

rective surgery. Today Jose can ride a bike, has his own paper route and is doing well in school.

Over the years Tony has arranged corrective surgery for crippled children, eye operations for blind or cross-eyed children and plastic surgery for deformed children. One of his current charges is a child who suffered a skull fracture, leaving him deaf and dumb.

In addition, Tony must arrange for the necessary transportation, food, clothing and schooling for the children in his care—sometimes as many as four at a time.

HELPING HANDS

"I couldn't do it without help," says Tony. Friends and fellow workers keep him supplied with food, clothes and donations for the children, and major groups such as the East Los Angeles Kiwanis, Catholic Welfare and the North Hollywood Congregational

Church have also made financial contributions. The needy keep him supplied with letters asking for help.

He works with private hospitals such as Shriner's, Los Angeles Orthopaedic, Queen of Angels and White Memorial, who provide as much free medical care as possible. But expenses are still incurred, so bake sales, art shows, and white elephant sales are common activities for Tony.

Those wishing to help can mail contributions to the Community Service Organization for the Tony Hart Project, 714 California Ave., Venice.

Besides his work with the children themselves, Tony helped to raise funds needed to build a school in Sopolote, a community near Rosario, Mexico. The school is now completed, and funds are being raised to purchase enough livestock for a class in Animal Husbandry.

A documentary program, "And Who Is My Brother—The Tony Hart Story," was produced by NBC Television and shown on March 14. It will be televised again in June on Channel 4.

Tony was named "Man of the Year" by the Jewish War Veterans of the Los Angeles area and was also awarded a plaque for his work by Radio Station KABC.

His story has been told in many local newspapers and in the December issue of *Pace* magazine.

But the real story of Tony Hart is told in the shining eyes of a crippled child as he takes his first step, or in the tears of joy in a mother's eyes as her son walks into her arms.

Tony Hart may never become rich and famous, but he is already a true success—just ask the children who will never forget him.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 22, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Lead me in Thy truth and teach me:
for Thou art the God of my salvation;
on Thee do I wait all the day.—Psalm
25:5.*

O God and Father of all men, who changest not in a world of change, who art forever loving, forever forgiving, and forever patient, amid the tumult of these troubled times we would enter the peace of Thy presence, receive the strength of Thy spirit, and go forth to labor with Thee in making this planet a better place in which men can live together.

Help us to build on earth a rule of peace and good will, a reign of human rights where there shall be no hunger, no discrimination, no lack of education, and a realm where man can grow not only in body, but even more in mind and, best of all, in spirit.

"Set our feet on lofty places:

Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to set men free,
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 18, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 17241. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 14720. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspen-

CXVI—1300—Part 15

sion of duties on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products; and

H.R. 16739. An act to extend for a period of 10 years the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the compilation and printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress (1774-1970).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3691. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to lower the mandatory retirement age for Foreign Service officers who are career ministers; and

S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971.

A SWEET TAX BREAK

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend it was reported that 60,000 cases of cyclamate-sweetened diet drink, donated by the Carnation Co., are being shipped to Laos as a gift.

It is absolutely absurd to send a low-calorie diet food or beverage to a starving people. It is ridiculous for the American taxpayer to pay through AID the cost of shipping 60,000 cases of a product which is banned for use in America.

This program is as insulting to the people of Laos as it is to the people of America. It is a gift of something which should be thrown away. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I fear that this gift is designed to provide a gift-tax deduction for the producer of a product declared to be unfit. It is a cheap and cruel expression of American generosity.

This is no small thing. It could provide the basis for a multimillion-dollar tax writeoff for the producing company.

The writeoff could be worth many times the cost of producing the banned cyclamate gift. The gift deduction is based upon retail value. The loophole is big and permits producers of banned and defective lotions, potions, and drugs to unload their mischief at a profit.

I am preparing legislation to prevent the use of gift-tax deductions for the disposal of merchandise banned for sale in the United States.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN MANGANESE ORES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6049) to amend the definition of "metal-bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, 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 in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a brief explanation. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means the purpose of the pending bill is to amend the definition of the term "metal-bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States in order that imports of man-

ganeses ores which have been roasted and sintered will be classified as manganese ore under item 601.27 of the tariff schedules.

Under present law only manganese ore which is crude or which has been concentrated by crushing, flotation, washing, or by other physical or mechanical separation not involving chemical change is considered to be a metal-bearing ore. Such manganese ores and concentrates are dutiable under item 601.27 of the tariff schedules, and are temporarily free of duty. Imports of manganese ore which has been concentrated by roasting or sintering—generally involving chemical change—are considered to be dutiable as "other metal-bearing materials" under item 603.70 of the tariff schedules at the rate of duty of 10 percent ad valorem.

Ores of iron, lead, copper, and zinc which have been concentrated by roasting or sintering are defined and are dutiable as "metal-bearing ores." Thus H.R. 6049, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, would provide for the same type of tariff treatment for manganese ores which have been concentrated by roasting or sintering as now is provided for such imported ores of iron, lead, copper, and zinc.

Favorable reports were received from the interested departments and agencies on this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does this country not have this ore available now?

Mr. MILLS. There is not sufficient manganese ore produced in the United States to take care of anything like our needs. The maximum, in World War II, was about 10 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Did we not sell a substantial amount from the government stockpile recently?

Mr. MILLS. Not manganese ore, so far as we were advised by the departments.

Mr. GROSS. Not manganese ore?

Mr. MILLS. No, so far as I am aware, but even if such was the case, I do not see that it is related to our views on this bill since our production is a very small percent of our consumption.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that, as I understand it, about 95 percent of the manganese ore is imported as a new supply each year. So we are very definitely deficient in it.

Mr. MILLS. Very definitely.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 6049, a bill to redefine, in the U.S. Tariff Schedules, manganese ores which have been concentrated by roasting or sintering.

Essentially, the bill would provide the same tariff treatment for these ores that are now provided for roasted and sintered ores of lead, zinc, copper, and iron.

Roasted or sintered manganese ores now are classified under item 603.70 of the tariff schedules, as "other metal-bearing materials." The bill would reclassify them under item 601.27 as "metal-bearing ores."

This would make them subject to a lower duty, but duties on imports of manganese ore are under temporary suspension.

The committee was informed that imports of manganese ore account for some 95 percent of total new supply in the United States, but that roasted or sintered ore shipments are very slight. Deposits of manganese ore which requires roasting or sintering are being developed in Mexico, the committee was told, and these deposits account for the current concern over the dutiable status of this item.

No objection to the bill was registered before the committee, which unanimously approved it.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

H.R. 6049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That headnote 2(a) of part 1 of schedule 6 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States be amended by inserting between "copper," and "zinc concentrates," the following: "manganese."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That headnote 2(a) of part 1 of schedule 6 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting 'manganese,' after 'copper,'."

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.

EXEMPTING SHRIMP VESSELS FROM CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16745) to exempt shrimp vessels from the duty imposed on repairs made to, and repair parts and equipment purchased for, U.S. vessels in foreign countries, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

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 in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to exempt U.S. vessels primarily used for the catching of shrimp from the 50-percent ad valorem duty imposed on repairs made to, and equipment purchased for, such vessels in foreign countries.

Under present law, a vessel documented under the laws of the United States to engage in the foreign or coasting trade, or a vessel intended to be employed in such trade, is required to pay an ad valorem duty of 50 percent on the cost of repairs made to, and equipment purchased for, such vessels in a foreign country. Vessels licensed solely for the purpose of engaging in the fisheries may not engage in foreign or coasting trade. However, if during a fishing voyage a vessel intends to touch and trade in a foreign port, it is required that a permit to touch and trade be obtained prior to departure of the vessel. Under such circumstances, the Department of the Treasury considers that such a vessel is documented to engage in foreign trade within the meaning of the above-described provisions of law during the particular voyage.

The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the imposition of the 50-percent duty on the cost of repairs made to, and equipment purchased for, U.S. vessels engaged in the shrimp fishery is particularly onerous. The U.S. vessels which are engaged in the shrimp fishery off the northeast coast of South America land their catch at any of several South American ports, the catch then usually being transported to the United States as frozen raw headless shrimp.

It is the practice for shrimp vessels to remain on station for long periods of time—3 to 5 years. During this time, necessary repairs and equipment are obtained in nearby foreign ports. Under these circumstances, one of the purposes of existing law, to encourage and support American repair facilities, is not being served and at the same time, a penalty is being imposed on operations of U.S. shrimp fishing vessels.

The Committee on Ways and Means concluded that an exemption from the 50-percent ad valorem duty should be made for U.S. vessels primarily used for the catching of shrimp. As reported by the committee, H.R. 16745, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, would provide such an exemption, except that the exemption does not apply to the cost of fish nets and netting.

Favorable Departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Was this legislation made necessary in any part by the attacks upon, the seizure of, and in certain cases the shooting up of shrimp boats?

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me yield to the gentleman from Florida, who I think is probably as familiar as anybody with the problems involved because many of these ships do have their home port in Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will be glad to respond to the gentleman. No, sir. That is not the cause of the legislation. This is just to correct a chronic problem. For many years shrimp boats, being small vessels, on occasion would get in trouble when far from port. Some of these boats have gone as far as South America to fish. For a long time the Bureau of Customs had to gloss over this. They started enforcing the law a few years ago and made it very difficult for these small boats and small fishermen to survive. It is something limited to shrimp boats and has nothing to do with our foreign problems and things of that sort.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 16745, a bill to exempt from duty certain repairs made abroad to American shrimp vessels.

These vessels must remain on station, usually off the South American coast, for as long as 5 years at a stretch, the committee was informed. During this time, necessary repairs have to be made at nearby foreign ports, because long voyages back to this country would be much too expensive.

For this reason, the committee agreed unanimously to recommend enactment of the exemption as provided by H.R. 16745.

It should be noted that the bill does not exempt a shrimp vessel from the responsibility of making entry on its first arrival back in the United States following repairs or purchases abroad. And the committee was told that the Customs Bureau will continue to check the logs of such vessels to verify expenditures.

The committee also amended the bill to remove the exemption for fish nets and netting.

Favorable reports on the measure were received from six executive departments, and an informative report was received from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge enactment of this bill.

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. 16745

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3114 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (19 U.S.C. 257) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "This section shall not apply with respect to any vessel which is primarily used for the catching of shrimp."

Sec. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with re-

spect to articles entered on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry of any article—

(1) which was made after January 1, 1969, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 7, and insert:

"That section 3114 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (19 U.S.C. 257) is amended by adding before the semicolon in the first sentence of that section the following: ', except that, in the case of any vessel primarily used for the catching of shrimp, such duty shall apply only with respect to so much of such cost as relates to fish nets and netting'."

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.

MANUFACTURERS CLAIMS FOR FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 17473), to extend the period for filing certain manufacturers claims for floor stocks refunds under section 209(b) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, 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 in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 17473, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin, is to permit a manufacturer who complied with all the requirements of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 with regard to floor stock refunds, except that he did not file his claim within the time specified, to file a claim for refund by the 90th day after the date of enactment of this bill.

The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965—Public Law 89-44—repealed various manufacturers' excise taxes and provided for floor stock refunds for previously taxed items that dealers held for sale on the date the tax was repealed. It

has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means that in several instances the 40 days allowed by the act between the deadline for obtaining requests from dealers and the deadline for filing of refund claims by manufacturers was too short. In some instances, it appears that delay was occasioned by difficulties in properly classifying the dealers' requests in the available time, especially because of the large number of separate taxes that were repealed by the one act. The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that additional time should be made available for filing claims for refund where all the other requirements had been met by the dates originally provided in the 1965 act.

The bill does not change existing law with regard to the obligation of the manufacturer to demonstrate his entitlement to a refund, which normally will constitute taxable income in the hands of the manufacturer since in most cases he deducted the excise tax as a business expense when it was paid.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17473, a bill increasing the time during which claims for floor stock refunds may be made under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965.

Under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, Congress repealed or reduced various manufacturers' excise taxes, effective June 22, 1965, for most of the manufacturers' excise taxes, but effective January 1, 1966, for automobile parts, cutting oil, and electric light bulbs. Floor stock refunds were provided for items that dealers held for sale on the date that the tax was reduced—either June 22, 1965, or January 1, 1966. This was in accordance with past practice.

For the items on which the tax was reduced effective June 22, 1965, the manufacturer was required to file a claim for refund by February 10, 1966, based upon a request by the dealer submitted to the manufacturer before January 1, 1966. On or before February 10, 1966, the manufacturer was required to have reimbursed the dealer or secured his consent to a refund.

In the case of items on which the tax was reduced effective January 1, 1966, the same procedure was required, only the applicable date for securing dealer requests was July 1, 1966. Additionally, the dealer in these cases had to give his consent to a refund or be reimbursed by August 10, 1966, and the manufacturer's application for the refund also had to be filed by August 10, 1966.

The period between January 1, 1966, and February 10, 1966, and between July 1, 1966, and August 10, 1966, was unduly short and created a hardship on some manufacturers. As a consequence, the claims of some manufacturers were received by the Government after the February 10 or August 10 deadlines.

