenditures have been frozen. I have often privately wondered whether I should make a recommendation that the Navajos take themselves across the ocean, lose the war, and appeal for foreign aid. I am completely frank. The United States must recognize its obligations to its "first" citizens.

I do want to say that we can point with some pride to the fact that last year there were no deaths from tuberculosis in Alaska; that our hospital and our clinic visits of Alaskan natives have increased; that the infant death rate is falling in the Indian and Alaskan native population, and falling decidedly; that gastro-enteritis deaths are falling.

We are going to have to spend more money on nutrition, dental service, visiting nurses, doctors for clinics, and shorter hours of those personnel in our clinics.

I think it might be a little thought provoking and disheartening to this committee to know that as the Indian health program has prospered and our infant mortality in the Indian world has gone down, deaths for some of the other nonwhites in the United States have been increasing.

From the standpoint of pure dollars and cents, on page 1045, volume 4, of our hearings, Dr. Johnson of the Indian Health Service said:

It has been shown that an average case of tuberculosis will cost around \$23,000. Calculating what it would take to provide a program for the Navajos specifically, we have determined that with about \$250,000 per year over a 5-year period we could expect to reduce the tuberculosis load of that reservation by 60 percent. Using the \$23,000 per case, it seems to me that for the cost of \$1.25 million we would save \$16.5 million over the 5-year period in terms of tuberculosis hospitalization.

INFANT DEATHS PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS, SPECIFIED POPULATION GROUPS, CALENDAR YEARS 1965-67

	1967	1966	1965
United States:			
All races.....	22.4	23.7	24.7
Whites.....	19.7	20.6	21.5
Nonwhites.....	35.9	38.8	40.3
Indians and Alaska Natives (24 reservation States).....	32.2	39.0	39.0
Alaska:			
All races.....	29.2	31.3	38.1
Whites.....	19.1	22.0	24.0
Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos.....	55.6	51.4	65.4
New York City, selected districts:			
City as whole.....	23.9	24.9	25.7
Central Harlem.....	39.3	43.5	37.2
East Harlem.....	35.8	33.6	34.8
Flushing.....	14.2	13.7	16.1
Forest Hills.....	11.0	14.8	17.9
Mississippi:			
All races.....	35.5	38.8	40.6
Whites.....	22.8	23.1	24.5
Nonwhites.....	47.4	52.6	54.4
Navajo Indians.....	38.7	52.3	46.2
Sioux Indians.....	35.7	45.8	50.1

Lest any of you think that the Indian Health Service is luxurious compared to other hospital programs in the United States, may I point out that on page 1102, volume 4, of our hearings, the ratio of doctors to 1,000 admissions for general hospitals in the VA was 8.3 and the Indian Health Service was 3.9. And Dr. Johnson of IHS said on the outpatient visits:

We have, I believe, 0.53 employees per 1,000 outpatient visits. The VA's ratio is something like 2.3 per 1,000 outpatient visits.

Relative to the sanitation programs of the Indian Health Service which must be stepped up, on page 1105, volume 4, of our hearings, the Indian Health Service reports that in fiscal year 1970 they are reaching about 57 percent of their needed total service.

On page 1131, volume 4, the Indian Health Service testifies that after 1971 and the receipt of \$99,611,000 for sanitation facilities, there will still be an unmet need of \$65 million in the Continental United States, and \$43 million in Alaska.

In the field of housing, on page 1135, volume 4, the Indian Health Service testified that 68,000 Indian homes either needed replacement or major rehabilita-

tion. The figure arrived at after some discussion was that 90 percent of Indian housing was inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, this is the reason I conclude by saying in all candor that this bill is undoubtedly not as adequate as it should be. We are always prone to talk about one bit of expenditure in the context of other expenditures. Therefore, I cannot resist pointing out that although \$1,800,000,000 may look extravagant, it is well to bear in mind again that this bill manages one-third of the land in the United States; it is a self-liquidating bill except for a very few million dollars; and that in this bill we take care of not only land and resources but our own people.

I also cannot resist equating this with other costs. An hour of war at the current time is estimated at a \$2 million cost. This would provide 235 Indian homes; it would provide 1,800 scholarships; it would make sure that our fishing exploratory research vessels were not phased out of operation; and it is equal to insure the inspection of oil spills which could damage the entire United States

coastline and cost a substantial amount of money either to the taxpayers or to those private industries associated with the production of a source of energy.

In other categories of spending between the years 1946 and 1970, the United States provided as a total for economic and military loans, grants, and assistance in the foreign operations budget, approximately \$138,029,000,000. In those same years, for the management of those agencies concerned with our resources and the development of our wealth, the maintenance of the health and welfare of our people I have named who are covered by this bill for the Department of the Interior, Forest Service, and our related agencies, the Federal Government spent approximately \$18,352,485,941, including this year's budget, which year is not included in the Foreign Operations summary.

Now, if we want to go one step further, let us take the gap between the revenue and the expenditures in the bill. This year our proposed expenditures are \$1,801,599,700. The estimated receipts for

the categories of the bill and the departments are \$1,783,842,073. The gap is \$17,757,627.

This deficit is the total cost to Americans for our country's share in the resources and management of our land. It is our investment in our own people—in the Indians, Samoans, Guamanians, persons in the trust territories.

I think it is time this committee stopped, looked, and listened. It is time we began to spend the money that needs to be spent to preserve our watersheds, make sure that we have the water resources, that minerals and sources of energy are inventoried; that we preserve and protect the land we love—or we shall have nothing to defend.

Members of this committee, you are not going to protect it by turning your backs, littering and cluttering its landscape, or failing to manage its resources.

I urge you today to support this appropriation not solely because it is the funding for departments of our Government but because it is for funding for you and your children and generations to come.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971

Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1970 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (3)	Bill compared with—		
			New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Public Land Management					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	\$53,823,000	\$58,940,000	\$58,940,000	+\$5,117,000	
Construction and maintenance.....	2,899,000	3,215,000	3,215,000	+316,000	
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)		
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	16,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	+2,000,000	
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	1,769,000	1,841,000	1,841,000	+72,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	74,491,000	81,996,000	81,996,000	+7,505,000	
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Education and welfare services.....	181,646,000	216,995,000	217,145,000	+35,499,000	+\$150,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(1,057,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(-443,000)	
Resources management.....	55,242,000	66,217,000	65,690,000	+10,448,000	-527,000
Construction.....	26,264,000	14,266,000	18,935,000	-7,329,000	+4,669,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)		
General administrative expenses.....	5,013,000	5,626,000	5,600,000	+587,000	-26,000
Tribal funds (definite).....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
Tribal funds (indefinite).....	13,204,000	13,204,000	13,204,000		
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	284,369,000	319,308,000	323,574,000	+39,205,000	+4,266,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,750,000	4,025,000	3,825,000	+75,000	-200,000
Land and water conservation:					
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite).....	108,472,000	138,500,000	138,500,000	+30,028,000	
(Appropriation out of the fund to liquidate contract authority).....	(15,528,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(-14,472,000)	
Total Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	112,222,000	142,525,000	142,325,000	+30,103,000	-200,000
Office of Territories					
Administration of territories.....	14,921,400	17,409,600	17,350,000	+2,428,600	-59,600
Permanent appropriation (special fund).....	(239,400)	(118,000)	(118,000)	(-121,400)	
Transferred from other accounts (special fund).....	(292,700)	(330,000)	(330,000)	(-37,300)	
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	48,112,000	60,000,000	50,000,000	+1,888,000	-10,000,000
Total, Office of Territories.....	63,033,400	77,409,600	67,350,000	+4,316,600	-10,059,600
Total, Public Land Management.....	534,115,400	621,238,600	615,245,000	+81,129,600	-5,993,600
Mineral Resources					
Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	96,455,000	105,757,000	108,057,000	+11,602,000	+2,300,000
Bureau of Mines					
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	39,331,000	44,972,000	45,122,000	+5,791,000	+150,000
Health and safety.....	26,332,000	54,395,000	54,395,000	+28,063,000	
General administrative expenses.....	1,647,000	1,799,000	1,799,000	+152,000	
Helium fund (authorization to spend from public debt receipts).....	24,000,000			-24,000,000	
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	91,310,000	101,166,000	101,316,000	+10,006,000	+150,000
Office of Coal Research					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,300,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	+900,000	

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1970 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
Office of Oil and Gas					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$994,000	\$1,195,000	\$1,181,000	+\$187,000	-\$14,000
Total, Mineral Resources.....	204,059,000	224,318,000	226,754,000	+22,695,000	+2,436,000
Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources					
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries					
Management and investigations of resources.....	26,600,000	27,156,000	28,168,000	+1,568,000	+1,012,000
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program).....	15,000	15,000	15,000		
Construction.....	2,325,000			-2,325,000	
Construction of fishing vessels.....	3,000,000	200,000	200,000	-2,800,000	
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development.....	4,590,000	4,040,000	4,040,000	-550,000	
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation.....	2,307,000	2,168,000	2,168,000	-139,000	
Administration of Pribilof Islands (definite, appropriation of receipts).....	2,654,000	2,774,000	2,774,000	+120,000	
Fishermen's protective fund.....	60,000	60,000	60,000		
General administrative expenses.....	765,000	896,000	896,000	+131,000	
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund.....	(385,000)	(385,000)	(385,000)		
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	42,316,000	37,309,000	38,321,000	-3,995,000	+1,012,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife					
Management and investigation of resources.....	49,160,000	56,226,000	56,356,000	+7,196,000	+130,000
Construction.....	4,259,000	2,619,000	4,175,000	-84,000	+1,556,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance).....	5,800,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	+1,700,000	
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation.....	2,294,000	2,311,000	2,311,000	+17,000	
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program).....	100,000	100,000			-100,000
General administrative expenses.....	1,699,000	1,875,000	1,875,000	+176,000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	63,212,000	70,631,000	72,217,000	+9,005,000	+1,586,000
National Park Service					
Management and protection.....	49,150,000	58,021,000	57,670,000	+8,520,000	-351,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	40,050,000	48,763,000	48,500,000	+8,450,000	-263,000
Construction.....	7,700,000	16,885,000	16,385,000	+8,685,000	-500,000
Parkway and road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(21,500,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(-5,500,000)	
Preservation of historic properties.....	1,600,000	6,950,000	6,801,000	+5,201,000	-149,000
General administrative expenses.....	3,317,000	3,605,000	3,580,000	+263,000	-25,000
Total, National Park Service.....	101,817,000	134,224,000	132,936,000	+31,119,000	-1,288,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources.....	207,345,000	242,164,000	243,474,000	+36,129,000	+1,310,000
Office of Saline Water					
Saline water conversion.....	25,000,000	29,373,000	28,573,000	+3,573,000	-800,000
Office of Water Resources Research					
Salaries and expenses.....	11,229,000	13,312,000	13,181,000	+1,952,000	-131,000
Office of the Solicitor					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,530,000	7,344,000	6,924,000	+1,394,000	-420,000
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,912,700	11,954,000	11,353,000	+1,440,300	-601,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....	997,191,100	1,149,703,600	1,145,504,000	+148,312,900	-4,199,600
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	973,191,100	1,149,703,600	1,145,504,000	+172,312,900	-4,199,600
Definite appropriations.....	(833,746,100)	(978,158,600)	(973,959,000)	(+140,212,900)	(-4,199,600)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(139,445,000)	(171,545,000)	(171,545,000)	(+32,100,000)	
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	24,000,000			-24,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(61,585,000)	(71,000,000)	(71,000,000)	(+9,415,000)	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,058,776,100)	(1,220,703,600)	(1,216,504,000)	(+157,727,900)	(-4,199,600)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
Department of Agriculture					
Forest Service					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management.....	192,810,000	*211,575,000	213,412,700	+20,602,700	+1,837,700
Forest research.....	42,137,000	45,066,000	46,671,000	+4,534,000	+1,605,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	22,729,000	21,939,000	23,939,000	+1,210,000	+2,000,000
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	257,676,000	278,580,000	284,022,700	+26,346,700	+5,442,700
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(100,570,000)	(115,000,000)	(115,000,000)	(+14,430,000)	
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	80,000	80,000	80,000		
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	700,000	700,000		
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service.....	259,456,000	280,360,000	285,802,700	+26,346,700	+5,442,700
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review					
Salaries and expenses.....	148,000			-148,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1970 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recom- mended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, fiscal year 1971 (6)
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$115,000		
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare					
Health Services and Mental Health Administration					
Indian health services.....	101,529,000	113,217,000	114,692,000	+\$13,163,000	-\$1,475,000
Indian health facilities.....	20,952,000	17,950,000	17,950,000	-3,002,000	
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	122,481,000	131,167,000	132,642,000	+10,161,000	-1,475,000
Indian Claims Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+150,000	
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,222,700	1,390,000	1,070,000	+847,300	-320,000
Public Land Law Review Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	922,000	171,000	171,000	-751,000	
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses.....	28,134,000	36,367,000	35,737,000	+7,603,000	-\$630,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	2,316,000	4,500,000	2,500,000	+184,000	-2,000,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	600,000	200,000	200,000	-400,000	
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	525,000	1,130,000	1,080,000	+555,000	-50,000
Construction.....	200,000			-200,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(3,300,000)	(8,897,000)	(5,200,000)	(+1,900,000)	(-3,697,000)
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	7,500,000			-7,500,000	
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	3,390,000	3,716,000	3,716,000	+326,000	
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	42,665,000	45,913,000	43,233,000	+568,000	-2,680,000
Executive Office of the President					
Salaries and expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.....	700,000			-700,000	
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska					
Salaries and expenses.....	192,500	263,000	214,000	+21,500	-49,000
Historical and Memorial Commissions					
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,000			-5,000	
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	175,000	375,000	373,000	+198,000	-2,000
National Council on Indian Opportunity					
Salaries and expenses.....	286,000	300,000	275,000	-11,000	-25,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies.....	428,218,200	461,054,000	464,895,700	+36,677,500	+3,841,700
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	428,218,200	461,054,000	464,895,700	+36,677,500	+3,841,700
Definite appropriations.....	(427,438,200)	(460,274,000)	(464,115,700)	(+36,677,500)	(+3,841,700)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)		
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(103,870,000)	(123,897,000)	(120,200,000)	(+16,330,000)	(-3,697,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(532,088,200)	(584,951,000)	(585,095,700)	(+53,007,500)	(+144,700)
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	1,425,409,300	1,610,757,600	1,610,399,700	+184,990,400	-357,900
Consisting of—					
1. Appropriations.....	1,401,409,300	1,610,757,600	1,610,399,700	+208,990,400	-357,900
Definite appropriations.....	(1,261,184,300)	(1,438,432,600)	(1,438,074,700)	(+176,890,400)	(-357,900)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(140,225,000)	(172,325,000)	(172,325,000)	(+32,100,000)	
2. Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	24,000,000			-24,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(165,455,000)	(194,897,000)	(191,200,000)	(+25,745,000)	(-3,697,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,590,864,300)	(1,805,654,600)	(1,801,599,700)	(+210,735,400)	(-4,054,900)

¹ In addition, \$770,000 transferred from "Land Acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System."

² Includes \$14,000 contained in budget amendment listed in House Document 91-305.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentlewoman. I realized she just mentioned something that I think the report should clarify or we should hear. On page 8 of the report there is an item of \$100,000 for maintenance of law and order at Omaha, Nebr. That is the reservation they are talking about, is it not?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Omaha Tribe.

Mr. HALEY. That is the Indian reservation?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. The report is not complete because it should have specified the item as the Omaha Tribe of Indians.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentlewoman. I just did not want the Indians to be deprived of this \$100,000 and have it go to the city of Omaha.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Oh, goodness, no. I can assure you this funding is for the Omaha Tribe. I thank the gentleman for bringing this up.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill to provide appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

My good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee did an outstanding job in putting this bill together. All of us can appreciate the tremendous

efforts involved in drafting legislation of this scope and magnitude. I commend and congratulate the gentlewoman and her very capable subcommittee for a job well done. I would suggest and recommend to all of my colleagues in the House that we give this bill our very close attention and vote of approval.

I was, of course, pleased to learn that sufficient funds were allocated for the land and water conservation fund so that further purchase of lands for Point Reyes National Seashore can be made. These important and valuable lands have hung in the balance for a long time, constantly under the ominous cloud of the threat of subdivision and bulldozing. Should this happen, the entire project would be lost forever.

We were delighted that the administration just this year saw fit to approve the funds necessary to finalize all purchase of these lands. Just recently, this body approved a supplemental appropriation for Point Reyes, and now hopefully we will move on to provide the funds to further complete this project. Acquisition of these lands will be a valuable asset to our national park system. By adding these vast and beautiful acres of unspoiled and natural beaches, cliffs, pastures, and wooded uplands to our reserve of public lands, we will be making a monumental contribution to ecological preservation and conservation efforts. I again thank the distinguished Chairwoman and her capable subcommittee for their wisdom and foresight in seeing the value of these lands and the importance of this project.

I was also especially happy to see that the subcommittee added funds for vital environmental programs. The subcommittee thus acted to close the "performance gap" of the Nixon administration in this vital area. The administration for all its verbal commitments to environmental quality has been very remiss in not funding the programs and proposals that they have recommended. The committee acted wisely in providing substantial funds for these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentlewoman from Washington for a most thorough job.

This bill, to me, demonstrates that the gentlewoman has taken cognizance of the needs of the Department of the Interior throughout the country. Her remarks in her opening statement reflect her thorough knowledge of the activities in this bill and her keen understanding of our natural resources requirements. This is a job well done and she deserves the compliments of every Member of this House.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in the House and to state that the gentlewoman from Washington, as chairman of this subcommittee, has done a wonderful job in preparing this bill and taking into consideration the broad spectrum that she has under her jurisdiction, and the fact that a good segment of the territory that needs attention is located in my Second Congressional District of California.

Especially I want to thank you for the courtesies extended to me and the results of your committee's activities in providing the necessary funds for the forestry department.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in paying our compliments to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee not only for the very fine statement she has made but for the work that you have done and particularly for the kind comments you had in behalf of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I may say to the gentleman that those comments are from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. FOREMAN. I must say I certainly appreciate them. I join in those comments and I commend you and the members of the committee for the outstanding work that you have done.

If I may just say this, I know of no one anywhere in the country who has exhibited more sincere concern for the really forgotten American of today, the American Indian, than you and the members of your committee.

You have exhibited your feeling and your interest and your willingness to do something about it by putting in the additional funds to help these people to help themselves by funding the Navaho Indian Reservation project and by helping them to help themselves by having better health facilities and roads and educational facilities.

I commend the gentlewoman and the members of this committee for the job you have done. I appreciate it as a representative of these Indians.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wish to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to the able chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill. I thank the subcommittee for its kindness to Oklahoma on several matters of very keen interest, including the \$585,000 provided for the long delayed Indian boys' dormitory at Eufaula, Okla.; and the additional health care money, amounting to \$1,475,000, to provide for urgent needs among our Indian people that go right down to the point of medicine in the hospitals. I think that certainly justifies the remarks made just a minute ago by my friend and colleague from New Mexico about the kind of appreciation that this committee and its able chairman have demonstrated for the needs of the Indian people of the United States.

To clarify the record, I would like to cover one additional point, if the gentlewoman will permit me. On page 12 of your report you treat briefly and provide figures for the Bureau of Mines, including specific reference to \$300,000 to be spent for continued research efforts at the Bureau of Mines Petroleum Research Center or laboratory at Bartlesville, Okla. It is my understanding—and I think the other figures in the bill and in the report bear it out—that this is intended to supplement the \$1,053,000 in the budget, providing a total of \$1,353,000 for this Petroleum Research Center at Bartlesville, Okla. Am I correct in that statement?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct. The Department had programed a \$300,000 reduction and I may say that in the testimony before the committee they also stated that this facility was one of the better laboratories in the country for pollution research. So, since there is nothing that succeeds like success, the committee felt that the \$300,000 should be restored. Therefore, there will be \$1,353,000 for the operation of this facility.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman. I think that action by the committee assures the continued employment and activity at that center of some of the best experts in the country on air pollution as well as water pollution control.

I certainly wish to add one further word. The gentlewoman a moment ago led a standing tribute to a very fine colleague of ours, BEN REIFEL, and I know every Member was proud to join in that salute to a great American. But I would like to suggest a standing tribute is in order also for the gentlewoman who is Chairman of this subcommittee and who I think has demonstrated as fine a capacity to handle a bill and bring it to the floor as any Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I deeply thank the gentleman.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague. Of course, I wish to thank the gentle-

woman for what she has done for Oklahoma. But more importantly, I should like to point out that she has done a great job for the Nation. She is a great chairman. She understands the mission of her subcommittee, and she is a great servant of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for H.R. 17619, the 1971 Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill.

In this connection, I want to warmly commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and other members of her subcommittee. As always, they considered carefully the value of programs in relation to the overall desirability of being frugal with the taxpayers' money.

When comparing the committee's bill against the budget request and likewise against the funding in 1970 fiscal year, one is impressed with the care and consideration given by the committee to the needs of public service, as well as to the values that come from the investment of the public money.

These latter benefits include intangible benefits such as accrue from research in, for example, our fishery resources. Also, of course, there are direct returns to the Federal Treasury from receipts of, for example, sale of timber. These latter returns bring with them additional benefits in jobs.

Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation to the committee for its action in including \$337,000 for fisheries research and continuation of the Milford Laboratory in Connecticut and \$400,000 for continued operation of the Ann Arbor Laboratory in Michigan; also \$75,000 and \$200,000 for evaluation studies of Bureau of Commercial Fisheries research vessels and various other important and vital problems. The total is approximately \$1 million above the budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these items shown in the committee report because my House Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been holding hearings, and the testimony bears out the wisdom of the action of the committee. Especially, I have felt the need to continue operation of the Research Vessel *Miller Freeman*. Testimony of the North Pacific salmon industry clearly shows how essential this is.

Altogether, Mr. Chairman, I think Chairman HANSEN and her subcommittee have done a most commendable job and I fully support its recommendations.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I think little can be added to the standing ovation the House has given to the gentlewoman from Washington and to members of her committee for this splendid bill. I, too, associate myself with the

complimentary remarks of the other Members.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, within this bill there is an item that is small in terms of money, but large in terms of importance to my district. I refer to the \$250,000 earmarked for the San Marcos sports fish center. I realize this is a minute amount of money compared to the sum of the whole bill, but we can provide statewide benefits with this small amount.

By its action today, the House has given our project much needed construction funds that will assure our chances of orderly progress. It adds an element of permanency to our sports fish center.

I am pleased that the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife supports our position.

Assuming that similar action is taken in the other body we can move ahead with the stage one construction action—that is, the development of the water supply systems, which includes the pumping stations, the connecting pipelines, and so forth.

None of this would have been possible, Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the courage of the subcommittee chairman, my colleague Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN and her very capable committee.

In my years in Washington, I have always found this committee to be ready to listen and to support those projects which are beneficial on a large scale. And, I know from experience, that when you testify before Mrs. HANSEN's committee, you would be wise to have prepared your homework carefully. The questions from the committee can be sharp and penetrating and you had better have your facts in order or you will get nailed.

May I also extend my compliments to the Honorable BEN REIFEL, who is retiring from the committee. He is a splendid gentleman, and one of the best men who ever served on this committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

Did the Bureau of the Budget release construction funds for fiscal year 1970?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I understand they have released some of the funds.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the hearings that certain notices were served on certain people about these construction funds.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It seems to me it would be very silly for us to hold budget hearings and to appropriate additional funds, if the funds previously appropriated were not released. So the Department of the Interior, which has been most thoughtful about these matters, has assured us of the budgetary release by July 1, 1970.

I might point out that funds reserved on these projects involved projects of high priority to the lives of the people

of this Nation.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there was also mention of a cultural center. What cultural center is involved in these funds that Mr. Hartzog spoke of? He spoke of funds for the Centennial Commission and the Bicentennial Commission and the cultural center. What cultural center is involved here?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not recall. There are several so-called cultural centers.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Director of the Park Service, Mr. Hartzog, was referring to the Cultural Center at Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I think that is it. He did discuss Wolf Trap Farm Park. I do not have the committee hearings before me, they are at my desk, but I can assure the gentleman there are many cultural centers all over the United States, as the gentleman is aware.

Mr. GROSS. Is that in connection with the Hirshhorn Galleries?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Hirshhorn Museum is part of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. GROSS. It is in this bill?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Construction funds for it are in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Construction funds.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The bill contains funds for this year's construction only. I will refer the gentleman to the hearings, where we had a complete review of all the questions which were raised by the very competent members of my committee. The very competent attorneys on my committee asked a great many questions with respect to that.

Mr. GROSS. But there are no funds in this bill for the so-called Kennedy Center in Foggy Bottom?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman from Iowa will refer to the report, he will notice the table on page 45 indicates no 1971 funds for the John F. Kennedy Center.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It is a pleasure to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice of commendation for the gentlewoman from Washington and for the fine work she has done since she has been the chairman of the subcommittee. I also commend her for the fine relationship in her work with her ranking minority counterpart, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL), and the members of the subcommittee itself.

There has been wonderful cooperation all through the years between this appropriations subcommittee and the authorizing committee with respect to most of the work that comes under the jurisdiction of the committee. I appreciate that.

The gentlewoman is a very fine successor to a great Member of this House who carried on the responsibility in this

field for a long, long time. I refer, of course, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN).

The work of the gentlewoman and her committee, I believe, comes as near to being responsive to the national needs as could possibly be. I commend them for their fine work. There are several benefits here which go to individual communities, which are very pleasing to me, but I believe the national scope of the work of the subcommittee pleases me the most.

I wish to say, "Thank you very much," for all the pleasurable associations we have had and for the wonderful work done with the committee which I am privileged to chair at this time, and for the work done by the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has been a great pleasure to work with him on these programs. It was a great privilege for me to serve on his committee, as well as the Appropriations Subcommittee.

I may say further, it has been with some sadness during the past 2 years I have stood here and "taken the place of" the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN). One can never take his place. I had the pleasure of serving under the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN). We will forever miss him in our hearts. We are sorry he is not here with us today. I know he probably joins us in regret that he cannot be here.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to the commendations made for the very diligent and effective efforts of the chairman of our subcommittee.

I certainly agree with everything the gentlewoman has said about our distinguished ranking minority Member, Mr. REIFEL. We all regret very deeply his departure from our committee and indeed from the Congress.

I would commend the gentlewoman also for the hours and hours and hours of hearings held in our subcommittee. I only add that I am dismayed by the fact that we find, although we have reduced the total request of the Bureau of the Budget by something in excess of \$4 million, there seems to be some effort being made to knock out certain increases which we provided in certain areas, based on hours of testimony, which we felt on the basis of priority should be added to resources development.

Mr. Chairman, on another subject, in connection with Forest Service appropriations, I believe it would be appropriate now to mention that in the report of the Senate in connection with last year's bill the question of possible modification of deferred measurement-payment bond procedures was discussed. The Senate committee expressly directed that no change in these procedures be undertaken in fiscal year 1970. The Senate committee also urged the Forest Service and the industry to attempt to

work out their differences during the fiscal year. I am advised that these differences have not been resolved, and in fact continue to exist.

It is my understanding also that really there has been no joint effort as such to this date. A partial study by the Department has pretty much ignored social consequences of the proposed change and has concentrated on short-term accounting considerations. Because all aspects of this situation should be reviewed if maximum national benefits are to be achieved from the practices used by the Forest Service, I would urge the Secretary of Agriculture to fully consider the impacts of the proposed change on employment in economically depressed areas of the West, the impact on increased needs for borrowed money on interest rates, and the ability of smaller operators to continue an orderly program of year-round market operations, and the effects of diminished supply on our capacity to meet housing goals. I would also urge them to consult with our committee and the industry before implementing any changes. I would also hope that whatever agreement is finally achieved it would be uniform in its application throughout the United States.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of this Committee for the wonderful reception given to the kind and commending words of our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). Members on both sides of the aisle have become my warm and close friends over a period of 10 years. It is particularly difficult to leave those on the Appropriations Committee, and especially members of the Interior and Legislative Subcommittee. These ladies and gentlemen have all been most helpful and most encouraging, and have made these 10 years of my life some of the most exciting that I shall ever know.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to take this occasion to join with those who have expressed their admiration for the service of the gentleman from South Dakota to the House and to the Nation during the past 10 years, particularly in the field of sensitivity to the needs of the Indian people. He has contributed a background of knowledge and sympathy which has commanded great respect, giving us the leadership we need in solving difficult problems in the scope of Indian affairs. His influence will continue long after he has ceased to be a Member of this body.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank my good friend from the bottom of my heart.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE), and I share a little joke. When I first came to the House I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to travel briefly overseas.

I am also probably the only ward of the U.S. Government serving in the Congress who happens to be his own guardian while here. Therefore, when we traveled overseas I would ask the gentleman from New York if he would serve as my guardian in order that this issue would be properly taken care of. My wife has always said that he has done a marvelous job.

Mr. Chairman, our bill is essentially divided into two parts. One part has to do with the resources of our Nation as has been so eloquently, adequately, and effectively presented to you by the chairman of our subcommittee. These resources, if properly husbanded, can provide the sinew, strength, and power with which we can continue to be a free Nation responding to all of the needs of all of the people in our country. The other part of this bill is concerned with the Indians of our country and is the only people-oriented aspect of this particular legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in the past when this bill came before the House, and when I first came here 10 years ago, the distinguished, venerable, highly praised, and honored gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, served as its chairman. MIKE referred to this bill as "the all-American bill." It is just that and, perhaps, more.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains funds within it for the forests, the seas, the waters, the lands, and the Indian peoples who populated this country before the coming of the white man. So, it truly is an "all-American bill."

Mr. Chairman, during the years that I have been in Congress and especially while serving on this committee for 8 years, contributing to my pleasure is the fact that I have been "half all-American." I have been a part of this bill that is so well managed and handled by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Those of you who have had an opportunity to read the report and those of you who have listened to the explanation of the bill know that this is a non-partisan effort. Our main question with any request has been, "Is it good for America?" This has been our test.

Unfortunately, because of the budget restraints of the last administration, and also faced by this administration, the Department and its agencies have not been able to ask for the amounts of money that they should have.

Total funds exclusively for the Department of the Interior—less BIA—recommended in the fiscal 1971 appropriations bill are \$907,634,000.

However, receipts generated by the Interior Department activities total \$1,404,940,073. The surplus of proposed receipts over proposed expenditures in fiscal 1971 is \$497,306,073.

To bring these figures into better perspective, we should realize that for every \$1 appropriated for use exclusively by the Department of the Interior, we receive back to us \$1.54. In other words, the Department of the Interior is paying for itself and also returning us a 54-cent dividend.

Funding the Department of the Interior should not be considered an ap-

propriation, rather we should consider funds for Interior more like an investment. Wise financial management tells us that it is better to invest our money where we will be assured of a return on our investment. Such is the case with the Department of the Interior. It is making money for the Federal Government in addition to its valuable work as a protector, conservator, and innovator of the Nation's resources.

A similar analogy is applicable to the Forest Service. Total appropriations for the Forest Service are \$284,022,700.

However, proposed receipts in fiscal 1971 will be \$378,902,000. The Forest Service program will produce surplus receipts of \$94,879,300. For every \$1 invested in the Forest Service, the Federal Government will receive \$1.33 as a return.

The value of these Federal Government programs can be measured in more than just dollars. These programs are essential to life itself. One example is watershed restoration and the production of water. There are 390.4 million acre-feet of water produced from our national forests. The economic implications and intangible benefits for protecting this clean water resource go directly to our people.

Research in this area has led to the discovery of better methods to treat the land and cheaper means of increasing water yields. Is it now best to direct money toward developing our clean water supply rather than wait until the water is polluted and then face the full consequences of the problem.

The Forest Service has estimated that with a capital investment of \$80 million over a 10-year period an additional 1,552,000 acre-feet of usable water supply can be achieved. The areas of treatment would be timber harvest design, brushland area management, riparian vegetation management, alpine snowpack management, and noncommercial timber management. After the initial conversion, the annual maintenance cost would be only about \$9.90 per acre-feet of sustained water yield. This water production program of the Forest Service, like many programs in the Department of Interior, goes to the heart of our environmental quality.

Our Nation cannot afford to stand by and wait until problems are created. In the areas where problems do exist regarding our environment, of course, we must seek solutions. But overall our goal should not be solutions to problems but innovation and foresight regarding our resources and our ecology to prevent the problems from forming in the first place.

I should also like to point out that in the Department of the Interior are a number of faithful, long-serving Federal employees. They are sometimes forgotten, but without their services we would not have the kind of Government that our people desire.

We asked Mr. Hartzog of the Park Service during the course of his testimony a number of questions. He said that it has been a practice to report each year all donations to the national parks systems. He stated:

I am pleased to tell you that the cash donations to the system last year were \$977,000. Donations of land and other objects were

valued at approximately \$6.3 million. But the important one, the most important contribution that I think all of us should keep in mind is the donation given by our employees of the National Park Service who forfeited a total of 73,000 hours of annual leave last year valued at \$238,000. This is to me a meaningful, inspirational, and significant contribution, and one of many examples that could be given by all the other agencies.

During the period from July to December, 1969, Interior employees contributed, additionally, 115,000 hours of uncompensated overtime which has a value of \$700,000. Over a twelve month period they estimate this overtime would amount to \$1,400,000. This was donated by the employees of the Park Service.

Can one ask for more loyalty and dedication to the Service?

As I said earlier, one of the purposes of our coming before this Committee as managers of this bill is to explain its contents. This bill has been adequately and effectively presented by our distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). I am grateful to her for her services to our country. This House and our committee appreciate the fact that she is particularly knowledgeable on this subject because of her past experience in the State legislature of the State of Washington, and also because of her own personal association in the fields of education, forestry resources, and land management. She is well informed about and well versed on all of the activities with which this appropriation bill is concerned. I believe that the people of our Nation and we who represent them can be grateful that we have a person such as the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to chair this subcommittee. She has carried on in the tradition of our great friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN) who contributed so much in past years, as has the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the other members of that committee on the legislative side of this bill. They probably will not be extolled in the history books of the future, but they will always be known by those of us who are aware of the mark they have made on this legislation.

In the future when others look back, they will see and understand that it is through their efforts and help that we have made America a better place in which to live. If the younger generation who follow on our heels will only accomplish as much, they too will have something as worthwhile for others to reflect upon.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY).

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have two Indian reservations in my district, and as a relatively new Member of this Congress, serving my second term, I was very concerned about them. I spent many hours doing research and preparing my testimony before I requested an opportunity to be heard by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

I arrived at the committee and was all set to sell my bill of goods, and I found

that the chairman, and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) knew more about my problem than I did.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an outstanding committee, and I commend them and I want to offer my accolade to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) and to all the other members of the committee. I think they have all done an outstanding job. I certainly do support this bill.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my commendation to the gentleman's work on the committee and in the Congress. It has been wonderful to have such a friend present and working on the problems that mean so much to the building of America.

The gentleman very eloquently spoke about members of the National Park Service often giving up their vacation time, without being compensated.