The 1965 Excise Tax Reduction Act

was the most comprehensive in the history of our excise taxes, and the refund claims therefore presented considerable problems for the manufacturers. In view of the variety of product lines and the variation within product lines that today's manufacturers produce, the recordkeeping and bookwork required to file these forms were fairly extensive. Manufacturers and their accountants were required to file their claims shortly after the first of the year, at a time when their tax work was the heaviest.

A particular hardship is imposed on some manufacturers who were unable to meet the February 10 or August 10 filing date. The manufacturer often reimbursed his dealers for the amount of the tax in accordance with congressional policy as expressed in the statute. If the manufacturer is unable to secure a refund, he will be out the amount of the tax twice—having paid the tax to the Government and also reimbursed the tax to the dealer.

The Treasury Department has reviewed this legislation and agrees that the bill addresses itself to an inequity that should be corrected. The committee was unanimous in reporting this legislation.

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. 17473

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in applying section 209(b)(1)(A) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 (relating to floor stocks refunds with respect to certain manufacturers excise taxes), a claim for credit or refund filed by the manufacturer, producer, or importer with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on or before the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be treated as satisfying the requirement of such section 209(b)(1)(A) of filing on or before February 10, 1966, or on or before August 10, 1966, as the case may be.

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 ARTICLES REIMPORTED FOR FAILURE TO MEET SAMPLE OR SPECIFICATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9183) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that imported articles which are exported and thereafter reimported to the United States for failure to meet sample or specifications shall, in certain instances, be entered free of duty upon such reimportation, 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, I reserve the right to object in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to provide that imported articles on which the duty has been paid and which are subsequently exported, but reimported for failure to meet sample or specifications abroad shall be accorded duty-free treatment in certain instances.

Under present law, insofar as articles exported and returned are concerned the Tariff Schedules of the United States provide that in the absence of a specific provision to the contrary, the tariff status of an article is not affected by the fact that it was previously imported and cleared through customs whether or not duty was paid upon such previous importation. There is no specific provision for imported articles, on which duties have been paid, which are subsequently exported and returned to the United States due to failure of the articles to meet sample or specifications in the foreign country.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the law should be changed, as proposed in H.R. 9183, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable JAMES G. O'HARA, to prevent double liability for duty payment on imported articles under these circumstances. Accordingly, H.R. 9183, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would accomplish this purpose by inserting a new duty-free tariff classification provision, item 801.10, in schedule 8 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. This provision would permit duty-free entry for articles, previously imported, with respect to which the duty was paid upon such previous importation, under certain stated conditions.

Favorable reports were received on this legislation from the Departments of Commerce, State, Treasury, Labor, and Agriculture, and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. No objection to the bill was made known to the Committee on Ways and Means, which is unanimous in urging its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 9183, a bill to provide for the duty-free entry of articles which are reimported for failure to meet sample or specifications.

The committee was informed that in at least one instance a shipment of articles was imported and the normal duty on it was paid. Subsequently the same articles were sold and exported to a foreign customer, who rejected them on the ground they did not meet specification. Upon return to this country, the articles were subject to duty again under U.S. tariff law.

The committee took the view that double liability for duty payment on imported articles in such circumstances

should be avoided, and H.R. 9183 would accomplish this aim. Favorable reports on it were received from the Departments of Commerce, Interior, State, Treasury, Labor, and Agriculture, in addition to other agencies, and no opposition to it was registered before the committee.

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. 9183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That schedule 8, part 1, subpart A of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting after item 801.00 the following new item:

"01.10... Articles, previously imported, with respect to which the duty was paid upon such previous importation and which were removed from continuous customs custody after such importation, if (1) exported within three years after the date of such previous importation, (2) reimported without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means at any time after such previous importation and before reimportation, (3) reimported for the reason that such articles do not conform to sample or specifications, and (4) reimported by or for the account of the person who imported them into, and exported them from, the United States. Free Free".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date of enactment of this Act and not exported or reimported before such date.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike out all of the matter appearing after line 2 down through line 7 and insert the following:

801.10 Articles, previously imported, with respect to which the duty was paid upon such previous importation if (1) exported within three years after the date of such previous importation, (2) reimported without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means while abroad, (3) reimported for the reason that such articles do not conform to sample or specifications, and (4) reimported by or for the account of the person who imported them into, and exported them from, the United States. ... Free... Free.

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 enactment of this Act and which had not previously been so entered or withdrawn before such date.

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.

CEMETERY CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16506) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the applicability of the exemption from income taxation of cemetery corporations, 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 do so only for the purpose of yielding to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable BARBER B. CONABLE, is to extend the tax exempt status presently granted under the Internal Revenue Code to cemetery corporations which are chartered for burial purposes to cemetery corporations which operate a crematorium, either alone or in conjunction with their burial activities.

Present law provides tax exempt status to a cemetery corporation which is chartered solely for burial purposes if it is not permitted by its charter to engage in any business not necessarily incident to its burial purpose and if no part of the earnings of the corporation benefits any private individual. The Internal Revenue Service in 1969 ruled that the operation of a crematorium was not necessarily incident to a burial purpose and thus caused an exempt cemetery corporation operating a crematorium to lose its tax-exempt status.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the operation of a crematorium is of the same nature as the activity which an exempt cemetery corporation presently is permitted to carry on, and that it is not appropriate for the exempt status of a cemetery corporation to depend upon which of these methods of disposing of bodies it utilizes.

Accordingly, H.R. 16506, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would modify the tax exemption provided by the Internal Revenue Code for cemetery corporations to bring within the scope of the exemption corporations chartered solely for the purpose of the disposal of human bodies by burial or cremation. As under existing law, a corporation of this type would not qualify for tax-exempt status unless it is not permitted to engage in any business not necessarily incident to the purpose for which it is created and unless no part of the net earnings of the corporation inures to the benefit of any private individual.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways

and Means is unanimous in urging its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 16506, a bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to clarify the tax-exempt status of cemetery corporations.

Under present law, nonprofit cemetery corporations chartered solely for burial purposes and not permitted to engage in businesses not incidental to burial are exempt from taxation. However, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that a cemetery corporation operating a crematorium is not exempt under the law, since a crematorium is not incidental to burial purposes.

It is common knowledge that many people prefer to dispose of bodies through cremation rather than by burial, and it does not make sense to predicate tax exemption on the particular form of disposal that is selected. This bill, therefore, will permit a cemetery corporation that meets all of the other qualifications for tax exemption to continue to be tax exempt even though it operates a crematorium.

The Treasury Department has reported favorably on this bill, and the committee was unanimous in recommending it.

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. 16506

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 13 of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exempt organizations) be amended to read as follows:

"(13) Cemetery companies owned and operated exclusively for the benefit of their members or which are not operated for profit; and any corporation chartered solely for burial purposes (including the disposal of bodies by cremation) as a cemetery corporation and not permitted by its charter to engage in any business not necessarily incident to that purpose, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That paragraph (13) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exempt organizations) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Cemetery companies owned and operated exclusively for the benefit of their members or which are not operated for profit; and any corporation chartered solely for the purpose of the disposal of bodies by burial or cremation which is not permitted by its charter to engage in any business not necessarily incident to that purpose and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment, and that it be printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

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.

ARTICLES INTENDED FOR PREVENTING CONCEPTION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4605) 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, 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, Mr. Speaker, in order to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation, which was introduced by the Honorable JAMES H. SCHEUER, and co-sponsored by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable GEORGE BUSH, is to remove the prohibition against importing, transporting, and mailing in the U.S. mails articles for preventing conception.

Under the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, unsolicited mailing or articles for preventing conception would be limited to samples among certain authorized parties—manufacturers, dealers, and licensed physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and so forth—and the bill continues the prohibition against the mailing of advertisement with regard to such articles if unsolicited and not mailed to a licensed person such as those indicated above.

In connection with this legislation, the committee received reports from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, State, Labor, Treasury, and Post Office, all of which were favorable. Informative reports were also received from the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Department of Justice. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 4605.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4605, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the United

States Code, to remove prohibitions against importing, transporting and mailing articles for preventing conception. The bill also would lift these bars against advertisements of such items.

Present law imposes severe penalties on the importation, transportation, and mailing of contraceptive articles and advertisements of such articles even where they are requested by doctors, nurses, or individuals working with clinics. These penalties range as high as \$5,000 and 5 years imprisonment for the first offense and \$10,000 and 10 years imprisonment for the second offense. Recognizing that the use of contraceptive devices is a matter of individual choice for each citizen, the severe penalties imposed by present law are removed subject to carefully developed safeguards. The penalties will still be applicable if unsolicited contraceptive articles or advertisements are mailed to any individual other than a dealer or manufacturer, a licensed physician, surgeon, nurse, pharmacist, druggist, hospital, or clinic. Except in these specific cases, unsolicited contraceptive materials will continue to be nonmailable under the law and subject to seizure and disposal by the Postmaster General.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a letter approving the bill, stated:

There no longer seems to be any justification for associating with the obscene and immoral the importation, transportation, and mailing of drugs and other articles for the prevention of conception, and information thereon.

The Postmaster General stated:

In our view, existing statutory prohibitions against the deposit of contraceptive materials in the mails today merits reappraisal, in the light of court decisions and present attitudes.

Approvals also were received by the committee from the Departments of Commerce, State, Labor, and Treasury. With these endorsements, and in the absence of any objections to the bill, the committee reported it unanimously.

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. 4605

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 305(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1305(a)) is amended by striking out "for the prevention of conception or".

SEC. 2. Section 552 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "preventing conception or".

SEC. 3. Section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended (1) by striking out "preventing conception or" each place it appears, (2) by striking out "conception may be prevented or" in the fourth paragraph thereof, and (3) by inserting "may be" before the word "produced" in the fourth paragraph thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "preventing conception, or".

SEC. 5. Section 4001 of title 39 of the United States Code, relating to nonmailable matter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Every article or thing which is unsolicited by the addressee and which is designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception, except unsolicited samples thereof, mailed between or to manufacturers thereof, dealers therein, licensed physicians and surgeons, nurses, pharmacists, druggists, hospitals, and clinics, is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out line 9 and all that follows down through line 19, and insert:

"SEC. 5(a) Section 4001 of title 39 of the United States Code, relating to nonmailable matter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) Every article or thing which is unsolicited by the addressee and which is designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception (except unsolicited samples thereof mailed to a manufacturer thereof, a dealer therein, a licensed physician or surgeon, or a nurse, pharmacist, druggist, hospital, or clinic) is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs.

"(2) Every advertisement of any article or thing which is designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs if the advertisement is unsolicited, unless the advertisement—

"(A) is mailed to a manufacturer of such articles or things, a dealer therein, a licensed physician or surgeon, or a nurse, pharmacist, druggist, hospital, or clinic; or

"(B) accompanies in the same parcel any such article or thing mailed under conditions permitted under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

An advertisement shall not be deemed to be unsolicited for the purposes of this paragraph if it is contained in a publication for which the addressee has paid or promised to pay a consideration or which he has otherwise indicated he desires to receive."

"(b) The eighth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting 'or section 4001(d) of title 39' after 'this section'."

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the United States mails articles for preventing conception."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHHOLDING OF CITY INCOME TAXES ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076) relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees, 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 for the purpose of yielding to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas, for a brief explanation of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct impression that the legislation before us has as its underlying purpose the muting of criticism of city wage, commuter, or occupational license taxes, and particularly the vehement and outspoken opposition to such taxes as they are imposed on nonresidents and out-of-State residents. The Congress would surely have felt the strength of this protest directly if it had enacted the District of Columbia commuter tax as had been proposed by the city administration earlier in this Congress.

My colleague from Pennsylvania who is the sponsor of this legislation, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, represents a portion of the city of Philadelphia. I observe on page 3 of the committee report that the income tax rates imposed by a variety of cities in nine States which permit such taxation by their municipalities range from one-fourth to 1 percent to 3 percent. Ironically, the wage tax rate in the city of Philadelphia is perched at the top of the range—3 percent—and it might be added that it is 3 percent of one's gross earned income. Furthermore, the tax rate is the same for out-of-State residents and in-State nonresidents of the city as it is for city residents who benefit from all the city services 24 hours a day.

The gentleman must certainly be aware of an article that appeared in his hometown newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, last October under the headline, "Revenue Emphasis Shifting To Wage Tax, Tate Declares." The article went on to point out that city officials predict the future revenue needs of the city—primarily for housing, education, and other such programs from which city residents alone benefit—would be met by increases in the wage tax rather than the real estate tax. The gentleman is further aware, no doubt, that since January of this year the newly established Non-resident Taxpayers Association of Pennsylvania and New Jersey has been organizing the longstanding opposition

against the Philadelphia wage tax insofar as it applies to nonresidents of the city. The association's membership now represents residents in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland and continues to grow daily.