There is a small appropriation in this bill, some \$54,000, if I remember correctly, for volunteers for the park. Is it not true that in addition to Park Service staff giving their leave and vacation without compensation, members of their family have also served the people of the United States without compensation. I am sure they will continue to do so. I believe the small amount of money in this bill will take care of some of the expenses to see that this service continues.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for calling this to the attention of the Members. This is true. This dedicated service on the part of the Park Service employees and their families sets an example. It is one of the reasons why these employees and others who appreciate the parks that you provide for in your great committee want to keep them clean and in a condition permitting them to remain available in perpetuity to all of the citizens who are to come after us.

This amount that you have mentioned will provide expenses for these citizens who live near the parks and are willing to make this contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to take this opportunity to thank my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) for all of the courtesies extended to me when I appeared before his subcommittee. The gentleman has visited our State many, many times in dealing with the resources of our State and has spent much time in my congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman on the part of all the people for the kind treatment you have given us

and for your wisdom in bringing in a very substantial budget here to take care of the resources of the Second Congressional District.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) who is also of the attitude and nature of mind of our distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. The gentleman has been concerned with the resources of this Nation, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs concerned with irrigation. His committee has made it possible for my State to look forward to the opportunity when we can increase our use and productivity of our natural resources. I say to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), that I thank you for your services to the Nation and to my State.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to join briefly in adding to the accolades and laudatory comments that have been made with regard to what I refer to as our great all-American Congressman, BEN REIFEL.

I also want to express my appreciation for all of the considerations you have personally given to the requests we have from those on the north coast of California that has had certainly more focus and attention brought to it over the last few years with regard to the Redwood National Park and the Point Reyes National Seashore, and so forth.

Also, you have touched on something here that I think is most worthy of comment and this relates to the part that the Forest Service lands themselves actually play in providing the accommodations and facilities and the opportunity for outdoor recreation for the many, many visitors.

To give you somewhat of an idea for the Members who are still here on the floor, while there was great discussion about the acreages associated with the Point Reyes National Seashore and the Redwood Park, and they were talking in terms, as I recall, of 6,000 acres in the one case for the Redwood National Park and around 53,000 acres for the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues that we have nearly 6 million acres of Forest Service lands that are almost immediately contiguous to all of these parks in California that are available for outdoor recreation. The fact that you have added to this in the budget and recognize that fact of life has made a great contribution.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) for his kind remarks. The chairman of our subcommittee has followed the policy that what is good for the Forest Service—the protection of our trees and timber resources—and what is good for the Park Service—making areas available for people looking for recreation in this country—is good for America.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I would like to get a word in edgewise among all the laudatory comments that have been made concerning your service to your country and to your State. I share the sentiments of this House in that regard.

I have a few words to say insofar as the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries aspects of this legislation are concerned.

I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 17619.

My colleagues have used strong words in support of this bill. I share their concern on the urgency of using all available means within reason to restore the U.S. fishing industry to its former position of leadership. Research and adequate funding are the keys to this end especially when combined with imaginative and sound executive management of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

I am deeply concerned by the continually increasing threats to our vital natural resources and feel that a stronger counterattack must be made through research not only to preserve, but to enhance our food supply from the oceans and contiguous shores.

There has been talk of retirement of marine research vessels, closing of marine shellfish research laboratories, abandonment of research programs, and many other essential projects, supposedly in the interest of economy. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that such thoughts are "penny wise and pound foolish." If there was ever a time to take strong action to guarantee and expand the supply of food from the sea, it is now.

I have a great interest in the valuable work being performed at the Milford Laboratories for shellfish research, at the Woods Hole Bureau of Commercial Fisheries unit, and aboard various marine research vessels such as the *Albatross* out of Woods Hole.

There is no question that this work is of immense importance to our generation and to future generations. It is of such importance that it may provide a solution to feeding the hungry people of the world who are victims of a massive population explosion.

If I do not share the strong words of my distinguished colleagues, I do share their honest and earnest convictions that we must support the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to the utmost through thick and thin; to do otherwise would seriously jeopardize this Nation and the untapped resources of its oceans and seas.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman that the knowledge, understanding, and concern of the chairman of our subcommittee is responsible for the provisions of this bill concerned with the fisheries. She asked the questions that needed to be considered of those who came from downtown in connection with the budget justification. All of the credit for the things which are going to be beneficial in the area which you just mentioned must go to her.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I concur heartily with what you have said concerning the gentlewoman from Washington. She has done an outstanding job. We in Massachusetts in particular are very grateful for her services in this regard.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending appropriation bill. I first write to associate myself with remarks made by our distinguished and able colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington. She has always demonstrated her capacity to come to grips with the many problems that face this Nation by her leadership on this important piece of legislation. And I wish to remark also that she has never been more accurate than when she paid such a richly merited tribute to our colleague from South Dakota, BEN REIFEL. The news that he would retire from Congress at the end of this session left me with greatly mixed emotions. I do not begrudge him the time that he wishes to spend with his charming wife and the other members of his family. His 37 years—get that, 37 years—of creative public service certainly have earned him the right to what I hope will be many years of warm and peaceful tranquility. Yet, this Congress and the Nation face a time of unparalleled crisis. In such a time, the wisdom, the guidance, and the wise counsel of the gentleman from South Dakota are needed more critically than ever. And so, while I offer him my warmest and most sincere good wishes on the occasion of his retirement I must include one caveat. Please do not be surprised when your phone begins to ring or when the letters begin to arrive seeking your advice on the problems that confront the Congress. Whether in active service or not, whether physically present in this Chamber or not, all of us will continue to seek your counsel and guidance. I know no man who has done more to bring credit to his nation, to his ancestry, and to his profession than the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank my gracious friend very much.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago I rose in support of a similar appropriations bill, and remarked that by supporting appropriations for the Department of the Interior, we were acting to shape the destiny of our Nation, that it should be a richer and greener pasture for our children and their children. This bill is almost entirely an environmental bill, just as it was 4 years ago, and the crisis of our environment today is even more critical than it was then.

This bill is the result of conflict between the many needs of our society and the great, but still limited, resources which we have available to meet them. I feel that within the context of these needs and resources, the bill now before us is one which deserves the support of all of us.

There is much talk these days of the need to reorder our national priorities, and it is clear that such a need exists. It should be equally clear, however, that this reordering cannot be fully accomplished overnight, nor in the myopic context of any single piece of legislation. In considering this bill, I feel that the committee has concerned itself with both the increased needs for the protection and improvement of our surroundings, and the capacity of the agencies funded in this bill to restructure and retool themselves to meet those needs during the coming fiscal year.

There is a lesson to be learned from the experience of the people in my own district—a lesson which applies to the entire Nation. We have learned that even with intensive efforts, an environment that has been mistreated for decades cannot be fully restored in a matter of a few months or even a few years. If a person who had visited this area even 4 years ago were to return today, he would notice some remarkable improvements. Nevertheless, some very serious environmental problems are still as I described them to this distinguished body in 1966. I then pointed out that in my own district we have mine fires that have been burning for 50 years, and that we had no hope of extinguishing them by nightfall. We still have refuse dumps, called culm dumps, in the anthracite area which also have been burning for 50 years. We continue to have serious problems of air and water pollution, and the results of the abandoned mining industry still scar the land and make much of it unavailable for any commercial or residential use.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues on the committee for having joined with me in recognizing that some of these culm dump fires still rage out of control. The bill now before us contains an account of \$1 million in one item of the Bureau of Mines budget. This item is explained at page 12 of the committee report. The committee states:

On many occasions, the Committee has recognized the urgent necessity for combating the culm bank fires in Pennsylvania which have destroyed life and property in that area for many years. To date, action producing tangible results has been negligible. It is the very strong recommendation of this Committee that immediate action be taken for development of a demonstration program that will produce a meaningful solution to this critical situation that has existed much too long.

These words need no clarification. I simply wish to request that they be noted and that this action be approved today by the entire membership of the House.

I would also like to add my personal endorsement to the recommendation of the committee that the full amount requested—\$54,395,000—for the health and safety activities of the Bureau of Mines, which include the activities prescribed by the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, be approved. The men who mine the coal that means so much to the economy of this country are entitled to the full protection of this significant legislation. They are entitled to the safest possible working conditions. It is our responsibility to make available the necessary manpower, skill-

fully trained, to afford the protection the new safety law provides. We can fulfill that responsibility today by passing this important piece of legislation.

Finally, I would like to point out the significance of one other item in the bill now before us. The committee has recommended an appropriation of \$10,231,743 for land acquisition relating to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I understand that this proposed national park will be of great benefit to the entire northeastern region of the country. I would also point out, however, that the taking of land for the project is causing great hardship to many persons who have spent their entire lives in this area. In the interest of these people, it is important that land acquisition not be delayed, because such delay only adds to their hardship.

It is most important that land acquisition proceed at a level which will permit development of the area that is rationally coordinated with construction activity to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers. I am gratified to see that during the coming fiscal year, the Corps of Engineers has requested funding for new construction which will start this important project on its way to becoming a reality.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to support this bill today, because it is a good bill, and also because it contains an appropriation for the urban forestry and research program to be jointly run by the U.S. Forest Service and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and some other northeastern universities which will participate. This represents the culmination of effort made over a great many years.

I believe special tribute should be paid today—and I know a great deal has already been said, but if I may trespass on the patience of my colleagues—to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). I dare say she is one of the finest subcommittee chairmen on the Appropriations Committee. She is a person with a tremendous amount of courage and knowledge, who stands up for what is right regardless of what the odds are. She has done a good job, as anyone knows who has taken the time to read the voluminous hearings she has brought forth as a result of the testimony presented to her committee. I hope everyone will read the hearings. This is one of the most important committees, I feel, in the Congress.

Also I pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota, BEN REIFEL, and I say that from the bottom of my heart. He is one of my closest friends and has been during the 10 years we have served together. I know many times when the going got rough and the issues were really hot in the Congress, I could always find a word of consolation when I sat next to BEN. Many times we found ourselves in the minority on this side, and it is great to have a friend like BEN, and to be able to lean on his shoulder

and get a word of encouragement.

BEN is certainly a great credit to the fine institution in Massachusetts, Harvard College. I think now, when he will be retired and will have a little time on his hands, he ought to go back to Harvard College. I think they ought to offer a chair to BEN REIFEL. I think the gentleman from South Dakota could help straighten out that institution with some of their problems.

I wish the gentleman from South Dakota well, and I take this opportunity to wish BEN many decades of good health and happiness, so he may reap the rich dividends and spiritual satisfaction which he has so ably earned in his lifetime of dedicated service to his country and to his great State of South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, the basic idea behind this project is to develop a program to study and enhance the role played by trees, parks, and forested open space in creating a quality environment for people living and working in urban areas.

This is a project that goes beyond merely talking about the problems with our environment. It will actually attack one facet of the problem by determining how best we can utilize our trees, parks, and forests to serve people in densely populated areas.

If we seriously intend to save our environment from growing urban sprawl, and the loss of healthy vegetation that entails, then we desperately need projects such as this one.

While this study will benefit all urban areas of the Nation, it is particularly important for those of us in the East. Although the eastern seaboard is the most heavily populated section of the Nation, more than 50 percent of the land area is still covered by trees and forests. These trees play a major role in making our environment habitable by removing dust, pollen, and other pollutants from the air, by helping to smother noise, by manufacturing valuable oxygen for our air, and by providing us with visible natural beauty.

But to insure these benefits for future generations, we must know the problems such as the effects of air pollutants, salting of streets and highways, trampling of soil, injury arising from excavation for construction, pruning of branches and trimming of crowns, vandalism, and the like. This project will do all that—and more.

There are undoubtedly many more benefits not yet fully appreciated. One of the purposes of the research project would be to further explore these benefits.

At the same time, more study is needed to determine how best to protect our trees from encroaching suburbia. What kinds of land use are most suitable for this protection?

These are questions important to all of us, but especially for the inner city resident who must be assured some access to tree belts and recreational areas near the city.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, one of our great challenges as we enter the seventies—a decade dedicated to restoring and preserving our environment—is to see that such forested areas are properly managed.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that prospects for the success of this project are excellent. I have already mentioned the interest of the University of Massachusetts. Under the direction of Prof. Arnold Rhodes, the university is prepared to provide space for laboratories and offices, funds, and personnel, as well as to assist in the formulation of a joint program.

Our Forest Service is no less excited about this proposal, and plans are already underway to initiate its development. The Gifford Pinchot Institute for Environmental Forestry, named for one of America's great conservationists, is due to be set up soon, in Milford, Pa., near Philadelphia. High on the list of projects the institute hopes to promote is this joint project in Amherst.

In short, all the experts I have talked with are most enthusiastic. I am pleased to commend the project to all of my colleagues.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of appreciation and relief that I offer my gratitude to the distinguished Chairman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and to the ranking member, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL), for responding to my plea to have the operating funds for the fiscal year 1971 for the Great Lakes Biological Research Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Mich.

I am indebted to the committee for recognizing the value of the laboratory to the Great Lakes area and for their supporting our longstanding fight to maintain the laboratory at its current level. The preliminary decision regarding the reduction in the work of the Ann Arbor laboratory was ostensibly made because of the laboratory's low priority within the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. However, recognizing the high esteem with which the laboratory is held within the general field of resource management, the laboratory is to be transferred to the Bureau of Sports Fisheries; and its activities to be vastly increased by the beginning of fiscal year 1972. It is acknowledged by the Department of the Interior, the administration, and all other parties concerned, that this laboratory is the leading fresh water environmental research facility in the country.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when the precarious ecological balance of our country has finally received attention by Federal, State, and local governments, as well as the general public, it is totally incomprehensible that the leading biological research facility in the Great Lakes is to have its operating expenses reduced merely because of an administrative definition.

This lab contains some of our Nation's outstanding biological scientists and is one of the few facilities available for complete research investigation. To have its funds and personnel reduced merely because it falls under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries rather than that of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries is exactly the type of hypocrisy

and semantical juggling that American youth is protesting today. This reflects a total lack of sensitivity and evaluation on the part of those responsible. No one denies the need for reducing Government spending but a sense of priorities must be established in selecting the areas in which to be reduced so as not to damage those efforts necessary for the basic welfare of American people.

I will pursue my continuing fight to maintain and improve the support for the Great Lakes facility in the other body and with the Bureau of the Budget and with the administration. Parenthetically, but most importantly, it may well be that the "case of the Ann Arbor laboratory" may be the prime example of why a total resources management approach within the Department of the Interior is sorely needed.

Chairman JULIA HANSEN, of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman JOHN DINGELL of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, have both shown their great sense of concern and cognizance over the importance of this laboratory. The people of Michigan as well as the Nation will long be grateful for their responsive efforts to the needs of our environment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my fervent hope that the Members of this austere body will pass this appropriation with their fullest support and that the Bureau of the Budget under the direction of the President will see fit to provide the Department of Interior with the necessary authority to spend these funds and that they not be impeded as inflationary. No one is more aware of the affects of inflation on the lives of their people than I am in the Second District of Michigan. There are many areas of the Government which can afford some reduction in operating expenditures and I dare say there are some areas in the Department of the Interior which can afford reductions. But, the fight on our environment is too precious, too immediate, and too important to be reduced at this time. This has been recognized by the willingness of the administration and the Department of the Interior to increase this laboratory's effectiveness in fiscal year 1972 and there is absolutely no justification in reducing it in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes—and I shall yield more, if needed—to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL), for so graciously yielding me this time. I would like to join my colleagues in expressing to him my sorrow at his departure and my sincere and warm good wishes to him for every happiness. He and I have been good friends over the years of our service together, and I have taken great pride in his friendship and in the privilege of having known him.

I should like to express my particular appreciation of his good work, as well as that of the distinguished chairlady of

the subcommittee which brings this bill to the floor today. I should like to commend them and the subcommittee for the outstanding work which has been done with regard to our Oceanographic Fisheries Resources and Research programs.

I should like to express particular commendation to the subcommittee and to the distinguished chairlady, who have served this body so well, for their labors in seeing to it that our commercial fisheries resources and research programs are continued in the fashion that they should be and with the fundamental and proper philosophy and approach which they have so well shown over the years.

At this time I should like to have the particular attention of my dear friend the gentlewoman from Washington, to discuss with her the closures of the laboratories which have been projected, one in Milford, Conn., and one in Ann Arbor, Mich. I note with some pleasure that the subcommittee has indicated these will not be closed and that they will be funded.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Funds are provided in this bill for the laboratories, and we have directed the Department of Interior not to close them.

As the gentleman is well aware, the laboratory at Milford, Conn., has made an outstanding contribution on shellfish, and the laboratory at Ann Arbor, Mich., is doing the same outstanding job in respect to general fisheries throughout the Great Lakes region.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support of this appropriation bill, H.R. 17619, and at the same time announce that this is a joint statement. This statement represents the views and concerns of the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; the Honorable ALTON LENNON, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography; the Honorable RICHARD HANNA; as well as myself, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

We urge approval of this bill and seek to call attention to those sections of the legislation which would provide funds for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. Specifically, we are making an urgent appeal for the approval of those funds, which would be utilized by the Bureau to continue the operation of two vital fisheries research laboratories at their fiscal year 1970 level. One of these is in Milford, Conn.; the other one is in Ann Arbor, Mich. But the significance of this appeal goes far beyond a simple request for funds for these two laboratories; it has serious implications and raises grave questions concerning the present intentions and future plans of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—as well as the Department of Interior—in the entire area of environmental and fisheries research.

Our Nation's great natural resources—our wildlife, our fish and shellfish, our rivers and lakes, and even our great oceans—are threatened by massive and

ever-growing pollution, overuse, and neglect. These problems have reached a crisis stage. There is a clear and urgent need for immediate action, and for increased scientific study in the areas of environmental control and fisheries research.

And yet, despite this obvious and pressing need for more research, our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has uncovered a deliberate plan and intention on the part of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to further drastically cut the meager research that is now being carried out; the committee has documented the fact that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, which is charged with the responsibility to promote and preserve our fisheries and marine environment, is abandoning that responsibility under the guise of economic necessity. The extremely unwise nature of this plan to terminate valuable research and research facilities was compounded by the fact that part of this plan was a secretive one; it was kept under wraps. Our committee, which has a responsibility in these areas—and, therefore, a right to be informed of such important decisions—was not informed until the 11th hour. Consequently, the committee was forced to call hasty hearings and conduct an investigation which is not yet completed. These hearings were jointly chaired by the chairman of our Subcommittee on Oceanography and the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

Despite this time shortage, the committee acted quickly and—in just 3 days of hearings—has already compiled a record that is disturbing and alarming. It is, in fact, an indictment of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Department of the Interior, and perhaps the Bureau of the Budget. Since our investigation is not yet completed, we are not sure to what degree each of these agencies is responsible, but we wish to serve notice at this time that the investigation will continue, the responsibility will be determined and whatever congressional action is needed will be taken.

Mr. Chairman, in order to obtain the information needed, in timely fashion, the committee was forced to subpoena a witness, who happens to be a marine biologist and a regional director for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The distinguished chairman of our Committee, Congressman GARMATZ, issued that subpoena—not because the witness was unwilling to testify, but because the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries had planned to send this biologist on a sudden assignment to Brazil. The use of this extraordinary process was necessary in order to guarantee the appearance of the witness at the committee's hearing. We also wish to serve notice that in the future, measures necessary for completion of the committee's investigation, including the subpoenaing of witnesses, will be utilized as deemed appropriate, and that the Congress will not be obstructed in its search for facts.

In respect to the two laboratories for which funds have been added in this appropriation bill—one of which the Bureau intends to close and the other, sharply reduce its activities and transfer

to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—we want to submit a few relevant facts uncovered during the committee's hearings. Both laboratories are unique in character, and are making a contribution to our attack on environmental and fisheries problems that cannot be duplicated or replaced. Furthermore, the closure or severe reduction in research of either of these installations will constitute a severe threat to our environment and to our precious natural resources.

In the case of the Ann Arbor laboratory, we would like to briefly outline the importance of that installation:

It is the best laboratory for fresh water research in the United States, if not the world.

Twenty years of accumulated scientific data will be lost on this plan. All this invaluable research, impossible to evaluate in terms of dollars, will be lost for an ostensible savings of \$400,000.

Important data on the predacious lamprey eel—which threatens the Great Lakes, decimated the lake trout and is again making other inroads—will be lost.

Trash fish are increasing in the lakes, while valuable fish are decreasing.

Mercury and DDT poisoning are contaminating the Great Lakes—the greatest fresh water resource in the world; pollution in general is increasing and threatening the lakes.

The research laboratory at Milford, Conn., has an equally impressive record:

It is probably the only laboratory in the world conducting organized scientific work on basic shellfish genetics.

It has unsurpassed facilities for research on biology and the effects of pollution on estuarine or marine organisms.

It specializes in mollusks research—especially oysters and clams—it is world renowned in this field and attracts scientists from many other nations; they go to Milford to study techniques developed there.

It has developed techniques on hatcheries of oysters and other mollusks which are used in many areas of our Nation.

Its work on predator control has—in many instances—increased the survival rate of oysters tenfold.

Much of this laboratory's scientific data will likewise be lost if the facility is closed.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that the Bureau's proposal with respect to these two outstanding laboratories represents either lack of intelligent judgment, indifference, or incompetence. We intend to find out which. In both cases, the directors of these laboratories were never consulted about the Bureau's plans. They were simply told it would be done. The plans appear to be arbitrary decisions made by a few high-ranking officials who decided it was not important to consult with the concerned scientists, concerned members of our committee, or Members of this Congress.

But this is not all. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has also admitted that, in addition to the two laboratories named above, it intends to make further cuts in research facilities and activities. Two more laboratories at Palo Alto, Calif., and Terminal Island, Calif., have been scheduled for either closing or severe re-

ductions in research projects. The Bureau has also admitted it intends to deactivate a number of research vessels, specifically: the *Albatross IV*, of Woods Hole, Mass.; either the *Cromwell* or the *Gilbert* in Honolulu; the *Miller Freeman*, at Seattle; and the *Undaunted*, at Miami. In fact, the *Undaunted* has already been transferred to the National Science Foundation. These additional laboratories and these research vessels are also scheduled for closure or deactivation during the month of May, or at least by June 30.

Mr. Chairman, our committee did not have sufficient notice nor adequate time to hold appropriate hearings or to obtain sufficient information to document the need for continuing the operation of these additional installations and ships; we do, however, have sufficient information to indicate that the ruthless disregard for research that led to the decision with respect to the Milford and Ann Arbor laboratories is the basis for this additional budgetary hatchet job.

But even this is not all. During its investigation, our committee uncovered the fact that—again in a less than open way—the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is moving to drastically cut even more research activities. The Bureau calls this plan a "proposed reprogramming for fiscal year 1971," and it calls for shifting funds from other valuable research facilities into various other areas of activity.

We hope that each Member of Congress will scrutinize the list of these additional planned cuts, and we again want to emphasize that this latest plan has not yet been made public by the Bureau. Since our committee discovered this information, we feel it is our duty to let the Congress know what other surprises are being planned. Briefly, the planned reductions will have an adverse impact upon the following research activities:

Mammal research and biological programs at Seattle, Wash.....	\$270,000
Menhaden studies at Beaufort, N.C.	420,000
Tuna studies at Honolulu.....	810,000
Biological research programs at LaJolla, Calif.....	472,000
Herring research at Boothbay Harbor, Me.....	472,000
Biological studies at Galveston, Tex	450,000
Biological program at Auke Bay, Alaska	260,000
Biological research on Great Lakes fisheries	637,000
Shellfish research at laboratories in Milford, Conn.; Oxford, Md.; and Seattle, Wash.....	314,000
Exploratory fishing and gear research in the Great Lakes.....	152,000
Technology research at various locations throughout the country.....	577,000
The tying up of additional research vessels—locations not listed.....	500,000

Mr. Chairman, what kind of reasoning is this? Who could show such callous indifference to the wishes of Congress and the American public, and to the future needs of this Nation? This is one of the worst examples we have seen of disregarding the future of our resources. We have had few better examples of "burning our seed corn" or examples of the Bureau of the Budget's unrealistic approach to our pressing environmental

problems. This certainly does not convey the impression that the Department of the Interior is properly discharging its responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, week after week, the Interior Department tries to cast a favorable image to the Congress, the news media and the American public; week after week it grinds out press releases vowing to increase the fight against pollution, promising to increase research and pledging itself to improve conservation and preservation of our precious natural resources; this image conflicts with its action as described herein. We can no longer tolerate nor can we ignore such folly. The Interior Department preaches conservation and a better quality of living out of one side of its mouth; and out of the other side, it ruthlessly conspires to cut the very heart out of research which is so very vital to this Nation's rapidly dwindling resources.

And, just how much money are we actually talking about saving? All of the cuts, the slowdowns, the deactivations and reprogramings we have so far described—in their entirety—represent approximately \$6.5 million. Compare this paltry figure with the millions which will be lost in invaluable research data; compare this paltry figure—if you can—with the value of fresh water, of unpolluted streams and lakes, of fish and wildlife which may be threatened by extinction or contamination if such cuts are implemented. Can we place a dollar value on such resources? It would be idiotic to answer "yes."

It might be noted, however, that the Department of the Interior in a news release dated May 8, 1970, indicated that our Nation's domestic commercial fisheries catch for the year of 1969 amounted to \$518 million. We would like to request that a copy of this release be inserted in the RECORD following our statement.

Mr. Chairman, still another valuable resource that is impossible to place a price tag upon is being squandered as a result of this folly. We are referring to the human resource—the countless scientists and specialists who have dedicated their brains, their talents, and their lives to programs that are now being terminated or drastically cut. Over the years, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries accumulated a scientific staff that was unsurpassed by any organization in the world for this kind of work. Some of the most eminent scientists in the world—marine biologists, ichthyologists, specialists in metallurgy, water quality, oceanology, and other important environmental and biological areas—were attracted to the Bureau and the Interior Department because of the work being done by these agencies. Our committee has received many disturbing reports that scientific morale—already bad in these agencies—is deteriorating rapidly, that these scientists are disgusted, frustrated, and disillusioned by the present cuts and future plans of the Government. We now face the danger of dissipating this irreplaceable fountainhead of knowledge. A number of capable scientists have already resigned; others are planning to do so in the near future; and many others are actively looking elsewhere—

searching for a place where they can find stability and pursue the research to which they have dedicated their lives. Our committee has personally been contacted by a number of such scientists, all of whom have expressed their concern at the actions planned by the Bureau, and their dismay that many of the scientists most involved in the affected programs were neither consulted about nor warned of such plans.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding our remarks, we want to commend the distinguished madam chairman, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and her subcommittee, for having the courage to criticize the Interior Department's lack of leadership and responsibility in the area of environmental control. In her subcommittee's report on this appropriation bill, specific language was devoted to this criticism. We feel the following quotes should be emphasized:

In recent months, the protection of our environment from various pollutants has become a national movement and has gained many supporters. . . . The Committee was disappointed at the paucity of funding proposed for the very activity our Nation's leaders are currently endorsing as one of the highest priorities which this Nation must consider.

The committee perceived during the hearings that not only was the 1971 budget estimate deficient in the provision of funds to correct various situations contributing to the pollution of our environment, but it also discovered that funds appropriated for the 1970 fiscal year and specifically earmarked for the abatement of pollution, such as sanitation facilities at various Federal installations, had been placed in reserve and would not be expended.

It was with these basic objectives in mind that the committee considered appropriations for activities in this bill for fiscal year 1971. The continued need for fiscal restraint tempered the committee's desire to provide additional funds to attain these objectives. In view of this, the committee will be decidedly disturbed if funds specifically appropriated for conservation of resources and pollution abatement are again placed in reserve or used for pay increase costs or other purposes of lesser importance and urgency.

We also want to emphasize that Mrs. HANSEN's subcommittee added on \$75,000 for an evaluation study; the purpose of this study is to determine the potential for various laboratories and vessels of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. We again quote from a section of this report, which reads:

It is recommended by the Committee that insofar as possible there be no major lay-ups of vessels utilized by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, we sincerely feel this statement is necessary to alert the Congress to the magnitude of this problem and to serve notice on the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget that Congress has no intention of letting this condition deteriorate any further.

We have no intention of making this a partisan political issue, but we are determined that our Nation's natural resources will not be further imperiled. The record and the intent established by certain members of our committee and the Appropriations Committee are clear. The thrust of this statement and

of any additional colloquy on the floor, should, therefore, become part of the legislative history of this bill. It should further be made clear, in view of the study proposed by the Appropriations Committee, that no research vessels be laid up and none of the laboratories be closed until that study is completed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we respectfully request that it be made absolutely clear that the legislative history established here today is not a request; it is, in fact, tantamount to a congressional mandate.

The Appropriations Committee has voiced its concern, certain members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have voiced their concern, and the American public has joined in this mounting chorus of national protest against the continued abuse and neglect of this great Nation's natural resources.

It is about time that the appropriate Government agencies heed this protest and carry out their responsibilities in response to this clear and undeniable mandate.

My Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, chaired by our able friend the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, and my good friend and colleague the Honorable ALTON LENNON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography, and our good friend and colleague the Honorable RICHARD HANNA join me in this concern. We are particularly troubled that over the last year there appears to be an attempt to change the fundamental orientation of the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Commercial Fisheries from programs oriented toward wise management of the resources on a long-term basis to one that is based strictly on exploitation.

Our committee has come up with a number of documents in the course of an investigation which would lead us to believe there may well be some attempt not only to close the laboratories referred to but also to lay up a number of oceanographic vessels.

Indeed, one of the things that was most troublesome to me was a document which fell into the hands of our committee dealing with proposed reprogramming for fiscal 1971 calling for a shifting of funds approved in this bill from research facilities to various other forms of activities. I note that since the appearance of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries before our subcommittee that I have received many documents, including a letter received by me today signed by Mr. Charles Meacham. This letter, which will be inserted pursuant to unanimous-consent request at a time appropriate, indicates that the Department of the Interior perhaps has had second thoughts. I have made this information available to the gentlewoman from Washington and I wonder what her thoughts and feelings are with regard to the proposed reprogramming.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am completely opposed to reprogramming of these activities. The committee has gone through the testimony of the hearings and we have carefully evaluated the programs. The committee is deeply aware

of the necessity, as we move into international programs and as we work with people of other countries and as we sit down at bargaining and conference tables, for all of the knowledge that we can possibly acquire as to what our fishery resources are and what will make these resources even greater. Therefore, I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that I would not approve a reprogramming to change any of the basic funding for our fishery research or for our vessel use. I think the department has been completely indiscreet in attempting even to formulate such program revisions, and I will be very frank with the gentleman from Michigan that I feel the Department of the Interior has its hands tied behind its back, because I think the Bureau of the Budget has for several years decided that they should phase out the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for some obscure reason. The fishing industry in the United States does not seem to hold any great significance to the gentlemen in the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to thank the gentlewoman. Her comments make most invaluable and clear legislative history.

At an earlier time our Subcommittee on Fishery and Wildlife Conservation and Oceanography had the honorable Mr. Phillip Roedel, the new Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries before us in a joint hearing wherein we took testimony with regard to a number of aspects regarding laboratory closures. One of the things most troublesome to me was the fact that in his testimony director Roedel enumerated a number of things that he proposed to do with regard to proposed reprogramming at a time later after the budget was successfully completed. Documents which have fallen into the hands of the subcommittee since that time tend to indicate that there are a large number of resource oriented programs that this agency proposed to terminate. The subcommittee thinks that the department intends to go from a resource and long-range oriented management program in research into one which is—and I am just quoting directly from him now—one having a high payoff potential. That was the first criteria they proposed to establish with regard to the Office of Oceanographic Research.

Second, with particular emphasis to the solution of pressing fishery problems.

Third, to move into engineering fields promising to increase the efficiency of "search and harvest technology."

And then to do something which I believe is desirable, that is, to further the development and useful management precedents established by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

Finally, under the fifth suggestion, again to return to the exploitation theory where they will emphasize the studies of socioeconomic aspects of American fisheries in what they denominate as an economics-limited entry approach to research.

I hope that the gentlewoman and the subcommittee on the Interior will be apprised on the perils and hazards inherent

in this kind of an approach. I would like to and I will indicate that I am critical of the Interior Department's hiding behind a smokescreen of press releases indicating what they propose to do with regard to preservation and enhancement and protection of the environment and our fish and wildlife resources and which their behavior up to now does not indicate they intend to carry out. The press release I will insert in the RECORD at the appropriate time, indicating more fully the reasons why I am concerned about their behavior and why their proposed program does not seem to comport with the high quality of their press releases.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, because of the limited amount of time that has been afforded our subcommittee since our discovery of the program of the Department of Interior, we have had less than adequate opportunity to call in the witnesses and ascertain the facts and circumstances attendant upon this most unfortunate change in direction of policy by the Department of Interior.

I would point out in closing, in cooperation with my distinguished friend and one of the most valuable Members of this House, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), as well as the other members of the committee, and our very able chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), as well as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON), who is the chairman of the Oceanographic Subcommittee, I propose to pursue this matter further in trying to explore a number of questions like, why did the Department of the Interior engage in a rather doubtful practice in sending our witnesses to Rio de Janeiro on matters of very limited importance when they had much more important research to do at home, particularly in view of the fact that the Department sought to send our witnesses abroad at the very time we were undertaking our hearings.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DINGELL. This was done during the week that our committee was engaged in the actual scrutiny of these matters pending before it.

So I believe, Mr. Chairman, there is need for close oversight and very careful watching not only by our subcommittee but by the committee chaired by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Following is the letter I received from Director Roedel:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and
Wildlife Conservation, Committee on
Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I understand that your Subcommittee has come into possession of a draft, now outdated, internal budget document prepared in the Departments and relating to Bureau of Commercial Fisheries activities in fiscal year 1971, and that, as a result, some question has arisen in your

mind. I can assure you that the document, which was prepared in connection with the continuing review of BCF activities on which Director Roedel testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee (transcript, pages 273-274), was not approved by the Department and has no status.

I am also happy to assure you that funds appropriated and apportioned to the Department for use in fiscal year 1971 for commercial fishery activities will be expended in accordance with the provisions of the President's Budget and/or the Appropriations Act and that should the Department wish to effect changes, it will consult with the Congress in the usual way.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. MEACHAM,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and
Wildlife and Parks.

I might point out that on April 17, 1970, Director Roedel testified at our subcommittee hearings and made the following statement. This statement clearly indicates the Department of the Interior had under consideration the reprogramming funds as of that date and so far as we are concerned still has the plan under consideration:

We have been devoting considerable time to analyzing our present programs to see if it is possible to give more emphasis in these areas within our present budget for fiscal year 1971. In this regard, there is presently under consideration in the Department a proposal which would shift over \$4.0 million into these areas in fiscal year 1971. I want to emphasize, however, that the Secretary has not yet had the opportunity to review the proposal. If it is approved, it will be submitted to both the Bureau of the Budget, and the Appropriation Committees of the Congress prior to implementation. We will be pleased to give you a copy of the proposal at the same time that we submit it to the Appropriation Committees.

Following is a press release indicating the value of the domestic commercial fisheries catch for 1969:

DOMESTIC CATCH FOR 1969 WORTH RECORD
\$518 MILLION TO FISHERMEN

During 1969, the Nation's domestic commercial catch of fish and shellfish sold for \$518 million—the highest dollar value in the Nation's history—Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel announced today.

Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (BCF) reported that the value of the 1969 catch represents an increase of \$47 million over that of the 1968 harvest. The volume taken—4.3 billion pounds—was 176.4 million pounds above the 1968 level, and the largest catch since 1966.

Secretary Hickel said that new records had been established in a number of the individual domestic fisheries.

Catch data gathered and compiled by BCF's Division of Statistics and Market News indicate record landings for shrimp, Gulf menhaden, Pacific anchovies, yellowfin tuna, spiny lobsters, tanner crabs, Dungeness crabs, and surf clam meats.

Secretary Hickel said there were also substantial increases in catches of Atlantic cod, Pacific halibut, and blue crabs; landings of Atlantic flounders, pollock, and soft clams also showed gains over the 1968 levels.

The gain in production by some segments of the domestic fisheries was partially offset by serious declines in landings of haddock, Atlantic sea herring, Pacific salmon, whiting, industrial fish caught by otter-trawl, sea scallop meats, and king crab, the Secretary added.

In addition, he said, landings of jack mackerel, Atlantic ocean perch, and oyster meats were also below 1968 levels.

Louisiana led all States in volume of catch, with slightly over 1 billion pounds, followed by California with 575.9 million pounds; Alaska, 346.8 million pounds; Mississippi, 310 million pounds, and Massachusetts, 280 million pounds.

In value of catch, Alaska was first among the States with \$71.1 million; California was second with \$62.1 million; Louisiana, \$56.7 million; Texas, \$46.9 million, and Massachusetts, \$41.9 million.

San Pedro, California, led all other domestic fishing ports in both value and volume of catch.

In the area of international trade, imports of fishery products during the year were valued at \$844.3 million, compared to a previous high value of \$822.7 million in 1968. New import records were established for shrimp, spiny lobster, canned tuna, frozen albacore tuna, groundfish (including ocean perch), and fish filets and steaks other than groundfish.

Exports of domestic fishery products were valued at \$104.5 million, well above the previous high of \$84.8 million in 1966. Exports of fresh and frozen shrimp totaled 25.2 million pounds, more than double the previous record of 12.1 million pounds in 1968. Canned shrimp exports totaled 5.7 million pounds, up from 5.3 million pounds in 1967. Exports of fresh and frozen salmon which go mainly to Europe set a new record of 30.6 million pounds, compared to 22.6 million pounds in 1964.

Further information on the domestic catch, consumption, prices, processed products, vessels, foreign trade, supplies, world fisheries, and related subjects is available in the annual statistical publication, "Fisheries of the United States . . . 1969."

Following is an article appearing in the May 16 New York Times quoting from a portion of the committee report on H.R. 17619 which I would like to call to the attention of the House Members:

HOUSE PANEL ADDS TO POLLUTION FUNDS

WASHINGTON, May 14.—The House Appropriations Committee added millions of dollars Thursday to a Nixon Administration money bill to combat air and water pollution.

The amounts of committee's additions to President Nixon's 1971 budget requests were obscured in the estimated total of 20,000 different items in the \$1.8-billion appropriations bill for the Interior Department and its related agencies.

But the committee said in its report to the House that it "was disappointed by the paucity of funding proposed for the very activity our nation's leaders are currently endorsing as one of the highest priorities which this nation must consider."

Among the additions was a \$2-million increase over the Budget request to hire 37 additional inspectors to watch over oil drilling operations on the outer continental ocean shelf.

Others involved underground coal fires in Pennsylvania, national park recreation funds to construct added sanitation facilities and new projects to guard against mine waste flowing into rivers.

Mr. REIFEL, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I am in hopes of getting some information with regard to the lamprey control problem on the Great Lakes. Rather interestingly on the heels of the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), may I make this observation.

Prior to 1969, which I do not think was under the present administration, a reduction had been made in the number of electrical barriers for lamprey counts that are operated specifically in the Lake Superior streams. These barriers or weirs are used for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the control of these lampreys.

Interestingly, too, is a report which appeared in one of the Chicago metropolitan newspapers regarding the tremendous increase over the past 5 years in the sea lampreys in Lake Huron. Apparently, they enter through the St. Lawrence Seaway and go into Lake Huron and subsequently, of course, move into the other of the four Great Lakes.

I wonder if any indepth study has been made or, let us say, hearings held to make an evaluation of this situation. Incidentally, I had occasion to write the committee about this matter several months ago and called the Department of the Interior and got little or no satisfaction.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say that the lamprey control work is done with funds appropriated to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and this is funded by the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill. A portion of these funds are transferred to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Commission for investigation and control of the lamprey eel.

I would agree with the gentleman from Illinois that there should be more work done by the Department of the Interior on this problem. I would also say that is exactly why we are asking that this committee receive full progress reports on funds expended for fisheries research.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me ask this question: In all sincerity, how long does one research a problem before there is a determination made as to how effective the so-called chemical control is?

I ask that question because this program, as the gentleman knows, was started back in 1956, I believe, I have an abundance of reports on one particular area on this question, and I am sure there are reams of information available. But at some point it seems to me that researching should provide some conclusion from which we move.

Now, I do not know whether the particular chemical control program, which started before the understandably current concern over environmental problems arose, has been very successful, mildly successful, or a failure.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would state to the gentleman from Illinois that time frames for research results are not definite in any case. I was interested the other day when the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow, said that a report had been issued on the control of blackbirds and one of the little-known techniques used turned out to be extremely valuable and has done a remarkable job.

Then again researchers may work 5, 6, 7, or 8 years and not produce definite results. This is particularly true in the case of fisheries. That is why many of us are deeply concerned that we afford full opportunity to find some of the answers on fishery problems. These problems are not easily solved because there are so many factors that can change the fishery ecology of this Nation.

So I would say to the gentleman do not be discouraged that the Department does not come up with an answer. It may not be their fault at all. But I know that it is something that can be very exasperating. But, as I said, they cannot always readily obtain some of the answers.

Mr. COLLIER. I recognize that there are changes in conditions as they affect the five Great Lakes and the pollution problems therein. However, I doubt that they would have any major effect upon the number of sea lampreys, because they are not the kind of animals which are affected by the types of pollution in the Great Lakes which many, many kinds of fish life would be. But as the gentleman knows, the Department has constructed weirs on some 59 rivers connected with the Great Lakes.

For 7 years the commission has operated these electrically charged weirs in the Brule River. In many instances while they are counting to determine the effectiveness of the chemical control program, they are also electrocuting and maiming trout in that area.

I have taken this up with the Department, and I understand that their estimates on the count of the number of trout that are killed during a 3-month period by these electrically charged weirs are installed. However, I am also told by other people who live in that area that these counts are not accurate. In fact, many times the people working on this program gather the dead trout in tubs with no water in them and dump them out into the forest areas.

After 10 years, and looking at the figures of the count of the number of lamprey, it is hard to determine how effective or how ineffective the chemical lamprey control program is.

Now the folks up there are told that these weirs are going to have to be installed in the river for another 7 or 8 years.

What would be the estimate of time as to how long it would take to make some final determination? Will it be 10 more years, 15 years, or 50 years? In other words, after this period of time, it seems to me there should be some results upon which to make a finding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In the first place, the amount of money in the House version of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission is \$1,352,000.

The hearings as to the success or failure of the operations of the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission is not presented to our Committee on the Interior and related agencies. They are presented to the State-Justice-Commerce Subcommittee.

May I suggest that you might contact the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), chairman of that subcommittee, and ask him to give you a report in this connection. This matter is not presented any place in our hearings whatsoever, or I assure you that we would have the information.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington and I shall follow her advice. But I am not optimistic in the light of my past experience about getting information that I would like. But again I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking Member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MARSH).

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the appropriation bill which we are considering today and I would certainly commend the chairlady of the subcommittee for another outstanding job. I, too, would like to pay tribute to Congressman REIFEL, who has made a tremendous contribution to this and preceding bills. He will be sorely missed in the ensuing Congresses.

I am aware that it has been previously mentioned, but I think it is well to repeat the request that Members examine page 2 of the report, and that portion which relates to the revenues generated by agencies funded in the bill. The reason that I make this point is to raise the question seriously to the membership as to the amount these revenues might be increased simply through modest increases of some of the appropriations which relate to renewable resources coming within the purview of the bill.

By renewable resources, I refer to America's public lands and waters, including the resources of the sea.

Those of us who listened to the testimony of the various departments, agencies, and bureaus in the context of programs and money, cannot help but be impressed by the relationship which exists in cost-benefit ratios when considered in terms of investment in natural resources.

I suspect that all of us feel that in allocating funds from the General Treasury for a myriad of Government efforts, we are often pennywise and pound foolish.

Each of the members of the subcommittee can cite numerous examples where an increase in appropriations either in research, management, or capital improvements would yield monetary returns to the Federal Government that far exceed the sums invested. Sadly, we can point out where there is a direct loss-ratio when sums are not invested in not only deserving, but absolutely essential programs. By way of example, I refer to funds that go into forest fire prevention and control. Experts in forestry can almost predict a certain loss-ratio in thousands of board feet of timber burned when considered in light of a per-dollar reduction of funds for forest fire prevention or control.

Those of us who serve on the committee would ask our colleagues to consider seriously the plight of the American fisheries industry which demonstrates tragically, but dramatically, the decline

not only of an industry, but a great national slippage from a position of leadership to a definitely trailing participant in developing and harvesting marine resources. However, it is not principally the loss of position or accompanying prestige with which we are concerned as it is the impact on a major American industry and its wage earners by our failure to be in the forefront in developing and benefiting from what is likely to be one of the great food resources of the future.

Yet, the potential benefits of this bill to the American people are not simply monetary, but more far reaching. This bill relates to the quality of American life through the quality of the American environment. If we are to make progress in the field of ecology and improvement of environmental health by coming to grips with the problems of air and water pollution, it will be through the avenues afforded by the department and agencies funded in this bill. Frequently, the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies is referred to as the small bill, if you can consider \$1,800 million small, but this small bill may well be the key to unlock the lock represented in our environmental problems, which are visited on a society by modern technology and mass population.

Those of us who hear the testimony for the need of recreational resources for the American people are vitally concerned on the inadequacy of our fine parks and national forests to accommodate the ever-increasing visitor load. For those of you who are interested in low-cost recreation and the availability of these resources to population masses, you should consider well what might be accomplished in this area alone.

As has been pointed out, our Government has a special responsibility to the Indian people, and we have tried to address ourselves to this responsibility. I would point out that the chairlady and the ranking minority member would have to be considered two of the experts on this particular phase of our appropriations. It has been through their persistent and continued efforts that the committee has tried to enable the Congress to meet its obligation through increasing appropriations for education and other assistance to the American Indian. I believe the efforts of BEN REIFEL on behalf of the Indian will be one of the great monuments to his service here.

This far-reaching bill touches at the heartstrings of the cultural life of our Nation, from history to art—from restoration to renovation. Of special significance in this regard is the funding for the Bicentennial Commission of the American Revolution. As we approach the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we find that we are currently living in the bicentennial of the revolutionary period of our Nation's history.

The committee is aware that the development of a program in reference to this event is one that requires adequate leadtime, guidance, and direction, for historical research and planning and preparation. The committee feels that the dividends that will result from the Commission's work now will richly en-

dow our Nation in the decade ahead as we move into the third century of the American Republic.

For other reasons I have outlined, I urge my fellow Members to join in supporting this important appropriations bill that so vitally affects our land and our people in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Biological Laboratory in Milford, Conn., has, in its 39 years of existence, distinguished itself as one of our Nation's finest research centers in the field of shellfish research. The Milford Laboratory is well known for its specialized research in the areas of genetics and the effect of the environment on the production and development of commercial shellfish. The research performed by the Laboratory is unique and would be extremely difficult to duplicate without a substantial expenditure of money.

Operating on a modest budget of \$336,000 per year, the Laboratory conducts research of oysters and clams in the areas of artificial culture, disease control, and predator control. However, despite its extensive accomplishments in these areas, the Interior Department is seeking to cut appropriations for the Laboratory as part of an effort to reduce the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries by \$7.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, such a move would, in the long run, be inexcusably wasteful.

The achievements of the Laboratory have been most outstanding. Exemplary of the superb quality of work at Milford was the successful attempt to revive the Connecticut oyster industry, an industry vitally important to the State's economy.

Extensive water pollution, combined with an increase in the number of oyster drills, a dangerous shellfish predator, which will kill close to 75 percent of the oysters in any given bed, threatened the existence of this essential industry. However, a young researcher at Milford, by the name of Clyde McKenzie, developed techniques for the treatment of oyster beds with the chemical Polystream. This chemical will kill from 85 to 95 percent of the oyster drills without harming any other form of life. Without these discoveries, the oyster industry in Connecticut would almost certainly have disappeared.

Even Mr. Philip M. Roedel, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, has described Milford as "an excellent research facility." And, he is "hopeful" that the research can be continued through other sources, such as industry or the university.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we cannot afford to rely on shallow expectations. Although the Bureau claims that it is presently negotiating with a multi-organization for genetics research, we have received no assurances from the administration; yet we must act today on the matter of appropriations for the continued operation of the Lab.

As Mr. John Mulhall, manager of the New Haven office of New England Oyster Farms, Inc., has observed:

To dismantle that whole organization would be detrimental to the whole oyster industry in Connecticut, since we don't have

any kind of state facilities that can take over the work being done by the Milford Lab. We'd be entirely abandoning any scientific program in Connecticut.

Ironically, cutting appropriations for the lab would actually prove to be markedly more costly if we look at the whole picture. The new facilities and equipment involved in recent expansions are valued at well over \$2 million. More important, all the various research programs now in progress would have to cease operation. Four years of intensive research work would be lost and the loss in terms of invaluable scientific knowledge would be incalculable. Instead of saving the taxpayers around \$300,000, dismantling the lab would waste millions of tax dollars which have been appropriated in the past.

Furthermore, the Connecticut Shellfish Commission recently estimated that there are 2 to 3 million bushels of oysters maturing in Connecticut beds, at a market value upward of \$40 million in the 3-year harvesting period from 1971 to 1973. Thus, it is evident from these figures that the contributions of the lab have already helped pay for Milford's operation in the hard cash earned by the commercial oystermen using techniques developed and recommended by the lab staff.

Moreover, at a time when the problem of pollution control has become vital, it is unwise at best to close a laboratory which has contributed so successfully to developing pollution control solutions. The laboratory has been investigating and publishing facts relating to the effects of pollution on shellfish since 1961; factual studies have been published regarding pesticides, detergents, turbidity, silting. Other accomplishments include the development of testing methods for oil pollution and sulfur wastes. This is a commendable research record to be sure.

Consequently, I find the request to cut appropriations for the biological laboratory at Milford, Conn., shortsighted and ill advised. The waste, both economic and scientific, which would follow from this ill-considered act are unnecessary and destructive.

In view of the tremendous value of the research at Milford, I most strongly support the committee's recommendation to continue appropriations at the same level.

Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington and members of the subcommittee for a job well done.

Under the leadership of Mrs. HANSEN, this committee not only voices its willingness to seriously consider the requests of the Members of this body but by its action it demonstrates its sincerity. It is a committee with a heart. I urge the passage of this bill.

To my good friend BEN REIFEL, who has been a member of the committee for years and who will not be with us next year, my best wishes for a long, happy retirement. Perhaps no monument will be erected in Washington to you, Ben, but your deeds, your kind sympathetic attitude toward your colleagues, your devotion to duty will always be remem-

bered by those of us who have been privileged to know you and serve with you.

Mr. HANNA, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the comments being made by other members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee concerning the deliberate attempt by the Interior Department to cut funds for two vital fisheries research laboratories. Once again we are confronted with the administration's attempt to institute a fait accompli by talking one way and acting another.

Without the quick intervention by the leadership of the Merchant Marine Committee we might well have found ourselves reducing our commitment to preserving the environment at the very time we need to increase our efforts. Fortunately, this quick action has restored the appropriations for the two fisheries research laboratories.

My esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will explore at length the chronology that has led us to this point, and he will describe the programs of the two laboratories. I wish, at this time, to emphasize two concerns of my own in regard to this matter.

First, the Interior Department's attempt to dismantle the two laboratories flies in the face of all the fine rhetoric that has been emanating from the public relations types in the administration. The attempt to phase out these laboratories is a sobering reminder that despite all the administration rhetoric, their commitment to the environment is tissue thin.

This is another distressing example of breaking up the needed scientific expertise and facilities so vital in our fight to save the environment. This type of approach is counterproductive. If we dismantle our scientific ability, rather than strengthen it, at this juncture, we will be faced with the immense cost of having to restore the whole thing when the requirements become so compelling that we cannot avoid postponing the fulfillment of our commitments.

Now that we have demonstrated momentum in our research laboratories, our policy must be to strengthen and direct them rather than dismantle them.

My second point strikes at the very core of this matter. On April 30, I conducted extensive ad hoc hearings in Santa Ana, Calif., on the alarming problem of fish cancer. During those hearings, it was rather dramatically demonstrated that pollutants poured into rivers are damaging fish that habitate in the areas near the outflows of these rivers. In the specific case, many fish caught near the outflow of the Santa Ana River were found to have lip cancer. The species of fish having these cancers are commonly eaten.

The overwhelming testimony at these hearings clearly pointed to the need for immediate and intensive research in how pollutants affect fish, and how these diseased fish affect man. There is a tremendous gaping hole in our knowledge about this chain.

Almost everyone agreed that more needed to be learned, and we had better get about the business quickly. The Los

Angeles Times, in an important editorial on these hearings underlined the concern of every citizen that solutions be found before we are overwhelmed.

And what is the answer of the Department of the Interior to such grassroots concern? A recommendation that two of our most vital fisheries laboratories be phased out. Absurd? Of course it is.

The Appropriations Committee has restored the funds for these laboratories and the House should give its support to the leadership of both of these committees. At least we can demonstrate that the Congress commitment to the environment does not lack substance.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the following statement on page 13 of the committee's report:

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The committee has recommended the total amount of the budget estimate, \$54,395,000, for health and safety activities of the Bureau of Mines. This is an increase of \$28,063,000 over the \$26,332,000 appropriated to date for fiscal year 1970. The major portion of this increase is to provide funding for activities prescribed in the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-173), enacted December 30, 1969.

As a result of information it has received through its budget hearings and otherwise, the committee is quite concerned that administration of the mine health and safety program is not proceeding as expeditiously and effectively as the Congress intended in its enactment of the new mine health and safety legislation. (Italic supplied.)

While the committee appreciates this is a greatly expanded and intricate program, it is also conscious of the seriousness of loss of life in mine disasters. The committee directs the Department of Interior to give this phase of its operation its most concerted effort and attention so that a viable program can be in effect with the least possible delay.

This report language is quite important and I commend the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) for it.

The Interior Department has not met its responsibilities under the act.

The Department delayed publication of necessary regulations under the law. Then, when it finally published them 2 days before the effective date of the safety provisions of the new law, the operators went to court for a Federal restraining order prohibiting their enforcement because of certain errors in the publication.

The Interior Department has not acted expeditiously in obtaining and training inspectors. The Department knew full well late last summer that a new law would be enacted requiring more inspectors. But it did not act until late last year to undertake an accelerated program to acquire and train inspectors.

The same top officials who are concerned with everyday enforcement and implementation of the act are also trying to qualify people as inspectors. The Department has not provided a top official whose sole responsibility is to obtain the necessary inspectors.

Yet, the Department found time to criticize the Congress during hearings before Mrs. HANSEN's subcommittee for

some of the safety standards included in the new law. Here is what the Department said:

Mr. WHEELER. Madam Chairman, overall I do not think anyone would have any question with the objectives and law itself. But there are a few provisions and I would like to cite one of them to you—there is a provision in the law that all mine cars after a year must be provided with automatic brakes that can be put on mine cars.

Mrs. HANSEN. Are they nonexistent?

Mr. WHEELER. There are none in existence. Mrs. HANSEN. What are you going to do about that provision?

Mr. WHEELER. Maybe we have some consternation in our own organization. I think what we will have to do is to cite them as being in violation of the law, because they will be.

Mrs. HANSEN. Is anyone in the process of developing automatic brakes?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, ma'am. We have met with all the car manufacturers to first find out if there are any brakes, and we found out there are none. And since then we have been talking with them as to how we can get some developed as soon as possible.

Mrs. HANSEN. Has the Department appeared on behalf of this provision before the Education and Labor Committee?

Mr. WHEELER. We have not gone back to them yet. We will have to after we study all the provisions of the law. We are now studying this new law section by section to determine what the problem areas are. This is just one which is obvious on the face of it that I have decided to use. There are others.

Mrs. HANSEN. Will you please insert in the record other areas of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act which cause similar problems?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, ma'am.

(The information follows:)

In addition to the matter of the act requirement for car brakes which must be resolved before March 30, 1970, there are other unresolved problems. Among these are:

1. Sec. 315 of the Act provides that the Secretary may require that rescue chambers, properly sealed and ventilated, be erected at suitable locations in the mine. Such chambers to be equipped with first-aid materials, an adequate supply of air and self-contained breathing equipment, an independent communication system to the surface, and proper accommodations for the persons while awaiting rescue, and other equipment. Where shelters are required, there shall be an approved plan for the erection, maintenance, and revisions of such chambers and an approved training program for the use of the shelter.

Much of the technology involved is unclear, especially in connection with an integrated standby system. A contract for the development of a total rescue and survival system should be awarded shortly and completed within a year thereafter.

2. Section 317(e) requires the Secretary to propose standards by December 30, 1970, under which all working places in a mine shall be illuminated by permissible lighting within 18 months after promulgation of the standards.

The nature and content of these standards is being considered in the light of practicability. Some research may be required and new permissibility standards may have to be developed. These efforts are being carried on at a rapid pace in order to meet the deadlines. It is not certain, however, that the present uncertainties can all be resolved in the available time.

3. Section 317(j) authorizes requiring electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with canopies or cabs to protect the miners from roof falls and from rib and face rolls where the height of the coal bed permits.

Practical designs are under consideration and consideration is being given to determining the minimum height of the coal bed which will permit installation of such devices.

4. Section 317(g) provides that the Secretary shall require, when technologically feasible, that devices to prevent and suppress ignitions be installed on electric face equipment.

Research on an ignition suppression system has been carried out in the Bureau's laboratories and experimental mine for several years. We are presently concentrating on converting out basic knowledge into a commercially feasible system. Progress is being made and emphasis placed on the project; nevertheless, it is not possible to set a specific completion date.

Congressman DENT, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, and Congressman PHILLIP BURTON, a member of that subcommittee, and myself responded to this criticism in a joint letter of April 22, 1970, to Secretary Hickel—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13480. Among our comments are the following:

It is obvious that the Department's witness is not very familiar with the provisions of the Act in making this criticism. None of the standards referred to in the Department's four numbered paragraphs just quoted requires action by March 30, 1970. In the case of the rescue chambers, the Department, by section 315 of the Act, is given discretion to require them when the technology is available. The same is true for underground lighting and canopies and cabs. In the case of ignition suppression devices (the reference is section 317(q), not section 317(g)), we fall to see why it is the Bureau's responsibility to convert its experiments into a "commercially feasible system." Why not make this knowledge public and let American business convert it competitively into an effective commercial system?

In regard to automatic brakes, the Act only requires them "where space permits." The Department, in its letter of July 17, 1969, to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Sen. Hearings—Part 5, Appendix, p. 1589, 1594) said that the provision "should be deleted at this time because in many instances it is not physically possible in the limited space underground in some mines to install and operate such automatic brakes." (Italic supplied.) Based on this comment, the Congress added "where space permits", the Department did not say, as it is now contended, that they were unavailable in all mines or that they were "non-existent". "Where space does not permit," other devices may be used to achieve the same objective. What has the Department done to insist on such other devices?

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the Interior Department act more responsibly in administering this new law. Like Mrs. HANSEN and the Committee on Appropriations, we should all be concerned with the Interior Department's gross shortcomings to date in administering this landmark law. I hope that Secretary Hickel who is deeply concerned about the health and safety of coal miners and the other officials at the Department will heed the committee's statement.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us, the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Interior and related agencies, is both responsible and forward looking, and I urge its swift approval.

One part of the bill of particular concern to me is the level of funding pro-

vided for environmental protection activities. The control and improvement of our environment must be one of our paramount concerns, Mr. Chairman, and we cannot deal adequately with these problems until we are willing to commit adequate resources to their solution. As I pointed out to the House on March 25 of this year, in connection with the consideration of the water quality improvement act of 1970:

All our good intentions and our best legislative projections will come to nothing unless sufficient money is recommended by the President and appropriated by the Congress . . . to honor our commitment to the taxpayers of the United States to provide them with a wholesome environment, free from pollution and poison.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us provides funds for such environmental purposes as the land and water conservation fund, mineral resource management and research, mining conservation and development, and fishery management and investigation. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee expressed its disappointment over the "paucity of funding proposed" in the administration's budget request for these activities. The committee also discovered that some funds already appropriated for the current fiscal year and specifically earmarked for pollution abatement had been placed in reserve by the executive branch and would not be expended.

If we are to progress at all in our fight against environmental deterioration, Mr. Chairman, we must all cooperate. The administration needs Congress to provide the programs and the funding; the Congress depends on the administration to implement the programs and expend the funds provided. A common effort, arising from a common dedication, is sorely needed.

The amounts recommended by the committee for the environmentally related programs in this bill, Mr. Chairman, represent the minimum productive levels of funding. Any attempt to reduce these amounts would be disastrous and should be summarily rejected. I call on the Members of the House, therefore, to approve this measure quickly, and without crippling reductions.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that the Interior Subcommittee under the leadership of its chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has taken a hard look at the budget requests for the Bureau of Indian Affairs' educational programs.

The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education has termed Indian education "a national tragedy." With Indian dropout rates exceeding 60 percent in most school districts, it is obvious that massive new educational efforts are needed.

New programs are costly, of course, and it is apparent that the appropriation measure before us today will not permit a major expansion of Federal efforts. Certainly we should be doubling Indian educational expenditures rather than increasing funding levels by only 15 percent—as this bill does.

But money alone will not improve Indian education. Equally important is a reassessment of the policies that have shaped educational programs during the

last 20 years. In this regard, it is important to note that the subcommittee has attempted to correct the imbalance that has existed for too long between relocation-vocational training and higher education.

Many Indian people are deeply dissatisfied with the relocation projects that send them from the reservations to the cities for vocational training. But since there are so few other educational or employment opportunities available to them, they often enroll in the relocation program by necessity rather than by choice.

Currently the AVT relocation program is funded at a level of \$38 million while funding for college scholarships is set at only \$3 million. To younger Indians this means that the Federal Government is telling them that most of them are really not good enough to go to college and that they should settle for trade school instead.

BIA and Interior Department officials, including Assistant Secretary Harrison Loesch, agree that the AVT relocation has received too much emphasis in relation to Indian higher education aid. This year, the subcommittee has transferred \$1 million from relocation-vocational training to college scholarships, an action that is likely to be supported by many American Indian organizations.

The Indians' deep concern about BIA's relocation-vocational training emphasis was effectively expressed at a meeting earlier this year of the National American Indian College Student Association. I am including the following report of a February 12, 1970 of NAICSA meeting with my remarks:

REPORT OF A NAICSA MEETING

Attending the meeting were: Ralph Reeser, Office of Inter-Governmental Relations; Bill King, Acting Officer of Education, BIA; Sherwin Broadhead, Congressional Relations Officer; Catherine Redcorn, Coordinator of Youth Programs, BIA Steering Committee; Duane Bird-Bear, Acting Coordinator, NAICSA; Bud Mason, Black Hills State College, and Jo Allyn Archambault, University of California.

KING. Began by reiterating his feeling that the BIA grant programs were presently in limbo.

ARCHAMBAULT. Why is it that there is only \$3 million for college and \$28 to \$43 million for vocational training?

KING. Legislation was the problem.

REESER. This (vocational training) was a favorite project of E. Y. Berry (Rep.-S. Dak.). While other programs got cut, it quickly gets increased. The approach to vocational training in Congress was that it was a program with a quick payoff. In two years you could give a person training, feed him and get him off welfare rolls. And it was aimed primarily at adults.

MASON. But at the local level, kids in high school are quickly sent downstairs to Relocation. And in this the farthest you can go is two years.

REESER. The maximum is two years except for nurses training, which is three years.

MASON. Why can't a person get this subsistence money now given to people on Relocation and use this for subsistence during the time that he goes to college?

REESER. King's predecessor tried to extend this but he had only two choices. He could channel his efforts and emphasis on getting more money for subsistence or plug away trying to develop a larger group on campuses but with the same amount of money. (He adopted the latter.) You see we can change

our policies, but we have to play with the same amount of money.

ARCHAMBAULT. So, what you are saying is that legislators want to go for the vocational programs and that is simply racist.

BIRD-BEAR. This program of vocational training is self-defeating because it perpetuates itself by providing an easy way for guidance counselors to get out of counseling the Indian student. Subsequently as more students are directed down to Relocation, the statistics grow and the requests for money are increased and the requests are granted.

REESER. The advantage of vocational training for later advancement. Some junior colleges count some courses taken during vocational training. But we are under restrictions, and one of the restrictions is that the work must be toward vocational or on-the-job training.

KING. Interesting law, this P.L. 959. They gave us the legislation and all it does is hamstring us. But we are under restrictions and one of the restrictions is that the work must be toward vocational or on-the-job training. It gives us a dollar ceiling as to how much we can give out for subsistence that each time we need more we have to go back and ask for more.

BIRD-BEAR. From my observations in Denver, Relocation does not take into consideration the periodic cost-of-living increases.

REESER. There has been a 5 to 10% cost of living rise and we are now taking that into consideration. We are going to base basic subsistence money on cost-of-living figures obtained from the Department of Labor.

MASON. We're talking about putting people in Adult Vocational Training. What happens is that a family will go on Relocation and take their children with them. But when the student is ready to go to college and applies to the Bureau for aid-grants, they tell him: no, that he is on a low-priority list and that the Bureau must first work with the reservation Indians. The inconsistency here is that the child had nothing to do with where he ended up, but now must suffer for it. The BIA's aid structure should extend to the urban student.

REESER. Last year there came the possibility of a breakthrough for college grants for urban areas. But still today urban Indians are low-priority compared to reservation Indians.

KING. The Bureau, should be in all rights, of greatest service to college students. In Chicago alone there are 500 school age Indian children. There are 2000 in Los Angeles. At the boarding schools like Concho and Haskell the school authorities really encourage the student to go into AVT programs. The BIA is heavily skewed to off the reservations.

REESER. Not the scholarship program?

KING. No. No. The Relocation Program. But now what we need is people who will give their opinions of this program on the Hill.

MASON. But even then, on the local level (now, today) they still send you (the young Indian adult) down to Relocation. There should be a better evaluation at the local level. The temptation exists for the guidance counselor to shirk their duties, and many do.

KING. But the fact is, there are so many of these slots available—these people are very insensitive. They are not dealing with people, they are dealing with units.

ARCHAMBAULT. The schools that these kids (on Vocational training/Relocation) attend, some of them are not even accredited, and most of the schools are lousy.

OLGUIN. I know of cases where the Bureau itself does not even accept their credentials once they finish these schools.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Appropriations Committee and in particular the members of the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior under the extremely capable leadership of its chairman, JULIA BUTLER

HANSEN, are to be commended for their farsightedness reflected in the bill now under consideration.

This bill provides for the orderly and prompt acquisition of private inholdings in national parks, monuments and other recreation areas throughout the country. Chairman HANSEN's efforts to provide the necessary funding for this acquisition indicate a firm commitment to preserve the remaining natural resources in an economical and expeditious manner.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, also reaffirms the commitment of the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and the Congress to the protection and preservation of our Nation's remaining unblemished areas.

Environmental quality is today a subject of great concern across the country. Responsible citizens everywhere have realized the dangers of failure to take adequate measures to fight pollution and preserve our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, we must thank our colleague, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, for her foresight in preparing for this national awakening by leading the Congress for many years in support of the vitally essential programs to save our environment.

I rise in support of the pending bill and urge that it will be passed unanimously.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$58,940,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in looking at this Interior Department legislation in the past, I do not believe I have ever noticed a provision for appropriations and spending as follows: "That appropriations available for the administration of territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary."

Has this been standard in appropriation bills of this nature in the past, and if so by what authority does the Secretary of the Interior expend for purposes of this kind?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is part of the standard appropriation language that has been in the bill for several years. May I say to the gentleman that the problem of transportation in the trust territories is a most complex problem. Those responsible for the administration of the territories have to cover an area of 3 million square miles.

The people are scattered all over these various islands, and there are relatively few landing strips. There are few boat docks, and one of the greatest problems they have is making sure that there is an adequate transportation system. The provision that funds may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels in that area is merely to assure the shipment of supplies, particularly medical supplies, and the transportation of visiting nurses, doctors, and so forth. This has been exactly what we have always done. The Secretary has had that power.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman would say that this authority, then, has not been abused?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say it has not been abused. If the gentleman had heard the testimony about some of the conditions in the trust territories, he would recognize that those people have been extremely patient. I do want to commend the Secretary of the Interior for his deep interest in the problem of the territories and in trying to solve the transportation problem. It is impossible to maintain schools or take care of the health needs without these vital facilities.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentlewoman that I am not being critical. I am simply seeking information in that respect.

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

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

Mr. McCLURE. I would just like to assure the gentleman that the comments of the gentlewoman from Washington are absolutely correct. Having been in the trust territories on two different occasions trying to determine what their problems are, I can testify from personal knowledge that communication and transportation are among the most critical problems out there. Certainly we have not overreacted to the problems by providing too much transportation. In fact, it is too little, and the problems remain very critical.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Idaho for his observations.

I have not heard anything today about those apparently expensive office redecorations and refurbishings for the Secretary of the Interior and several of his top assistants. Has the Appropriations Subcommittee convinced the hierarchy in the Interior Department that they ought to consult with someone, at least the General Services Administration, in the future before they spend the kind of money they did on their offices?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We had a complete hearing on it. The Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior has sent us a complete report, which is available to any Member, showing the prices of all articles purchased. I think this will never happen again.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentlewoman say that she thinks it will

not be repeated. I assume the information she has obtained is on an after-the-fact basis, and I think she will agree that at least the General Services Administration ought to have been consulted from start to finish in this matter.

I understand from your hearings that there is a woman psychiatrist in the Interior Department who is paid \$100 a week, and she works 4 hours. Is that about the schedule, and why does the Department need such a person?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will say the information was as startling to me as it is to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why do they need a head shrinker in the Interior Department?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not know. I think the same information that came to the gentleman came to me.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Was money appropriated for the employment of this individual, can the gentlewoman tell me, or is she on the way out?

Mr. REIFEL. I believe the individual to whom the gentleman from Iowa refers, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, provides the kinds of services which the Department feels it needs to help some of the employees in that agency. I would assume the services are needed.

Mr. GROSS. Did she convince the gentleman from South Dakota that her services are needed?