It follows naturally as a trait of the proverbial "human nature" that if city taxes are allowed to be withheld from the compensation paid to Federal employees, persistent criticism to the taxes will drop off sharply. The very fact of withholding may best be likened to the "hidden tax" of inflation, for what one does not see he is not likely to miss. As for Philadelphia, allowing such withholding is tantamount to greasing the skids for further wage tax hikes. It is no doubt a valid argument that having to pay city income taxes in a lump sum is somewhat of a hardship on the individual taxpayer and imposes certain disciplines with respect to budgeting. I strongly contend, however, that the hardship toward which this measure is directed to relieving is that of the city officials who are responsible for the high level of taxes that now exist. I maintain that by letting the taxpayer know how much his government is costing him—to the extent that it hurts—the resulting pressure might well impose the same disciplines on governmental budgeting and management that are asked of the individual taxpayer.

I wonder if the gentleman would join me in urging the Judiciary Committee to undertake consideration of legislation I have introduced that addresses itself to the inequity of taxation by cities like Philadelphia between residents and out-of-State residents who work in those cities? The measure before us may well be supported by a majority of the Members of this body, but as I represent a large number of individuals who are unjustly taxed by the city of Philadelphia where they do not have representation, I am constrained to protest in their behalf by objecting to the consideration of this legislation under unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) object?

Mr. HUNT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do object.

AGRICULTURE CREDIT INSURANCE FUND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to call next the bill H.R. 15979, but following our practice for the past several years, when notice is served that there will be objection to the bill, we are not calling it up at this time.

DISTILLED SPIRITS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10517) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes, 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. MILLS)?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speak-

er, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I do so in order to ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for an explanation of the bill.

But, before I yield for that explanation, I would like to inquire further of my chairman with respect to the bill, H.R. 15979.

Did I understand the gentleman was not going to call that bill up?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct, because we have been advised that there will be objection to the bill. It would be my purpose to ask the Speaker to include it on the list of bills that he will entertain for consideration under suspension of the rules on the next suspension day.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The reason I raised this point is because this bill is vitally important to our smaller communities in moving ahead on their waste treatment and sewage disposal problems, as well as their efforts to develop a clean and adequate water supply. I am almost prompted to suggest that the gentleman who objects to this legislation ought to put his objection on the record, although I do realize we have the general understanding, Mr. Chairman, that we will not call up bills if we know they are going to be objected to. But I do want to make it crystal clear that H.R. 15979 is a most essential piece of legislation and I hope it can be scheduled and acted upon favorably at the very earliest opportunity, because otherwise we are delaying construction of sewer and waste treatment facilities urgently needed by smaller communities.

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

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

Mr. MILLS. Let me assure my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, I agree with everything he has to say about the bill and as to its importance and we will seek to legislate just as promptly as we can on the subject matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the bill, H.R. 10517, which is currently before us, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill on the ground that it would give substantial benefits to the liquor industry, and I object to it being brought up on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the bills that we had intended to call up this morning.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the bills that I have called up and that have been passed today.

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

There was no objection.

DRUG CONTROL

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, for the American people, Congress should pause to express appreciation and to pay tribute today to Attorney General John Mitchell, to Mr. John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, to the Bureau's criminal enforcement officer, Mr. George Belk, and to the officers and agents under their supervision. Over the weekend, they delivered history's most stunning blow to the criminal drug apparatus in America.

So far, 135 suspects have been arrested and charged. Further arrests are anticipated momentarily. Contraband drugs valued at more than \$8 million have been seized.

The figures are meaningless unless translated into human terms. Innocent citizens have been spared an \$8 million property loss. Many have been spared the trauma and terror often associated with the burglary and robbery practiced by frantic addicts seeking the purchase price of the next fix. And the families of countless potential addicts have been spared the misery, hunger, privation, and heartache which addiction thrusts upon them.

Unquestionably, the ripple effects of Operation Eagle, which crippled nearly a third of the wholesale segment of the illicit trade, will benefit society for years to come.

Such success could not have been achieved without the wiretaps authorized by the Federal courts in Miami, Chicago, and New York. This single event vindicates the Congress in the passage of the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control Act. It also illustrates the nature and dimension of the drug problem in the United States and the need for new laws equal to the problem.

Everyone recognizes the jurisdictional difficulty which underlies the legislative progress of President Nixon's drug reform legislative package. However, that difficulty is not one which cannot be solved, and I earnestly hope that the House can complete action on the legislation already passed by the other body and send the bill to the President's desk sometime next month.

OIL POLLUTION AT SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and I have just introduced a bill to provide a partial solution to our continuing very serious oil pollution problem in the area near Santa Barbara, Calif. The bill does not go as far as I would like, but does create a sanctuary which I hope Congress will enlarge.

I would like to make two points, however: First, to thank Secretary Hickel and his staff members for the assistance they have provided in bringing the proposal this far. Another very important point is that some news media, in their preliminary stories, have misinterpreted this proposal. This is in no sense a

something for nothing proposal. Oil companies which made bad leases and invested hundreds of millions or scores of millions of dollars in areas in which no oil is found or can be proved to exist will not get their money for that bad gamble. All they will get is the right to go to the Federal Government and prove such damages, if any, that they have suffered. This is a good start toward solving a very difficult problem, and I hope that the Members will study it, as we develop it further.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16516, NASA AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, 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 California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings on the House of June 15, 1970.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House bring back a conference report on H.R. 16516, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1971.

This bill passed the House on April 23, 1970, and was passed by the Senate on May 6, 1970.

In acting on the bill, the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and substituted new language.

The committee of conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain substitute amendments and with certain stipulations insisted upon by the managers on the part of the House.

At the outset of the conference there were 17 items in disagreement, 13 of which involved amounts to be authorized for appropriations.

In conference the disagreeing votes were resolved in seven instances by compromise, by the House receding in five instances and the Senate receding in five instances.

We have brought back what we feel is a good conference report signed by all members of the conference on the part of the House and the Senate.

For fiscal year 1971, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested \$3,333 million.

The House bill authorized \$3,600,875,000.

The Senate-passed version of the bill authorized \$3,315,950,000.

As a result of the conference, the total amount to be authorized was adjusted to \$3,410,878,000 which is \$188,997,000 less than passed by the House, and \$94,928,000 more than passed by the Senate.

In broad terms the committee of conference has agreed to authorize research and development programs totaling \$2,693,100,000; \$34,478,000 for construction; and \$683,300,000 for research and program management.

The conference report contains a detailed listing of the projects and programs and the amounts to be authorized for each as recommended by the committee of conference.

In addition to the projects and programs to be authorized, four general legislative amendments, all proposed in the Senate bill, were in disagreement as follows:

The Senate amendment added a provision to the House bill which established a monetary ceiling of \$500,108,000 on the amount that NASA could spend on personnel compensation and benefits for fiscal year 1971.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The House conferees objected to this provision, contending that a reduction in force of over 1,600 personnel would be required under a restriction of this magnitude.

The committee of conference agreed to a ceiling of \$506,108,000, and the bill was further amended accordingly.

The Senate amendment also placed a ceiling of \$500,000 on the amount that NASA may expend for the fees of consultants and related expenses.

The House conferees, recognizing that some limit should be placed on this type of expense agreed to the Senate provision, but with a stipulation that the level be reevaluated when the fiscal year 1972 budget is considered.

The Senate amendment also included a provision which prohibited the transfer of funds into the personnel account.

The House conferees objected to this provision on the basis that the language was entirely too restrictive, removed all flexibility, and failed to take into account the impact of reduction-in-force procedures on test and evaluation activities, mission operations, and more particularly mission safety.

The conferees agreed to modified language which will permit NASA to transfer up to 1 percent of the total personnel ceiling into the personnel account if the Administrator determines that such action is necessary in the interest of mission safety.

Normal reporting procedures advising the Congress of such transfers would prevail.

The Senate amendment also revised the language contained in the fiscal year 1970 NASA Act requiring certain former employees of NASA and of aerospace contractors to submit specified data concerning prior affiliations.

This language was adopted by the committee of conference to make it conform more nearly to prior-passed legislation concerning Department of Defense employees.

Mr. Speaker, we consider that the House conferees have returned to the floor a good conference report on the fiscal year 1971 NASA bill.

The bill as modified in conference will permit the Nation's space effort to move forward.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion about the best that can be said for this conference report is that the other body, the U.S. Senate, has become the economy body in Congress, because they cut this bill by approximately \$190 million. I must commend the other body in this instance for its foresight in behalf of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MILLER of California. In the interest of the space program and safety, I am very happy to say I am very proud to be a Member of this body.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, on his statement. I wish to state that there was unanimous agreement on the conference report by the Senate and the House after we had spent quite a bit of time discussing the various provisions and the items. Mr. Chairman, the conferees on the part of the House on the fiscal year 1971 NASA authorization have done a commendable job. The Members on both sides of the aisle who participated in the authorization hearings and in the conference with the other body deserve special commendation.

Unless those of us who are technically knowledgeable and competent, after some study, go into the details, it is a little difficult to say why there has been emphasis on certain items.

In broad terms, the results of the conference were that in the area of research and development a relatively small increase of \$87 million above the administration's request was agreed to. A decrease of \$100,000 was made in construction of facilities, and a decrease of \$9 million in research and program management was made by the conferees of the two Houses. Legislative changes to the bill included the establishment of a personnel fund ceiling of \$506,108,000. A limit of \$500,000 on consultant fees and associated expenses was established. A prohibition on transfer of funds to the personnel account was included, except that 1 percent may be transferred for purposes of mission safety by the Administrator of NASA. Government contract employees are required to report former affiliations.

NASA requested \$3,333,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971 space program. The House increased the NASA request for research and development to a level of \$3,600,875,000. The House action was principally to add increased emphasis to the manned flight operations during this decade as was recommended in the Pres-

ident's Space Task Group study. The Senate approved the administration's request for research and development, made a slight reduction in the construction of facilities request, and made a \$15 million reduction in the research and program management account. The Senate-passed version of the bill would have authorized \$3,315,950,000.

In conference the conferees agreed to a recommended authorization level of \$3,410,878,000. The amount agreed to in conference was \$189,997,000 less than passed by the House and \$94,928,000 more than passed by the Senate.

I feel that the Nation's space effort can move forward with the amounts that have been agreed to for authorization in conference. However, we recognize that the amount to be authorized by this conference report will be considerably short of what the President's Space Task Group recommended. With good, sound management and despite the austerity of the fiscal year 1971 NASA bill, I consider that the moneys to be authorized represent a good, well-rounded, safe and economic program for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The program as approved by the conferees will fall short of what we on the Science and Astronautics Committee consider to be an aggressive approach to our space flight efforts. For example, Apollo lunar exploration flights should be scheduled by NASA at the rate of three flights per year. The slippage in the Apollo program and anticipated level of funding for fiscal year 1971 will not permit the achievement of this objective. In my previous views added to prior NASA authorization bills, I have pointed out that two lunar flights or less per year would save expenditures only for the short term. In the long run this rate of launch is more expensive and increases the risk to the astronauts as well as adding to the probability of failures and loss of equipment.

Based upon extensive study and calculations, and using NASA figures, I believe that I have been able to prove that three launches per year for lunar exploration flights is an optimum, most efficient, and least expensive rate of operation. We must have sufficient operational activities within the NASA program to assure that our engineering and scientific talent, our space centers and their personnel, as well as contractor and subcontractor operations will be adequately used. Idle space equipment is an open invitation to obsolescence and deterioration. One factor that must be considered is that our astronauts, our finest young men, are held without space flight experience for a period of time by a launch rate of two Apollo lunar exploration flights per year. This is not only an unnecessary but also a more expensive and dangerous procedure.

Although austerity measures are being invoked because of other heavy demands upon our national resources, I believe that now is the time to begin planning and study of a new generation of boosters for the shuttle which will augment and follow on the Saturn V. These advances, as I have insisted for the past several years, will permit the Saturn V vehicle to take advantage of the latest technol-

ogy and prevent its obsolescence. These same funds would also provide for the development of critical technologies as well as maintain modern reliable launch vehicles.

While these actions that I have contended for many years should proceed, I recognize that the present limits on annual budgets will prevent us from proceeding at this rate. I think we are being penny wise and pound foolish.

Prior to the start of full committee hearings on the fiscal year 1970 NASA authorization, the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight conducted hearings in the field.

NASA requested \$956,500,000 for continuation of the Apollo lunar exploration program in fiscal year 1971. The committee recommends an increase of \$145,000,000 for the Apollo program for a total authorization of \$1,101,500,000 for fiscal year 1971.

The NASA budget proposed for Apollo for fiscal year 1971 was \$729,645,000 less than fiscal year 1970. This budget terminated Saturn V production and reduces launch rates to two lunar exploration flights per year until the Saturn V vehicles remaining are expended.

It was the view of the committee that the proposed level of funding fails to support the recommendations and proposed funding levels of the President's Space Task Group Report and, thus, fails to provide an adequate manned space flight program in the 1970's. The committee, therefore, recommended changes in the Apollo line.

Addition of \$45,000,000 was for long-lead production of payloads for lunar exploration flights after 1973—Apollo 18 and 19. These flights would use the basic Apollo systems with the increased lunar stay time and augmented scientific payload components which are currently being developed. System improvements to permit greater scientific return plus the development of data for possible future lunar and planetary exploration would be incorporated only when considered desirable as a result of flight experience. Production of the spacecraft and science payloads for Apollo 20 would also be started.

The amount of \$100,000,000 was added for long leadtime hardware and to permit the fabrication of improved Saturn V systems. This includes startup cost of vendors and subcontractors that have been phased out of the Saturn V program. Among Saturn V systems, engine funding would have the highest priority due to the long leadtime associated with their production.

In addition, to providing launch vehicles capable of orbiting nuclear flight stages, space station modules and other large payloads in the mid 1970's, continuation of Saturn V production would permit NASA sufficient flexibility to launch between two and three Saturn V flights per year. It is the view of the committee that launching Saturn V vehicles at a rate of two or less per year would significantly increase the risk to mission success. Consequently, this relatively small increase not only provides for Saturn V payload capability beyond 1974 but for reasonable

probability of mission success in future launches.

NASA requested \$515,200,000 for space flight operations in fiscal year 1971. The committee increased this by \$155,000,000 for a total authorization of \$670,200,000 for fiscal year 1971 for space flight operations.

The NASA budget proposed for space flight operations for fiscal year 1971 is \$172,100,000 more than for fiscal year 1970. This increase reflects increases in funding required to support the development and flight preparations for launch of an orbital workshop—Skylab I—in 1972 and three planned visits to the workshop, utilizing three existing Saturn IB vehicles, in 1973. A second backup workshop is being fabricated so that if problems are encountered with the launch or flight of Skylab I a second workshop will be available. This line item also includes funds for support of detailed definition and design study for a low-cost, earth-to-orbit recoverable shuttle.

It was the view of the committee that the proposed administration level of funding failed to support the recommendations and proposed funding level of the President's Space Task Group report and thus fails to provide an adequate manned space flight program in the 1970's. The committee, therefore, made changes in the spaceflight operations line item.

The sum of \$75,000,000 was added in order to augment the development and qualification effort on spacecraft and workshop subsystems for the long duration missions to provide increased assurance of mission success, and for initiating development of experiments which have been excluded from the program due to funding limitations. Experiment emphasis would be in the earth resources and medical areas. Preliminary design for a second mission will be initiated with special consideration given to incorporation of an artificial gravity capability.

Further, \$80,000,000 was added for more extensive and inclusive trade-off analyses and additional engineering studies, long leadtime space station payload definition efforts, and advanced prototype effort for testing and verification of preliminary designs of selected high technology areas and support of technology development in those areas critical to the design and performance of both systems.

It was the committee's view that this will assist NASA and the Congress in subsequent years to reach adequate decisions on the future progress and timing of shuttle and space station development.

For fiscal year 1971 NASA requested \$2,500,000 for advanced mission studies. The committee decreased this amount by \$1,500,000 for advanced missions for a total authorization of \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1971.

After a thorough review by the committee it was determined that none of the fiscal year 1970 advanced missions funds had been obligated. Considering the expected obligation rate for 1970 funds, it was the committee's view that \$1,000,000 would adequately support

NASA advanced missions studies requirements for fiscal year 1971.

These changes which I have outlined were considered at length and in great detail by the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and by the full committee.

In conference with the Senate, \$38 million was added to the original request for the Apollo program. This action was taken for the express purpose of providing additional scientific payloads for later Apollo flights and is consistent with my original views and those of the committee that we must achieve a maximum scientific return from the remaining Apollo lunar exploration flights.

In the area of space flight operations, \$50 million was added in conference to the original NASA request to be used for additional capability on the long duration missions planned for the orbital workshop, now called Skylab. This, again, is consistent with my own views and those of the committee that the Skylab, which is the forerunner of a major space station, should provide an opportunity to investigate not only scientific objectives but also utilize applications of manned earth satellites.

In the advanced missions studies area, it was apparent that NASA's projected rate of obligation for studies was less than originally outlined. Consequently, the conferees agreed to reduce by \$1 million the NASA request of \$2,500,000 for advanced missions studies. This is consistent with orderly advanced mission study development and will allow adequate funds for future planning in this area.

The conference report before us today presents a well-balanced NASA space program for fiscal year 1971. Funds are provided to support adequately the remaining lunar exploration flights. Thirty-eight million dollars were added to the Apollo line item above the administration's request to assure additional scientific payloads for the six remaining lunar exploration flights. I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), who has supported me in urging the additions of these funds. With the additional money, it will be possible to get significantly greater scientific return on our remaining Apollo flights.

In the area of space flight operations, an additional \$50 million were added to the administration's request in order that when the orbital workshop, Skylab, flies in 1972 we will gain the best performance and the most information from this effort. The Skylab program represents a forerunner to the development of a space station for scientific experimentation and utilitarian benefits here on earth. My efforts to assure adequate funding for that program are at least met in part by the addition of those funds.

We have said that we want to make sure of mission safety. I have criticized NASA from year to year, and have offered legislation, as well as amendments, to require that there be an independent office of Inspector General. NASA needs an Inspector General organization as there is in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. These various agencies use Inspector General organizations to see that safety is emphasized.

At the present time a man who is going to fly a mission can only complain. Our trouble is that the people who are on the receiving end of these complaints are restricted by program deadlines. They are all program people.

My feeling is, on Apollo 13, for example, that there should have been an Inspector General organization overseeing the program management. He could have watched these routines and could have shut down the program if proper inspection was not being done. An Inspector General could act on those components which did not live up to NASA specifications or the level of industry capability.

I think it should be pointed out that on page 4, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision with which you and I are both very familiar. Beginning in section 4, and further on down to subsection (b) on page 4, this provision states:

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of amounts for personnel and related costs pursuant to section 1(c) to exceed amounts authorized for such costs, except that a transfer in the manner prescribed by this section of funds not to exceed 1 per centum of such amounts authorized may be made whenever the Administrator determines that such transfer is necessary for the safety of any mission.

As part of that amendment, the Administrator of NASA is allowed to transfer up to 1 percent, if necessary, for mission safety. This would permit the Administrator to transfer \$5 million into the personnel account if safety risks so dictate. As all of us who have spent years with the space program know, no one can guarantee mission safety. In this period of NASA's reduction in force, it is important that the Administrator be able to assure that highly specialized and skilled technicians, engineers, and scientists are available to accomplish crucial tasks. The 1-percent transfer authority provides the means by which the Administrator can minimize risks to mission safety. It is possible at the design level, at the manufacturing level, and at the test and operation level that it may be essential for the Administrator of NASA to invoke this 1-percent provision. I am confident that he will do so, recognizing that as conferees we have noted the need for NASA to have flexibility in the area of mission safety.

Now, I emphasize the word "safety." I would like the legislative intent to show that it is the duty of the Administrator of NASA to provide for the safety not only of the personnel that are in a particular space flight but also ground personnel and likewise the suppliers' personnel and people who are in the traditional countdown role. We in the legislative branch should never incorporate language in authorization legislation which would preclude or prevent the Administrator from exercising the necessary authority to take every conceivable action to maintain the highest possible levels of operational and mission safety. Likewise it is necessary that we provide for safety in the matter of mechanical components such as parts, valves, fittings and, yes, even the capsules themselves. Safety itself, in this connotation, does not refer to human safety alone. It refers to

a high standard of manufacturing that is above the ordinary and that must be observed. It is for these reasons that the Administrator of NASA needs a transfer authority to achieve some assurance that no mission shall fail because of defects and no mission shall fail because of lack of safety of the various kinds I have mentioned.

Webster's New International Dictionary, in the second edition, defines safety as "a condition or state of being safe; freedom from danger or hazard; exemption from hurt, injury, or loss; as a committee of safety."

Now, injury can occur to any one of these flights either on the part of workers, managers, components, equipment, instrumentation, or during the operational phase of the flight itself. So what we are providing is a mechanism whereby the Administrator has an opportunity to make a solid, sound judgment as a measure to assure that each of these missions shall receive all possible considerations necessary to mission success.

Would the chairman agree with that as to the legislative intent? Do you agree on the positions I have taken on the definition of the word "safety," that it shall be in the definition that the Administrator has the duty to make sure that within the limits of this authority no mission, manned or unmanned, shall fail?

Mr. MILLER of California. I fully agree with you, and I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In other provisions of the bill, we have made some increases and some decreases. On balance, this is a good bill and deserves your support. The committee has worked diligently to arrive at a reasonable level for our space program for the coming year.

For many years I have advocated a strong national space program not only in current operational programs, but in basic research and development. The small but important budget for chemical propulsion in this bill will mean much to our national space program in the future. If time and funds permit, I shall work as I have in the past to see it become an even larger effort. This is equally true in the area of nuclear rocket development. It is in these areas that we will develop the propulsion necessary to undertake important new scientific exploration, and to reduce the cost of future national space efforts.

It was gratifying that the Senate conferees thoroughly agreed with the House in insisting on increased emphasis on aeronautical research by NASA. The increase in funds for that work was matched by an equal reduction in the tracking and data acquisition account, a modest \$2.8 million.

We all know that flight operations have been severely aggravated in recent years by unacceptable congestion in the air that includes critical hazards. NASA, through the space technologies developed over the past 10 years, has the knowledge, the people, and the facilities to assist the Department of Transportation in attacking those problems. So, really the increased research emphasis on collision avoidance, clear air turbulence, engine

noise, and sonic boom will make substantial contributions to the safety and welfare of our people. The gentleman from West Virginia, KEN HECHLER and his colleagues of the Advanced Research and Technology Subcommittee should be congratulated for continuing their persistent effort in that very vital area of committee responsibility.

May I say in conclusion that I strongly urge the passage of this conference report. It has been unanimously agreed to. It will give a real opportunity for the United States to remain first in space and to make progress in safety techniques and equipment available not only to the astronauts but to all people working in the space program.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee of conference I commend the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the House conferees on their decisions and in particular for the actions which were taken to strengthen aeronautical research.

This conference authorization increases the research and development funds available in three program areas by \$2.3 million. These funds are to be used for such items as pilot warning indicators, wake and clear air turbulence, flight crew stress analysis and noise and combustion problems, all contributing to solutions to safety and pollution problems. These research projects were considered by the House committee to be of high priority and should proceed in the fiscal year 1971. The authorization also provides an increase of \$500,000 for "Technology utilization" to speed the transfer of new NASA technology for the solution of urban development and environmental quality problems. I hasten to add, however, that the "Tracking and data acquisition" item was reduced by \$2.8 million, the exact amount of the increase.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Subcommittee Advanced Research and Technology which I chair have been particularly active in trying to realign the efforts in NASA to stress the importance of additional work in aeronautical research. The aeronautics portion of NASA's budget is still only 5.6 percent of the total and because of the emphasis on space activity, progress in aviation has about exhausted the store of basics available to our aircraft which is, of course, the industry's life blood.

We would like to see a proportionate research effort commensurate with the output of NASA's predecessor, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. However, in the interest of economy and in an attempt to abstain from making serious modifications to the aeronautical research program in NASA, the increases recommended were modest and only involved flight safety items and pollution research in the reduction of pollution emanating from aircraft. Each of these increases was designed to correct a specific deficiency which is stipulated

in the conference report. The Senate members of the conference committee were in full agreement with these increases and they also support the purpose for which these amounts are designated.

In the "Research and program management" area the Senate conferees were in agreement with the need for NASA to correct the trend of the reducing number of younger aeronautical scientists being hired by NASA. However, the overriding demands of the Senate to reduce the Research and program management personnel account would not allow a compromise which stipulated that the \$1.4 million approved in the House bill be held specifically for the personnel action called for in the House report on the bill. It was the opinion of the Committee on Science and Astronautics that an increase of \$1.4 million would provide sufficient funds to allow NASA to hire 100 additional summer employees, provide 50 research fellowships and 100 graduate and undergraduate scholarships, all related to aeronautical research. The conference report instructs NASA to correct this uneven situation in Aeronautical personnel within the amount authorized for Research and program management, which totals \$9 million less than the NASA request.

Mr. Speaker, it is mandatory that NASA continue a viable and forward looking aeronautical research program to keep our Nation foremost in this field. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker as we consider the conference report on the fiscal year 1971 NASA authorization it does not represent a victory as far as our future national space program is concerned.

In the area of manned space flight small additions have been made in both the Apollo and space flight line items to improve the return on the investment that we are making in these programs by providing additional experimental capability and funds for studying future NASA programs.

A reduction was made in the advanced missions line item recognizing unobligated funds available in fiscal year 1970 will allow sufficient study effort. But these and similar actions do not go to the heart of the problem of our future in space. As the Members of this body know, our national space effort has shrunk from over 400,000 people 4 short years ago to less than 170,000 people throughout the United States today. We are closing major technological facilities which are the backbone of our test, research, and development capability in the aerospace field. Both through adversity and success our national space program has demonstrated its ability to meet its goals and develop that technology which is so necessary to the future growth and well-being of our Nation. Yet we seem bent on continuing the decline of our national space effort.