Mr. REIFEL. I should like to say to the gentleman from Iowa, they have had sufficient difficulty with the Bureau of the Budget in trying to get some of their funds released; that this kind of service is probably in order.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I believe almost all large industries today and people who employ large numbers of people do put in their personnel department someone trained in psychiatry. This may not be their primary work, but they are trained in that field. There are many problems that arise that would probably result in disaster for the people concerned or could be harmful to the department, unless a psychiatrist takes care of the problem in time.

It seems to me I read in the paper just yesterday or the day before yesterday that a White House guard had a nervous collapse. All of us who are interested in the dignity of human beings would want to see that kind of thing stopped in time, before it started. So, while I cannot speak for the Secretary of the Interior, perhaps this is a very understanding modern concept of the treatment of people who may be ill.

Mr. GROSS. I would think they might be sent to the Public Health Service, where they deal with that kind of problem, or out to the National Institutes of Health.

Now let me ask about the request for the air conditioning of 307 automobiles that are used, according to the hearings,

in some of the extreme spots such as Asheville, N.C., which is a mountain resort, Pendleton, Oreg., which I never heard was extremely hot, Yakima, Wash., the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia, or San Francisco.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I believe the gentleman is referring to information in the hearings. No provision is made in the bill for air conditioning automobiles.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that, but funds for that purpose were requested, were they not?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. They were asked for.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad they are not in.

Then there was \$272,000 requested for special writers for the Secretary of the Interior. I am wondering if they write letters or just speeches. Is that not a great deal of public relations and special writers?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I suggest if the gentleman will refer to the hearings, he will see that most of the problems arose and most of the additional letterwritings were imposed on the Secretary of the Interior as the result of the Santa Barbara oil spill. That is when the avalanche of letters from people descended on the Department. This is largely in response to the environmental problems. These are answers provided on the problems that arose.

Mr. GROSS. I am beginning to understand now what this environmental business is going to cost us throughout Government. I am beginning to understand now, if all these people are necessary to explain the oil disaster on the west coast. The Lord save us from any more oil spills or any more environmental problems right away.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, if the United States had provided additional inspectors and had spent some additional money earlier, we might not have had that oil spill in Santa Barbara.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand that, but to assemble this kind of public relations-speech writing outfit in the Department of the Interior to handle that seems incredible. If every department spends that kind of money, we are going to be deeper in the red than the message we got from the President a little while ago indicates we will be in 1971.

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

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION
For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (16 U.S.C. 757), \$2,168,000.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on lines 1 through 3 of page 19 as unauthorized for an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

May I say, relative to the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation,

the bill was signed by the President of the United States on May 14.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule.

The language in the bill indicates that this is under the provisions of the act of October 30, 1965. As the gentlewoman from Washington points out, the program has recently been reauthorized—Public Law 91-249.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES
CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (16 U.S.C. 757a-757f), \$2,311,000.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I repeat the point of order previously made insofar as lines 9 through 12 of page 21 are concerned. The basis of my point of order is the committee's own report, on page 5, at the bottom of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is in the same bill. It was signed by the President of the United States on May 14.

I would say to the chairman, when we marked up the bill the legislation had not yet been signed. Therefore, when it was reported to the full committee it had not been signed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule.

The language in the bill indicates it is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act of October 30, 1965, and the gentlewoman from Washington has again pointed out that this year's authorization bill was signed by the President.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL
COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491), as amended, establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, \$373,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 39, lines 15 through 20, as being unauthorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Washington care to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

We will concede the point of order because, as I explained in the statement I made before the House earlier, this is still in the Committee on the Judiciary, the new authorization bill, and has not yet been reported out. Therefore we had noted it in our report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman concedes the point of order. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take 5 minutes.

I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that we have been dealing with one of the most important bills that comes before the House, appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. It covers subjects that are increasingly in the news and which are increasingly important to our Nation's future. The environment is at long last a matter of great moment to America, and no bill is more closely related to environment than this one which deals with the forests, the waters and even the atmosphere.

I think the fact that we have gone through this afternoon's discussions and completed the reading of this very important bill without an amendment being offered, bespeaks the confidence that the Members of the House have in the distinguished subcommittee which has presented this bill to the House.

I know that all of you are proud of the really great work done by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), chairman of the subcommittee. I am equally certain that the entire membership of the House appreciates the outstanding work done through his entire service here by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL). I regret very much that he is leaving us after this term for his constructive work is going to be missed greatly in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is typical of the very fine work done year after year by all of the members of this very fine subcommittee and I believe the House owes to each of them a debt of gratitude and appreciation for the contributions which they have made.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to join in the statements made by my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of privilege.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1970, I was served by the Superior Court of Arizona, Yuma County, in the case of *Yuma Greyhound Park, Inc. v. Samuel Jenkins et al.* (Case No. 28609) with an order to appear and to show cause on Tuesday, May 26, 1970, at 9 a.m. under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with the order to show cause without the permission of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I send to the desk the order to show cause for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[The Superior Court of Arizona, Yuma County]

YUMA GREYHOUND PARK, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, PLAINTIFF, V. SAMUEL JENKINS, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

(No. 28609—Order to Show Cause (Division 1))

It is hereby ordered that you, Sam Steiger, be and appear before the Honorable Charles L. Hardy, Judge of the Maricopa County Superior Court, Division 13, in the Court-house of the City of Phoenix, Arizona, on Tuesday, the 26th day of May, 1970, at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m., then and there to show cause, if any you may have, why the attached motion for a Rule 37(a) order to compel you to answer oral interrogatories should not be granted.

It is further ordered that a copy of this order to show cause and the attached motion for a Rule 37(a) order shall be personally served upon Sam Steiger no later than the 19th day of May, 1970.

Done in open court this 8th day of May, 1970.

CHARLES L. HARDY,
Judge of the Superior Court.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS
FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COM-
MISSION, 1971

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 973 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 973

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. 17405) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 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 recommitt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 973 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17405 authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1971.

The purpose of H.R. 17405 is to authorize a total of \$2,290,907,000 for the AEC for fiscal year 1971—\$2,013,307,000 for operating expenses and \$277,600,000 for plant and capital equipment.

The three fundamental and interrelated issues concerning the program for fiscal year 1971 are:

First. The need for funds to improve and expand the capacity of the Nation's uranium enrichment facilities on a timely basis.

Second. The importance of maintaining a strong liquid metal fast breeder reactor program and of obtaining a realistic Government-industry cooperative arrangement to permit the construction and operation of the first LMFBR demonstration plant.

Third. The necessity for continuing participation by the AEC, in relation to its nuclear energy responsibilities, in the nationwide effort to improve the environment.

The total authorization is 0.3 percent greater than the authorization requested for fiscal year 1971, but \$157,145,000 less than the amount authorized for fiscal year 1970.

Included in the bill is the amount of \$119,450,000 for the high energy physics program. The AEC serves as executive agent for this program on behalf of the entire Federal Establishment and, as such, provides more than 90 percent of the funding from all sources for the program.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee reported H.R. 17405 unanimously and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 973 in order that the bill may be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are only three things that I would like to add to what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) has just told us with respect to the rule that we are asking for on the bill H.R. 17405. I make these remarks not only as a member of the Committee on Rules, but also as one who has been privileged to serve as a member of the authorizing committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I think that in this particular authorization bill it is important to point out that the Joint Committee has assigned its highest priority to three items, the first of these is the need to expand the Nation's uranium enrichment facilities, the second is the importance of maintaining a strong liquid metal breeder reactor program and to get a demonstration plant in operation quickly and, third, and this is very important, certainly, in the light of present conditions and interests, the continued participation of the Atomic Energy Commission in the effort to improve the environment.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize fiscal 1971 funding for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The total authorization is for \$2,290,907,000; this figure is \$7,707,000 above the agency request.

The authorization is broken down into two main categories:

Operating expenses, \$2,013,307,000.
Plant and capital equipment, \$277,600,000.

While the total authorization is less than \$8 million above the total agency requests, the separate items within the authorization have been realigned to give high priority to several major programs and to reduce a number of other lesser projects. Thus the naval propulsion project is increased by \$4,800,000, nuclear reactor development work is increased \$1,960,000, and new construction projects are increased by \$18,700,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I think it is in line with, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG), has pointed out, the request that the administration made, the budget request. I know of no objection to the granting of the rule and I would urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. YOUNG. 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. HOLIFIELD. 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. 17405) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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. 17405, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts 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 California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

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

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks, I recognize that we got to this late in the day and it is the intention of the present speaker and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) to bring this matter to a conclusion as expeditiously as the House determines we can work.

While we have 2 hours of time, it is not our intention to use that time unless called upon to use it in explanation of the bill.

The authorization bill before this Committee today is the product of many days of hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, searching questions by our committee and its staff, and several months of careful consideration by the committee during which all differences among our members were resolved. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously supported H.R. 17405. On May 13, the Senate passed the companion bill, S. 3818, by a vote of 83 to 1.

Last year, when I had the privilege of seeking favorable action in the House on the AEC authorization bill for fiscal year 1970, I pointed out that the bill was one of the most austere fiscal measures reported out by the Joint Committee in recent years. The bill now before you is, in many respects, even more stringent.

This bill would authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission totaling \$2,290,907,000. This amount covers both "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" costs. This total amount is less than the equivalent total in the authorization act for fiscal year 1970 by the sum of \$157,145,000 or 6.4 percent. A realistically precise comparison would show the reduction from the previous year's authorization to be even greater, because of the escalation in cost that has occurred in the past year. The President's Council on Economic Advisers estimates that inflation in calendar year 1969 effected a 4.5 percent rise in cost. Thus, the total amount authorized in the bill before you essentially represents a reduction of more than 11 percent below the amount authorized for fiscal year 1970.

In terms of constant dollars, H.R. 17504 contains the lowest dollar amount authorized in the last 5 fiscal years; in fiscal year 1966 the total was 29 percent higher than the equivalent dollar amount in this bill.

The joint committee is somewhat concerned that the fiscal year 1971 authorization bill may in fact be too austere.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 17405 would authorize appropriations of \$2,013,307,-

000 for "Operating expenses" of the Atomic Energy Commission. A table summarizing the operating expenses for the AEC's major programs is set forth in the Joint Committee's report accompanying the bill. The table also shows the changes which the Joint Committee has recommended in relation to the amounts requested. These changes reflect the committee's judgment concerning the funding posture necessary to maintain AEC's higher priority programs at a viable or appropriate level.

WEAPONS PROGRAM

The AEC programs for military applications, of which the weapons program is the largest, comprise 53 percent of the Commission's total program costs. The other 47 percent comprise the AEC programs for the civilian applications of atomic energy.

The Joint Committee has recommended a reduction of \$8,500,000 in the weapons program. The total weapons program, including production and surveillance of nuclear weapons, research and development, testing, and special test detection activities, continues to entail about 40 percent of AEC's total costs. The Joint Committee watches this program very closely. It believes it is generally satisfactory, although the committee is concerned that two large cuts effected in the President's budget may lead to serious problems. These were the sharp reduction of \$18.5 million from the total amounts AEC requested for research, development, and engineering, which cutback will necessitate the loss of about 1,000 people and affect the morale and capabilities at the three weapons laboratories—Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and Sandia Laboratory—and a \$20-million reduction in the on-continent testing program, which allows for no spare test holes for use in fiscal year 1972; should something happen to an existing hole or holes, there could be a significant interference with the testing program.

In considering the details of the weapons program as prepared by the administration, the committee concluded that a reduction of \$8.5 million should be effected to adjust an imbalance it considered existed among the AEC's 14 program areas. The committee allocated this amount in its recommended funding for the civilian programs.

TERRESTRIAL ISOTOPIC POWER

The committee made a number of other reductions, including a cutback of \$1.3 million in the program for terrestrial isotopic electric power development, and \$1 million in the controlled thermonuclear research program.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

In the high energy physics program, the committee left unchanged the administration's request for \$119,450,000 for operating expenses. As is generally known, the AEC serves as executive agent on behalf of the entire Federal Establishment for high energy physics. As such, the Commission provides more than 90 percent of the funding from all sources for this program.

In regard to the high energy physics program, it is the committee's judgment

that the monetary level requested in the President's budget and provided for in this bill is severely minimal from the standpoint of the good of the country. It entails, for example, the distinct possibility that the Princeton-Pennsylvania accelerator may have to be phased out during the latter part of the fiscal year. This is a matter of some concern to the Joint Committee. The facility involves an investment by the Federal Government of about \$40 million, and it has been in operation for only 5 years. It is the principal high energy physics research tool for 15 university groups.

The committee is also troubled by the fact that no funds were sought in the 1971 budget for storage ring research facilities, such as the proton-proton intersecting storage ring facility at Bern in Switzerland. U.S. scientists will consequently have to endeavor to program some of their research abroad.

In connection with the high energy physics program, I should mention that the 200 Bev National Accelerator Laboratory project, which was fully authorized last year, is going well. The joint committee is watching the progress of construction closely. If there is a continued absence of major construction problems, the first beam from this great national facility may be achieved by July 1971.

The naval reactor program is also going well, but it is a program that in the committee's judgment clearly deserved a boost in funding. The committee has added \$4.8 million to the \$132 million requested of the Congress by the administration for operating expenses for this effort. The \$4.8 million is a partial restoration of the \$6.2 million reduction effected during the administration's budget review process. The total amount recommended by the Joint Committee will enable the Commission to proceed with its development program for advanced submarine nuclear propulsion reactors. I continually point with pride to the fact that it was largely through the efforts of Congress that this Nation developed its superior nuclear submarine capability. However, the committee is deeply concerned about the budgetary actions taken to reduce the advanced development program for submarine naval propulsion reactors, particularly in view of the massive resources that the Soviet Union is continuing to apply toward the design, construction, and operation of its nuclear submarines.

The Joint Committee considers it vital that we maintain superiority or at least parity with the Soviet Union in nuclear submarine capabilities.

The lineup of United States vs. U.S.S.R. in submarines is as follows:

United States:	
Conventional	59
Nuclear	87
Total	146
U.S.S.R.:	
Conventional	280
Nuclear	70
Total	350

However, this does not tell the whole story. Classified testimony before the Joint Committee has led the committee to estimate that the U.S. numerical ad-

vantage in nuclear submarines enjoyed over the U.S.S.R. is likely to vanish by the end of 1970. Further, numbers of nuclear submarines are only part of the total picture. Overall capabilities of the respective undersea nuclear forces are the key; such items as speed, depth of operation, quietness, and reliability could spell the difference in event of hostilities. In these fields the Soviets have recently made striking progress.

Classified testimony also leads the Joint Committee to the conclusion that the Soviets are building nuclear powered submarines similar to our Polaris types at a rate which will equal our fleet of 41 by 1973 or 1974.

BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Joint Committee has also recommended additional funds for four programs in biology and medicine and isotopes development fields. In the biology and medicine field, the committee's recommended increase of \$140,000 would apply to the Commission's food irradiation activities. The committee believes it is important for the AEC to conduct certain research relative to the petition to the Food and Drug Administration for papayas, research on the chemical basis for botulinum control in marine products, and studies on chemical changes in foods due to irradiation. These efforts will enhance the vigor of the food irradiation program and will materially contribute to its potential for success.

Under the biology and medicine program, the committee has also strongly recommended the addition of \$2 million in plant and capital equipment funds, as an item in section 101(b) of the bill, to construct an addition to the physics building at Argonne National Laboratory to house a newly created Center for Human Radiobiology. During the Joint Committee's extensive hearings on the environmental effects of producing electric power, which were held in the fall of 1969 and in January and February of this year, the high desirability of acquiring increased knowledge concerning the effects of chronic low-level irradiation on humans was stressed. The radiobiological consequences of such low doses appear to be nonexistent or indiscernibly subtle. Experimental work has been conducted, and is being continued, on low-level radiation exposures of selected species of animals, and a significant body of data is being accumulated. However, in order to develop meaningful information concerning human exposure, it is necessary to extrapolate the animal data to humans, relying upon similarities which may exist in system or organ response.

As a point of clarification, I would like to point out that in order to observe the effects of low-level radiation doses we need data on large populations. In our efforts to observe detectable radiation damage on mammals, we have conducted experiments at Oak Ridge National Laboratory on over 5 million mice. A man and wife team—the Drs. Russell—have conducted these experiments over the past 20 years. Dr. Russell testified before our JCAE on January 29, 1970, that it was necessary to irradiate mice at total doses of 600 to 1,000 roentgens in order to detect damage which could be transmitted

to their offspring. In discussing these laboratory experiments therefore the terms "low level" or "low dose rate" may be used but it should be realized that the levels at which we create detectable damage is in the ranges of 600 to 1,000 cumulative dose.

Let me emphasize that the AEC has set its ceiling on radiation exposure to populations at 170 milliroentgens—or 170/1000ths of a single roentgen. When we refer to permissible levels of radiation from atomic reactors therefore, we are referring to levels far below those levels used in laboratory experiments to cause detectable radiation damage on a small mammal such as a mouse.

The acquisition of human exposure data proceeds at a very slow rate. It is very important that, wherever possible, study and research programs learn as much as possible from actual exposures. The efforts of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission in Japan are an outstanding example of a worthwhile program in this field. The unfortunate experience of the radium dial watch painters, whose exposures occurred during the first third of this century, has provided considerable scientific data, but much more can be learned from examinations of affected individuals. The Joint Committee believes it is important that everything possible be done to assure that as many of the victims as possible participate in the study and research program, that the medical teams engaged in this important endeavor receive appropriate support, and that suitable facilities be provided to permit the study and research efforts to proceed systematically. The \$2 million authorization added by the Joint Committee for the "Plant and capital equipment" category will aid in achieving these objectives.

I should mention in this connection that important lifetime and mortality studies of atomic energy workers is being carried out by the University of Pittsburgh under a contract with the AEC. These studies will benefit from the relatively accurate measurements and documentation of the radiation doses received by the individual workers. The Joint Committee encourages all reasonable efforts to assure that no significant source of hard information is overlooked in the quest for increased knowledge relative to low-dose irradiation of humans.

FOOD IRRADIATION

To the isotopes development programs, the Joint Committee added \$120,000 for work on radiation preservation of foods, and \$800,000 to begin the development of a power converter for an isotopic heart pump. Although the food irradiation program was retained in the budget submitted to the Congress, the level was greatly reduced. From a six-product program, work on only three foods—strawberries, papayas, and finfish—is now planned. To keep at least this reduced effort viable, the committee recommended the addition of \$120,000, thereby increasing from \$150,000 to \$270,000 the funds to be applied.

ISOTOPES HEART PUMP

Last year the Joint Committee recommended \$800,000 for research and development by the AEC on the power con-

verter for a radioisotope-powered artificial heart. This artificial heart program is being worked on cooperatively by the AEC and the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health. The \$800,000 was appropriated by the Congress, but the money was never apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget because it was applied to the unallocated congressional reduction of \$22 million in the fiscal year 1970 budget. The Joint Committee has strongly recommended that these funds be authorized and that AEC start work on the power converter for the artificial heart. AEC is continuing its research on isotope fuels and radiation measurements for this program. Successful development of an isotopic powered artificial heart would provide tremendous help for thousands of Americans.

CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER

Included in "Operating expenses" is \$254,790,000 for the civilian reactor development program of the AEC. For the nuclear safety category in this program, the Joint Committee has recommended an increase of \$1.36 million. Even at the higher level, which totals \$37.3 million, cutbacks and delays in some of the work will be necessitated. The major fraction of the increase recommended by the committee would be utilized in reactor safety work pertinent to the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program. This breeder program is the highest priority civilian nuclear reactor program of our Nation. In the judgment of the Joint Committee, it is of major importance to the general welfare of this country, and it may well be essential to satisfy the need for adequate, safe, reliable, and economical energy. It will also assist in reducing environmental pollution.

POWER SHORTAGE

On May 5, 1970, the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness of the Executive Office of the President issued a statement to the effect that electric powerplant generating capacity to meet peak loads this summer will be in tight supply in many areas in the east and midwest. He also pointed out that coal, principal fuel for power generation, and gas, were in short supply. He further stated—and correctly in my judgment:

Electricity is the lifeblood of our high energy civilization. It is imperative that industry and government work together in order to avert disruptions to the consuming public.

I issued a statement the following day, May 6, in which I remarked, at the outset in response to the issuance from the OEP:

Better late than never.

In my statement I also made several comments which are highly relevant to our great need for the civilian nuclear reactor program reflected in H.R. 17405—I would like to read pertinent excerpts:

Those of us who have watched the approaching shortage of electrical power have seen the problem developing over the past several years. We on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy did what we could to get attention focused on this important problem. We have continually called attention to the need to build modern electric power plants

of all types. Over and over I've called for a cooperative effort among those responsible for providing electrical power to add both fossil fueled and nuclear generating plants since it is obvious that all available sources of power will be needed to meet our requirements for energy. Some segments of the public, out of a single-minded concern for the quality of the environment, have been significantly delaying the construction of all types of power plants—hydro, fossil and nuclear. I've pleaded for recognition of the dual need for safeguarding the environment and at the same time providing a sufficient amount of energy to meet the public need. Unreasonable fear and confusion are being stimulated by a relatively few well-meaning but misguided zealots.

Unfortunately, while we gyrate ineffectively around a welter of unwarranted assumptions, scientifically unsupported extremist views, and often sincerely held but infirmly supported fears, it appears certain that we will have to experience more electrical "brownouts" and "blackouts" before a rational, balanced and appropriately responsive attitude is attained to solve the power problem and achieve the companion need of safeguarding.

The troublesome aspect of this solution, as I've said many times, is that this route may seriously affect the welfare and well-being of a number of our communities. Another factor which I have warned about concerning the brownout route which we appear destined to follow is that once a shortage of electrical energy is permitted to occur, corrective action to eliminate the shortage and accommodate the normal growth in electrical demand would in all likelihood take the major portion of a decade. This could be a serious blow to our Nation. We are already beginning to pay a toll because of the shortsightedness of those citizen groups who have obstructed the building of both conventional and nuclear plants.

EFFECTS OF RADIATION ON MAN

In the bill before you, there is a total of \$71 million for the conduct of research and development on the effects of radiation on man and his environment, and related matters. It is with great pride that I point to the fact that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress have continued from the inception of the Atomic Energy Act in 1946 to date to see to it that radiation is controlled, regulated, and understood as completely and comprehensively as the human mind and human resources reasonably permit. A full decade ago, a report by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council was able to state:

Despite the existing gaps in our knowledge, it is abundantly clear that radiation is by far the best understood environmental hazard. The increasing contamination of the atmosphere with potential carcinogens, the widespread use of many new and powerful drugs in medicine and chemical agents in industry, emphasize the need for vigilance over the entire environment. Only with regard to radiation has there been determination to minimize the risk at almost any cost.

This is still true today. The AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine has spent nearly \$1 billion from its inception to date in support of more than 1,000 projects designed to contribute new knowledge and increased understanding of the biomedical effects of radiation. The AEC's unparalleled safety record is a direct result of these efforts.

Nuclear fueled electric generating plants will more and more materially contribute to the safeguarding of the en-

vironment. We are continuing to make progress in all areas. For example, studies are being conducted in AEC's national laboratories on potential uses of waste heat from electric powerplants. Such potential uses include central heating and cooling for cities and high density industrial areas, water purification by evaporation and recycling, large-scale greenhouse agriculture, particularly in colder regions, desalting of sea water, and aquaculture.

The trash disposal problems faced by this country are enormous. We generate daily almost five pounds of paper, bottles, cans and other discards per person. In our major cities the cost of garbage collection is up to about \$25 per ton. The annual expenditure for collection and disposal of trash is estimated to be \$4.5 billion. This does not include the processing of sanitary wastes. Nor does it include the tremendous quantities of animal wastes from domestic livestock. Recycling, refabrication, reuse—over and over again—will be the concepts embodied in future processes that will save us from being buried in our own refuse. Electric energy will be the keystone to essentially all such useful—indeed, desperately needed—recycling and refabrication processes, and to a decent, dignified, practical standard of living. We must strive mightily to achieve the dual objective of an adequate supply of safe, reliable, economical electric energy and a safe, healthy environment.

Today, nuclear energy is only about 2 percent of the total electric generating capacity. It is being added at an ever increasing rate; one-third of all generating plants built over the past 4 years has been nuclear. By 1980 it is estimated that nuclear energy will represent one-quarter of all our electric generating capacity; that when this decade is over there will be 200 installed nuclear powerplants, with a capacity of 150 million kilowatts, costing about \$40 billion. Both conventional as well as nuclear generating facilities will be required for our future. This emphasizes the need for strong measures toward avoiding environmental degradation. Expenditures for this purpose will be the best investment we can make.

In the not-too-distant future the breeder reactor will provide the Nation and the world with a virtually limitless supply of energy. It is the judgment of our committee that the development of breeder reactors must proceed as a matter of the highest priority.

LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER AUTHORIZATION

Section 106 of the bill before you would provide the authorization requested by the administration for the Commission to enter into a definitive cooperative arrangement for a liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) powerplant demonstration project. The demonstration project would comprise research and development, design, construction, test operation, and the full operation of an LMFBR powerplant. The project would be a cooperative effort with a reactor manufacturer-utility team. The threshold phase of this demonstration program was authorized in fiscal year 1970 by section 106 of Public

Law 91-44, AEC's Authorization Act for fiscal year 1970.

The Joint Committee firmly believes that the success of the breeder program will largely depend on the information and data provided by LMFBR demonstration plants. With respect to the authorization in section 106 of the bill, the committee is concerned that the ceiling amounts requested by the administration for the first demonstration project may turn out to be insufficient to permit the Government and an industry-utility team to work out an appropriate definitive arrangement in the latter part of fiscal year 1971 when the results from the project definition phase authorized in fiscal year 1970 will be at hand. Should this occur, the loss of valuable time and effort will adversely affect the Commission's base program, the useful momentum of industrially sponsored efforts in this field already in being, and the overall progress toward attainment of the tremendously important objectives of the breeder program. The Joint Committee hopes that an appropriate cooperative arrangement can be effectuated without additional delay.

The amounts of Government assistance authorized in section 106 of the bill are those requested of the Congress. The assistance provides for \$50 million, plus commitments of up to \$20 million for Commission-furnished services, facilities, or equipment which the Commission has available or is planning to have available to it under its civilian base program, plus a total of up to \$10 million in the form of waiver of the Commission's use charge for special materials.

Now, I have discussed some of the highlights of section 101 and of the concluding section 106 of the bill. The four intervening sections are similar in form to provisions normally appearing in AEC authorization bills. Sections 102, 103, and 104 are indeed identical in substance to equivalent sections routinely incorporated in previous authorization bills; they are, in essence, a number of controls, limitations, and specific understandings regarding the use of funds for authorized programs. As indicated in the report accompanying the bill, procedures informally worked out between the committee and the Commission several years ago, and still in effect, provide for certain additional conditions and undertakings. All these controls have thus far served well. Also, over the years, the Commission's activities during a fiscal year have accorded with pertinent recommendations made by the joint committee in its authorization report.

This year, one of the committee's strongly expressed wishes relates to a separate directorate that the Atomic Energy Commission, at the request of the President, proposed to establish for the purpose of operating its uranium enrichment facilities by means of a separate organizational entity within the AEC. The President announced this decision on November 10, 1969, in a press release which stated that the directorate would operate these facilities in a manner approaching more closely a commercial enterprise. The White House statement also expressed the President's views that the

uranium enrichment facilities should be transferred to private ownership—I quote:

By sale, at such time as various national interests will best be served, including a reasonable return to the Treasury.

The proposed establishment of the directorate is intended to facilitate the eventual transfer of the plants to the private sector.

During the authorization review process, the joint committee found no basis for acquiescing to the proposed expenditure during fiscal year 1971 of about \$300,000 for the luxury of creating the new directorate structure. It would contribute nothing toward improved capacity, efficiency, or operational techniques. The committee concluded that, in the context of the very stringent budget for fiscal year 1971—a budget which will force curtailment of a number of worthwhile research and development activities—that it was unreasonable to approve the expenditure of funds for an unproductive procedural item such as the proposed directorate. The joint committee stated in its report that it was not clear why the AEC could not, under its present organizational structure, satisfactorily provide the type of planning and preparatory work that apparently motivated the desire to establish the proposed new separate organizational entity. The report contains the following conclusion by the committee:

The Committee is not recommending authorization of any funds for the proposed directorate and its separate staff, and it directs that no funds shall be used by the AEC for such purpose.

CASCADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

Our uranium enrichment facilities consist of three gaseous diffusion plants, one at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; one at Paducah, Ky.; and the third in Portsmouth, Ohio. These enrichment facilities have cost the Government billions of dollars in research, development, and construction funds. They are truly a national asset. Their product is the key to the Nation's future supply of energy. Last year, the Commission requested \$138 million to begin the improvement program in fiscal year 1970 which would improve and increase the capacity of these facilities; however, funds for the program were not requested of the Congress. For fiscal year 1971, the Commission requested \$170 million to begin the improvement program, identified as the Cascade improvement program. Instead, only \$5 million, earmarked for architect-engineer work on diffusion plant support facilities, was included in the administration's request. The bill before us raises the \$5 million by \$16.1 million to provide a total of \$21 million to permit not only architect-engineer work but also a meaningful beginning of the CIP. The joint committee strongly urges the executive branch to proceed with this program in order that we can meet our energy requirements and fulfill our responsibilities to other nations for the supply of enriched uranium.

SECTION 105—PRIOR YEAR'S AUTHORIZATION

Now, I have discussed the highlights of all the sections of the bill, except section

105. This section effects several amendments to prior year acts. One of them would permit the present cooperative power reactor demonstration project with Philadelphia Electric Co. and Gulf General Atomic, Inc., to continue for an additional period of up to 5 years beyond the present 5-year term. No additional AEC funds will be involved. Results from this project can only continue to benefit the civilian nuclear program. Another item in section 105 would enable the AEC to proceed from the previously authorized architect-engineer work stage to construction of waste encapsulation storage facilities at Hanford. The committee agrees with the administration's view that this project is highly desirable.

SUMMARY

The Joint Committee believes H.R. 17405 provides the minimum authorization practicable for the continuation of the major programs and activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. The effect of all the careful adjustments made by the committee in relation to the administration's request to the Congress is that \$4.593 million was subtracted by the committee from the total amount for "Operating expenses," and \$12.3 million was added by the committee to the total amount for "Plant and capital equipment." In total net effect, the committee added \$7.707 million to the overall budget, or a net increase of 0.3 percent.

I agree with what is essentially the unanimous view of this country's leading scientists that our great need to improve the quality of life, and to protect our environment, will not be aided by the abandonment of scientific processes or of prudent and reasoned applications of the knowledge science provides. On the contrary, if reason, based on an ever-increasing fund of knowledge, will not insure our survival and lead to a life worth living, nothing else will for our species.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously urges the enactment of H.R. 17405 as reported out by our committee.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of the gentleman concerning the future demands for power. Quite coincidentally, recently both public and private power interests have consulted me about the problem the gentleman so eruditely discusses. I believe his remarks should be emphasized to the Nation.

It seems almost impossible that this Nation should have to suffer more brownouts and blackouts because more and more coal mines are being shut down. Now, whether it is because of the high cost of production or whether it is because of mergers taking place and other power sources taking over and absorbing many of the small mines; whether it is because of Government-passed regulations that make it no longer economically feasible for the small so-called wildcat operator to operate within livable health and safety standards; whether it is because of the depletion of our natural re-

sources and maybe not too good a husbandry of those or the failure to bring our great resources forth in the form of shale oil or many other reasons; the depletion of our natural gas reserves, the failure to draw on other resources, it does not seem possible, regardless of these many reasons, that we would have these brownouts and blackouts. It does not seem possible that we would have to go through this modern age of science and technology, with regular breakthroughs in many fields, into these additional brownouts and blackouts. I think the gentleman will agree with me that one of the principal reasons, in addition to all of these others I mentioned, that we face this dismal situation is because of a lack of economically feasible breakthrough in the production of atomic nuclear power, although again we have made great strides in this field. Although this production is not necessarily helped by the high cost of production which is killing the goose that laid the golden egg, many of us have expected that by the end of this decade at least we would have sufficient power through nuclear fission to offset this and to allow us to conserve more of our natural resources if, indeed, nuclear fission is a natural resource. One is mechanical and contrived by man, and the other must involve a production from the earth with changes in the quantities of energy.

Could the gentleman from California enlarge a little bit more on whether there is a slowdown and whether the Congress could or should do more in this field and whether we simply need more of a technical breakthrough in order to make atomic nuclear power production more feasible?

In asking this question I want to make it perfectly clear that I appreciate what he has said and pointed out thus far and certainly hope that we can share with our military the uses of nuclear fission with all of the side effects we are getting from it. I am familiar with the radiobiological research of power and the protoplasmic research. I wonder if we should not emphasize it at this time, and I ask the question for that purpose.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's comment on the power situation indicates his wide knowledge of this subject matter and awareness of the acute problem facing our country.

We must double the existing electric generating capacity in 7 to 10 years. If we talked about doubling automobile or steel production in 10 years, why, some people would raise their eyebrows, but we must do it if we are to have enough electrical energy to fill the needs of our people.

In the field of atomic power we have a limited number of manufacturers that are capable of doing this work.

It is a new art, as the gentleman knows. Only a few years ago did we actually put on the line in California an economically competitive plant. Immediately there was a surge of interest from the utilities throughout the Nation. There are about 49 nuclear plants that are now being built in the United States. For a while the power equipment manufacturers were in a position where, let us say, they became independent and they would raise

their prices. Now, there are others coming into the field and will come into the field and I think that probably a normal competitive situation will develop where there is not such a scarcity of reactor manufacturers. There is no doubt that it is economically competitive. When we look at the problems in coal and in oil and in gas, as the gentleman has referred to, we see there is a constantly rising price in those fossil fuels. We also see that there is a scarcity, by the way, in the gas fields; there is a scarcity presently existing. None of the coal companies today will make a long-term contract with the utility companies because they do not know and are not certain about the price of coal and, therefore, they do not want to tie themselves to the present price of coal.

So, the economic forces are at play. Therefore, I feel they will work themselves out, as they always do in our country.

I think we will have cheaper prices offered by the reactor manufacturers as we get more into the field and also after the backlog which is now keeping the present manufacturers very busy begins to fade out.

In fact, in California just recently there were three fossil-fueled plants that were going to be built, big plants in the 1,000-megawatt range, but they were stopped because of the problem of air pollution. Two of these plants happened to be gas-fired plants, one at Huntington, Calif., by the Southern California Edison Co. which wanted to build them, but the Orange County supervisors ruled against them on the basis of pollution.

They also had a third plant at Victorville in the Mojave Desert outside of the area of Southern California that was going to be fired by coal from Utah. It was to be located right on the railroad line from the coalfields. However, the Mojave supervisors refused to let them build it because they did not want the contamination from coal going into the air.

It is interesting to note that when you burn a ton of coal there is generated 300 pounds of particle matter such as sulfur dioxide and other substances which go into the air. This is going to force them—because of our interests in clean air—to turn to nuclear power more than would otherwise occur.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman very wisely brings up an additional problem, that of our environment and the effect upon ecology which is, of course, the most popular subject today and, therefore, coal production for power is vital. However, in my hometown a public utility can no longer get a contract for the delivery of coal.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HALL. That is, only on a standby basis.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HALL. They bought coal and contracted for it on an annual basis and usually in advance for a period of years, from throughout the major Midwest coal companies, but they just no longer are interested in making a contract to sup-

ply this coal. As a result, this public utility has gone on the market looking for some of the small coal producers in order to guarantee a standby coal stockpile; whereas, they use natural gas which is available except at a time of natural or manmade disaster and they very seldom need the coal.

Again I say this, as the gentleman does about the pollution of the atmosphere and the particulate matter that comes from the burning of bituminous coal especially as an example of what we are facing in power production.

I am especially pleased that the gentleman brought out the increasing requirements which we have and I might emphasize that by underlining the fact that these are mandatory requirements devoid of all the window dressing of additional air conditioning, and so forth, but are simply requirements of having adequate power available.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right. It is interesting to note that 70 percent of all of our electric power goes for industrial and commercial uses which provide jobs for the young people who are coming into the employment market. So when we say that we must deny our industry and we must deny ourselves adequate electric power, it simply means denying ourselves a portion of that 70 percent expected amount going into industry to provide jobs and 30 percent going into the residential and business communities of our country. So it means a complete slowdown. Those who say that the way to solve this problem is just not to use so much electric power—not to have additional industries, or additional homes for our people, and so forth—or course, these people are burying their heads in the sand, because the gentleman from Missouri knows as well as I do that the pressure of population is such that we must take care of these people. That is the function of the free enterprise system and the Government in conjunction with it, to do this job, and I think it will be done.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to pay my best regards, deep affection, and great respect to the gentleman from California who is the present chairman of this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and to this entire committee.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no group in either branch of the Congress, or any combined group in the Congress who have done more in the area of nuclear propulsion and for our preparedness than has this committee. This Nation has no conception of what this great committee has done to bring about modern propulsion to our Navy.

Without the dedicated leadership of the chairman and his great committee, our Navy would be 100 years behind the rest of the world in nuclear propulsion—and that means behind Russia.

We are indebted, Mr. Chairman, today at this very moment for what this committee has done to bring us abreast of and to bring us knowledge of what the

Russians are doing in the field of nuclear propulsion.

I call to your attention the submarines—the Attack and the Polaris—which make up our modern Navy.

I want the record to show that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy under the dedicated leadership of this great chairman has done as much for America, if not more than, any committee in the Congress to keep us abreast in this field. That is just about all we are abreast—with the great research and development and application of this gigantic and little known energy to propel ships both above and below the seas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects and express my admiration for what the gentleman himself has done and his great committee has done. The Nation owes you an eternal debt of gratitude.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his most gracious remarks.

I might say that I recall the days when we were first advocating the nuclear submarine fleet, and when there were great forces at work to eliminate Admiral Rickover from his work in building that great fleet. The gentleman from South Carolina and the members of his committee—and I want to pay special tribute to two members, our former companion Bill Bates from up in the New England States and my present companion today, also a member of the Committee on Armed Services, Congressman PRICE—these two men worked with us on the committee and we fought the battle to keep this great man, Admiral Rickover. Many people have reviled him, but I say today that he is responsible for the really hidden strength, and I say hidden, because we have at this time 41 Poseidon-type submarines cruising in the oceans of the world, each one of them having 16 missiles that they can launch from underwater. Each one of those submarines has three times the TNT power of all the bombs that were dropped in World War II—with 4,000 bombers going over the European continent and dropping these bombs for 4 years, each one of those submarines carries more power by three times than all of the bombs dropped in World War II. You multiply that by 41 and you can see what a tremendous and terrific amount of nuclear power—power in the defense of this country—exists in the submarine nuclear navy.

I want to return the gentleman's compliments by saying that if it had not been for the support of the Committee on Armed Services, in behalf of Admiral Rickover, and making available those hulls where we put the first submarine engines—the first four engines that were built by funds from our committee. The gentleman from South Carolina and his colleagues on the committee made the hulls available for the *Sea Wolf* and the *Nautilus*—the first two submarines. After we once showed what the *Nautilus* could do, we did not have too much trouble getting additional ones because it was of a different order of magnitude and military effectiveness, not to mention the tremendous support we have in the case of the 16 missiles.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, since the

gentleman has mentioned Admiral Rickover, and I recognize that there are those in this country who have not agreed with him—I want to say that there is no more dedicated military man—or civilian in the United States. He was quite discouraged in the days of McNamara. Had it not been for the backing of your great committee to a man, I guess this great patriot might have become discouraged.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, he might have been lost.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, he might have been lost and we did all we could do but we had to have your help and we saved this man. He is a great patriot, and he got us to the point where we are now with a modern nuclear Navy at least competitive with our enemy—Communist Russia.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, with our able colleague's consent, I should like to join his statements of and concerning the very able and dedicated Admiral Rickover.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. The praise is well deserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on his excellent summary of the principal features of H.R. 17405, and I am pleased to rise with him to urge passage of this bill.

Every effort has been made by the Joint Committee to obtain the maximum value for each dollar included in this austere authorization bill. Thus, despite the Joint Committee's addition of \$4.8 million for Admiral Rickover's naval propulsion program, and its addition of \$16.1 million for the necessary improvements to our gaseous diffusion plants, the total amount recommended by the Joint Committee is only 0.3 percent higher than the sum requested of the Congress. In reality, considering the effect of inflation, the total amount to be authorized by H.R. 17405 is more than 11 percent less than the amount authorized for fiscal year 1970—almost \$160 million less than last year.

While our able chairman has mentioned the major features of the bill, there are a few programs that I should like to touch upon briefly. The first is the AEC's raw materials program. Fiscal year 1971 will be the last year for AEC procurement of uranium concentrate and the financial support that procurement has provided to the uranium industry. That program has been exceptionally successful, bringing the United States from a position of total dependence on foreign sources of supply in 1942 to our present status of world leadership in uranium production. The domestic uranium mining industry is a vigorous, up-to-date industry with every indication of being fully capable of responding to the anticipated future demands. This represents yet another phase of our Nation's nuclear program which will have become completely self-sufficient by the end of 1970.

Another program which I feel warrants special comment is the Plowshare program—the peaceful uses of nuclear explosives. Those who compare numbers only will detect what appears to be a substantial reduction in effort in this program—\$7.5 million for fiscal year 1971 as compared with \$14.5 million for the current year. I should like to point out that all of the funds in the bill before you will be employed in connection with underground engineering and device development with all efforts in excavation by the use of this technology being deferred. The committee is of the view that concentration of resources—manpower as well as financial—in the development of low radiation devices and underground engineering technology and procedures should yield the maximum derivable benefit from the available funding.

It is also felt that with this recommended budget we can effectively move forward in meeting our international commitments under the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. As I stated last year relative to the AEC authorization bill, our credibility in international affairs demands a continuing effort to develop and make available to the nonnuclear signatories to that treaty the benefits of peaceful applications of nuclear explosions. Though the amount recommended is conceded to represent an austere program, the concentration of effort in one major area should yield proportionately greater return than in the past.

There are, of course, many other aspects to this total program too numerous to comment upon in detail. I shall attempt to answer any questions my colleagues may wish to ask about the bill or the accompanying report.

As noted by the gentleman from California, Chairman HOLIFIELD, this bill represents the results of thorough inquiry and careful consideration by the 18 members of the Joint Committee and the report before you was filed without dissent. The bill has the committee's unanimous support and I commend it to you for your favorable consideration.

The following is an excerpt from the report:

COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR 1971 AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS WITH THOSE OF PRIOR YEARS

AUTHORIZATION

The amount recommended for AEC authorization for fiscal year 1971 is \$2.291 billion, a decrease of \$157 million, or 6.4 percent, from the \$2.448 billion authorized for fiscal year 1970.

If one takes into account the escalation in costs which has occurred in the past year—about 4.5 percent according to the President's Council of Economic Advisers—the recommended authorization represents a reduction of about 11 percent below the amount authorized for fiscal year 1970.

The marked trend toward reduced funding of Atomic Energy Commission activities is accentuated when one looks at the amounts authorized for the past five years, compared to the recommended FY 1971 authorization:

Fiscal year:	billions
1966	\$2.556
1967	2.275
1968	2.634
1969 (continuing downward trend)	2.618
1970 (continuing downward trend)	2.448
1971 (continuing downward trend)	2.291

The amount recommended for FY 1971 is \$265 million less than the authorization for FY 1966. If one assumes a 4-percent annual escalation in costs over the past 6 years, and compares the FY 1971 authorization to the FY 1966 authorization in terms of 1966 dollars, the FY 1971 authorization is about \$750 million, or 29 percent, less in purchasing power than the amount authorized 6 years ago.

Also, the FY 1971 authorization would be less than the amount authorized in any of the past 6 years, expressed in terms of constant dollars.

These comparisons graphically illustrated the stringency of the proposed FY 1971 authorization.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Atomic Energy Commission requested appropriations of \$2.363 billion for fiscal year 1971. The amount appropriated for fiscal year 1970 was \$2.218 billion, a decrease of nearly \$400 million from the \$2.616 billion appropriated for fiscal year 1969.

Although the appropriations requested for fiscal year 1971 are \$145 million more than the amount appropriated for the current year (FY 1970), a truer index of AEC program funding levels is obtained by comparing the total funded operating costs which are estimated at \$2.189 billion and \$2.194 billion for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, respectively. There is an increase of only \$5 million, or about two-tenths of 1 percent. When cost escalation is considered, there is a decrease of about 4 percent built into the requested level of funding for FY 1971, compared with FY 1970.

FISCAL YEAR 1971 AUTHORIZATION, JCAE INCREASES AND DECREASES

(In thousands)

	Increase	Decrease
Operating expenses:		
Weapons		-\$8,500
Reactor development:		
Civilian power reactors	\$500	
Nuclear safety	1,360	
Space electric power development		-340
Terrestrial electric power development		-1,300
Naval propulsion	4,800	
Physical research: Controlled thermonuclear		-1,000
Biology and medicine	140	
Isotopes development	920	
Plowshare		-500
Regulation	900	
Program direction and administration		-300
Foreign travel		-100
Selected resources		-1,273
Total operating expenses	8,720	-13,313
Plant and capital equipment:		
Plowshare equipment		-700
Cascade improvement program	16,100	
Human radiobiology facility, ANL	2,000	
Science information center, Oak Ridge	600	
Sodium pump test facility		-5,700
Total plant and capital equipment	18,700	-6,400
Totals	27,420	-19,713
Net increase in authorization	7,707	

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in commending the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. HOLIFIELD, for the excellent statement he has made. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the leader-

ship that the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) has shown on the committee as the ranking member.

I rise in support of this authorization bill.

I would like to take this opportunity to briefly review the progress to date on the construction of the 200 billion electron volt accelerator, the largest facility of its kind in the world.

On January 26, 1965, President Johnson sent to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a study entitled, "Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics." The report recommended and I quote:

Construction of a high energy proton accelerator of approximately 200 Bev, in accordance with technical specifications developed by Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, to be operated as a national facility. This machine should be authorized for design in fiscal year 1967, and for construction in fiscal year 1968.

During the initial deliberations on the proposed accelerator, the Joint Committee, being well aware of the fact that European scientists were discussing the possibility of building a 300-Bev facility, insisted that provisions be incorporated in designing the U.S. accelerator to permit an increased energy beam in future years without major modifications or major cost, that is, major relative to initial cost.

In the course of the AEC authorization hearings for fiscal year 1969, Dr. Robert R. Wilson, the director of the National Accelerator Laboratory, stated that not only had his staff been able to design the machine to reach its original intensity goal of 30 trillion protons per pulse, but that they had also incorporated an option to go to a higher energy than 200 Bev at a later date. This was accomplished within the established budgetary guidelines.

We were recently informed that the magnets designed for the main accelerator ring will be sufficiently flexible in operation to allow the acceleration of protons to energies of 500 Bev although at reduced beam intensities. Continuous operation at 500 Bev with high-intensity beams should be possible with state-of-the-art cryogenic magnets several years from now.

We also learned that in spite of the austere construction budgets of the past several years and that proposed for fiscal 1971, the first beam can be obtained by July 1971—if there is a continued absence of major labor problems. It should be noted, however, that by July 1971 the main laboratory building and the large experimental areas will not be completed. Nevertheless, there will be sufficient facilities available to perform meaningful experiments which are possible at or slightly above 200 Bev.

I am very pleased, as a member of the Joint Committee, to have been associated with the development of this great project which already has many notable achievements to its credit. I urge the Congress to demonstrate its continued support of the 200-Bev accelerator by appropriating the necessary funds to continue this important work in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the committee added \$2,000,000 for the construction of a facility at Argonne National Laboratory for the Center on Human Radiobiology. This was the priority radiobiology facility in the AEC's request to the Bureau of the Budget which was turned down strictly on the basis of budget restrictions.

This facility is exceedingly important since it is needed to accommodate research work on radiation effects on humans. The data on humans is obtainable only because of the existence of a unique group of humans who are carrying radioactive material in their bodies because of uninformed or careless use of radium both industrially and for external and internal therapy. The majority of these unfortunate incidences took place in the 1920's. These humans acquired doses of radioactive materials as luminous-dial painters, radium chemists, and by medical injections of radioactive compounds. The object of the work at this facility will be the collection of all significant data possible on the effects and tolerance of humans to radiation. Such information is vital to guide our activities as we enter the nuclear age.

There is no substitute for man as the relevant experimental species for data of this nature. The extrapolation of animal data to man for the determination of radiation toxicity is of questionable reliability. These unfortunate exposures of humans 40 or 50 years ago can, if carefully studied, supply us with unparalleled data. There is no prospect of duplicating such exposures simply because exposures of humans specifically for such data cannot be justified. It is our moral obligation to future generations to obtain every bit of information we can from these people. The facility covered by this authorization is aimed at accomplishing this objective.

The full background information on this work, including numbers and locations of persons concerned, scientists who are engaged in the work and indications of data thus far collected is printed in the committee authorization hearings starting on page 578. A description of and justification for the facility are printed on pages 57 and 58 of the committee report.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight on the so-called successes and the failures we have had in the civilian nuclear power program.

Our successes truly began in the late fifties with the Shippingport, Dresden I, and Yankee atomic powerplants. At present the Shippingport reactor is not only being used to produce electrical energy but also for advanced experimental purposes. It is being modified to test out the feasibility of breeding in a light water reactor. The Dresden and Yankee reactors have been operating successfully for the past 10 years. Other nuclear plants have come on line since then. Some prob-

lems have been encountered but in large part they have been of a conventional nature and in no case have they posed a threat to the public health and safety.

There are some understandable misconceptions in the minds of the public and perhaps among some Members concerning the so-called success of some of the reactors constructed under the cooperative power demonstration program. I refer to projects such as the Hallam facility in Nebraska, the city of Piqua reactor in Ohio, and the Elk River reactor in Minnesota. These projects were undertaken for a variety of experimental and developmental reasons, including tests of the feasibility of a given type of reactor system, the first demonstration of certain specialized features of an established reactor system, and other first-of-a-kind or prototypal reasons. Operation of these first generation type of plants, though for limited periods, has produced the sort of technological and economic information for reactor designers, utilities, and other organizations that the demonstration program intended to elicit. Most have been decommissioned since their small size does not permit economic operation in the long term.

We are now entering an era where substantial blocks of power will soon be generated by families of large nuclear plants, having up to five times as much power generation capability as the Dresden I and Yankee plants. To date, 17 nuclear plants are operational, 49 are now under construction, and more are planned. We expect that in 1980 this Nation's nuclear generating capacity will be 150,000 megawatts. There have been delays in the construction and operation of some of these nuclear facilities. There have been some problems—principally concerning the conventional aspects of these plants. In every case, however, there has been special care to assure that the operation of these plants would pose no threat to public health and safety. Nuclear power has an important contribution to make toward meeting the energy needs of our country—elements of this bill provide for a continuing development of this capability.

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), and commend him for his excellent work and this excellent bill.

Certainly, I support this authorizing legislation for the Atomic Energy Commission and I am particularly pleased that in this bill authorization is made for construction of a new building for the American Museum of Atomic Energy in Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The museum will be a section of an information complex that will include other related facilities.

The new museum is needed and desirable as a symbol of the development of the atom for peaceful purposes—the "Good Guy Atom," it is called.

I recommended construction of new quarters for the museum some years ago, and I have long advocated this new facility as needed and necessary.

The present museum is housed in an outmoded wartime barracks-type structure that is inadequate and outdated.

Thousands of Americans—including many children—from throughout the Nation, visit Oak Ridge and the American Museum of Atomic Energy each year.

And so this museum is for all America—for all our people—for education—and for inspiration.

Again, I want to commend the distinguished chairman for this bill and this excellent report and recommendation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), a member of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee having to do with raw materials, I wish to say I think this piece of legislation takes care of all the problems in that particular field, keeping in mind that as of December 31 of this year we will have a free market as far as uranium is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and the vice chairman, and with them the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), for the fine work they have done on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the three issues highlighted in the Joint Committee's report on the AEC authorization bill was the urgent need for funds to begin a program to improve and thereby expand the capacity of the Nation's uranium enrichment facilities on a timely basis. These facilities—the three U.S. gaseous diffusion plants—are the sole source of enriched uranium for fuel to power nuclear reactors. Enriched uranium is also used in nuclear weapons. The Joint Committee has recommended authorization of the sum of \$21.1 million in construction funds to initiate a cascade improvement program which will provide needed additional enrichment capacity. This amount is \$16.1 million more than the \$5 million requested by the administration.

The gaseous diffusion plants have cost the Government and the taxpayers billions of dollars in research, development, and construction funds. They are truly a national asset which should continue to provide enriched uranium at low cost to meet domestic and foreign needs. The product of these plants is a keystone to the Nation's future supply of abundant, low-cost energy.

As many of you know, uranium is enriched, that is, the percentage of fissionable material is increased, by means of a gaseous diffusion process which remains highly classified. Developments in the technology associated with this process have provided us with the ability to increase the production capacity of the three existing plants by improving the cascades—the actual diffusion machinery—without increasing the electric power level at which they are operated.

The CIP is the first of several steps which must be taken to increase our capacity to meet the rapidly growing demand for enriched uranium. It is a large-scale project which will take several years to complete, but it will provide additional capacity at the lowest cost of any means presently available.

While our gaseous diffusion plants do provide a source of material for our nuclear weapons, such uses now draw on only a very small percentage of the plant capacity. By far—and I mean well over 95 percent—of the enriched uranium is used as fuel in domestic and foreign nuclear reactors. The capacity of the diffusion plants has a finite limit and estimates of the demands upon that capacity, both foreign and domestic, indicate that such capacity will be exceeded by demand by the mid-1970's. In fact, the greatest proportion of the capacity will be committed by the end of this year. The AEC has estimated that, by the end of 1978, the demand will outstrip AEC's ability to supply all customers from both current production and preproduced inventory.

Our continued capacity to supply low-cost nuclear fuel is an important economic factor in deterring other nations from development of their own enrichment capability. With such capability comes the attendant increases in the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons. In addition, our inability to supply the fuel for foreign reactors will represent the loss of a very substantial foreign market. A commitment to the CIP must be made now to avoid these problems in the very near future.

Last year, the Atomic Energy Commission, having recognized this need to increase its uranium enrichment capacity, sought authorization from the Bureau of the Budget of \$138 million to begin the CIP in fiscal year 1970; however, no such request was made of the Congress. BOB denied the request. For fiscal year 1971, the AEC asked that \$170 million be authorized and \$61 million appropriated. Instead, the administration's approved budget request to the Congress included only \$5 million for architect-engineering work. This small amount of architect-engineering work would provide no assurance that the administration will eventually get on with the job of increasing the capacity of these plants. All we know for sure is that the installation of the CIP would be delayed at least 1 more year. The rapidly growing demand upon our limited enrichment capacity is clear evidence that we cannot afford this procrastination and delay on the part of the administration.

The Joint Committee has recommended \$21.1 million to make a meaningful start on this program. These funds will not only provide for most of the architect-engineering work requested by the President but also the first hardware for installation of improvements to the cascades and needed additions to the gaseous diffusion production support facilities. The Joint Committee is urging your support for timely action. We are faced with a reluctant administration much as we encountered when we suc-

cessfully urged the development of the H-bomb and the nuclear submarine. This project is as important to our Nation's need for electric power as were these others to our national defense.

A statement on the gaseous diffusion plants would not be complete without a discussion of the financial benefits which the Government will realize from the sale of enrichment services. The price of enrichment services, which was established in 1967, is \$26 per unit of separative work. That price covers not only the funded costs, including interest, of about \$18.85 per unit, but also depreciation of about \$3.65, as well as a contingency factor of \$3.50. During the 10-year period from July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1980, enrichment service revenues are expected to total about \$4.2 billion. About 27 cents of every dollar of this revenue represents a net return of cash to the U.S. Treasury.

What this means is that these enrichment plants are producers of tremendous amounts of revenue for the Federal Government. The CIP will further reduce the cost of providing enrichment services with the result that even greater net cash returns will be realized. The net cash flow from the sale of enrichment services is expected to amount to more than \$300 million in the year 1980 on sales of close to \$1 billion in that year alone, provided that sufficient enrichment capacity is made available by means such as installation of the CIP.

A substantial part of the revenues and the resultant net cash flow will be realized from the sale of enrichment services to other free world countries for use in reactors supplied by U.S. manufacturers.

With the assured availability of a continued U.S. supply of enrichment services by means such as prompt installation of the CIP, our balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced through the sale of more enrichment services and more U.S. reactors to qualified customers abroad. For this and the other reasons discussed earlier, the Congress must act now to make known its resolve that we will have available sufficient enrichment capacity to meet the needs of this Nation for low-cost, abundant electrical energy and to fulfill our commitments abroad. Authorization and appropriation of the \$21.1 million recommended by the Joint Committee will serve this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with the Government's gaseous diffusion plant operation, the Joint Committee is recommending action which would reduce administrative overhead by \$300,000 in fiscal year 1971, and \$500,000 in each succeeding year. I am speaking of the committee's recommendation that data on the operation of these plants, based on commercial-like accounting practices, be developed by the existing organization and not through the establishment of a separate uranium enrichment directorate with its own, independent staff within AEC as recommended by the President.

Many are the times that I have proudly pointed to these facilities and the uranium enrichment process as performed by the present organization as models of efficiency—highly automated

and progressively managed. I know of no operation by the Federal Government which give the taxpayers so much for their tax dollars.

The recommendation of the administration is to set up a separate organization, as part of the AEC, to operate these plants in order to develop data of operation on a commercial-like basis. This apparently is a prelude to efforts to sell these plants to private enterprise. But this issue aside, the committee has been presented with no justification for this new organizational structure nor any explanation as to why the data cannot be developed with the present organization through revised accounting techniques.

Accordingly, the committee has recommended a \$300,000 cut in authorization under program direction and administration—see page 47 of the report.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. May).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, join as a member of this committee in my expression of appreciation for the excellent statement made by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Included in that is my appreciation as a member of this committee for the devotion to duty that was shown by both the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) over the months in which I have been a comparatively new member of the committee. I do not believe in my years in Congress I ever have seen a more devoted chairman or ranking minority member, taking into account the time and the study and the complete attention to every detail in this tremendous field. I believe my colleagues in this House owe a great debt of gratitude to the dedication and devotion to this subject shown by these two men and every member of the committee. This is a comment from the newest member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17405.

There has been much said in these Chambers during the past year on the quality of our environment and what the Federal Government is doing or ought to be doing, about it. With respect to the generation of electricity and the Atomic Energy Commission's contributions to the study of environmental problems and their solutions, we have spent substantial amounts of committee time on acquiring information and studying proposed programs. For a number of years the Joint Committee has held the responsibility of reviewing the Atomic Energy Commission's budget and recommending to both Houses the authorization of funds for the purpose of carrying out the Commission's overall program for weapons and for peaceful uses of atomic energy. With respect to this year's allocation of funds to the AEC as reported in the Joint Committee's report accompanying this bill, I would like to make the following observations:

The amount of \$71 million in the fiscal year 1971 budget is provided for the study of the effects of radiation on man and

his environment and related matters. The breakdown of these funds is as follows:

Land and fresh water environmental sciences.....	\$9,570,000
Marine sciences.....	3,895,000
Atmospheric sciences.....	4,900,000
Interaction of radiation with biological systems.....	35,080,000
Exposure to external and internal radiation	8,755,000

In addition, a total of \$3,800,000 is provided for the studies which include effluent control, powerplant siting and disposal of radioactive wastes. AEC research and development in the aforementioned categories has been underway for a number of years. It is the committee's view that these levels are appropriate to the present need and in no case are these programs hastily drawn nor could they be termed "crash" programs totaling more than \$1 billion of work which has been in progress for some time. I might interject at this point that over the years the Atomic Energy Commission has conducted research programs totaling more than \$1 billion in biology and medicine and related fields. Much has been learned, more scientific research lies ahead. It is the committee's belief that, unlike other industries whose safety criteria have arisen out of the debris of their accidents, the nuclear industry has benefited from years of study carried out well in advance of the time when the use of atomic energy has become more widespread. The safety criteria for the protection of workers and the general public have been carefully and conservatively drawn. Design standards for nuclear plants call for high quality workmanship and redundant safeguards for prevention of accidents. The record in the nuclear business is excellent and it is our expectation that it will continue to be so.

On another matter, Mr. Chairman, on page 11, the report comments on the closing of the K-West reactor at Hanford, Wash.

I am very concerned about the ruling by the Bureau of the Budget which resulted in the shutdown on February 1, 1970, of the K-West production reactor at the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plant, located near Richland, Wash. The use of fiscal year 1970 funds to accomplish this shutdown is particularly disturbing because of the strong plea made by the AEC to the Senate Appropriations Committee in October 1969 to restore funds for operation of both K reactors at the Hanford site. This was subsequent to the action by the House to appropriate funds for sequential operation of these two reactors. At that time the AEC spokesman said, and I quote:

The sequential mode of operation would result in a substantial loss of plutonium production capacity which would compromise our ability to meet most efficiently firm and contingent future requirements. There are major uncertainties in the future total requirements for reactor products for weapon purposes; these are expressed in our production planning as contingent requirements. It is only prudent to provide for a reasonable reserve of reactor products to permit accommodating modest increases in firm weapons requirements without having to re-

sort to crash programs, and without having to incur the heavy cost involved in reactivating standby capacity.

The Congress agreed with this statement and ordered that both K reactors be operated.

It is not obvious how we can worry about the loss of plutonium production capability in October and then not be concerned in January, particularly when the President talks about the need to increase the size of the ABM deployment and there is also underway the modernization of other strategic and tactical systems which require heavy use of plutonium.

Of as much concern as the loss of production capability is the loss of qualified reactor operating and maintenance personnel. Also of serious concern is the impact of this latest shutdown on the economic diversification program, a model program of self-help. Through diversification, the technical and scientific knowledge gained in 25 years of Hanford operation is being applied in areas that have potential benefit for industry, agriculture, medicine, and other fields. The program is still minuscule in relationship to the overall job demands of the community, but it is working.

The additional shock of closing the K-West reactor—the seventh shutdown of the nine production reactors at Hanford—is a tremendous setback to a community that is making every effort to separate itself from its reliance for jobs on the Federal Government. As a member of the congressional delegation of the State of Washington I pledge we will do everything possible to assure that this will not happen again.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her very kind remarks.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I also thank my colleagues on the committee for their attendance at the committee hearings and for their support of this bill.

I also thank the staff. They have worked Saturdays and early in the morning and late at night in order to help the committee in every way that is possible. I am really proud to be able to say we feel we have a tremendously capable professional staff.

I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) for his continuous attendance at every meeting that has ever been called and his willingness to stay there until the end of the day. Many days we have had sessions as long as 5 hours of hearings, so I am tremendously grateful for the cooperation which I have had from Members on both sides of the aisle. It would have been impossible to bring out this kind of bill without that.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in order that there be no misunderstanding, the reason I have stayed so assiduously is not that I lacked confidence or had suspicion regarding the chairman. It is because the pleasure of his company is great and the example of his intellect is incomparable.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for those very kind remarks.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if we were asked how much it would be worth to beneficially extend the lives of 100,000 Americans each year, could we name a figure? I seriously doubt that anyone would even try to arrive at an answer. It has been stated by experts that a circulatory support system could prevent the death of 10 to 15 percent of the some 750,000 Americans who now die annually from heart disease. The Atomic Energy Commission and the National Heart and Lung Institute are working on such a system.

One could ask: Why not depend upon human heart transplants? There is a two-part answer—first, there just are not enough donors available, and, second, essentially every case has ended in death because of rejection. These problems would not materialize with the circulatory support system which is expected to be developed from the joint AEC-National Heart and Lung Institute program. The system would consist of an isotopic heat source, a power converter, a power transmitter, and a heart pump. The AEC's fiscal year 1971 budget includes \$500,000 for continuation of the research on developing medical-grade plutonium-238 for an isotopic heat source with a low radiation background. This \$500,000 constitutes a minimum level of effort to obtain meaningful progress in the fuel development.

An additional \$800,000 is required, and I strongly urge that it be authorized, for the AEC to start research on the second item of the circulatory support system—the power converter. In fiscal year 1970, the Congress appropriated the \$800,000 to start this important research, but AEC lost the funds because of a subsequent \$22 million reduction in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

I do not know what the dollar figure should be for alleviating the suffering and preventing the death by heart disease of 100,000 Americans a year, but I do know that \$1.3 million is a small enough price to do the research on the circulatory support system which will go a long way toward achieving this worthy goal.

The 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator at the National Accelerator Laboratory at Batavia, Ill., was fully authorized in Public Law 91-44, the fiscal year 1970 AEC Authorization Act. Nevertheless, the Joint Committee has continued its interest in observing the progress of this outstanding project. Aside from the fine technological progress being made in spite of operating budgets which are significantly reduced below those desired to keep development and construction within the original time schedule, the human impact is equally significant. At this time, I would like to focus on the human aspects of the work at the laboratory.

Since the inception of the laboratory, a sustained and successful effort has been made to recruit, train, and employ young people from minority groups in the ghettos. About 50 have been involved in the past 2 years and more than 40 are now employed. Similar summertime motivational programs were established as youth opportunity programs to demonstrate the advantages of studying for future employment in the scientific and

technological fields. We can all take pride in the successes achieved by these programs.

Efforts to get black small-business owners to bid for contracts has also been quite successful. For example, over 40 percent of the contracts below \$10,000 for work in the old village of Weston, Ill., which is being adapted to laboratory needs, went to black-owned small businesses in the period September 1969 to March 1970. Just this month, the laboratory announced the award of two contracts with a potential value of nearly \$600,000 to a black-owned manufacturing company on Chicago's south side. They represent the largest contracts awarded by the laboratory to date to a minority entrepreneur and are equivalent to the largest contract value awarded by the laboratory to any single supplier in the Greater Chicago metropolitan area.

The third factor I would like to mention is open housing. Since the selection of the laboratory site, 54 cities, towns, and villages, of which 35 are within 30 miles of the site, have passed fair housing ordinances. I consider this to be an outstanding response to the promise made that housing would be available to all.

I point to these three activities because of their impact on the socioeconomic side of science and because Dr. Robert Wilson, the Laboratory Director, considers these factors as important as getting a 200-billion-electron-volt proton beam.

I respectfully submit that the funds requested for appropriation for the National Accelerator Laboratory for fiscal year 1971 are the absolute minimum that can be voted without seriously curtailing the entire laboratory program. I urge your continued support of this program.

One of the perhaps lesser known but potentially most significant programs of the Atomic Energy Commission is the work being conducted in developing low level radiation preservation of foods. In terms of dollars, this is indeed a modest program, but in terms of promise for worldwide benefit for mankind, it is of the greatest magnitude.

The current program involves work on three food products—strawberries, papayas, and finfish—preparatory to the submission of a petition to the Food and Drug Administration for certification of wholesomeness of the products for public consumption. This has been a two-pronged program for several years with research in isotopes development as well as biology and medicine. We are approaching fruition with the petition for strawberries expected to be filed with the FDA by the middle of this year. The amount recommended by the Joint Committee for fiscal year 1971—\$540,000—is almost twice what was requested by the administration, but it is the minimum amount which the committee considers adequate to assure sufficient viability in the program to provide all necessary data to the FDA on strawberries and continue to move forward at a reasonable level on other products.

Until now, the United States has been in the forefront of research and development of this method of food preservation. However, so far we have obtained approval of only two products for consumption after radiation treatment—

wheat and potatoes. Other countries are rapidly surpassing us in this field. For instance, Russia has nine products on its approved list. At least nine other countries are actively engaged in this type of research. There is little doubt in my mind that radiation preservation and radiation disinfestation are destined to play major roles in assuring that a greater percentage of the foodstuffs produced by the world's farmers reach the world's hungry people without spoilage or insect destruction.

In addition to the vast humanitarian potential involved, I should also note that the economics involved are highly favorable to the United States. This method of preservation will open huge distribution markets for the foodstuffs produced by our farmers which have heretofore not been available because of lack of refrigeration or other preservation processes in the potential market areas. If you wish to let your imagination run free for a moment, simply contemplate the removal of all domestic commodity restriction and support programs, full production on our farms, a truly world market for our farm products, and an end to starvation or even hunger. This is indeed a glorious prospect. This is the altogether realistic potential of this program. I urge the AEC to press forward vigorously in this area. Together with the Army's high radiation dose sterilization program, this Nation is at the threshold of presenting the world with one of history's truly significant scientific achievements.

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

The CHAIRMAN. 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,

Sec. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended:

(a) For "Operating expenses", \$2,013,307,000, not to exceed \$119,450,000 in operating costs for the High Energy Physics program category.

(b) For "Plant and capital equipment", including construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition; and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, a sum of dollars equal to the total of the following:

(1) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 71-1-a, contaminated storm water runoff control facilities, Savannah River, South Carolina, \$900,000.

Project 71-1-b, in-tank waste solidification systems, Richland, Washington, \$6,300,000.

Project 71-1-c, storage and waste transfer facilities, Richland, Washington, \$1,700,000.

Project 71-1-d, radioactive contamination control improvements, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$1,400,000.

Project 71-1-e, gaseous diffusion production support facilities, \$14,700,000.

Project 71-1-f, process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants, \$6,400,000.

(2) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 71-2-a, weapons production, development and test installations, \$10,000,000.

(3) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 71-3-a, modifications to reactors \$2,000,000.

Project 71-3-b, research and development test plants, Project River, Los Alamos Scien-

tific Laboratory, New Mexico, and Nevada Test Site, Nevada, \$1,000,000.

Project 71-3-c, modifications to EBR-II and related facilities, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$2,000,000.

(4) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 71-4-a, accelerator improvements, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$900,000.

Project 71-4-b, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, \$925,000.

Project 71-4-c, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California, \$825,000.

Project 71-4-d, accelerator improvements, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, California, \$950,000.

Project 71-4-e, accelerator improvements, medium and low energy physics, \$400,000.

(5) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 71-5-a, addition to physics building (human radiobiology facility), Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$2,000,000.