After 1974, as I have said a number of times on this floor, we will have no manned space flight program in near earth orbit or in deep space or anywhere else for that matter.

This year and next year represent the significant moment of decision on whether we choose to be a first-class technological Nation not only in space but in other fields. Technology, as we all know, is the bulwark of America's strength in commerce as well as in other fields. The employment in our aerospace industry in the past 2 years has declined at a precipitous rate. Upward of 4,000 to 5,000 personnel in industry per month have left our national space program. It has been necessary for NASA to reduce to a smaller but significant extent the personnel within NASA. This year, under the terms of this bill, it will be necessary again for NASA to reduce its work force within its inhouse laboratories, test, and launch facilities. These inhouse personnel represent the last strength of our space capability. Consequently, in an amendment in the bill, authority is provided such that up to 1 percent of the total funds within the research and program management area, or slightly over \$5 million can be reprogrammed by the Administrator of NASA when he determines that for any reason mission safety is jeopardized.

Mission safety as we all know is something that never can be guaranteed in programs as complex as those undertaken by NASA. In fact, mission safety can be affected at all levels and in all parts of the agency's effort. It is my hope that this authority will be used where necessary throughout the organization to assure that the key people in design, development, manufacturing, test, launch, and operations will be retained to minimize the risks to mission success and safety in future NASA activity.

If our Nation is to grow in the future, one of its strengths will be found in its technology and its contributions to our Nation during the decade of the 1970's. Support of the NASA effort and the development of its new programs during the next several years will measure the foresight and the determination of this body to maintain our position as a leader in the world community.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks with respect to the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING THE EVENING OF THE 24TH DAY OF JUNE 1970 AS "JOHN W. McCORMACK NIGHT"

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further

consideration of House Resolution 1084, designating the evening of the 24th day of June 1970 as "JOHN W. McCORMACK Night," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1084

Whereas the Honorable John W. McCormack, the beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, is a true and loyal fan of the national pastime; and

Whereas the Speaker for the past decade has, through his leadership and support, encouraged American baseball in the American legislature; and

Whereas no annual congressional rollcall baseball night would be complete without the first pitch of the game being delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the evening of the 24th day of June 1970 is hereby designated as "John W. McCormack Night" at Robert Francis Kennedy Stadium in Washington, District of Columbia, with his good sportsmanship, kindness, and camaraderie engraved in our hearts henceforth.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask this body for its unanimous approval of House Resolution 1084, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) and myself.

My colleagues well know, Mr. Speaker, that we gather here today a mere 48 hours or so before the titanic annual baseball battle in which Members from both sides of the aisle will be represented on the diamond by their most vigorous, if not youngest, colleagues.

This year, the playing field of R. F. K. Stadium will again be the scene for the game, and 6:30 p.m. Wednesday will be the time.

In recent years the legitimacy and the spirit of this game has been greatly enhanced by the distinguished Speaker of the House, JOHN W. McCORMACK, who has thrown out the first ball.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we wish to return the honor by designating the evening of June 24, 1970, as "JOHN W. McCORMACK Night" at the stadium.

Not only has the distinguished Speaker been a true and loyal fan of baseball in general, and the congressional baseball game in particular, he also has been a true and loyal friend to all of us in this body.

This will be the last congressional baseball game that Speaker McCORMACK will preside over. After 42 years in this Chamber, after the second longest tenure as Speaker in history, and after constructing a luminous career as public servant, steadfast patriot and compassionate friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is retiring.

We know that the burden of leadership is always heavy and often tedious. While he bore this burden and bore it well, however, he also found time to journey to the ball park each year to watch our version of the game he loves so well.

And while he was tactfully silent as to our prowess on the basepaths, he was always more than generous in his praise of our spirit and the vigor in which the game was played.

As manager of the Republican team, and with my counterpart for the Democrats, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I urge this body to join its erstwhile athletes by granting unanimous approval for this resolution honoring Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK—a gentleman who boasts a pretty fair pitching arm at the ball park and an extremely good batting average in the Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 743, TOUCHET DIVISION, WALLA-WALLA PROJECT, OREGON-WASHINGTON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla-Walla project, Oregon-Washington, 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there were two House amendments to S. 743 which were before the conference committee. The first of these consisted simply of a correction of a misspelled word in the Senate bill.

The second amendment was one of appreciable substance. The Senate bill contained customary language to authorize the necessary appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior with which to build the facilities authorized for the Touchet division. The House bill contained two separate authorizations of appropriations, the sum of which would be required to build the project. The first authorization provided by the House bill was to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for sufficient money to cover that portion of the project cost relating to nonreimbursable anadromous fish enhancement. The second authorization provision was to the Bureau of Reclamation for the balance of the project.

The House provisions were based on

the fact that the Touchet division was unique from the standpoint of being an exception to general law in two respects. In addition to fish and wildlife representing more than one-half the project, and thereby exceeding the generally permissible limits in that regard, the separable costs of anadromous fish are nonreimbursable.

These departures from general practice are sufficiently far-reaching as to distinguish the Touchet division from conventional reclamation programs and to suggest consideration of special funding procedures of the character set out in the House bill.

The committee of conference adopted the principle of the House bill but adjusted the language to make the authorization for funds for the anadromous fish aspects to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Fish and Wildlife Service is the parent organization of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, and is a broader based administrative entity in the fiscal sense. The amendment adopted by the conference committee conveys more budgetary latitude to the executive branch and would appropriately let both sports and commercial fish bureaus participate in the funding of the project.

The amendments are germane, and the amendments were agreed to unanimously.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse what the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) has said relative to the bill and the conference report, and the reasons for the actions of the conferees, and urge the adoption of the conference report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2062, DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF LANDS, FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2062) to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there were two House amendments to S. 2062 which were before the conference committee. The conference committee agreed to retain the first amendment which permits the delivery of water to State-owned excess lands, without the payment of interest, in those few projects where interest payment for service to excess lands is required.

The second House amendment involved the question of whether State-owned lands might receive water from a Federal reclamation project if they are placed in leaseholds of not to exceed 160 acres. The House deleted a provision of S. 2062 which would have allowed such a delivery of water. The House position was based on the feeling that service to State-owned lands under lease to individual operators was not wholly in keeping with the basic purposes of the reclamation program, in that benefits from the program should flow to individuals as distinct from political subdivisions.

The conference committee adopted language which allows lessees of State-owned lands in amounts not to exceed 160 acres each to receive water service but only for a period not to exceed 25 years from the date of the act. Mr. Speaker, this amendment preserves the basic policy position of the House bill yet it avoids the difficulty that would be visited on a State by virtue of forced immediate divestiture of its lands. Under the conference language, administrators of State-owned lands can operate them in otherwise qualifying leaseholds while an orderly program is developed for disposing of them to private owners; thus avoiding the disruptive impact on public programs dependent upon such lands for operating revenue.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments in the report were agreed to unanimously, and they are germane to the legislation.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse what the gentleman from Colorado has said relative to the bill, the action of the conferees and the reasons therefor, and to urge adoption of the conference report.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a few remarks to the House concerning the conference report on S. 2062.

Part of the purpose of this legislation is to help resolve a longstanding problem involving Washington State school lands on the Columbia Basin project. State-owned lands aggregating slightly less than 3,500 irrigable acres make up about 30 farm units in platted irrigation blocks on the project. The State is presently entitled to a 160-acre nonexcess landholding in each of the three Columbia Basin irrigation districts. The remaining irrigable State lands are not entitled

to receive project water unless covered under a valid recordable contract or sold at a price not in excess of the current fair market value without consideration to the construction of irrigation works. For the most part, this has precluded sale of irrigable State lands at public auction. It has also meant that these lands have not received irrigation water.

The preferred solution of the three irrigation districts was that the State be allowed to sell these dry lands at an irrigated land price to encourage the transfer of the lands into private ownership. This was the solution provided in the House version of S. 2062. The Senate version had differed in that it would exempt the State lands from the 160-acre restrictions, thus making the lands eligible for water delivery and permitting the State, at the same time, to retain ownership.

As these matters were finally resolved by the conference committee, the lessees of not to exceed 160 acres of State-owned lands may receive water for a period of 25 years from the date the bill is approved by the President. The conference report states:

This arrangement will lessen the impact of immediate forced divestiture on State programs dependent upon income from State lands and permit an orderly and deliberate program to be developed for disposal of State-owned lands to private owners.

Mr. Speaker, I do regret the preferred solution was not the one finally adopted. However, it is good to have this matter finally dealt with in some manner because the present situation is the worst situation of all.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17138, SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND TEACHERS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 15, 1970.)

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17183, as reported by the conferees, will increase the salaries of District of Columbia policemen, firemen, and teachers, and other professional employees of the Board of Education.

The average overall increase in policemen's and firemen's salaries will be some 13 percent, and will take effect as of July 1, 1969. The beginning salary for privates will be increased from \$8,000 to \$8,500, and the top salary for privates is increased from \$10,300 to \$12,240. Substantial increases are provided also for officers, with the maximum salary of the chief being increased from \$25,605 to \$32,775.

The average increase in salaries for professional school employees is also 13 percent, and will become effective as of September 1, 1969. The starting salary for teachers with the bachelor's degree is increased from \$7,000 to \$7,800, and the maximum for such teachers from \$12,040 to \$13,000. Also, the time required for all teachers to attain the maximum salary level is reduced from 18 to 15 years. The salary of the superintendent is increased in the bill from \$30,000 to \$38,500. It is hoped that this will enable the Board of Education to attract a well-qualified person to fill this position, which is presently vacant.

The estimated net cost of these salary increases, for the 18-month period from January 1, 1970, through July 1, 1971, is approximately \$30.8 million, which is funded by the provision in the bill increasing the personal income tax schedule for residents of the District of Columbia as of January 1, 1970. In addition, the net funds required for the increased salaries from their respective effective dates through December 31, 1969, is estimated at some \$8.8 million, up to \$8 million of which is provided in the bill as a one-time additional Federal payment to the District of Columbia. Thus, the bill is substantially funded.

The policemen, firemen, and teachers in the District of Columbia have not had an increase in salaries since 1968. Since that time, the salaries of the classified employees of the Federal and District of Columbia Governments, as well as the costs of living, have increased substantially. Also, during this 2-year period the salaries for policemen, firemen, and teachers in other cities of comparable size, as well as in the other jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area, have increased considerably, creating an increasingly difficult problem for the District as far as recruitment and retention of these vitally important employees is concerned.

In view of these facts, it is the opinion of the conferees on the part of the House that the provisions of H.R. 17183, as reported, are both justified and practical.

Following is a section-by-section summary of conference language of H.R. 17138, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Section 101 cites title I and title II as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970."

Section 102 establishes new salary schedule—the House schedule amended to increase pay in service steps 2, 3, and 4 in Class 10—for police and firemen, raising beginning privates pay from \$8,000 to \$8,500 per year and increasing salaries in all ranks an average 13 percent.

Section 103 establishes a single technician level, subclass (b), (1) and (2) in salary classes 1 and 2, combining present and subclasses (b) and (c) by upgrading lower level; (3) and (4) establishes classes 10 and 11 as separate classes for Assistant Chiefs and Chiefs, respectively; (5) increases additional compensation for dog handlers other than Privates from \$580 to \$595 per year, consistent with raise in additional compensation provided Privates assigned as technicians because they are dog handlers. Also includes U.S. Park Police dog handlers.

Section 104 revises salary step advancement provision for steps 1, 2 and 3 of Class 1 to reflect removal of subclass (c).

Section 105 changes method of determining step placement on promotion of technicians to permit assignment to the step of the higher class which exceeds by one step increase the rate received at the former salary step in subclass (b). Presently, technicians receiving promotions are assigned to the step of the higher class which exceeds by one step increase the rate shown for subclass (a) in the same step of the class from which promoted.

Section 106 conforms provisions relating to longevity step increases with the new salary schedule.

Section 107(a) adjusts the rates of basic compensation of officers and members in active service whose latest promotion occurred between January 6, 1963, and the bill's effective date, over and above any salary increase received under the new schedule, by determining step placement as though their promotions had occurred under the new schedule. This redetermination of step placement will eliminate or substantially reduce inequities in the higher classes that otherwise would occur in certain cases where individuals promoted after the legislation's effective date would be placed in higher steps than those previously promoted to the same class;

(b) Precludes salary reduction by reason of enactment of the section;

(c) Credits any individual receiving additional compensation as a result of enactment of the section with any active service in his previous salary step for subsequent step advancement purposes;

(d) Excludes individuals retired from active service prior to the date of enactment of the title from receiving an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of enactment of the section.