(6) TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION.—

Project 71-6-a, National Nuclear Science Information Center (AE only), Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$600,000.

(7) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—\$42,000,000.

(8) CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.—Acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, \$173,050,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (b) (1), (2), (3), and (4) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (b) (5) and (6) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start any project under subsection 101 (b) (7) only if it is in accordance with the following:

(1) The maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be \$100,000; *Provided*, That the building cost limitation may be exceeded if the Commission determines that it is necessary in the interest of efficiency and economy.

(2) The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101 (b) (7) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. The Commission is authorized to perform construction design services for any Commission construction project whenever (1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

SEC. 104. When so specified in an appropriation Act, transfers of amounts between "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be made as provided in such appropriation Act.

SEC. 105. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR ACTS.—(a) Section 110 of Public Law 86-50, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end of the present text of subsection (f) of said section: "*And provided further*, That waiver of use charges by the Commission may not extend beyond ten years after initial criticality of the reactor."

(b) Section 101 of Public Law 89-32, as amended, is further amended by adding to subsection (b) (4) for project 66-4-a, sodium pump test facility, the words "for design and Phase I construction."

(c) Section 101 of Public Law 91-44 is

amended by striking from subsection (b) (1), project 70-1-c, waste encapsulation and storage facilities, Richland, Washington, the words "(AE only)" and further striking the figure "\$1,200,000" and substituting therefor the figure "\$10,750,000".

SEC. 106. LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM—FOURTH ROUND.—(a) The Commission is hereby authorized to enter into a cooperative arrangement with a reactor manufacturer and others for participation in the research and development, design, construction, and operation of a Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor powerplant, in accordance with the criteria heretofore submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and referred to in section 106 of Public Law 91-44, without regard to the provisions of section 169 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission is further authorized to continue to conduct the Project Definition Phase subsequent to the aforementioned cooperative arrangement. Appropriations totalling \$50,000,000 are hereby authorized for the aforementioned cooperative arrangement and for the Project Definition Phase authorized by section 106 of Public Law 91-44 and this section, said total amount to include the sum authorized by section 106 of Public Law 91-44. The Commission is also authorized hereby, without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to agree under said cooperative arrangement to provide assistance up to a total amount of \$50,000,000 less the sums available to the Commission and utilized for the Project Definition Phase contracts authorized pursuant to section 106 of Public Law 91-44 and this section; and, in addition to said total amount, in the Commission's discretion, to provide assistance up to a total amount of \$20,000,000 in the form of Commission-furnished services, facilities, or equipment otherwise available to or planned by the Commission under its civilian base program: *Provided*, That said ceiling amounts shall not be deemed to include assistance in the form of waiver-of-use charges during the term of the cooperative arrangement and the Commission may agree to provide such assistance without regard to the provisions of section 53 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, by waiving use charges in an amount not to exceed \$10,000,000.

(b) Before the Commission enters into any arrangement or amendment thereto under the authority of subsection (a) of this section, the basis for the arrangement or amendment thereto which the Commission proposes to execute (including the name of the proposed participating party or parties with whom the arrangement is to be made, a general description of the proposed powerplant, the estimated amount of cost to be incurred by the Commission and by the participating parties, and the general features of the proposed arrangement or amendment) shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment for more than three days): *Provided, however*, That the Joint Committee, after having received the basis for a proposed arrangement or amendment thereto, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of, or all or any portion of, such forty-five day period: *Provided further*, That such arrangement or amendment shall be entered into in accordance with the basis for the arrangement or amendment submitted as provided herein: *And provided further*, That no basis for arrangement need be re-submitted to the Joint Committee for the sole reason that the estimated amount of the cost to be incurred by the Commission exceeds the estimated cost previously submitted to the Joint Committee by no more than 15 per centum.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (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 California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolff: Page 8, after line 16, add the following new section:

SEC. 107. Transfer of Certain Functions Relating to Commercial Uses of Nuclear Power.—(a) All functions, powers, and duties of the Commission under chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, relating to the issuance and review of licenses for the transfer, receipt, manufacture, production, acquisition, possession, use, import, or export of utilization and production facilities, are transferred to and vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") to be exercised by him in accordance with subsection (b).

"(b) The functions, powers, and duties transferred by subsection (a) shall be exercised and carried out by the Secretary through the facilities and personnel of the Public Health Service, except that from and after the transfer (1) no license shall be issued with respect to a utilization facility if the Federal Power Commission determines (and notifies the Secretary) that such facility has not been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes or that the issuance of such license would otherwise be contrary to or inconsistent with the national power policies of the United States, and (2) no license shall be issued with respect to a utilization or production facility if the Secretary of the Interior determines (and notifies the Secretary) that the issuance of such license would be contrary to or inconsistent with the conservation of natural resources in the area involved or with the national conservation policies of the United States.

"(c) So much of the positions, personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of authorizations, allocations, and other funds of the Commission as were employed, held, used, or available for use in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred to the Secretary by subsection (a) shall be transferred to the Secretary along with such functions, powers, and duties.

"(d) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall prescribe such regulations (including regulations establishing the procedures to be followed by the agencies involved in carrying out subsection (b) and governing the transfers referred to in subsection (c)) as may be necessary to carry out this section."

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it H.R. 17405 to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1971. That authorization would fund \$2 billion for the total atomic energy program. Of this, \$437 million is to promote the civil use of nuclear power, and \$12.6 million is to regulate this application of atomic energy. For every dollar designated to promote the proliferation of huge nuclear powerplants throughout the country, only 3 cents is to be spent to assure the public of their safe design, construction, and operations.

According to the AEC's own figures, as of March 31, there were 17 operable nuclear powerplants—and, parenthetically, I note the AEC is careful to distinguish between the operable and operating plants, for the performance record of the Oyster Creek, and Nine Mile Point powerplants has been anything but reliable—there are 17 operable nuclear powerplants, 49 being built, 37 more on order, and 7 planned but not yet ordered. The total generating capacity for these 110 nuclear powerplants is 85 million kilowatts. Of this, all but 5 million kilowatts are in construction, planning, and anticipation. There is an enormous regulatory workload coming up, yet in the AEC's scale of values, it proposes to spend almost four times more on space nuclear propulsion than it will on regulation of nuclear power; almost nine times more on high energy physics, four times as much on chemistry and eight times as much for its own internal bureaucracy. For me, this is the latest of many factors that demonstrate it is time to remove the regulation of nuclear power from the Atomic Energy Commission. That is why I am proposing now an amendment to the AEC's authorization bill to correct the present incompatible combination of promotional and regulatory functions for civil nuclear power within the AEC.

According to the Nucleonics Week, the AEC's regulatory staff has been frozen at a ceiling of 504 for the 2 years that began last July and end in June of 1971. Since 1965 the regulatory staff has increased about 50 percent while the combined caseload of reactor licensing and compliance has increased by 600 percent.

Mr. Chairman, ever since Congress in 1954 revised the Atomic Energy Act with the intention of opening the doors to private development of this new source of energy, the AEC has been in an untenable position. And as the utilities rush toward nuclear power, the AEC is increasingly forced into the position of King Solomon. But our Government, as we all too well know, is not comprised of Solomons, as the young men who drafted our Constitution were well aware. The solution is to remove from the AEC the function of regulation and relieve it of the stress of setting in motion with one hand activities which must be curbed or even stopped by the other.

If the AEC is relieved of this regulatory function, who then should perform it? We are told that almost half of the Nation's electrical output is to be in nuclear powerplants just 10 years from now. Thus, the coming regulatory effort will be enormous both in sheer volume of work and in demands of the best judgment to protect the public against the immediate horrors of a major accidental release of radioactive materials, or the long delayed, insidious perils of prolonged exposure to routine releases from nuclear powerplants. Who should do this?

The amendment I am introducing would transfer the functions of regulating nuclear power from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There, at least, the regulators will have no vested interest in promoting nuclear power. There too we find the nucleus of

a capability which would, of course, be expanded by the concurrent transfer of staff and funds.

The amendment would also restrain the promotional efforts of the AEC in two ways. First, it would provide that no nuclear powerplant would be licensed by the DHEW if the Federal Power Commission determines that the facility has not been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes. Second, it would give the Secretary of the Interior a veto over the licensing of a nuclear powerplant that he determines would be contrary to or inconsistent with the conservation of natural resources at the proposed site or with the national conservation policies of the United States.

A few months ago one of our most responsible critics of nuclear power programs, Prof. Harold Green of the George Washington University National Law Center, observed that the "nuclear controversy" is here to stay. It will not be dissipated, he points out, through slick advertising and public relations campaigns or carefully staged congressional hearings. What is necessary to defuse the current controversy is that all parties recede from extremist positions. I propose that relieving the AEC of its regulatory responsibilities is a vital first step in this deescalation. Furthermore, by bringing regulation of atomic power within the public health philosophy, we can expect a drastically altered role of the regulatory staff. Its mission would then be to bring about full and candid disclosure of what the risks of the proposed facility are, what the applicant has done to minimize the risks, what risks remain despite these efforts, and how these balance against the anticipated benefits of the facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the next 5 to 10 years are literally vital to the future of the American nuclear power industry, to the future of the electricity industry, and to the future radiological health of the Nation. If we delay, if we pass by this opportunity to provide urgently needed further assurance that nuclear power in its applications will indeed be safe both for the long and short term, we and our children may indeed have cause to look back in pain and sorrow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York introduced an amendment which seeks to accomplish a very important change in the structure and function of the AEC. Therefore it is a matter of considerable importance—I might say of major importance—to the whole atomic energy program.

I am aware that the gentleman cosponsored a bill early in 1970 to accomplish approximately the same purpose. I want to say I respect the gentleman. He has talked of his concern to me a number of times on this matter. I have tried to give him what I thought was the best information I could on the subject matter. When the bill which he cosponsored came to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I immediately sent it to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Science and Technology, the Department of the In-

terior, the Department of Justice, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Power Commission for their comments. As of today we have not received a response from these agencies. I will say to the gentleman from New York that when I receive their comments I will transmit them to him, and if at that time the gentleman wishes to appear before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and testify on this matter, I am sure that that can be arranged.

However, I must, because of the great effect that this would have upon the Atomic Energy Act—and I believe it is more far reaching than the gentleman may realize—I must oppose the amendment and call for a "no" vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and urge its defeat.

Mr. Chairman, the regulatory group should be left in AEC because:

First. Coordination of regulatory and development reactor safety research requires continuing those functions within a single agency;

Second. Day-to-day technical liaison between regulatory and development personnel within a single agency, as can and is done under the present organization, should be continued;

Third. Through Atomic Safety and Licensing Board hearing procedures now in effect there is adequate impartial exercise of the regulatory responsibilities.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The idea that the AEC cannot develop and promote and at the same time regulate is fallacious. The very essence of developing and promoting atomic applications is to do so safely, with every regard for the public health and safety. And that is the purpose of the regulatory group. It is where it belongs and where it can function best.

If it were moved, it would still be somewhere in the Government, part of Uncle Sam's activity and such a move accomplishes exactly nothing.

Further, the U.S. Government is not a profitmaking enterprise. It is organized and exists to serve its citizens. That is exactly what the present organizational setup accomplishes. It should not be tampered with.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, 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. 17405) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 973, 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.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3818) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, an identical bill to the bill just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3818

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended:

(a) For "Operation expenses", \$2,013,307,000, not to exceed \$119,450,000 in operating costs for the High Energy Physics program category.

(b) For "Plant and capital equipment", including construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition; and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, a sum of dollars equal to the total of the following:

(1) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 71-1-a, contaminated storm water runoff control facilities, Savannah River, South Carolina, \$900,000.

Project 71-1-b, in-tank waste solidification systems, Richland, Washington, \$6,300,000.

Project 71-1-c, storage and waste transfer facilities, Richland, Washington, \$1,700,000.

Project 71-1-d, radioactive contamination control improvements, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$1,400,000.

Project 71-1-e, gaseous diffusion production support facilities, \$14,700,000.

Project 71-1-f, process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants, \$6,400,000.

(2) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 71-2-a, weapons production, development and test installations, \$10,000,000.

(3) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 71-3-a, modifications to reactors, \$2,000,000.

Project 71-3-b, research and development test plants, Project Rover, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, and Nevada Test Site, Nevada, \$1,000,000.

Project 71-3-c, modifications to ERB-II and related facilities, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$2,000,000.

(4) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 71-4-a, accelerator improvements, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$900,000.

Project 71-4-b, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, \$925,000.

Project 71-4-c, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California, \$825,000.

Project 71-4-d, accelerator improvements, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, California, \$950,000.

Project 71-4-e, accelerator improvements, medium and low energy physics, \$400,000.

(5) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 71-5-a, addition to physics building (human radiobiology facility), Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$2,000,000.

(6) TRAINING, EDUCATION AND INFORMATION.—

Project 71-6-a, National Nuclear Science Information Center (AE only), Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$600,000.

(7) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—\$42,000,000.

(8) CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.—Acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, \$173,050,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101(b) (1), (2), (3), and (4) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101(b) (5) and (6) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start any project under subsection 101(b) (7) only if it is in accordance with the following:

(1) The maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be \$100,000 provided that the building cost limitation may be exceeded if the Commission determines that it is necessary in the interest of efficiency and economy.

(2) The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(b) (7) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. The Commission is authorized to perform construction design services for any Commission construction project whenever (1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

SEC. 104. When so specified in an appropriation Act, transfers of amounts between "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be made as provided in such appropriation Act.

SEC. 105. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR ACTS.—(a) Section 110 of Public Law 86-50, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end of the present text of subsection (f) of said section: "And provided further, That waiver of use charges by the Commission may not extend beyond ten years after initial criticality of the reactor."

(b) Section 101 of Public Law 89-32, as amended, is further amended by adding to subsection (b) (4) for project 66-4-a, sodium pump test facility, the words "for design and Phase I construction."

(c) Section 101 of Public Law 91-44 is amended by striking from subsection (b) (1), project 70-1-c, waste encapsulation and storage facilities, Richland, Washington, the words "(AE only)" and further striking the figure "\$1,200,000" and substituting therefor the figure "\$10,750,000".

SEC. 106. LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM—FOURTH ROUND.—(a) The Commission is hereby authorized to enter into a cooperative arrangement with a reactor manufacturer and others for participation in the research and development, design, construction, and operation of a Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor powerplant, in accordance with the criteria heretofore submitted to the Joint Committee

on Atomic Energy and referred to in section 106 of Public Law 91-44, without regard to the provisions of section 169 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission is further authorized to continue to conduct the Project Definition Phase subsequent to the aforementioned cooperative arrangement. Appropriations totalling \$50,000,000 are hereby authorized for the aforementioned cooperative arrangement and for the Project Definition Phase authorized by section 106 of Public Law 91-44 and this section, said total amount to include the sum authorized by section 106 of Public Law 91-44. The Commission is also authorized hereby, without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to agree under said cooperative arrangement to provide assistance up to a total amount of \$50,000,000 less the sums available to the Commission and utilized for the Project Definition Phase contracts authorized pursuant to section 106 of Public Law 91-44 and this section; and, in addition to said total amount, in the Commission's discretion, to provide assistance up to a total amount of \$20,000,000 in the form of Commission-furnished services, facilities or equipment otherwise available to or planned by the Commission under its civilian base program: *Provided*, That said ceiling amounts shall not be deemed to include assistance in the form of waiver of use charges during the term of the cooperative arrangement and the Commission may agree to provide such assistance without regard to the provisions of section 53 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, by waiving use charges in an amount not to exceed \$10,000,000.

(b) Before the Commission enters into any arrangement or amendment thereto under the authority of subsection (a) of this section, the basis for the arrangement or amendment thereto which the Commission proposes to execute (including the name of the proposed participating party or parties with whom the arrangement is to be made, a general description of the proposed powerplant, the estimated amount of cost to be incurred by the Commission and by the participating parties, and the general features of the proposed arrangement or amendment) shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of adjournment for more than three days): *Provided, however*, That the Joint Committee, after having received the basis for a proposed arrangement or amendment thereto, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of, or all or any portion of, such forty-five day period: *Provided further*, That such arrangement or amendment shall be entered into in accordance with the basis for the arrangement or amendment submitted as provided herein: *And provided further*, That no basis for arrangement need be resubmitted to the Joint Committee for the sole reason that the estimated amount of the cost to be incurred by the Commission exceeds the estimated cost previously submitted to the Joint Committee by not more than 15 per centum.

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. 17405) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include ex-

traneous matter on H.R. 17405 and S. 3818, the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ARMSTRONG NASA AERONAUTICS HEAD

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report that NASA has selected Col. Neil A. Armstrong to head the aeronautics program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Colonel Armstrong is one of the most efficient aeronautical engineers in the United States. He will make a great contribution in this field.

I am incorporating as a part of my remarks the following release from NASA:

ARMSTRONG NASA AERONAUTICS HEAD

Neil A. Armstrong, the first man to set foot on the Moon and one of the nation's foremost engineering test pilots, has been named to head the aeronautics program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Armstrong, commander of the Apollo 11 lunar landing mission, becomes Deputy Associate Administrator for Aeronautics, Office of Advanced Research and Technology at NASA Headquarters, Washington, effective July 1.

He succeeds Charles W. Harper who is joining Dr. Wernher von Braun, NASA Deputy Associate Administrator, in carrying out the agency's planning effort for future United States space missions.

In his new position, Armstrong will be responsible for the coordination and management of overall NASA research and technology work related to aeronautics and cooperation and coordination between NASA, industry and other government agencies with respect to aeronautics.

NASA conducts a broad program in aeronautics including aerodynamics, loads and structures, propulsion, operational environment problems and flight dynamics. The program is directed toward all types of aircraft, both civilian and military in the areas of general aviation, vertical and short take-off and landing aircraft, subsonic aircraft, supersonic and hypersonic aircraft and other advanced aviation technologies.

NASA in the past few years has been devoting some \$75 million of its annual budget for aeronautics. The fiscal year 1971 budget request calls for \$87 million in aeronautics research.

Armstrong, a civilian astronaut, has more than 20 years experience as an engineer and pilot. He was a Naval aviator from 1949 to 1952 and flew 78 combat missions during the Korean action.

He joined NASA's Lewis Research Center in 1955 (then NACA Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory) and later transferred to the NASA High Speed Flight Station (now Flight Research Center) at Edwards, Calif., as an aeronautical research pilot for NACA and NASA. He was an X-15 project pilot and flew that aircraft to altitudes above 200,000 feet and at speeds approximately 4,000 miles per hour.

Other flight test work included piloting the X-1 rocket airplane, the F-100, F-101, F-102, F-104, F5D, B-47, the paraglider, and others. As pilot of the B-29 "drop" aircraft, he par-

ticipated in the launches of over 100 rocket airplane flights.

Armstrong's aircraft test pilot flights covered the areas of icing research and de-icer tests, gust research, varying leading-edge slat configurations, supersonic compressor stall, boundary layer determination, roll coupling alleviation using pitch damping, supersonic boundary layer transition and heat transfer research, minimum aircraft controllability, subsonic boundary layer noise research and catapult and arrested landings.

Armstrong became a NASA astronaut in September 1962 and he was command pilot for the Gemini 8 mission March 16, 1966. During that mission he was successful in achieving the first space docking of two vehicles.

Shortly after docking, a malfunctioning thruster caused the spacecraft to gyrate widely but exceptional piloting skill by Armstrong and his fellow crewman, Astronaut David R. Scott, overcame the problem and resulted in a successful recovery.

Armstrong and Astronaut Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., on July 20, 1969 accomplished man's first landing on the Moon. Armstrong, and then Aldrin, became the first men to walk on the Moon as they conducted a two-hour and 40-minute exploration of the lunar surface, deployed experiments and collected Moon material for return to Earth.

Armstrong has received many awards and honors including the Octave Chanute Award, the Collier Trophy, the Thomas White Trophy, the Presidential Medal for Freedom, the National Civil Service League Award, and the National Geographic Society's Hubbard Medal.

Armstrong was born Aug. 5, 1930 in Wapakoneta, Ohio. He attended local schools, received a bachelor of science degree in aeronautical engineering from Purdue University in 1955 and master of science in aerospace engineering from the University of Southern California in 1970. He is married to the former Janet Shearon of Evanston, Ill. The Armstrongs have two children.

COORDINATE AND FUND ANTIPOLLUTION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while my own interest in antipollution measures goes back a considerable period of time, every day new evidence is reaching me indicating that my many previous utterances calling for organized, massive war against pollution were well justified and timely.

The fears I expressed so often are actually coming to pass in more ways than many of us could possibly have anticipated some years ago, when we first started our fight on pollution.

Every day brings startling new evidence of more widespread, deeper, more dangerous pollution than even those of us who mounted the antipollution fight could ever have foreseen. New infected areas and victims are being uncovered daily.

As new developments unfold, day after day, it seems literally that the whole economy, flora, and waters, in most of their principal features are infested with foul pollution.

Our transportation media, streets, byways, highways, tracks, streams, waters, and oceans—every phase of it except possibly isolated and remote areas—are

becoming actually contaminated with dirty water, stench, rubbish, filth, litter, unsightliness, and wastes, noise, and esthetic chaos and discard.

It is not only a question of water, soil, and air that is polluted, but the ground we walk on is littered with dirty wastes, often with poison, pesticides, herbicides, and the screaming, earsplitting noises from many sources, the smoke and gas in the air. All add up to what may well be termed a ghastly situation, horrible to view and experience, dangerous to human and animal life and all living things, unsightly, stench ridden, and disgraceful.

The cars and aircraft we ride on are permeated with pollution, noxious gases, odors, disease-bearing molecules, atoms, and substances.

So many polluted materials are spreading on the waters, over the ground, in the air of our civilized world that as yet we can hardly identify and classify all of them, even though we know that many of them are filthy, odoriferous, and loaded with disease.

We ask ourselves: How can human life and animal life possibly continue to exist tolerably in such environments?

Is it any wonder that people everywhere are rising up in a loud cry of demand for the alleviation of such baneful conditions which are threatening humankind, animal life, and the order, scenic beauty and esthetic outlines of the places of our habitat, our waters, our green areas and the air we breathe?

Under these circumstances, it is surprising that we are not moving faster than we are to combat and eliminate these frightful conditions.

Congress has taken strong action. We have authorized antipollution measures, provided the funds to implement them, and the organization to plan and carry out counter measures against pollution of every kind.

But what good does it do for the Congress to take such action, and then see the moneys we have appropriated, not in all instances as generous as they should be, but nevertheless very substantial, cut back by massive meatax slashes by the executive department, and watch all the planning efforts that have been started bogging down in delay, talk, dialog, confrontations, and vocal multiplicity of local, State, county, regional, and National agencies talking, debating and haggling, while, in effect, to put it figuratively, "Rome is burning"?

To be sure, we need more money in this fight against pollution, but first we need some additional strong, vigorous leadership at the top in the Federal Government that will cleave through the mass of uncoordinated agencies and efforts, some of them working at cross purposes, that characterize antipollution programs, and focus administrative attention upon coordinating all these efforts under one central leadership, and moving all necessary programs, whatever and wherever they are, to start a vigorous attack, and take broad, effective, remedial action to banish pollution of all kinds from our Nation.

I think this kind of effort and organization can no longer be delayed. In fact, further delay in these matters is

intolerable. The country is screeching for action, and the Congress, and especially the executive department, must move to give action to the people, and boldly strike out to track down and eliminate every source and type of pollution currently contributing to turn our beautiful country into pools, puddles, and masses of obnoxious wastelands, where no civilized people could hardly hope to survive.

I urge that the administration speed up its administrative forces engaged in combating pollution, so as to organize into a coherent, coordinated, central agency, embracing regional, State, local, and Federal bodies that can combat the evils of pollution throughout the country. This effort should involve all kinds of pollution in our waters, on our streets and local communities, in the air—everywhere corrective or preventive measures may be needed.

Every day that we allow to pass without moving against these evils will be threatening human life, increasing the dangers of spread of disease in our country. It will also be causing widespread deterioration, spoilage and rot in many parts of the country, our local communities, and the environments in which people live and work.

Not only must the Government at every level be mobilized for this battle, but the entire country must be organized, and goaded into action to stand behind and support the massive efforts that will be necessary to attack and, hopefully, to banish these evils, and purge and cleanse our Nation from the widespread environmental filth that threatens us so gravely.

Let us insist upon total coordination of our national efforts against pollution, and let us make sure that the Congress provides all necessary funds to do the job. There is no time to lose.

TROUBLES GETTING TO SEE THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the morning newspapers that my good friend and colleague, Congressman BILL CLAY, has been having his troubles getting to see the President. It appears that his prophecy of 16 months ago is coming true.

It was on January 17, 1969, that Congressman CLAY and I, along with the other freshmen Democratic Members of the 91st Congress, were invited to the White House for a chat with former President Johnson. We were just preparing to walk in the door of the White House when Congressman CLAY stopped us.

He looked around for a few minutes, studying that famous House and getting a good look at the door through which famous persons have passed for years. He then made a statement that I have not forgotten and which, apparently, is coming true. He said:

I just want to get a good look at this place now because this is the last time I will be walking through this door for four years.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States is the world's largest producer of pork. In 1966 the United States produced 5,138,000 metric tons of fresh pork. The Soviet Union, the second-ranked nation, produced 1,992,000 metric tons.

AMERICA SHOULD NOT SURRENDER CROWN OF ST. STEPHEN

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a letter which I have today sent to the President:

MAY 19, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent news reports indicate that the diplomatic and commercial relations between the United States and Hungary are improving and it has come to my attention that the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, Hungary's national treasure and main symbol of constitutional government, may be surrendered by the United States in future negotiations. Allow me to impress upon you, Mr. President, that this should not be a negotiable item.

The Crown of St. Stephen is the symbolic source of all Hungarian laws and powers. It has become the symbol of Hungarian sovereignty, achieving particular significance since 1945 when the Crown was entrusted to the United States for safekeeping until Hungary would once again function as a constitutional government established by the Hungarian people through free choice.

Despite the current improvement in our relations with the leaders of the Hungarian government, the United States cannot violate her trust by surrendering this state symbol to the totalitarian regime of a Soviet satellite. The unresolved dispute over United States claims on American properties confiscated or nationalized by Hungary after World War II gives us ample legal justification for holding this Crown as security against those unpaid claims. I urge that we maintain a firm stance on this matter.

The hopes of the oppressed people of Hungary for a future of freedom and liberty and the hopes of their brothers and sisters, the American-Hungarians in this country, will be dashed forever if the United States breaks its sacred trust and relinquishes the Crown.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

BUDGET DEFICITS DUE TO ADMINISTRATION'S FAILING ECONOMIC POLICIES

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President's statement today on the budget verifies in a most distressing manner recent statements concerning the deteri-

orating state of the Nation's economy. Many in Congress have been pleading with the President to utilize the tools which Congress has provided to help bring down the excessive interest rates fostered by the economic policies of this administration; our pleas have been ignored.

The budget deficits both for 1970 and 1971 can be laid directly at the door of the White House where policies were formulated which brought on the excessive high interest, recession, and unemployment which are creating the deficits.

The shortfall of \$3 billion in tax revenues over earlier estimates for fiscal year 1970 is due to declining business brought on by the recession and inflation. Unprofitable businesses and men out of work do not pay taxes. For fiscal year 1971, the President's own report shows that there is an additional \$1 billion estimated tax revenue shortfall, an additional \$1 billion in interest costs due to the excessive interest rates, and another one-half billion more expected to be paid in unemployment insurance. All three factors—decreased tax revenue, more interest on the money borrowed by the Government and increased unemployment are directly attributable to the failing economic policies of this administration.

LEGISLATION REGULATING NATIONAL GUARD USE OF LIVE AMMUNITION ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced on behalf of myself and six other Members of the House of Representatives H.R. 17698, legislation prohibiting the use of live ammunition by National Guardsmen on college campuses unless a situation imperiling life exists.

U.S. Army guidelines and almost every respected military authority warns against confronting students with loaded weapons. Yet with the increased use of Guardsmen on college campuses has come an increased disregard for life. The result can only be more Kent and Jackson States, where the innocent onlooker is the victim.

We introduced this legislation because we see no excuse for National Guardsmen carrying live ammunition when so many nonlethal methods of controlling potential riot situations exist.

The bill prohibits the carrying of weapons with live ammunition by Guardsmen on college campuses except where a situation imperiling life exists, and a specific order to carry ammunition has been issued. In addition it prohibits the sending of any Guardsmen to a college campus who did not have a minimum level of riot control and live ammunition training. States failing to meet these procedures would lose Federal grant assistance to their Guard units.

Increased riot control training makes the Guardsman more sure of himself and less likely to react violently to unex-

pected or fatiguing situations. Neither of the guard units at Kent State University received anywhere near the average amount of such training of units throughout the country. One received only the minimum level recommended by the U.S. Army. The other did not even receive that much. Units elsewhere have three or four times the recommended minimum.

The recent National Guard performance on many college campuses appears symptomatic of the slipshod character of training in some States. When a Guardsman takes a test in some units, he is asked if he has studied for it. If he replies in the affirmative, he is passed. I believe supervisory officers should administer critical National Guard tests to eliminate such situations. A full scale investigation of the Guard's procedures should also be undertaken immediately leading toward a total overhauling of it.

Joining me in sponsoring this bipartisan legislation are Congressmen DANIEL E. BURTON, Republican, of New York; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; ROBERT E. LEGGETT, Democrat, of California; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii; and OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the bill:

H.R. 17698

A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to prescribe standards for training and control of National Guard units assigned to duty in connection with civil disturbances occurring on or adjacent to institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 5 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 508. Training and use of the National Guard for certain civil disturbances.

"(a) No enlisted member or officer of the National Guard may be assigned to duty in connection with any civil disturbance occurring within or adjacent to the boundaries of any public or private university, college, junior college, or other institution of higher education unless such enlisted member or officer has had at least 100 hours of training in the use of firearms and at least 56 hours of training in riot control.

"(b) No enlisted member or officer of the National Guard who is assigned to duty in connection with any civil disturbance described in subsection (a) of this section and who is armed with a firearm may load such firearm with live ammunition in connection with such duty until ordered to do so by the commanding officer and no such order may be given by the commanding officer unless the disturbance is of such severity that the lives of the members and officers are in imminent peril.

"(c) Notwithstanding section 108 of this title, if the Secretary of the Army finds that any violation of subsection (a) or (b) of this section has occurred, the National Guard of the State concerned is barred from receiving money or any other aid, benefit, or privilege authorized by law until such time as the Secretary determines that all units of the National Guard of such State have taken such actions as the Secretary deems appropriate and necessary to insure that such violations do not again occur."

(b) the analysis of such chapter 5 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
"508. Training and use of the National Guard for certain civil disturbances."

ANTHONY LEWIS AND THE WASHINGTON STAR COMMENT ON THE SST

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times columnist, Anthony Lewis, commented yesterday on the SST, calling it "utterly uneconomic" and "a civilian version of our society's tendency toward vainglory and official self-deception." That sums it up rather well.

In addition, the Washington Star noted yesterday in an editorial that there is already a \$76 million cost overrun on the SST and suggested that "before the first SST shatters its first silence the civilian planners may yet be contending for top honors in underestimation with the Pentagon."

I include both these comments in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1970]

VAINGLORY ON THE CIVILIAN SIDE (By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—The cause of the environment, for all its deep significance, has seemed something of a distraction in recent months. The moral disquiet of Americans about the Vietnam war was channeled into environmental protest—too often into rather empty, abstract gestures instead of the specific, difficult, controversial programs really required to reduce the destruction of our surroundings.

Any thought that vague environmental cheerleading could be a substitute for political action and protest against the war has been dispelled by Cambodia. It is hard for even the person most worried about clean air or water to keep his mind on that subject while Americans are widening the war in Southeast Asia and shooting each other at home.

But there is one issue related to the environment that now requires urgent public attention—the development of supersonic transport planes.

All along, the arguments for supersonic transports have been of a mystical kind—the urge to the ultimate, the irrepressible human desire for bigger and faster machines, the challenge of design.

Those are understandable motivations. When the first Concorde lifted its odd-shaped beak off the runway, there were doubtless feelings of pride among Englishmen and Frenchmen apart from the engineers and politicians who feel their prestige so directly engaged.

LIKE CLIPPER SHIPS

But the Concorde and the projected SST are a little like the American clipper ships of fond memory: beautiful in their way, adventurous—and utterly uneconomic. Most people forget that those lovely sailing ships were never competitive with tubbier competitors. And the clippers were a burden only on venture capital, not on the public purse, public health and public tranquility.

Professor R. E. Newell of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology estimates that 400 supersonic transport planes—a moderate projection of the sales targets of the Concorde and SST—would inject about 150,000 tons of water vapor into the stratosphere every day. That, he says, would increase the natural intake of water by a third.

The result could be to increase cloud cover, reflect more of the sun's heat away and reduce the earth's temperature. Members of President Nixon's Council on Environmental Quality have said that there might be "serious consequences on climate."

Then there is noise. So far attention has been focused on the sonic boom. Prince Charles reflected the concern of many Britons when he remarked the other day that the Concorde's worth would be questionable if it damaged ancient churches, as some fear it will on the forthcoming first supersonic flights over Scotland and England.

But engine noise may be a more painful and destructive fact of supersonic life than the boom. The chairman of the President's Council, Russell E. Train, has just testified that the planned SST would be "three to four times louder" than the present legal limits on aircraft engine noise. The Economist, the British weekly, speaks of "the noise of fifty jumbo jets at take-off."

MARGINAL BENEFITS

For a society willingly to undergo pain of that kind, one would assume that it expected in return an enormous increase in efficiency and convenience of air transportation. But in fact the supersonic planes, by the most optimistic accounts of their boosters, would provide only marginal benefits if any.

The actual cabins would be less spacious and comfortable. Assuming that SST's would be bearable at present urban airports and that ground time would not increase—doubtful assumptions—the trans-Atlantic traveler might save two hours. To do so he would have to pay a premium fare. Even then, the aircraft would probably not be economic to operate; airline executives are saying that they would have to be subsidized from other operations.

All airline passengers, then, would be paying for the doubtful time-saving of a handful of travelers in SST's. So would the public, of course; billions of dollars in development costs are being paid by the British, French and American Governments.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In the light of this grotesque imbalance of costs and benefits, why should governments press on with the adventure? The latest American answer is that otherwise airlines might buy supersonic planes elsewhere and injure the balance of payments. And the Nixon Administration put that argument forward. The Economist says, "largely because it could find no other sensible reason."

In short, the SST is a civilian version of our society's tendency toward vainglory and official self-deception. And here, as on the military side, it will take an aroused public to end the illusion and the waste.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 18, 1970]

OFF WE GO

The supersonic transport has already gone off into the wild red yonder with the first announcement of a cost overrun since the United States joined the international race for a bigger and better sonic boom.

As such things go these days, the amount involved is no great shakes—a mere \$76 million. But it's still early in the game, and before the first SST shatters its first silence the civilian planners may yet be contending for top honors in underestimation with the Pentagon.

It must be considered that military equipment, such as the much maligned C5A transport, may be a very handy thing to have around. It may even, someday, prove to be worth what we paid for it.

The billion dollar SST program, on the other hand, was conceived not because of a pressing need for jet passengers to roar along at mach 2.7, but because of a belief that America will lose face—and part of aircraft

market—if we stay too long out of the supersonic race. The Russians and the British-French combine have beaten us, of course. But just the knowledge that Uncle Sam is in the race, we are told, will preserve a part of our prestige. And the fact that when we do arrive we will be the fastest, the roomiest, and noisiest of all will, presumably, restore our image and our international balance of payments. Lots of luck.

It might have been pleasant, just for once, to let someone else make the costly mistakes so that the United States might profit by them instead of paying for them. But that, it seems, is too much to hope for. All that's left now is to watch the cost overruns rise like a one-way tide, and to hope for the best.

THE NEED FOR LAW AND ORDER AMONG THE BIG BANKS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been deeply concerned by the lawlessness that exists in the big banking community.

This disregard for law and order has been aided and abetted by the policeman on the corner—the bank regulatory agencies. My statements concerning this continued disregard for the law, have, in large part, fallen on deaf ears, both in the press and official Washington.

Last week, a courageous public official—J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors—stepped forth and told it like it is in the world of the big banking community. He pointed to numerous instances of the big banks' efforts to circumvent the law for their own particular desires and needs. He pointed out that the banks were in a poor position to talk about law and order in the society as a whole while they consistently made end runs around the law and banking regulations.

Even more startling—and this fact was missed in many reports of Governor Robertson's speech—is the fact that the bank supervisory agencies have, in many cases, actually been partners in the banks' end runs around the law. Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon used his office to issue administrative fiat designed to destroy the intent of banking laws passed by the Congress and gave the banks a free run throughout the economy. His successor, William Camp, has followed faithfully in his footsteps.

Governor Robertson points out that the bank regulatory agencies have declined to follow up Supreme Court decisions and thus have allowed the banks to continue unlawful activities. I quote this significant paragraph from Governor Robertson's speech:

Sticking as closely to my own field of endeavor as possible, let me say that I have seen no great rush by the federal bank regulatory agencies to comply with the law of the land, as expressed by the Supreme Court, in the first decision written by Warren Burger as Chief Justice, over five months ago. (*First National Bank in Plant City, Florida vs. Fred O. Dickenson et al.*, 396 U.S. 122). The actual decision in that case calls for reversals of administrative rulings with respect to whether depositories and pick-up services are branches, and its reasoning calls for a change in the rulings concerning loan production offices.

In addition, Governor Robertson calls attention to the big banks' efforts to circumvent the Federal Reserve's program to control inflation. Governor Robertson says:

One of the reasons we have had so much trouble bringing inflation under control during the past year and a half is because we have not had the willing cooperation of much of the banking system.

Governor Robertson, of course, referred to the importation of billions of "Euro-dollars" at a time when the Federal Reserve was tightening the money supply. He also refers to the banks' use of commercial paper as another end run device around the Federal Reserve's inflationary program.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of Congress and the public will remember Governor Robertson's speech the next time they see an ad by one of the big banks proclaiming their great desire to control inflation. Governor Robertson is one of the most knowledgeable men on banking in the entire United States and he says that it is the banking community itself that has blocked the efforts to bring it under control.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Robertson's criticism of the banks' lawlessness is summed up in this paragraph:

Cutting corners may not be a violation of law, but is it ethical to seek out ways of legally evading laws and regulations adopted to promote the public interest? To be sure, there are those who say that it is up to the authorities to devise perfect laws and regulations that will have the effect of making everything that is undesirable also illegal. But there is a higher standard. A man of character does not require laws that constrain him to do what is ethical or is in the best interests of the community. We rightly look down on those shady types who make their way in the world by skirting along the fringes of the law, observing the letter but ignoring the spirit. The best society is one in which men do what is right because they believe that it is right, not because a policeman is standing over them watching their every move.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of Governor Robertson's speech to the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, given at Phoenix, Ariz., and articles from the Washington Post and the American Banker concerning the speech:

THE TASK AHEAD

(Remarks of J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Boards of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and its Los Angeles branch and area bankers and businessmen, Phoenix, Ariz., May 14, 1970)

It is a great pleasure to be out here in sunny Phoenix. However, there is one difficulty that I encounter when I get out of Washington. I find that people are constantly asking me what is going to happen to the economy, apparently assuming that I know the answer. I do not consider myself to be a prophet, and I am not an expert at economic forecasting. The economists are becoming more and more adept at making projections, but I find that sometimes even they get so wrapped up in trends that they make mistakes similar to the one made by an old friend from my home town, Broken Bow, Nebraska.

She was taking her first airplane ride to Europe. Soon after leaving New York, the

plilot announced to the passengers that the number one engine had failed. "There is nothing to worry about," he said, "but we will be about an hour late getting into London." An hour later he came on the intercom again to announce that the number two engine had failed. "Don't be concerned," he said. "We have plenty of power in the remaining two engines, but we will now be two hours late into London." Shortly after, he came on again. "Ladies and gentlemen," he said, "I regret to announce that the number three engine has just failed. Please don't be concerned, but we will be delayed an additional hour in getting to London."

My friend turned to the man sitting next to her and said, "Sakes alive! I certainly hope that fourth engine doesn't fall or we will be up here all day."

Obviously it is not always safe to project a trend, and it is difficult to call a change in a trend in advance. I do not intend to project any economic trends today. However, I would like to say a few words about a different kind of trend that should be of concern to all of us. I refer to the trend away from strict adherence to the law. This is not as easily measured as economic data, but it can be observed. And I think that we can forecast with some assurance what its consequences will be if we do not reverse it.

One of the remarkable achievements of any civilization, including our own, is the establishment of the rule of law. This involves securing the consent of something like 99 percent of the population that they will abide by certain rules. I do not know exactly what the percentage is, but it has to be pretty close to unanimous consent for the system to work. If any substantial percentage of the population refuses to observe the agreed rules—the law—then the whole system breaks down. We do not have enough policemen and prisons to make the system work if a substantial portion of the population is determined to ignore or defy the law. This was what the British discovered in India when Mahatma Gandhi and his followers resorted to massive civil disobedience.

This is what we recently discovered in our own country when many of our postal employees flouted the law and went on strike. The postal strike was soon followed by another illegal strike, that of the air controllers. These strikes, because of the number of people involved and the number affected, dealt a serious blow to the notion that the law must be obeyed.

However, viewed in prospective, they are only the latest events in a trend of permissiveness and law-flouting that goes back several years. Those who have engaged in illegal strikes have justified and rationalized their actions by pointing to the others who have advanced their own interests by defying the law. Every act of defiance, every violation of law that goes unpunished serves to weaken one of the bedrock principles upon which our society is based—that the law must be obeyed. This produces a cumulative effect, which will in the end profoundly weaken and perhaps destroy the rule of law.

This should be of profound interest to all of us. No group, least of all those in the banking business, can sit back and view these trends with equanimity. I am sure that all of you are well aware of what happened to the Bank of America branch at Isla Vista, California. All of you have probably seen the statement attributed to one of the country's leading opponents of the rule of law, Rennie Davis, in which he said that the 1970's would be the years in which to burn the banks.

If we are to reverse this disastrous trend, we must individually raise our voices to demand that the laws of this country be respected and be enforced. They will not be respected if they are not enforced, and they cannot be properly enforced if they are not respected by the overwhelming majority of

the people. All of us, government officials, bankers, businessmen, labor leaders, and, in fact, all concerned citizens, must be scrupulously correct in observance of the law. We are going to be in a weak position to criticize others if we ourselves are guilty of stretching the law as if it were a rubber band, or of cutting legal corners.

Cutting corners may not be a violation of law, but is it ethical to seek out ways of legally evading laws and regulations adopted to promote the public interest? To be sure, there are those who say that it is up to the authorities to devise perfect laws and regulations that will have the effect of making everything that is undesirable also illegal. But there is a higher standard. A man of character does not require laws that constrain him to do what is ethical or is in the best interests of the community. We rightly look down on those shady types who make their way in the world by skirting along the fringes of the law, observing the letter but ignoring the spirit. The best society is one in which men do what is right because they believe that it is right, not because a policeman is standing over them watching their every move.

I cannot condemn too strongly those who burn banks or college buildings or who advocate illegal violence for any end. But I also shudder at the damage that is being done by those who ignore court rulings, or who interpret the law to suit their own notions of what it ought to say. One could cite examples from almost any walk of life today, but if I looked too far afield I might be charged justly with hypocrisy. So let me use tendencies observable in my own field—banking. But let it be clear that in so doing, there is no intent to leave the implication that banks and bank regulators are the only ones touched by the malady to which I am pointing a finger.

Sticking as closely to my own field of endeavor as possible, let me say that I have seen no great rush by the federal bank regulatory agencies to comply with the law of the land, as expressed by the Supreme Court, in the first decision written by Warren Burger as Chief Justice, over five months ago. (*First National Bank in Plant City, Florida vs. Fred O. Dickenson et al*, 396 U.S. 122) The actual decision in that case calls for reversals of administrative rulings with respect to whether depositories and pick-up services are branches, and its reasoning calls for a change in the rulings concerning loan production offices.

In the field of commercial banking one need look no further than the devices used by some bankers, in the last year or so, to enable their institutions to avoid the impact of the Federal Reserve's restrictive anti-inflationary monetary policies.

I do not think the banks want to have the Federal Reserve act as an omnipresent policeman, directing every move they make. The Federal Reserve, as a regulatory agency, strives to lay down guidelines for the banks that are generally recognized to be in the public interest. The System has been deliberately structured to insure that its decisions are made after taking into account a wide diversity of views. This is because we know that we must have the willing cooperation of the banks we regulate.

When that cooperation is not forthcoming, our system is in trouble. [One of the reasons we have had so much trouble bringing inflation under control during the past year and a half is because we have not had the willing cooperation of much of the banking system.] We sought to curb the volume of money and credit chasing after goods and services, driving prices upward at an excessive rate. Our efforts to reduce inflationary pressures by the imposition of monetary restraint were frustrated and delayed by the ingenuity of the banking system in finding ways to get around the restraints of

monetary policy and regulation. A large part of this ingenuity was exercised to raise funds with which to honor unwise "commitments to lend", which had been designed to enable big customers to avoid the impact of "tight money" and force others (like small business, housing, state and local governments, etc.) to take the brunt of it.

As you know, the Federal Reserve has endeavored for a year and a half to combat inflation by tightening the availability and cost of money and credit. Ever since December 1968, we have directed our open market operations to achieve this goal. In April 1969 we increased reserve requirements and boosted the discount rate. Throughout 1969 we maintained the existing ceilings on interest rates under Regulation Q (although we did adjust them upwards early in 1970). By those actions we hoped to achieve a substantial moderation in the expansion of business loans, with some slowdown in the growth of consumer credit as well. If this objective had been achieved and demand curtailed, much of the steam would have been taken out of the inflationary forces early in the struggle.

While some of the expected cutbacks in lending took place, the objective was not achieved because of the use by many banks of various devices to acquire additional loanable funds, free from the restraints imposed by reserve requirements and interest ceilings.

Initially these activities were helpful to the banks in cushioning their adjustments to deposit losses, caused by market interest rates rising well above the ceiling rates that they were permitted to pay on deposits. But as time went on and banks continued to increase their use of these other sources of funds, the devices became escape hatches rather than safety valves. They became massive leaks in our system of monetary restraint.

One result was that commercial bank lending was not effectively curbed in 1969. Business loans expanded at about the same rapid pace as in the latter part of 1968. If we adjust the statistics to take account of sales of business loans under repurchase agreements, the rate of increase of business loans made by weekly reporting banks actually rose in 1969. Monetary policy succeeded only in curbing business lending by the smaller banks. The big banks found ways to step up their lending while the Federal Reserve was trying to get them to exercise restraint.

We tried to plug up some of the loopholes. One big one was the banks' use of Eurodollars. The big banks doubled their Eurodollar liabilities in the first seven months of 1969. This led us to impose a reserve requirement of funds acquired through overseas branches, effective last October. This has helped discourage increased use of this source of funds.

Some banks also made heavy use of commercial paper, mainly that of their newly created one-bank holding companies, to obtain so-called nondeposit funds with which to make more loans. We have had under consideration for some time measures designed to plug this loophole, but they have not yet been applied. The loophole still exists, and commercial paper liabilities of the banks rose nearly 50 per cent in the first quarter of 1970.

There are those who have described the success the banks have had in finding ways to avoid the impact of tighter monetary policies as imaginative and healthy. They have certainly been imaginative. But I question whether they have been healthy.

It is true that these actions were not strictly illegal or contrary to existing regulations, but only because when the regulations were drafted, both the regulators and the banks knew that deposits were deposits, and no one thought they could become nondeposits when called by another name. However, the frantic search for ways to increase lending activity at a time when the whole nation, including the entire banking fratern-

ity, was alarmed at the inflationary pressures that were so apparent, did not reflect a high degree of intellectual consistency.

Is it really necessary and desirable that the Federal Reserve find itself in what one official has described as the "undignified position of chasing after commercial banks to plug up loopholes or throttle overworked safety valves?" I guess I am only saying what was said better by the president of the New York State Bankers Association, Mr. Patrick J. Clifford, about a year ago. He said: "Banks have a moral obligation to live up to the intent—even more than the letter—of the regulations designed to reduce inflationary pressures."

It is most unfortunate, for many reasons, that the drive to bring inflation under control has been so long delayed. Aside from the disastrous effects on those people least able to protect themselves, this lack of effective action contributes to the erosion of faith in government and respect for law. Those who are hard hit by inflationary price rises have a legitimate grievance against those of us who have, by our actions or inactions, let inflation get so far ahead of us.

I am convinced that we are now on the right track and that inflation will be curbed without a depression—despite the many doubters still in our midst. However, it is incumbent upon us to examine the experience of the last few years with great care, to determine what our mistakes have been and how they can be avoided in the future. We simply have to find better and quicker ways of achieving our objectives—full utilization of our human and material resources, with a reasonable degree of price stability.

Our dilemma is well known. We know that inflation can be checked if we put the brakes on economic expansion hard enough. This has been done in the past and it has been successful in bringing inflation under control, though admittedly at the cost of keeping the economy operating below capacity for too long. We have been searching for a better way of reconciling the conflicting demands of price stability and the maintenance of a high rate of utilization of our productive resources. Some despair of achieving this goal, but I do not. I think it is possible, but only if we can reach broader agreement on the rules of the game. All concerned, management and labor, bankers and business, consumers and government, must understand the agreed rules and then follow them—not try to find ways to evade them.

The government's responsibility is especially heavy, for others will not be inclined to collaborate willingly in a battle against inflation if they do not see government doing its part. Government must provide the leadership, and it must lead by itself adopting and adhering to proper policies. The people must be convinced that the government is serious when it says that it intends to bring inflation to an end. In short, we must have a credible anti-inflationary program and the willingness to bear whatever pain may be involved in making it effective. We cannot again permit the development of a credibility gap which leads businessmen to believe that government will not follow through on its program when the going gets rough.

Now we have in place a program that can do the job. It is causing some pain, evidenced by a profit squeeze, higher unemployment, lower stock prices, etc.; all of which I regret. However, the pain of the hangover is the fault of the binge, not the fault of the black coffee and tomato juice. If we wanted to avoid the pain, we could simply prolong the binge, but the results would in the end be something worse than a hangover.

Superficially, it would seem that quicker results could be obtained by adopting controls over wages and prices, but the consequences of that make me shudder. It would take an army of policemen to enforce the rules, and we would truly lose a large part of our precious freedom. Those who had in-

creased their wages and prices through the exercise of their economic muscle would be frozen into position and the more public-spirited members of society would be precluded from catching up.

We are right to press forward with an impersonal stabilization program, based on sound monetary and fiscal policies. But we must do our utmost (much more than we have done thus far) to bring about a broad understanding of the fact that this program will succeed, that evasive tactics are not praiseworthy, and that inflation will be halted. When, of course, depends upon how long it takes for businessmen, labor leaders, bankers, and others who make the decisions that are pushing wages and prices up, to understand that they, too, have an obligation to society to take a broad view of their own interests and the public's interest.

As I said before, we must have agreement that everyone will not only play by the rules, but will cooperate in achieving our common objective. This is easily said, but I have no illusions that it will be easy to achieve. We have had some experience with labor-management councils, and we have tried to obtain voluntary compliance with economic guideposts. These methods had some success for a time, but they could not withstand the pressure created by the failure of government itself to abide by the rules. Too much inflationary pressure from the budget washed out the guideposts and created tremendous problems for monetary policy. Fine tuning will help an automobile that is fundamentally sound run better; but a tune-up will not help if the transmission is bad.

I think that a large part of our problem has been in the transmission—the transmission of the basic ideas that must be understood if everyone involved in this joint effort is going to pull together and move in the same direction.

Ultimately, it is ideas that move the world. The political leaders, the consumers, the bankers, the businessmen and the labor leaders will cooperate only if they all share a common goal and agree on the best way to achieve it. This is not something that we can hope to accomplish overnight. It takes time for ideas to penetrate and produce results. John Maynard Keynes pointed this out when he wrote: "But soon or late, it is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil."

This being the case, we might reasonably conclude that our frustrations in dealing with inflation in recent years have been caused in large part by the ideas about inflation and economic policy that were popularized in past decades. If we want to ameliorate these problems in the future, we should give the highest priority now to the dissemination of the ideas that will help us combat inflation.

Put more specifically, people must understand that maintenance of the integrity of the dollar is of foremost importance. Without it we are in for trouble—trouble from which even our bright younger generation will not be able to extricate us. Consequently, one of the most important services we can perform now is to educate the public about the evils of inflation and the measures necessary to prevent it.

What do we tell them?

First, we must make it clear that our governmental and economic institutions exist to benefit the people, balancing as equitably as possible the diverse demands that must be satisfied in our pluralistic society. This is fundamental, because if a substantial number of people are hostile to our institutions, it will be difficult to get them to play the game by the rules, whether the game is combatting inflation or something else.

Second, I think we can agree that while our system is predicated upon individualism, we should teach people to take a broad view of self-interest. Maximization of profit or

maximization of wage increases may be self-defeating if the result is to add to inflation and create losses in real income for important segments of the population. People must understand that the proper functioning of the system is in their own best interests. They should be guided not only by immediate personal opportunities for gain, but by a broader understanding of what helps our economic system to function properly.

Third, we must teach in every possible way the elementary principles of economics that explain what inflation is, what its effects are, and how it can be avoided. It is not enough these days that this information be confined to the experts. Our policies are being influenced by popular opinion, which is only proper. But where popular opinion is swayed by information that is false, and theories that bear no relationship to reality, countries are in trouble. It is inevitable in such circumstances that economic messes are created, and such messes either have to be lived with or cleaned up by rulers who override public opinion. We do not want either result in our country.

I suggest, therefore, that we have an obligation not only to carry out forcefully, with no backsliding, the policies that are indicated at this juncture. We have an equal obligation to use our resources of talent to educate ourselves and the public concerning the facts about inflation, its causes, its effects, its dangers to people and to the nation, and how we must manage economic policy to keep our economy on an even keel. Our nation cannot escape from the consequences of failing to abide by the laws of economics, any more than it can escape from the consequences of a breakdown in respect for its legal laws. I have always been an optimist, and I still am. But I realize that today we have our work cut out for us if we are to halt and reverse the trends that spell grave trouble for our country. We must individually and collectively dedicate ourselves to the task of teaching by both example and precept that our nation can continue to be great only if its leaders and its people understand and observe both its legal laws and the laws of economics.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
May 15, 1970]

ROBERTSON CHASTIZES BIG BANKS

The nation's big banks are on weak ground deploring the current trend toward disregard for the law after their own frantic scramble to find ways to evade the effects of recent tight money policies, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board suggested yesterday.

Fed governor J. L. Robertson identified one reason for continued inflation in the U.S. as the absence of "the willing cooperation of much of the banking system."

While the Federal Reserve tried for a year and a half to fight inflation by tightening the availability and cost of money and credit, the banks searched for new ways to acquire loanable funds, Robertson continued.

Later, the agency "tried to plug up some of the loopholes" by curbing use of Eurodollars and considering regulation of commercial paper, he noted.

The result was that small banks curbed business lending while big banks found ways to step up theirs, he said.

Robertson conceded that the banks' actions were not strictly illegal or contrary to existing regulations, but he made clear his view that they violated the spirit of announced anti-inflation policy.

Pointing a finger closer to home, he noted there had been no rush by bank regulators to comply with a recent Supreme Court decision on bank branching.

"I cannot condemn too strongly those who burn banks or college buildings . . . But I also shudder at the damage that is being

done by those who ignore court rulings, or who interpret the law to suit their own notions of what it ought to say," Robertson said.

[From the American Banker, May 15, 1970]
ROBERTSON CHARGES BANKS INTERPRET LAW
FOR OWN PURPOSES
(By Robert Dowling)

WASHINGTON.—Bankers "are going to be in a weak position to criticize others" who burn their branches or disrupt mail service if they too are "guilty of stretching law as if it were a rubber band," J. L. Robertson, vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board warned Thursday.

In an unusually sharp and frank speech to directors of the San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank and guests at a meeting in Phoenix, the Fed governor said last year's performance by banks in evading the intent of monetary restraints is a prominent example of "those who interpret the law to suit their own notions of what it ought to say."

Specifically, he told the group that the rush by many banks last year to the Eurodollar and commercial paper markets in an attempt to frustrate the Fed's policy of monetary restraint and more recently the slow response of Federal bank regulatory agencies to write new rulings on branches and loan production offices as a result of the Plant City case, are examples of the "malady."

"To be sure, there are those who say that it is up to the authorities to devise perfect laws and regulations that will have the effect of making everything that is undesirable also illegal," he noted.

"But there is also a higher standard. A man of character does not require laws that constrain him to do what is ethical or what is in the best interests of the community.

"We rightly look down on those shady types who make their way in the world by skirting along the fringes of the law, observing the letter but ignoring the spirit." Yet, he concluded, "the best society is one in which men do what is right because they believe that it is right, and not because a policeman is standing over them watching every move."

In at least two major areas, last year, he noted, banks were guilty of frustrating the Fed's objectives by ignoring what they called the "spirit of the law."

The first, which ran uncontrolled during the first seven months of 1969, was the push by "big banks" into the Eurodollar market, which culminated with the Fed applying reserve requirements to Eurodollar holdings in July 1969.

The second, still uncontrolled, has been the industry's greatly increased use of commercial paper as a source for loanable funds. Noting that the "loophole still exists," the Fed member said it accounted for a 50% rise in commercial paper liabilities during the first quarter of this year.

Initially, he noted, the loopholes were viewed as "safety valves," helpful to banks in cushioning their adjustments to deposit losses." But as time went on, he noted, their continued use for securing loanable funds made them like "escape hatches," operating as "massive leaks in our system of monetary restraint."

LEADERS HAVE DUTY TO SPEAK OUT AGAINST VIOLENCE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, some Democrats have the happy facility of demanding from Republicans responsibilities they are not willing to accept for themselves.

In recent days we have heard cries about toning down the attack on those who burn books and schools, those who riot, and those who advocate violence.

Those attacks, we are told, are responsible for additional violence and for polarizing segments of our population.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I heard on Saturday, May 9th, the foul-mouthed chants against the President, the inflamed and inflaming rhetoric against the President, and I have heard not one protest from those same Democrats, some of whom were out there participating in the demonstration.

Sometimes it appears that those who warn us of further violence if we speak out against those who create it are, in fact, helping to incite that violence by condoning it and expecting it.

Two weeks ago Hubert Humphrey said:

We now face the unhappy prospect of increased tension, protest and, I'm afraid, even violence here at home.

You will notice Hubert did not decry violence, did not urge that it not take place, he just expected it. Fortunately, he did not get as much as he expected, but that was certainly not because of any words or deeds on his part.

Mr. Speaker, those who seek to be leaders of our Nation, it seems to me, have a duty to speak out against violence, against incitement to violence, and against wrongdoing, even from their supporters. Hubert Humphrey has failed miserably in this respect.

DISAGREEMENT WITH PRESIDENT'S POLICY IN INDOCHINA

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Members of this body have had many visits from college students and professors to inform them of their disagreement with President Nixon's policy in Indochina.

These people have been successful in giving the impression that the whole academic community is united in its opposition to President Nixon's policy. However, I would like to bring to this body's attention a statement issued by Prof. Charles A. Moser, of the George Washington University Sino-Soviet Institute regarding President Nixon's action. His statement shows that there is support within the academic community for President Nixon's policy. Dr. Moser's statement has been signed by 13 professors of Washington area colleges.

For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert Professor Moser's statement into the RECORD.

I am further inserting the statement of Dr. Franz Michael for the benefit of my colleagues.

The statements follow:

PROFESSORS IN AREA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SUPPORT NIXON SOUTHEAST ASIA POLICIES

(Statement by Charles A. Moser of the George Washington University, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1970, at a press conference in Washington, D.C.)

The members of this group of academic people from several institutions of higher

learning in the Washington area (most of whom have met today for the first time) represent various disciplines ranging from chemistry to Asian studies. Some have specialized knowledge of Southeast Asia; some have not. Some have visited Southeast Asia; some have not. Not all view the situation in Southeast Asia in the same way. But all agree that, given the situation in which President Nixon found himself in that part of the world, his decision to move against the long-protected sanctuaries in Cambodia—and at the same time relieve some of the pressure being exerted on the unprepared Cambodian army by the North Vietnamese invaders—was an extremely reasonable one, and deserves the support of reasonable men. Unfortunately, there has been a strong element of irrationality in the reaction to the Cambodian decision now sweeping American campuses. By our presence here today we affirm publicly our support for the President's move, which will almost certainly save the lives of many American and South Vietnamese troops. We also appeal for a more rational discussion of the issues in Southeast Asia within the academy than has generally taken place up to now.

Professors in Washington area colleges and universities expressing support for President Nixon's Southeast Asia policies at a press conference in Washington, D.C., May 12, 1970: Dick O'Keefe (George Mason College); Jose Buñil (George Mason College); Donald Devine (University of Maryland); Walter Jacobs (University of Maryland); Sister Rosemary Rogers (Catholic University).

Chester Earle (American University); Leonard F. Colwell (Montgomery College); Joseph Schiebel (Georgetown University); Charles A. Moser (George Washington University); Franz Michael (George Washington University); Vladimir Petrov (George Washington University); Theodore Perros (George Washington University); Richard Thornton (George Washington University).

(Statement of Dr. Franz Michael, Director-elect of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at the George Washington University)

Our policy in Asia was once defined by former President John F. Kennedy in his inauguration speech. In his ringing phrases Kennedy said, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to insure the survival and the success of liberty." And he added, "To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our words that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far greater iron tyranny." I regard this still today as the basis of our Far Eastern policy. The question is not so much the principle involved as its application.

Because of a lack of understanding of the kind of force we are up against, we have tried to handle the defense of our Asian allies through predominantly military means and to handle it ourselves. This is wrong for two reasons. First, the kind of communist warfare that we face in Viet Nam as well as elsewhere is not a war of traditional variety. Wars of national liberation, as initiated by Lenin right after the Bolshevik Revolution and as directed by Stalin in the first application in China, are not traditional wars between governments. These are wars of infiltration and terror, in which the use of regular combat units is only a part of the story. To fight such wars, we must understand the political tactics applied by the Communists and to find an answer.

Secondly, as in any traditional war, we tried to do everything ourselves and in the American way. The Vietnamization policy, if properly applied, is the answer to both these mistakes. We should have started along that line long ago, but in order to apply it now, we need time, time not only for Viet Nam but time for the other countries threatened: Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and India. Our action in Cambodia is a part of a protective strategy that will gain us this time and a safe transfer of the major burden of the battle to the people directly involved. The attack against the sanctuaries does not constitute an invasion. It is rather a part of the same battle and has always been so.

Should we surrender, thereby losing the battle, this will not be the end of it, but only the beginning. It would prove to the Communists the success of a strategy applied not only in Indo China but in the Arab world as well. In fact, the two moves of the Soviets and the Hanoi-Peking cooperation remind us of the time when the Nazis threatened the Suez Canal and the Japanese moved into Indo China. If we give up, we will not only lose the confidence of our allies, but will bring the danger much closer than many realize today.

There is, of course, the hope for negotiations, but as long as we appear divided and as the enemy counts on our caving in, he can hardly be expected to give up any part of his purpose.

What is at stake is not a small Asian country. It is truly the pluralist world in which we believe and on which our own national security rests.

WAKE UP, AMERICA

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the very talented columnist, Henry J. Taylor, in his syndicated article for release on May 18, 1970, invites our attention to campus disorders, with very disturbing implications.

It is suggested all concerned Americans read this article and digest the serious international pattern Mr. Taylor points out.

The article follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA (By Henry J. Taylor)

Are part of the campus disorders a Red plot? You be the judge. For a perilous feature of our day is that too many people are either too civilized, too inexperienced, too distracted or too dense to grasp the documented truth.

We are being brainwashed whenever we are told that the thrust here is not organized. The CIA and FBI both know that the center for it is in Prague, within the shadow of the Ruzyně Airport. There the immense so-called International Union of Students, financed and brain-trusted by Moscow, is supporting university anarchists here and throughout the free world.

The Kremlin departmentalizes this place into "country desks." Each section supervises a country. Cunningly, each tailors the "issues" for each country. Naturally, the IUS drums on the Vietnam issue here and "Peace! Peace! Peace!" to further a Red victory in Southeast Asia.

A Pole, Vlod Konarski, a man with a bite like a saber tooth tiger, supervises the British thrust. The IUS vehicle there is the militant Radical Student Alliance in London. Two subdivisions are supervised by Jean Bougareau, a Frenchman, and Martin Abeln, who is Dutch.

In Eire the IUS thrust, locally called the International Movement, is based at Trinity College, Dublin. The IUS supervisor is Hardial Sinh Bains, a naturalized Canadian born in India.

A Bains sidekick is Ralph Schoenman, 34, the student shepherd of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation—the man who concocted the mock trial of President Johnson in Stockholm in protest against Vietnam. Iron-fisted Schoenman served a "martyr" stretch in Montjoy Prison, Dublin. Britain banned Schoenman and Scotland Yard caught him. To the dismay of the CIA and FBI, Schoenman had an American passport.

In West Germany the Berlin police documented the IUS's control of Rudolf Dutschke ("Red Rudi") when Dutschke was arrested on April 11, 1968, during riots in nearly all the West German universities.

In France the IUS thrust is supervised by Daniel Cohn-Bendit ("Before you can build you must destroy"), who is not even a Frenchman. He's German. The success, typified by the March 3 Natarre campus mayhem which saw Dean Paul Ricouer kidnapped and 125 policemen injured, has all but paralyzed French education. University faculty members are brutalized and kidnapped almost daily.

The French Parliament has enacted a university reform law. In it the campuses are supposed to be autonomous. But by staging demonstrations identical with those here the continued attacks have forced Education Minister Oliver Quichard to open France's campuses to police jurisdiction by declaring university grounds to be public thoroughfares.

President Georges Pompidou himself has stated, in desperation, that "there is no security on many major campuses in France."

I had lunch in New York not long ago with Italian Foreign Minister Aldo Moro. Italy, too, has enacted a new university reform law. Mr. Moro, himself a professor, sponsored it. "But what can we do?" he asked. "In my country, as in France, your country and throughout the free world, the Reds' technique is always to up their demands with every concession they gain."

Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato spoke similarly on his visit here. He said that last year student arrests in campus disorders exceeded 14,000 (ours exceeded 3,600) and that the IUS thrust has reduced Japanese education to a shambles. The IUS vehicle there is the immense Zengakuren student organization along with five other factions.

In addition to its thrusts in Europe, Asia, Latin America and the United States the IUS now runs terrorist training centers for African students. The CIA has uncovered them in Budapest and Warsaw and in Leipzig, Bernau and Bautzen, East Germany. These have trained and sent back to their African homelands more than 1,000 student insurrectionists in the past six months. The IUS's anarchists are entrenched in the colleges all the way from Morocco on the Atlantic clear down to the border of the Union of South Africa.

There's no Alfred Hitchcock mystery in what is happening here, nor the brainwashing that accompanies it. Of course, none is so blind as one who will not see. But wake up, America! Our enemies are promoting a civil war in the United States. "It can't happen here" is a totally dangerous philosophy. It will happen if we still refuse to wake up and call a spade a spade.

DRAFT COUNSELING NOW PROVIDED IN NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1970, I proposed by letter to Col. Paul Akst, Director of the Selective Service in New York City that a program be undertaken in the high schools informing the students of exemptions and deferments available to them under existing regulations. Colonel Akst immediately responded and stated in his letter:

We are always anxious to speak, not only in high schools where you think there is a dearth of information concerning the draft, but also, to associations and colleges.

At the time that I wrote to Colonel Akst, I also wrote to the New York City Board of Education urging that it approve a proposal that was then before them to have full-time draft counselors in each of the city's 92 high schools. In responding to that letter, Joseph Monserrat, president of the board of education, replied on April 17 as follows:

This matter is still under discussion by the Board of Education and consequently it is not possible at this time to determine either the support for the proposal or even its exact nature. In my deliberations in this matter I will take your support into consideration. I recognize the needs both met and raised by this proposal. Even though the inequities in the Selective Service System are abundant, I am still not sure whether the New York City school system should become entangled in the much needed effort to resolve and eliminate those inequities.

Fortunately, for the students and the parents of those students attending the New York City high schools, the board of education has resolved the matter in favor of undertaking such a program. On May 17, it was announced by that board that a draft counseling program would be established in the New York City school system.

Far too many students in the high schools and colleges across this country are unaware of their few rights under the Selective Service Act. And indeed, much misinformation is too often given currency by the students themselves. I am pleased that the New York City Board of Education is now leading the way by providing expert draft advice to those who desperately need it. And, I hope that the colleges and the private schools in New York will undertake similar programs. I urge our colleagues to examine the possibilities of introducing similar programs into their districts.

I annex for the interest of our colleagues the following article in the New York Times which reports the new program:

CITY SCHOOLS WILL COUNSEL STUDENTS ON DRAFT OPTIONS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm)

The city's Acting Superintendent of Schools, Irving Anker, announced yesterday that he would establish soon a network of draft counselors to serve students in each of the 92 high schools. The counselors represent the first organized attempt by the city school system, the largest in the nation, to provide students with information and advice on the military draft and its legal alternatives.

The counselors would, for instance, advise a student how to apply for medical deferments or conscientious-objector status, as well as detail all the special enlistment programs available, such as Officer Candidate School and Reserve Officer Training Corps units.

COORDINATOR TO BE NAMED

Mr. Anker said the counselors probably would take up their new duties next fall and would be headed by a full-time coordinator, who will be named in a few weeks.

The Superintendent said the new guidance system was being organized now because of the "critical importance" of the draft for youth today and to provide draft information to the city's poor students who do not have access to professional assistance.

He spoke with newsmen after an appearance on WNBC-TV's "Direct Line" program.

At present, such draft counseling in the city's schools is unorganized and informal, Mr. Anker said, with individuals familiar with the draft system making themselves available to students. Until recent years military recruiters provided most of the information for students during infrequent visits to schools.