Section 108 assigns the rank of Assistant Chief to all retired policemen who at any time prior to October 1, 1956, held the rank of Assistant Superintendent for the purpose of computing retirement benefits payable on and after the effective date of this title. Such individuals presently hold the rank of Deputy Chief for benefits computation purposes.

Section 109 (a) and (b) sets forth standard provisions for the payment of retroactive salaries to the title's July 1, 1969, effective date.

Section 110 (a) and (b) advances any officer in longevity step 7 in class 6 who completes at least 14 years of continuous service in his class to longevity step 8. The section amends a provision of the 1966 Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments which pertained only

to such officers in classes 5 and 8 but will take effect only as of the effective date of this title.

Section 111 limits the salary increases as they apply to group life insurance amounts to the date of enactment of the title.

Section 112 establishes the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1969, as the effective date of the title.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN POLICE MATTERS

Section 201 (a); (b) and (c) provides that the uniform of officers and members of the U.S. Park Police, Executive Protective Service, Capitol Police, and Metropolitan Police shall bear a distinctive patch, pin, or other emblem depicting the U.S. flag or colors thereof, effective 180 days after date of enactment of the title.

Section 202 changes "White House Police force" to "Executive Protective Service" in all U.S. laws in which the reference is made.

Section 203 provides that police and firemen may reside within a radius of 25 miles from the U.S. Capitol Building, and that the Police Chief and Fire Chief may grant exceptions to this limitation in cases which, in their judgment, merit such action.

TITLE III—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Section 301 cites title as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970."

Section 302(1) establishes new salary schedule for teachers and school officers, raising beginning teachers' pay from \$7,000 to \$7,800 per year and increasing salaries in all classes an average 13 percent. Salary for the Superintendent has been increased from \$30,000 to \$38,500.

(2) establishes within salary class 15 of the schedule a "bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours" category, designated as group A-1.

(3) (A) (B) allows teachers and school officers who complete the required two years in their salary class to become permanent, even though they may have served in more than one position. Presently, two years' service in the same position is required to complete the probationary period.

(3) (C) provides that a teacher or other employee in class 15 may be appointed to permanent status after one year as a probationary employee if he has completed at least two years of satisfactory service outside the D.C. public schools.

(4) allows teachers who possess a bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours to be transferred to group A-1 of class 15.

(5) establishes a salary-saving provision for Teachers' Salary Act employees who, through no fault of their own, are moved to a lower salary class.

(6) eliminates longevity step X in class 15 and places in longevity step Y those employees who were in longevity step X and those in service step 13 who satisfactorily complete 15 years of creditable service.

(7) conforms the salary step advancement provision with the elimination of longevity step X.

(8) includes group A-1 in the provisions pertaining to promotions.

(9) increases pay rate of teachers and school officers in the summer school, evening school, adult education and veterans' summer school center program in the same relationship to increases in the new salary schedule.

(10) provides that the payment of additional compensation (with maximum rate of \$1,000) to classroom teachers performing extra duty activities be made to all employees in salary class 15.

(11) provides that the payment of annual salaries to employees in class 15 be made in 20 or 24 semimonthly installments, at each employee's discretion, and to all other employees in 24 semimonthly installments. Teachers' Salary Act employees presently are paid monthly.

Section 303 restricts the salary increase for the Superintendent of Schools in class 1 to individuals employed in that position on or after date of enactment of the title.

Section 304 (a) and (b) conforms provisions pertaining to payment of salaries with the new semimonthly installments.

Section 305 (a) and (b) sets forth standard provisions for the payment of retroactive salaries to the title's September 1, 1969 effective date.

Section 306 establishes the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after September 1, 1969 as the effective date of the title.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE PROVISIONS

Section 401 increases in 8 steps the individual income taxes of District residents, with taxes starting at 2% on the first \$1,000 of taxable income, and reaching 10% at \$25,000 and above.

Section 402 authorizes a one-time Federal payment or contribution, up to \$8,000,000, for use in defraying the cost to the District of Columbia of the pay increases provided for by this Act for the period commencing July 1, 1969, and ending December 31, 1969. Such sum so authorized to be appropriated is to be in addition to any other sums authorized under any other law, and in addition to the increase in revenue from the income tax increases provided in Sec. 401.

TITLE V—PAY RATE FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Sec. 501 provides for payment of the salary of the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard by the Department of Defense (rather than by the D.C. Government as under present law).

Also it subjects such officer to the dual pay and dual employment provisions of title 5, U.S. Code.

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

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman in urging the House to pass this conference report.

The conference report represents about 95 percent of what was in the House bill and, after a number of meetings I might add, the final report that we came up with is substantially the same as the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) was one of the conferees on this bill and attended the meetings very religiously and was a pillar of strength in our debate with the Senate over the provisions and made a brilliant contribution to the House position. He was most persuasive in his arguments with the Senate and as a result we come to you with the House bill substantially in tact.

I might add that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) made a substantial contribution to this measure also.

The only major changes were the retroactive features which were extended from January 1, the period we had in the House provision, to July 1, 1969, for policemen—and September 1, 1969, for the teachers.

For that reason we did include a nominal Federal payment to cover any additional expenses over and above the tax measures the House adopted that may be needed to meet the expenses and costs of those retroactive provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to adopt this conference report.

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

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks.

I would like to point out to the House that, although the retroactive feature is moved back to July 1 in the conference report, which is contrary to what was passed by this body, the teachers, policemen, and firemen have been waiting for over a year for this legislation. We are all aware of the continued inflation of the Nation's economy, particularly here in the Washington metropolitan area where we can all testify to the fact that costs of food, shelter, and clothing, as well as taxes, have gone up steeply during the past year. These increased costs have stretched thin the budgets of our policemen, firemen, and teachers. Because they have families to support and expenses to meet, these public servants are being forced to choose between their profession and the best interests of their families. In view of the vital areas of public service with which we are dealing, it is doubly important that competent personnel be encouraged to seek these positions and to remain in them by providing them a decent living. I think this bill, including the retroactive provision, is an equitable response to their need to keep up with the cost of living, and I urge that the conference report be approved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. 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. 181]

Adair	de la Garza	Koch
Addabbo	Delaney	Kuykendall
Anderson,	Dent	Landrum
Calif.	Diggs	Long, La.
Anderson,	Dingell	Lowenstein
Tenn.	Downing	McCarthy
Andrews,	Dulski	McCloskey
N. Dak.	Eckhardt	McClure
Ashley	Erlenborn	McEwen
Barrett	Farbstein	McKneally
Boggs	Feighan	McMillan
Bolling	Fish	MacGregor
Bow	Fraser	Marsh
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	Meskill
Brasco	Gallagher	Minehall
Brock	Gaydos	Mollohan
Brooks	Gialmo	Monagan
Burleson, Tex.	Gilbert	Montgomery
Carey	Gray	Morse
Carter	Griffiths	Morton
Cederberg	Halpern	Murphy, N.Y.
Celler	Hamilton	O'Hara
Chisholm	Hanley	Ottinger
Clancy	Hanna	Patman
Clark	Hansen, Idaho	Pelly
Clay	Harrington	Pepper
Conyers	Hastings	Pike
Corbett	Hawkins	Pirnie
Daddario	Howard	Poage
Daniels, N.J.	Keith	Podell
Davis, Wis.	Kirwan	Pollock
Dawson	Kleppe	Powell

Preyer, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.	Tiernan
Price, Tex.	Roybal	Ullman
Pryor, Ark.	St Germain	Vigorito
Pucinski	Sandman	Wampler
Purcell	Scheuer	Watson
Quillen	Schwengel	Weicker
Rarick	Smith, Iowa	Whalley
Reid, Ill.	Springer	Wilson,
Reid, N.Y.	Stephens	Charles H.
Rivers	Stratton	Wold
Robison	Symington	Wright
Rodino	Taft	Zwach
Roe	Thompson, N.J.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RESTORING THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 953 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 953

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 (S. 2315) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. 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 Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. O'NEILL), is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 953 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 2315 to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

S. 2315 temporarily renews the authority for the Golden Eagle passport. The program as it existed on March 31, 1970, will be maintained until December 31, 1971, except that the authorized lim-

itation on the fee for the passport will be increased from \$7 to \$10.

The bill also extends the authority to enter into contracts for the purchase of lands authorized to be acquired prior to the appropriation of funds—commonly called the advance contract authority. The limitations placed on this authority are to remain binding on the extension. The statute clearly establishes that no contract shall be entered into for the acquisition of any property unless such acquisition is authorized by Federal law. It also limits the total contractual obligation for each fiscal year to no more than \$30 million and requires the contracts to be liquidated from the moneys in the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 953 in order that S. 2315 may be considered.

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I just want to thank the gentleman for giving a 2-hour rule for the discussion of this matter and thank the Committee on Rules for its usual consideration for those of us who have amendments to offer on this bill to make sure we have ample time for the discussion of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and support the bill. When we get an amendment or two in it, and get the eagle to fly right, I do not think there will be any votes against this bill.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 953, provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on the bill, S. 2315.

The purpose of the bill is, first, to temporarily renew the authority for the annual entrance pass to our Federal parks and recreational areas—commonly known as the Golden Eagle pass—and, second, to extend existing authority for the Department of the Interior to enter into contracts for the purchase of lands authorized to be acquired prior to the actual appropriation of the necessary funds.

Under existing law the Golden Eagle pass authority expired on March 31 of this year. The program has not worked as its supporters had hoped; far less in pass purchase funds than was projected has been received by the land and water conservation fund, the depository for all such funds. There apparently are a number of reasons for this unexpectedly poor showing, including lack of publicity.

The committee bill recommends continuation of the program until December 1971 at an increased rate—from \$7 to \$10—for the annual Golden Eagle pass. During this extension period a complete study will be undertaken by the Department of the Interior, and new recommendations will be forthcoming. The increase in the cost of the permit is to make available additional funds to the land and water conservation fund.

The bill also extends existing "advance contract authority." This permits the

Department of the Interior to enter in purchase contracts on land it intends to acquire where the authorization has been signed into law but where the appropriated funds are not yet available. This authority is limited to no more than \$30,000,000 in such contracts in each fiscal year.

The departments and agencies interested in the legislation generally support the bill as amended and reported.

Separate views are filed by seven Members. They believe that the cost of the Golden Eagle pass should remain at an annual charge of \$7 rather than the increased charge of \$10 as recommended in the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. 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. ASPINALL. 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 (S. 2315) to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

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 S. 2315, with Mr. MOORHEAD 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 Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill now before the House is essentially twofold: It seeks to revise and extend the program known as the Golden Eagle program through December 31, 1971; and it seeks to extend the provisions of law which authorize recreation land acquiring agencies to enter into contracts for the purchase of lands prior to the actual appropriation of funds.

GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

Without going into too much detail, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the background of the Golden Eagle passport program. As most everyone will recall, when we originally considered the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, there were three basic sources of revenue for the fund which it established: One source was the proceeds from the sale of surplus real property and related personal property; another was the revenues received from motorboat fuels taxes; and the third was to be from entrance and user fees.

A part of this third source consisted of the annual entrance permit now

known as the Golden Eagle passport. This permit, which sold for \$7, entitled the purchaser and everyone in his non-commercial vehicle to admission to virtually all federally administered outdoor recreation areas. Even though it was not enacted for that purpose, practically everyone realized what a potential bargain this program could be to the active recreationist. Based on this fact and on the belief that many people would want to contribute to the program, it was estimated that 36 million permits would be sold during the first 5 years after its establishment.

Although we were optimistic about the program at the outset, our optimism faded as the program matured. By 1968, it was clear that the program would probably never be as popular as anticipated nor produce the revenues estimated when the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was enacted. Instead of sales in the neighborhood of \$138,000,000, only slightly more than \$12,000,000 accrued to the fund. On the basis of these discouraging returns, it was then decided that the program should be allowed to expire and that the agencies having outdoor recreation responsibilities should be allowed to develop their own fee system in accordance with the statutory authority which had been extended to them. As a result, Public Law 90-401 provided for the termination of the annual entrance fee program on March 31, 1970.

Had the program shown signs of renewed vigor prior to March 31, it might have been possible for your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to recommend its unlimited extension, but sales showed no dramatic increase. Instead, passport sales seemed to stabilize between 600,000 and 700,000 annually. The committee recognized that little could be expected of the program as it was operating, but time did not permit a substantial revision of it.

Our recommendations are easy to understand—

First, we recommend that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to increase the price of the Golden Eagle passport from \$7 to \$10 if he deems such action appropriate.

Second, we recommend the extension of the status quo until December 31, 1971, in order to allow the program to be completely reviewed and revamped. Once these changes have been formulated and properly considered, the Congress would have another opportunity to pass on this issue.

Based largely on the correspondence on this subject, as well as on the preponderance of the testimony presented to the committee, we feel reasonably confident that passport sales at the increased price will not decline. Most people who wrote the committee indicating their views on the price of the passport stated that they felt an increase in the fee to \$10 or more would be desirable. In terms of percentages, this represents a significant increase, but the increased price represents a substantial bargain for many recreationists who utilize Federal outdoor areas frequently.

Undoubtedly some will say that the program is a complete failure and that it should be abandoned. In all candor, we must admit our disappointment in it. As idealists are wont to do, I suppose, we expected too much from too many. We thought that those who profess such a keen interest in the environment would want to convert their philosophical notions into something more meaningful and tangible, but the sales of the Golden Eagle passport proved that they were not quite that interested unless they could put it to active use for their personal benefit.

Now, the question is not whether the program succeeded or failed, but whether there is any salvage value in it. We firmly believe that there is. We feel that a temporary extension of the program will allow us time to develop the reforms needed to make it more productive. Whether the original objective can ever be achieved or not, I am unable to predict, but we should be able to substantially improve the program.

ADVANCE CONTRACT AUTHORITY

The other important feature of the bill involves the extension of the Advance Contract Authority. In 1968, when the Congress initially approved this aspect of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program, we believed that substantial amounts of money could be saved in the acquisition of recreation lands if the time lag between the authorization of a project and the appropriation of funds could be reduced. We recognized that land price escalation increases rapidly once authorizing legislation is approved. To help bridge this gap, we recommended the Advance Contract Authority provision of Public Law 90-301.

By allowing the land acquiring agencies some authority to proceed with some of the preliminaries for the acquisition of lands and by permitting them to enter binding agreements prior to the appropriation of funds, we feel that some speculative ventures were short-circuited. I hasten to add, however, that the limitations imposed by law and by the legislative history with respect to this authority remain intact and have not been altered in any manner.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in all likelihood some amendments to the bill will be offered. I do not wish to debate those questions at this time, but I do not want to urge the Members of the House to keep in mind the object of the programs which I have discussed. I sincerely feel that the recreationist, like any other user of Federal lands, should help pay his share of the cost of providing the benefit which he receives. While it may be unreasonable and more than likely inequitable in certain cases to establish a formula which would require him to pay the equivalent fair market value of these benefits, it would be equally unreasonable and inequitable to require the general taxpayer to unduly subsidize his individual recreation activities.

In conclusion, I want to say that a reasonable extension of the Golden Eagle program seems appropriate. Not

only will it permit a thorough discussion of the alternatives, but it will also allow the committees and the Congress an opportunity to consider the recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission in this regard. I urge the Members to approve S. 2315, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In response to inquiries which I asked the staff to make, I am advised that the agencies contemplate the following action if S. 2315, as amended, is enacted.

Interior Department—Anticipates continued utilization of the annual permits issued by the respective agencies on an interchangeable basis for the balance of the calendar year 1970. This will preclude the issuance of a new pass for the balance of the recreation season, but the Golden Eagle, as such, will be issued in calendar year 1971. Since the agency annual permits will take the place of the Golden Eagle passport for this year, the revenues collected from these permits should be placed in the Land and Water Conservation Fund as if they were receipts from the Golden Eagle program.

Forest Service—In compliance with the suggested procedures mentioned, the Forest Service indicated that it would be advantageous to continue to utilize the annual permits already issued on an interchangeable basis.

Corps of Army Engineers—As recommended to the House, S. 2315 does not repeal section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968; consequently, no entrance or admission fees would be charged at these areas in any event; however, the Corps has advised that it has designated 63 developed campgrounds where user fees have been or are being imposed. User fees, of course, are not contemplated or included in the Golden Eagle admission fee program as originally authorized.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert my statement in the proceedings today in regard to S. 2315, to restore the Golden Eagle passport program to the Land and Water Conservation Act.

I am in complete support of the contents of the bill and feel this is sound legislation to continue to provide a uniform admission fee system for tourists to purchase one passport annually for passage to all national parks and recreation areas.

I feel that the increase from \$7 to \$10 in the passport fee is fair to the vacationing public and will be a definite asset for the Federal Government which will assist the Department of Interior in keeping the parks and recreation sites clean and help further development of new parks and sites.

The traveling public overwhelmingly indicated its favor with the passport fee program so I do not believe the increase in fees would be against the general public welfare. The fact that additional funds would be available as revenue to continue to preserve the national park system and national recreation sites is a

tremendous advancement for the further conservation of natural resources and the scenic beauty of America.

I also support the continuation of the Golden Eagle program through December 31, 1971 and the special study of the Secretary of the Interior to be initiated into the entry fee issue and all user fees regarding America's national park system and the recreation sites across this Nation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Let me say first that I am very happy to hear the chairman say on the floor what he has just said about the working of this program and about his intentions in conference with the other body on the bill.

Do I understand the chairman correctly to say that at the present time entrance fees are not being collected at any of the outdoor recreation areas of the Army Corps of Engineers?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct in that regard.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Or of the Park Service with the exception of Jamestown. Is that not correct? With the national parks?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not know whether Jamestown is specifically mentioned here or not. Yes, it is. The gentleman is correct. As far as entrance fees are concerned, he is correct. But the Park Service does intend to have an annual permit for entrance into the national park areas which will be honored at all park areas as soon as they can get their entrance passports ready.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield further, is it also a fact that at the present time the Forest Service is collecting a user fee for camping facilities and is not collecting an entrance fee? Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. They are issuing an annual permit which, as they have always honored it, would be for a user fee rather than for an entrance fee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Do I understand that if this bill passes, the Park Service will go ahead and charge a user fee also?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand what they have in mind is that they have their annual permit which they will continue for the balance of the year and will give some credit on that annual permit for user fee purposes. It will not permit, however, an annual permit to be used, let us say, for 20 different nights in the park at the original price of the entrance fee.

Mr. HAYS. That is the point I am getting at, because, as I understand it, some of these people who can afford to pay \$12,000, \$15,000, or, as I understand it, as high as \$20,000 for a mobile camper then buy one of these permits and go in there and hook up to the water and sewer

and spend the summer. It does not seem right to me. The fellow who goes out with an occasional permit has to pay \$1 or whatever it is for his entrance fee, but it seems to me the person spending the summer there and getting all of the benefits ought to pay a little bit more.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is reasonable, he is logical and he is rational, and a study that will be made in the future that is provided for under this legislation was taken into consideration, because what the gentleman from Ohio suggests was not intended to be a bonanza for such users of our recreation areas.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if we vote for this now—and I hope to be able to vote for it—we can assume that there will be an additional fee for those who remain over long periods of time in the national parks?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is my understanding, I will say to my friend from Ohio.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2315, to restore the Golden Eagle passport program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. If enacted, this legislation would renew the annual permit authority of the Golden Eagle program.

The annual \$7 permit under the expired program entitled the purchaser, and anyone in his automobile, to enter several thousand designated Federal recreation areas without paying additional admission fees. The program, while it has not quite lived up to its revenue expectations, has brought in nearly \$20 million in the past 5 years with the sale of almost 3 million passports.

Support for the program in the State of Oregon, with its many parks and recreation areas, has been particularly good, and I have received numerous letters urging the reinstatement of the program. None of them, incidentally, objected to the \$3 increase of the passport provided in this legislation.

Many of these letters have come from senior citizens and people with large families. The Golden Eagle has allowed them to visit Federal recreation areas as often as they like without additional cost. The retired people who live on fixed incomes find they are able to spend many more leisure hours enjoying the beauty of our forests and participating in recreational activities than they could before the Golden Eagle. With a passport they are not penalized with a "per visit" charge.

Large families also benefit from the program because they are not penalized by a "per person" charge. The program has encouraged family outings and family vacations. Reverting to a "per person per visit" system would be especially burdensome to these two groups and would discourage their visiting Federal recreation areas.

This would be a troubling thing for the Congress to do. As our society becomes more and more urbanized, our cities more and more crowded and polluted, we should do all we can to encourage trips to our national parks and shrines. A visit to a Federal recreation area can be a refreshing escape for urban and suburban dwellers alike.

I urge my colleagues to permit our citizens to make full use of the Nation's natural wonders at minimal cost by passing this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, as amended and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The principal purpose of this legislation is to restore the Golden Eagle passport program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This bill only restores that program through December 31, 1971, and provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall, on or before February 1, 1971, conduct and complete a survey as to the Federal policy to be implemented on entrance and user fees and report his findings to the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

In addition, the bill as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs provides for an increase in the amount the Secretary may charge for the annual fee. This increase is from the present \$7 to not more than \$10. The bill as amended also provides for an extension of the advance contract authority under the act from a limitation of 2 fiscal years to each fiscal year, but retains the \$30,000,000 ceiling on the use of such authority.

In 1968, this body decided upon recommendation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Golden Eagle passport program should be terminated on March 31, 1970. I opposed the termination of the Golden Eagle program in the committee and on the floor. I opposed the termination of the program because the principal purpose for amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was to increase the revenues into the fund as a means of reducing the \$500 million backlog of authorizations demanded by the American people to meet the increasing need for outdoor recreation opportunities. The purpose was not to delete a revenue producing program from the act.

The reason the provisions deleting the Golden Eagle program were included in the 1968 amendments was because the anticonservationists were determined to have their pound of flesh. Much has been or will be said about how the revenues from the Golden Eagle program have not lived up to expectations under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The committee report on this legislation attempts to show that the Golden Eagle program has been a failure by stating that revenues estimated at \$180 million were expected based on a \$5 annual permit and that in 1969 there were only \$19,399,100 in revenues to the fund based on the \$7 permit.

In some 20 years on the committee, I have repeatedly opposed the chipping, chopping, and undermining efforts of the anticonservationists. If the Golden Eagle program has been a failure, it is only because these anticonservationists were successful in undermining the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act by providing in section 7 of that act that "moneys derived from the sources listed in section 2 of the act shall not be available for publicity purposes."

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 set up a Federal program for financing Federal and State acquisitions for park and recreation programs. Yet the act, as passed, included a prohibition against using revenues to advertise and bring about public awareness of the program. How inconsistent can we be?

If the Golden Eagle program has been a failure, it was doomed at the outset by the handcuffs and handicaps placed upon the administrators by giving them a national program to administer but prohibiting their ability to spend money to advertise the program to the American people.

Let us look at what the American people have had to say about this program once they were given the opportunity to know something about it. My colleagues will recall that for some time prior to March 31, 1970, much of your mail was in the form of pleas from the American people and organizations in which they participated to retain or restore the Golden Eagle passport program. You will recall, gentlemen, that the mail was quite heavy and the plea came from both young and old Americans. These pleas resulted in approximately 48 Members of the House sponsoring legislation in support of the program and one measure was introduced in opposition to the program.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in this body never got around to holding hearings on this legislation until approximately 30 days prior to the expiration of the program. A more meaningful bill in response to the plea of the American people passed the other body on September 24, 1969.

The opposition to this legislation not only comes from the anticonservationists, but also from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who, for reasons peculiar to their own interests, oppose the collection of fees at Corps of Engineers projects. Once again, the corps has strong opposition to this legislation because of their fear that this legislation interferes with their impregnable empire. In addition, part of the problem with this program has been the uncooperative attitude of certain other Federal agencies to work in concert for the establishment of a unified system because of the loopholes that have been purposely created in the law.

The passage of this legislation to restore the Golden Eagle program is imperative in response to the requests of the American people. Undoubtedly, a conference will be necessary to resolve differences in the bill passed by the other

body and the bill this House passes today. I urge my colleagues to support the bill as passed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that in this bill we are asking the Secretary of the Interior to check with the Department of the Army, the Corps of Engineers, and with the Forest Service in preparing the report authorized in the bill.

Nobody should be misled to the effect that we do not expect the report of the Secretary of the Interior to cover all recreation areas.

Now, it may seem strange to you, but the Flood Control Act of 1936, the original Flood Control Act, has absolutely no reference whatsoever to recreation. The Flood Control Act of 1944 has no reference whatsoever to recreation. But the new and amended Flood Control Act which is on the books at the present time does authorize the Corps of Engineers to include recreation in their projects purposes.

One of the reasons for including that and requiring the Secretary to make a survey is contained in the report that the Senate made on this bill. The important thing to remember is that the Corps of Engineers, believe it or not, has almost as many recreation areas as the Park Service and Forest Service put together. Let us tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, some of them are in horrible shape. Very frankly they are not fit for use. The garbage is running out of the cans, they are not policing the areas, the people do not get around to take care of these matters, and if you ask the local engineer why, he looks at you and says, "Well, very frankly, we do not have enough money to take care of them. We do not have enough money to police these areas."

Yet, when the Corps of Engineers comes before the Congress and asks for an appropriation for their rivers and harbors and for flood control projects, believe it or not, it is justified on the basis of taking care of these areas. They ask for about 32 percent of all their appropriations for recreation.

Now, what has happened is that the Corps of Engineers wants it both ways. They want to get all the money they can for recreation and use it as an adjunct in justifying their projects. Yet these people who come here and tell you that you cannot charge an entrance fee when any one wants to go on a corps project, the reason given for it is very simple. They say the Federal Government paid for it.