Much the same applied to local colleges, such as units of the City University, a spokesman there said yesterday.

Mr. Anker said that a few other cities, such as Philadelphia, were examining the possibility of draft counseling but that New York's would be the first organized on such a scale.

"The Selective Service Law provides a whole range of options to the young man," Mr. Anker said, "and we want to make sure that each student is informed about all of them—from enlistment to conscientious-objector status."

He said the counselors would provide information from sources ranging from the Selective Service and individual armed forces to pacifist organizations.

"The counselors will describe the draft and all alternatives to it," Mr. Anker said, "but they will not discuss acts outside the law."

He said he was referring to young men who leave the country to avoid being drafted.

"We hope the counselors will take the same approach as a good social-studies teacher, discussing all sides and not moralizing," the Superintendent added.

The counselors may have other guidance duties at their individual schools, he went on, but arrangements will be made so that existing guidance services are not reduced by the new demands.

The citywide coordinator can be from any field, Mr. Anker said, but he must not be "someone prejudiced in any direction," such as a recruiting officer or a member of an anti-war group.

The coordinator will provide the training for the individual counselors.

"The draft," the Superintendent added, "has only become a critical issue in recent years. It is of such critical importance now that I feel we need a more structured and organized program."

He said he had no estimate of what the new guidance opportunities would cost but that it was covered under existing budget allocations.

THE SUCCESS OF OUR CAMBODIAN ACTION

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is no lack of those who are trying to paint the blackest possible picture of President Nixon's courageous, timely, and well planned decision to move against the Communist sanctuaries of Southeast Asia. Much less has been mentioned about the apparent success of that action, yet the one man who knows all the facts has termed the operation, still in its early stages, an "enormous success."

I refer, of course, to the Commander in Chief, President Nixon.

Two recent news items have been brought to my attention that comment on both the success of the mission, and the courage involved in the decision to activate the mission. The first is from the Republican Congressional Committee's weekly "Newsletter," the second from the San Francisco Examiner. I offer both for the enlightenment of all.

The articles follow:

"AN ENORMOUS SUCCESS" IN CAMBODIA—NIXON

As some American troop withdrawals from Cambodia got under way last week, President Nixon characterized the operation to clean out Communist sanctuaries there as "an enormous success—far exceeding expectations."

In a special briefing for the AFL-CIO Executive Council, the President pointed out that the ammunition captured by allied forces operating in the sanctuary areas amounts to more than has been expended by the enemy in South Vietnam in the last five to six months.

At *Newsletter* press time, materiel seized or destroyed included:

7,274 individual weapons—enough to equip from 42 to 51 North Vietnamese battalions (400-600 men in a battalion).

1,012 crew-operated weapons.

2,390 tons of rice—enough to feed 105,160 men for a month.

22,256 rocket and mortar rounds—enough to conduct 4,000 attacks on allied bases at an average level of five to six rounds per raid.

8,375,925 rounds of small-arms ammunition.

1,200 land mines.

3,294 bunkers destroyed.

171 vehicles captured or destroyed.

In addition, some 5,097 of the enemy so far have been killed in the operation. The number of United States killed was described as "very, very low."

Summed up by House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford:

"I think the operation will wind up when the President said it would, by July 1, and that the President will achieve his goals. I think the operation will be successful; that it will pay the dividends the President expects and that it will pay extra dividends in shortening the war and hastening troop withdrawals."

Meanwhile, the 35-member Executive Council of the big labor federation overwhelmingly endorsed the President's Cambodian operation, with only 3 dissenting votes. Earlier, AFL-CIO President George Meany had commended the President for acting "with courage and conviction" and said he "should have the full support of the American people."

THE COURAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

(By Charles L. Gould)

President Nixon did not take the fighting to Cambodia.

The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese did.

In both worlds was hundreds of thousands of American troops fought across Europe.

They were not concerned with invisible national boundaries. They were concerned with meeting the enemy and destroying him.

In 1917 and again in 1941 our nation made open declarations of war. War-time rules were imposed at home. Dissent was stifled. Battle goals were established. And power at our command was used to achieve them.

Had we fought Hitler as we have fought Hanoi, our troops would still be mired down in the battlefields of Europe. Or—we would be saluting the swastika.

For six long years our men have fought in Vietnam under a weird, one sided code of Marquils of Queensbury rules.

Our men were not permitted to fight to achieve victory. Our fighting men and their allies were not permitted to pursue the enemy into North Vietnam. They were not permitted to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia.

Thus the enemy was given the right of initiative. He could pick the time and place and method of his attacks. He could strike and run.

Our men could lose but they could not win.

The danger of the fighting escalating into a worldwide conflagration was our alibi for not defining the enemy's defeat as our goal.

The danger that the war would erupt on a global scale was present the moment we committed our first fighting man to the conflict.

The same danger is implicit in each of the pacts we have with fifteen nations of Europe and with numerous other nations in Asia and the Middle East.

These pacts were established to protect weak friends and allies from the repeatedly declared aggressive aims of the Communists.

All should recognize that the danger of a third world war is ever-present. This danger was born the moment following World War II that the Communists again restated their goals of global domination.

If World War III comes it will come when the Communists believe the time is right.

They may believe the time is right if our country is so hopelessly divided that we—as a people—fail to support our President in supporting our fighting men as he did last night.

Let it be clear that President Nixon has not established victory as a goal in Vietnam. Months ago he mapped plans for honorably extricating our troops from the conflict and turning the defense of South Vietnam over to the forces of that nation. He has not changed those goals.

However, if the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were permitted to expand and perpetuate their sanctuary in Cambodia, President Nixon saw grave danger that his carefully planned timetable of de-escalation would be destroyed.

He saw a stepped-up threat to the safety of our fighting men. He saw the danger of expanded war through failure to act.

He acted with courage and statesmanship. He merits our support.

Reprinted from the San Francisco Examiner, Friday May 1, 1970.

SPEAKING OF MUZZLES

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the sophisticated, esoteric, intellectual aristocracy has been telling us that President Nixon should not have used the word "bums" to describe college students who are guilty of rioting, arson, and vandalism. We also have heard suggestions that Vice President AGNEW should be muzzled.

Let me say here and now, at the top of my voice and with all the eloquence that I can command, that I am adamantly opposed to censoring the Chief Executive and I am unalterably against efforts to gag the Presiding Officer of the other body. There are, however, some other individuals who ought to be turned off.

Jerry Rubin, in a recent address to over 1,500 students at Kent State University, said:

The first part of the Yippie program is kill your parents. I mean that quite seriously, because until you're prepared to kill your parents you're not really prepared to change the country, because our parents are our first oppressors."

Who is Jerry Rubin? He was recently convicted for inciting riots at the Democratic National Convention of 1968.

William Kunstler recently told an anti-war, anti-income-tax rally in New York:

You must resist and resistance means everything short of revolution—and if resistance doesn't work, revolt.

Who is William Kunstler? He is the attorney for the infamous "Chicago 7" and faces 4 years in jail for contempt of court.

In its issue of March 7, Human Events, a conservative weekly published here in the Nation's Capital, summarized Kunstler's activities:

The "Chicago 7" attorney has hit the road to raise funds for his clients and himself, addressing radical groups from coast to coast.

Four times in the past week, Kunstler has drawn blood. His clenched-fist salutes and his heated attacks on the hated "power structure" have preceded "street action" from New York to California.

Kunstler's first appearance, in Evanston, Illinois, was followed by rioting that left two injured and three others in jail. The barrister then flew to New York, where he denounced government "repression" in a speech to some 5,000 radicals in Bryant Park. Hundreds of youths then swept up Fifth and Sixth Avenues, smashing windows and pelting police with rocks.

Kunstler appeared also in Washington, D.C., where he addressed several thousand radicals on "the lessons of Chicago." He also said, "There isn't anything that's going to change anything in this country unless the people are in the streets." Violence followed quickly as young radicals, some carrying Viet Cong flags and chanting obscenities, poured into the streets. They hurled missiles at police and government buildings and tried repeatedly to rip down American flags.

Kunstler's greatest moment came in Santa Barbara, California, where he harangued a crowd of 3,000 gathered in the local football stadium. At the end of his "speech," where he advised his audience to fill the streets, some 600 youths marched on nearby Isla Vista.

Rocks and bottles were hurled at police. Fire-bombs smashed through windows of the local Bank of America as demonstrators screamed, "Burn, baby, burn!" and "Death to corporations!"

Firemen who rushed to the scene were driven back by the protestors' fury. Deputies in full riot gear were unable to control the rioters and the bank burned to the ground. "You can blame this entire affair on one man—Bill Kunstler," said a government agent who monitored the speech and watched the aftermath. "If this isn't a violation of the anti-riot statute, I don't know what is."

"Kunstler's actions seem to be in clear violation of the anti-riot act," Representative William C. Cramer said. "Although already sentenced to four years in jail for contempt of court in the 'Chicago 7' case, Kunstler has been allowed to remain free for the sole purpose of preparing his clients' appeals."

"Instead, he has used this time to make speeches around the country, protesting the jury's verdict. He has urged people to take to the streets and invariably disorder and arrests have followed."

The best way to turn off Rubin, Kunstler, and other revolutionaries is to in-

carcerate them in the penitentiary. In short, shut them up bodily and vocally.

Mr. Speaker, why should the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States be the subjects of insulting demands that they be gagged when criminals, subversives, and anarchists are permitted to travel from coast to coast and issue all sorts of invitations to violence?

DECENCY WEEK

(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, as proclaimed by this Congress, May 17 marked the beginning of Decency Week. There are few guidelines as to what should actually be observed during such a week. It is a truism that the observance must rest upon the individual's interpretation of the meaning of "decency."

All too often we rest content with such antiseptic definitions as "suitable" "modest," or "proper." I ask: Suitable for whom? Modest in what sense? Proper in what context? In the days that follow I propose to give my interpretation of the meaning that Decency Week might have for this Nation.

Freedom in America is based upon the premise that the rights of the individual must be carefully protected. Only when such rights are free from danger of infringement can man, as a rational being, fulfill his potential.

Yet there is one important qualification that is placed upon the exercise of such rights: we must insure that the individual in the exercise of such rights does not infringe upon the rights of another. If allowed to happen, we would have the opposite of freedom; we would have coercion and tyranny.

Violence represents the antithesis of the meaning of freedom in this country. Too often, the individual is left powerless in the wave of violence that may sweep over an area. The killings at Kent State and at Jackson College are cases in point. Because of these events, I believe that Decency Week is an appropriate time to reflect further upon this relationship, and to ask what is the "proper" course of action if our freedom is to continue unabated.

Polarization of a people into separate and mutually exclusive groups is a dangerous precedent if we seek to preserve a stable democracy. Usually the existence of such a deep polarization is a manifestation of a deep malcontent; the disappearance of tolerance by one individual for the beliefs of another. In an atmosphere of intolerance, too often violence will erupt and will be met by counterviolence.

Yet, it is not enough to say "no more violence," and to continue to send troops with loaded rifles onto college campuses.

It is not enough for the average citizen to say "no more violence," and retreat into apathy.

Each is an indecent reaction to the situation at hand. Each group is guilty of taking a position which says, "Do not do as I do, but do as I say."

I propose the Decency Week be the beginning of a period when people take

stock of their aims and the methods for achieving their aims. It should be time to hear from people who continue to support peaceful rather than violent alternatives to our problems.

Peaceful alternatives do not represent the absence of alternatives. Rather they are very real and usually the most powerful in bringing about a solution.

It is time to hear from such people on a permanent rather than on a sporadic basis. It is time to fill the vacuum that allows violence to grow and thrive. The ballot box remains the most powerful weapon in the hands of our citizenry. I propose that it be used to promote the end we seek—peace. Only then will Decency Week have some meaning.

A RADICALLY NEW DRUG PROGRAM

(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, a radically new program for the control of drug addiction and related crime is an absolute necessity. We are introducing such a program today. Our present inaction and patchwork remedies have thus far proven ineffective and, at times, dangerous. This program is designed to stop making criminals out of "sick people," and to remove the profit motive from the distribution of heroin. Instead, it seeks to encourage addicts to come to treatment centers where they can be helped. This program will reduce both drug addiction and crime. It will help society defend itself and at the same time enable society to help the helpless individuals who have turned to heroin.

The legislation we are introducing today is entitled "the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation, Research, and Maintenance Act of 1970," and is the first comprehensive program of its kind. It calls for the appropriation of \$200 million for the establishment of drug centers which would offer a broad range of services for the heroin addict.

I believe that the vast sums of money presently being wasted in fruitless and unworkable programs will more than defray the major costs of these projects.

The centers, under the direction of a trained physician, would provide everything from "cold turkey" or complete withdrawal from drugs, to free methadone or heroin if the doctor in charge deemed such drugs necessary for the health of the proven addict. At no time, would the addict be given the supply of drugs to take from the center. Instead, drugs would be administered by the physician only within the center.

Drastic action is necessary because heroin addiction continues to grow at an unparalleled rate. There is, at this time, no satisfactory medical, social, or legal program in operation. Each program deals unsuccessfully with only a small part of the total problem.

The program proposed is based on the idea that today any person who really wants to obtain heroin will be able to obtain it. Organized crime has a vested interest in increasing the number of addicts. Most of the crime in our cities is a

direct result of the policy of totally restricting the addict's access to heroin.

The choice we face today is whether we want an addict to get his heroin from the underworld, which is continually encouraging him in his addiction, or from a mental health agency or hospital that is encouraging him to break his habit.

In New York City alone, we have 100,000 addicts. The support of a habit costs at least \$50 per day. The addict must get his daily dose 7 days per week and 365 days per year. Statistics show that this is but one-half of the total addict population in the United States.

If 270,000 addicts must steal to support their habit, this costs the United States \$5 billion per year in crime. This money could be put to better use for the rehabilitation, treatment, and finally, the cure of addicts.

The proposed system is entirely unlike the so-called British system, where private physicians were able to give out supplies of heroin to anyone who said he was an addict. Under my program methadone and heroin would be available only at licensed centers, and the addict would not be given possession of the drug. Also, the addict would not necessarily be given a supply of the drug upon asking. The physician in charge would have to determine that there was a medically sound reason to give the addict the dosage.

If the addict is administered the drug, he would have to take part in a complete program of rehabilitation and treatment, which would include such things as therapy sessions, vocational training, and education. No comparable facilities are available in Great Britain.

To complement the first bill, I, along with my five colleagues, have introduced a House resolution to establish an international consortium within the United Nations to buy up the world's supply of heroin at its source. The consortium would be empowered to buy the poppy from farmers who are now growing it for profit in such countries as Turkey and Iran. They would be paid to grow food instead of opium.

The rising number of heroin addicts among our citizens, and especially among our youth, have demonstrated that the heroin supply must be stopped before it reaches our shores.

Otherwise, heroin will continue to elude even the most watchful customs official. For every pound of heroin that is captured, another hundred pounds is not. A multinational and preventive approach to the problem is mandatory.

These two pieces of legislation approach this serious social problem of drug addiction with a bold new program. We must try something new. All the present programs have not met the challenge. Addiction is destroying our society and threatens our No. 1 national resource—our youth. It is time for our youth to stop getting high on drugs and to begin to get high on life.

EVEN FLAG WAVING CANNOT GENERATE SUPPORT FOR CAMBODIAN INVASION

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, every political officeholder spends considerable time wondering how much of his mail on any given issue is spontaneous and how much is generated by organized groups. This is particularly true of the Cambodian invasion, which has produced an unprecedented flood of letters and telegrams into most of our offices.

The President says his mail favors the invasion by a large majority. I do not doubt his word, but I would like to insert in the RECORD a telegram which has recently been brought to my attention. This telegram, apparently sent by the president of the Retired Officers Association to all chapter presidents, urging that letters and telegrams supporting the invasion be sent to Congressmen, Senators, and the President.

I can report that in my district Admiral Smedberg's effort has produced the dullest of thuds. I have received only 20 letters and telegrams supporting the President's position, as against nearly 700 opposed to it.

I insert Admiral Smedberg's telegram in the RECORD at this point:

As the result of two small White House briefings which I attended as president of the Retired Officers Association prior to the President's report to the Nation last night, I have a strong conviction that his action was both militarily sound and urgently required. I hope you and your individual members will express support for our Commander-in-Chief by immediate telegram or letter, both to him and your Senators and Congressmen, on his difficult and courageous decision.

W. R. SMEDBERG III.

NIXON'S WAR

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Sacramento Bee points out that the Cambodian caper has made the Southeast Asian involvement into "Nixon's war." Let us hope he abandons all thought of escalating into the nations which border Vietnam, and that he proceeds to wind down the entire military involvement as quickly as possible.

I insert the editorial entitled "By His Cambodian Conspiracy, Nixon has Made the Vietnam War His Own," from the Sacramento Bee of May 1, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

BY HIS CAMBODIAN CONSPIRACY, NIXON HAS MADE THE VIETNAM WAR HIS OWN

It is now the Nixon war.

President Richard Nixon's decision, detailed last night in his television address to the nation, to invade Cambodia with firepower and American GI units, ends the time when the war in Asia could be called the Kennedy or the Johnson war.

For Nixon it may only be a gamble of political brinkmanship, and indeed it may render him a one-term president as he suspects it could; but for the nation, it commits us even further to a war the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower so carefully avoided and a war termed "unthinkable" and "suicidal" by the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The administration has put the United States back on the road of escalation, even as it seeks to mollify the American people with token troop withdrawals.

It has cast itself in a strange image as it assures the Communists in the peace negotiations in Paris it seeks no military victory yet widens the war.

It exposes the elements of growing military supremacy as it yields to the Pentagon's urgings and disregards Congress and the hopes of the American public for peace.

Obviously Nixon is reverting to his earlier hawkmanship. From the beginning the Pentagon has sung its delusory, siren song: "If our hands were only unshackled. If we could only bomb North Vietnam. If we could only get to the Viet Cong in their sanctuaries in Laos and Cambodia."

It was a fool's delusion. Every expansion of the war has spelled deeper alienation of the South Vietnamese people and greater loss of life, and victory has moved phantom-like even farther away into a mirage.

The United States is weakening its own democracy.

Not speeches but actions to end the war can restore the credibility of the Nixon administration. Congress and the American people must speak louder than the Pentagon.

MYTH OF STRICT CONSTRUCTIONISM

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have seen a great debate centered around the President's efforts to place a Justice on the Supreme Court who would be a "strict constructionist" of the Constitution.

With the overriding emphasis on the need for this judicial characteristic so much at issue, an in-depth analysis of the meaning of "strict constructionism" has been conspicuously absent from the debate.

A rare and timely analysis written by Mr. Leo Rennert appeared in the April 26 edition of the Sacramento Bee, and is inserted here for the benefit of my colleagues:

MARSHALL EXPLODED MYTH OF "STRICT CONSTRUCTION" (By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—In his determination to place "strict constructionists" on the US Supreme Court, President Richard Nixon is giving new currency to an old myth which was exploded more than 150 years ago by the greatest chief justice of them all—John Marshall.

In effect, Nixon would have the nation believe that the Constitution is a very precisely worded document which lends itself automatically to just one kind of interpretation by jurists who respect its every word.

If only "strict constructionists" were in control of the high tribunal, he suggests, the true intent of the Founding Fathers once again would blaze forth from every decision.

Although this notion undoubtedly has wide popular appeal, it is grounded in pure myth.

The Constitution is a brief document. It can be read in a matter of minutes. It is replete with general, almost vague, phrases which permit—may require—judges to furnish their own interpretations at any given period in history.

It is not a detailed architect's blueprint susceptible to only one meaning, rather, it is more akin to a sketchy road map with hazily defined directions and ambiguously worded landmarks. Each traveler must find his own way. And there are many ways.

This is exactly the view of the constitutionally Marshall took in 1819 in the landmark case of McCulloch vs. Maryland.

Three years earlier Congress had created a federal bank. In 1817, a branch was established in Baltimore. A year later, Maryland decided to slap a tax on Uncle Sam's operation. McCulloch, the cashier of the federal bank, ignored the state directive.

CONFRONTATION

It was a classic federal-state confrontation with the key issue: Did the Constitution give Congress the power to incorporate a bank?

Marshall acknowledged that nowhere in the Constitution is there a provision which gives the federal government specific authority to go into the banking business.

But he still ruled in favor of McCulloch and against Maryland. Why?

Because he held that the Constitution could not possibly detail every operation that the federal government could conduct. Because of its very brevity, he declared, it requires judges to render a "fair construction of the whole instrument."

If the Constitution contained a ready answer for every legal contest, he said, it "would partake of the prolixity of a legal code and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. It would, probably, never be understood by the public."

But this type of document, he emphasized, is not what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they kept the document short and furnished only some "great outlines" which judges later had to fill in.

"We must never forget," said Marshall, "that it is a constitution we are expounding." And he emphasized the word "constitution" to make the point that this basic blueprint could not possibly provide an "expressly and minutely described" solution to every legal question.

OTHER EVIDENCES

It is not necessary to accept Marshall's argument on blind faith to be convinced of its veracity.

Anyone willing to take the time to read the Constitution from beginning to end soon will see his point.

What is the exact meaning of Article I, Section 8, which gives Congress power to "provide for the . . . general welfare" and "regulate commerce . . . among the several states?"

Do these clauses contain immutable truths or are they not in effect a mandate for evolving interpretations according to the wisdom and needs of the times?

Or consider the Bill of Rights. Contrary to widespread misconceptions, it still is—and always has been—an integral part of the Constitution.

How does a "strict constructionist" tackle the meaning of the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against "unreasonable" searches and seizures.

Does anyone really believe that language drafted in the late 18th century can provide a single, clear clue to cases involving electronic eavesdropping and other invasions of privacy brought about by sophisticated 20th century inventions?

And what about the Fifth Amendment's guarantee that government cannot take life, liberty or property "without due process of law"?

Would Nixon argue as a lawyer (or even as President) that "due process" is a simple legal equation which any jurist with a strict slide-rule mentality always would interpret in the same way?

Or take the Sixth Amendment's right to a "speedy and public" trial. There again are words which can lead fair-minded men—and judges—to varying conclusions.

Actually, the President might do well to ask Atty. Gen. John Mitchell to re-read the Bill of Rights. For if he did, he might think twice about the advisability of packing the court with "strict constructionists."

After all, the framers of the Bill of Rights only recently had participated in a bloody revolution. They intended the first 10

amendments to the Constitution to be an eternal bulwark to protect personal liberties against the encroachment of central authority.

Any "strict" interpretation of the Constitution easily could lead Nixon's appointees to invalidate "no-knock" arrests, preventive detention, extensive snooping and other assaults on personal freedoms so dear to the heart of his attorney general.

Still, there is no denying that whenever the Supreme Court strikes out in new directions or reverses prior decisions, there is a widespread popular assumption that "strict constructionism" would not permit such action. The myth is alive and doing well. The President obviously thinks so.

But again, a careful reading of the Constitution would indicate that "strict" interpretation of its provisions not only permits—but actually requires—departure from precedent.

Capital punishment is a case in point. Quite aside from the merits, it can be argued with great legal plausibility that the court in the near future actually may find it necessary as a matter of "strict" constitutional interpretation to outlaw executions.

A startling idea? Not at all. Just open your copy of the Constitution and turn to the Eighth Amendment. Notice that it prohibits "cruel and unusual" punishments.

Now, there can be no argument that the death penalty was not considered "cruel" or "unusual" in the 18th and 19th centuries. Or for that matter in a good part of the 20th century.

But in recent years, there certainly has been rising public acceptance of the notion that it is "cruel." More importantly, executions have become not merely "unusual" but virtually nonexistent for long stretches of time.

What is a "strict constructionist" to do with the Eighth Amendment and capital punishment? Is it really far-fetched to assume that the court some day may feel compelled to hold the death penalty unconstitutional if it finds that it has become sufficiently "cruel" and sufficiently "unusual"?

Suppose you were on the court. How would you rule with only these two words, "cruel" and "unusual," to guide you?

If you find it difficult to offer a snap answer, you're in good company. Judge Harry A. Blackmun, the President's latest nominee for the Supreme Court, has expressed growing doubts about the constitutionality of capital punishment—precisely because of the wording of the Eighth Amendment.

Although he now is a White House certified "strict constructionist," Blackmun said just a few days ago: "I guess I would say it wouldn't surprise me if one day the Supreme Court would say today in 1970 or 1980 that it (the death penalty) is cruel and inhuman."

TRIAL AND ERROR

Justice Brandeis—often mentioned by Nixon as one of the greats—once remarked:

"The court bows to the lessons of experience and the force of better reasoning, recognizing that the process of trial and error, so fruitful in the physical sciences, is appropriate also in the judicial function."

The point made by Marshall and Brandeis also was echoed by Earl Warren when he retired as chief justice. Warren, of course, has been the No. 1 target of the "strict constructionists" in modern times—just as Marshall was in his day.

Echoing McCulloch vs. Maryland, Warren said the high tribunal has no choice but to interpret the "broad language" of the Constitution.

But he also offered the executive and legislative branches a simple prescription to restrain the activism of the court: Do not dump the nation's most pressing problems in the laps of judges. Take action, get involved, pass laws—and the court will not have to step into the vacuum.

"There was a long time, from the 1870s until 15 years or so ago that Congress passed no laws affecting the civil liberties of the people," Warren remarks. "Because there were no laws passed during that time and because problems involving civil rights were developing, the only refuge people had was in the courts, and the only law that the court could apply was the broad principles of the Constitution and we were very much alone at that time."

Happily, Warren said, as Congress moved into the civil rights field, it could devise far more detailed and appropriate remedies through statutes than the court could with the "broad" language of the Constitution.

The Nixon administration might do well to ponder Warren's words at a time when it is again moving toward a policy of "benign neglect" toward some of the nation's most vexing problems.

To the extent that the executive and legislative branches again may default on their responsibilities, the Supreme Court once more will be besieged by aggrieved groups and once more may have to decide issues better left to other branches of the government.

If that time should come, it would not do for the administration to feign surprise and shock. The judiciary cannot be expected to show restraint if the other two branches follow a do-nothing course.

In the meantime, if Nixon still feels irritation toward a court which stubbornly insists on going its own way, he might console himself with the words of another president who wrote to a friend that his political opponents "have retired into the judiciary as a stronghold—and from that battery all the works of republicanism are to be beaten down and erased."

That complaint was voiced in 1801 by Thomas Jefferson.

CRITICS WANT NO INDOCHINA SUCCESS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include editorial material.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible and yet true that some Americans apparently do not want the United States and South Vietnamese sweep of the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia to be a success. I personally believe that the Cambodian operation is proving enormously successful. I believe it means that we will be able to withdraw more than 150,000 U.S. troops from Vietnam over the next 12 months.

Yet some of President Nixon's critics do not want the United States to succeed in Indochina and they refuse to believe that the Cambodian operation can be successful. They shut their eyes and their ears to any word of success because they want the United States to withdraw precipitously from Vietnam.

The point that these critics, in effect, want the United States to fall on its face in Indochina is clearly made by Columnist Richard Wilson in the May 18 edition of the Evening Star. I invite my colleagues to read Mr. Wilson's comments. The article follows:

EMOTIONAL CRITICS WANT NO INDOCHINA SUCCESS

(By Richard Wilson)

The positive view in the Nixon administration is that the worst will be over by August and the polluted atmosphere will clear away to let in a little sunshine.

U.S. troops will be out of Cambodia, the economy will strengthen, the explosive tension on college campuses will have eased off, and it will be seen that the steady, protected retreat from Vietnam is proceeding on schedule.

There is real reason to surmise, however, that these idealized conditions may not be realized. They could be complicated by another hot summer in racial relations. The confrontation in the Middle East grows increasingly ominous. There appears to be another hard freeze developing in relationships with the Soviet Union.

Elements of continuing bitter controversy over Cambodia are forecast by the evident intention of the South Vietnamese forces to remain in Cambodia for a long time. If they do, they will want, need and no doubt demand American logistical and air support which the Senate is now trying to forestall in its limitations on the President's use of military funds.

It would be incredible folly, from the military point of view, to relinquish favorable positions in Cambodia following the pull-back of American troops.

Once these sanctuary areas have been made reasonably secure the kind of war the Communist side has conducted in the past could not continue and the South Vietnamese are fully justified in demanding that they remain there as long as they can, or until they can be as certain as possible that Cambodian forces can prevent Communist re-occupation.

This is in the American interest, also, so that the withdrawal can continue with the minimum of external threat.

Why the Senate and the raging, rioting college students cannot see this illustrates how emotion is blinding reason. Why they cannot see that Nixon is facilitating the orderly American retreat from Vietnam shows, too, how cultivated fear and distrust can befuddle the minds of those who wish to believe Nixon is playing some kind of a trick to prolong the war.

But from that point of view nothing fails like success. With the Cambodian operation Nixon is farther along toward a withdrawal that will leave behind an independent government in Vietnam than would have been thought possible a few months ago.

The very success of the operation so far is cause for complaint. He shouldn't have done it, the argument goes, because the war would be widened.

But it is not being widened for the simple and valid reason that clearing out the Cambodian sanctuaries reduces the ability of the Communist side to conduct the war, at least for the next 6 to 12 months while 150,000 American troops are coming home.

Nixon is also being criticized because it now becomes apparent that he seized an opportunity to help create the conditions he thinks must prevail in Indochina when all combat troops are gone. Why not? What is so sacred about enemy troops operating out of Cambodia against the desires of the Cambodian government?

It has been pointed out that this would be like denouncing the British for invading German-held Holland in World War II operations at Arnhem. Cambodia's neutrality was violated no less by the North Vietnamese than was Holland's neutrality by the Germans.

The difference, of course, is that the critics of Nixon in the Senate and on the inflamed college campuses want no success at all in Indochina.

They want defeat and admission of wrong. They want atonement and apology—apology for justifiable exercise power to bring political stability to Southeast Asia, apology for helping little countries avoid external domination, apology for as unselfish a national sacrifice as any nation ever made.

It is this atmosphere which will continue to prevail into that hopeful August the Nixon administration prays for.

Even if the economy picks up, even if there is no intensification of the war in the Middle East, even if we should move more rapidly toward nuclear arms agreement with the Russians, the recriminations will remain to embitter the national atmosphere.

Success on Nixon's part will be greeted with the reproach that he has not gotten all troops out of Vietnam and has not let the Thieu-Ky government go down the drain. There is no winning that argument with his opponents. Nor will they, it appears, win their argument with him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. FALLON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and until further notice, on account of illness.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. ALBERT, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to extend his remarks prior to the passage of the bills called up by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MILLS to extend his remarks on bills called up by him.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. RAILSBACK.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. LANGEN.
Mr. FOREMAN in four instances.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. GOLDWATER.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. BERRY in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. SCHERLE.
 Mr. Bow in three instances.
 Mr. REID of New York.
 Mr. STANTON.
 Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
 Mr. McDADE.
 Mr. BRAY in three instances.
 Mr. DELLENBACK in two instances.
 Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
 Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
 Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.
 Mr. HALPERN in five instances.
 Mr. MINSHALL in three instances.
 Mr. RHODES in five instances.
 Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.
 Mr. MORTON.
 Mr. PELLY.

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

Mr. POWELL.
 Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.
 Mr. BOLLING in two instances.
 Mr. HARRINGTON.
 Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
 Mr. GIAMO in 10 instances.
 Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. RYAN in three instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California in five instances.
 Mr. ALBERT.
 Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
 Mr. MEEDS.
 Mr. FRIEDEL in three instances.
 Mrs. CHISHOLM.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
 Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.
 Mr. MANN in five instances.
 Mr. FISHER in four instances.
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.
 Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in three instances.
 Mr. MAHON in two instances.
 Mrs. MINK in two instances.
 Mr. PATMAN.
 Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.
 Mr. STEPHENS in four instances.
 Mr. YATES.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 940. An act to prohibit the licensing of hydroelectric projects on the Middle Snake River below Hells Canyon Dam for a period of 8 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3479. An act to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing

for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 18, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 780. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 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:

2066. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase below-zone selection authorization of commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2067. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an explanation of the provisions of legislation to be proposed providing for an environmental control tax on the lead content of additives used in motor fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2068. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, fiscal year 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-338); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

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. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 17070. A bill to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4605. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the U.S. mails articles for preventing conception, and advertisements with respect to such articles; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1105). Re-

ferred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1029. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15424, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (Rept. No. 91-1106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1030. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 17604, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1107). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12960. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Southern Pacific Co., with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15012, a bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 16418, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the broadcasting of pay television programs; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 17692. A bill to permit a retired Federal employee to designate a spouse of a remarriage as the recipient of a survivor annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 17693. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 17694. A bill to provide for the regulation of the practice of dentistry, including the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of dentists and dental hygienists, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 17695. A bill to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17696. A bill to amend sections 2734a (a) and 2734b(a) of title 10, United States Code, to provide for settlement, under international agreements, of certain claims incident to the noncombat activities of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. AD-DABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr.

PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 17697. A bill to amend the act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting certain shore areas in order to authorize increased Federal participation in the cost of projects providing hurricane protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 17698. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to prescribe standards for training and control of National Guard units assigned to duty in connection with civil disturbances occurring on or adjacent to institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 17699. A bill to improve law enforcement in urban areas by making available funds to improve the effectiveness of police services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 17700. A bill to amend the act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting certain shore areas in order to authorize increased Federal participation in the cost of projects providing hurricane protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 17701. A bill to safeguard the consumer by prohibiting the unsolicited distribution of credit cards and limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17702. A bill to amend section 242(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require special deportation proceedings in connection with the voluntary departure from the United States of any alien who is a native of a country contiguous to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17703. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 17704. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans and certain of their dependents; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DENNEY, and Mr. SCHADEBERG):

H.R. 17705. 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. DENNEY:

H.R. 17706. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23, United States Code, to increase to 75 percent the Federal share of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado):

H.J. Res. 1237. Joint resolution to authorize the establishment of a Joint Committee on Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the National Commission on Consumer Finance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Con. Res. 622. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that no further troop withdrawals should take place until an agreement has been reached by the United States with representatives of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong regarding the release of all American prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 623. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to the establishment of a United Nations international supervisory force for the purpose of establishing a cease-fire in Indochina to aid efforts toward a political solution of current hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 624. Concurrent resolution expressing the need of small and medium sized cities for service by certificated air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOW, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H. Con. Res. 625. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and other college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. OLSEN, and Mr. OTTINGER):

H. Con. Res. 626. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and other college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 627. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and other college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 628. Concurrent resolution

encouraging a United Nations peace initiative in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. SISK, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. QUILLLEN):

H. Res. 1031. Resolution amending clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect of lobbying practices and political campaign contributions affecting the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Res. 1032. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the care of the aged in the United States and the effects of Federal laws and programs on the availability and quality of care; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H. Res. 1033. Resolution: International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. PEPPER):

H. Res. 1034. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jilma Venegas de Westbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 1035. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Loyola University of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H. Res. 1036. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Loyola University of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H. Res. 1037. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Loyola University of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

388. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the antiballistic missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

389. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the establishment of a labor-management program covering agricultural employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

487. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, East Orange, N.J., relative to Cambodia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.