Well, I want to know if there is anything that is used by the Forest Service that the Federal Government has not paid for. I want to know whether or not there is any unit in the National Park Service that the taxpayers have not bought and paid for. Nobody can show us, with one or two exceptions, areas which the Rockefellers have bought and given to the country, but that otherwise the taxpayers have paid for all of it.

These people have no objection to saying that you can charge an entrance fee at a national park, you can charge an

entrance fee in certain units of the Forest Service, but you cannot charge the holy of holies, you cannot say a word about the Corps of Engineers.

Now, when this survey is made I expect there is going to be a report back recommending that in those areas there will be a fee collected that there be a charge for the Corps of Engineers' projects also.

Now, do not let anybody be misled to think that that is not going to be in the recommendations because very frankly I have talked to some of the ranking members of the Corps and they are frank to tell me that in certain areas they feel an entrance fee is justified. They have no objection to charging users' fees, and they are charging users' fees today. They have a suggestion, and this may be in the report which the Secretary of the Interior reports back, that the money would not all go into the land and water conservation fund, but that in those areas where in the Park Service they collect an entrance fee and user fee, that money would go then to the National Park Service; in the Forest Service where they collect user fees and entrance fees it would go to the Forest Service for the development of the recreation lands. And as far as the Corps of Engineers are concerned, where it is available, where it should be justified, they will recommend a fee, and that that money go then to the Corps of Engineers for the further development of recreation in these areas.

Now, I do not see how anyone can complain if that is the report, and from indications which have come to me from people in the Corps of Engineers this is what they expect to recommend.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and that of the distinguished chairman before him. I do not quite agree with all of it, because I think there are a few additional postulates that for the purpose of legislative record ought to be made. I am sure neither the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, and least of all the one from Missouri, wants to put preconceived words into the mind of this commission, or the Secretary of the Interior, that is going to report back. I am perfectly willing to do just what he has in mind and let them study this problem. I well realize that the Corps of Engineers does have more recreational areas than the other two that have been mentioned thus far, but it is not true, or probably not true, including the Bureau of Reclamation, but certainly as far as the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture and Forest Service is concerned.

As to the exceptions, first of all the gentleman does agree with me that the present users' fees, which are quite small for the use being put on them, which was reimposed in six recreational areas in the Ozark Mountains of southwest Missouri and the Table Lake area this last week, serve no purpose in a true sense as being returned for improving of the sites which the gentleman says they should be, but at the present time they are not and continue to go into the land and water use

fund for additional acquisition of land on the recommendations of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; is that not true?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. So that I would hope with the gentleman that any finding about user fees as differentiated from entrance or admission fees would, as the gentleman has said, be stipulated to come back to the improvement of the facilities which there is capital investment of the taxpayers' money.

The reason I asked the gentleman to yield was not just to agree with him, but to ask him if he would not agree with me that there is some additional reason for not charging entrance or admission fees to the people's own waters—plus the fact perhaps in the case of the National Parks or the gifts that he mentioned, which I know about, or in the forestry service the land was not acquired on the basis of a promise to the people that they would never be denied access?

This is certainly true in the case of land impoundments, the implication of the use of the law of eminent domain in the land acquisition of the Corps of Engineers and their practices.

This has been documented. I submitted it on two different occasions before the gentleman's unusually hardworking and well-informed committee. It is a reversal of a statement, if not a reversal of principle—and I would hope the committee would make it clear once and forever that where people were promised entrance or access, not to be denied the use of waters. At one time when you had to come in by helicopter or parachute to use the waters under any other circumstances there may have been a difference in the method of land acquisition, of one versus the other. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say there may have been in the past some commitments made or attempted to be made by certain people in behalf of the Federal agency, particularly the Corps of Engineers.

I might call the attention of my colleague to the fact, that in practicing law I found on many occasions many people who represented agencies of the Federal Government made statements, and when we finally got to court we found a very unusual situation. The judge would say he was very sorry, but a local man could not bind the Federal Government—even though it was given in good faith.

You know years ago, we never had any income tax. A lot of people believed they would never have to pay any taxes.

The fact is when the original act was passed the Constitution was changed. I think you will find those who suggested or said that some day their income tax might get as high as 5 percent. Nobody believed it would ever get that high, even when we had the exemption of \$2,500 for each one of your children. But things have changed and so has the Congress. As my friend knows, one Congress cannot bind the next Congress. Now we find out that instead of having a \$2,500 exemption and a tax that might get to 5 percent, we are stuck with starting with a \$600 exemption and a tax that starts with 20 percent and until this

last change by the Committee on Ways and Means it could have gone as high as 98 percent.

So things are not always static. Recreation was not a part of the original bills upon which the Corps of Engineers was started. So I think we have to look at it in 1970 and not in 1936 or 1944 or 1956—when the last act was passed in regard to flood control. We have to look at it in 1970 for what we might expect in the years to come.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's analogies—I do not particularly agree with them.

As the gentleman knows, I am not a lawyer or legally trained. When I take a person's pancreas out and promise them they are going to have sugar in their urine for the rest of their life, it is just liable to remain that way. I am not used to going back on my word or changing it. But be that as it may, and I am sorry to say it has happened on too many occasions. I appreciate the gentleman's argument. But we know those areas, talking about stopped rivers and impounded rivers which are, I believe, going back further than the gentleman asked us not to, under the law of 1796 which defined navigable streams, and in the pinch—our people have had a right, particularly the elderly and retired people, to go there and they use these rivers.

They have used them commercially, they have used them recreationally, and they have used them in their retirement just to fish. I can quote the gentleman, but I do not want to take more of his time, as to some of the pleasures of fishing in an Ozark stream, whether you are active at it or just trawling a string in the warm sunshine under the zephyrs. But be that as it may, a commitment was made, and I plead with the gentleman that principles do not change merely because usage changes. I am with him 100 percent as far as users' fees are concerned, especially if they inure to the improvement of that which we are using. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. KYL. There was a time in our history when we had a different attitude toward the use of public lands of all sorts, when we gave the privilege to a commodity user to go on the lands almost without any charge, without any responsibility for what he might do to the land. Then we developed a little interim program permitting commodity groups to use them from the public lands, but with more stringent regulation. Now we are at a point at which we expect anyone who uses the public lands to pay for that use, whether they be miners, grazers, irrigators, or recreationists, because when one uses the public lands in any manner in which those lands are actually used, and in a manner which shows the results of use, then there should be some compensation for that use. Otherwise the resources which we

have will disappear. That is the point which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has so aptly made here in this discussion.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely wanted to make certain that the record was accurate with regard to the question of Army Engineers spending for recreational purposes. The Senate committee report on the bill which we have before us makes reference to a 32-percent benefit from recreational purposes on Army Engineer projects, but I do not think in any project of which I have personal knowledge, certainly not anywhere near that figure would be allocated in the way of expenditures for recreational purposes on Army Engineer projects. You may spend \$10 and get \$100 in benefits back, or you may make a \$500 investment and get \$200 in benefits back. But the fact is that you have a project with a 32-percent recreational benefit, and that does not indicate that 32 percent of the Army Engineers money is being spent on recreation. I am sure the gentleman would agree with me on that analysis.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague that the subject is further covered in the Senate report in the following language:

The Corps of Engineers places heavy reliance upon the use of recreational benefits to justify the construction of navigation and multiple-use dams and reservoirs. For example, Public Law 90-483, the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act, approved August 13, 1968, authorized the construction of 19 projects which included multiple-purpose reservoirs in the plan for development. Total benefits accruing to all project purposes would be \$71,322,400 annually of which \$22,781,090, representing 32 percent, would accrue to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

I did not write that report. Certainly they were justified in much of their construction, not on flood control, but in these other two areas, and I do not find fault with that. The only thing I am saying is that if they are going to charge that amount for recreation benefits for fish and wildlife, then those people who use those features should be charged for them and should pay for them.

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

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

Mr. KYL. There are a couple of other aspects that I would like to mention in order to complete the picture. In addition to the Corps of Engineer funds to build projects of the kind we are discussing, there are also inputs of money from other Federal sources as well as State sources. For example, in connection with a Corps of Engineers project there may be an addition of 1,000 acres of land which is purchased by the corps for development, either by the corps or through cooperation with the State, through both State funds, funds from fish and wildlife sources, funds from land and water conservation, the fund itself.

These additions of funds really add to the total amount of money which is put into these projects which are primarily for flood control and river stabilization, and both of us certainly want inclusion of recreational factors.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, S. 2315, which would restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. I am sponsor of one of the bills, H.R. 12490, to continue the program.

There is strong support in my congressional district in Kansas for the restoration of this program, and I believe that the demand is sufficiently widespread throughout the country for the enactment of this restoration legislation.

We should take this action now to restore the program in time for many Americans who are planning inexpensive vacations.

Much of the mail I have received on this matter comes from retired people—senior citizens who have found a new way of spending their retirement years in the out of doors at a price they can afford. The golden eagle program also has encouraged family vacations.

Continuation of the golden eagle program is consistent with the national policy of requesting users of special public facilities to be responsible for paying their fair share of the costs.

The revenues from this program are used to expand the Nation's outdoor recreation opportunities. Not only are they used to help Federal agencies acquire needed recreation lands, but they also are made available to assist the States in improving or expanding their outdoor recreation base.

The only reservation I have in regard to S. 1315, as amended, is that it would increase the present passport fee from \$7 to \$10. I would prefer to see the Federal Government "hold the line" on its prices in this inflationary period. As stated previously, the golden eagle is a great benefit to retired Americans. These people are on fixed retirement incomes and are having a hard time with inflation today.

However, what is essential in our consideration of this legislation is that we continue the Golden Eagle program. It expired as of March 31, 1970. We should act now to extend it, as recommended by the committee, through December 31, 1971.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2315, restoring the so-called golden eagle passport program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

I mention only three of the principal reasons for my support of this program and this bill.

First, it offers average citizens in our

country the opportunity to visit our national parks and recreation areas in a way that many of them would otherwise be unable to do. Consider what this means for a retired or for young parents with a number of children. For a reasonable fee well within their capacity to pay, they can take their campers into our parks and recreation areas throughout the entire country. They are able to enjoy personally, or to give their growing family a chance to enjoy America's magnificent areas which are set aside for recreation. America is the richer for this being possible.

Second, the golden eagle passport retains, for those using it, the values that come from paying for something instead of receiving it completely free of charge. When one has to pay for something he is often more careful than if he gets it for nothing.

And, third, the economic potential to the Nation's recreational programs of the golden eagle passport is considerable. Spending reasonable amounts for advertising could well result in considerably increased total revenues. These increased revenues could help materially in the further development of other highly desirable projects throughout the Nation.

I urge the House to approve this important measure before us today.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several weeks, I have received considerable mail from constituents inquiring whether the golden eagle is really dead or only in a state of suspended animation.

Today, we in this House have an opportunity to breathe new life into this venerable bird. This is an opportunity we should not fail to seize.

Today, with millions of Americans either on their way or getting ready to take vacations, the uncertainty over the fate of the golden eagle program has caused a great deal of confusion.

As all of you know, the Forest Service has initiated its own yearly use permit, with the sale price pegged at \$7 annually, which allows persons to use recreational areas under the jurisdiction of that agency. This permit does not cover areas administered by the National Park Service, so that agency is charging \$1 per day for use of facilities.

Even though the Forest Service has informed purchasers of the \$7 permit that this can be used in national parks when, if Congress acts on the Golden Eagle program, the people of this Nation are understandably confused as to where they may go, how much they have to pay, and to whom.

We, in the West, and particularly in my home State of Utah have many scenic wonders of singular interest to the tourists and the vacationers. It is, in my opinion, important that we make these areas readily accessible to people who wish to see them, and, at the same time, keep the cost and inconvenience to a minimum.

The golden eagle program is especially beneficial to our retired citizens, many of whom are now able to enjoy the time to travel and see the features of this country. Under this program, they can see the natural wonders of this great Nation at a significant reduction in cost. Without such a program, many retired citizens might not be able to see the things they have wanted to view for a long time.

I feel strongly that it is time we get a healthy golden eagle back on its perch. There can be no question as to the merit of this program. In 1965, when the program was initiated, 90,400 permits were issued—passports to our natural wonders. That figure was multiplied in 1969 to a total of 875,576, which attests to the popularity of this program with the touring public.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I rise in support of the legislation. However, I will be working to amend the legislation to maintain the section 210 of the Flood Control Act. This legislation can best be described as "must" legislation. Many of our traveling senior citizens and outdoor recreation facility users have become accustomed to the convenience of the golden eagle passport. Their plans are formulated but there is uncertainty hanging over them unless and until this bill extending the golden eagle passport program, actually passes.

At the urging of many of my constituents, I coauthored this legislation and am pleased to have been a member of the Interior Committee responsible for advancing it to the floor of the House here today.

We on the committee, realize that the great variance that exists, between agencies of Government, with regard to entrance and user fees, has caused confusion by users and in fact, has also created an administrative problem for all Federal employees.

Therefore, the complete survey by the Interior Secretary, as contained in section 4 of the House version, should bring about some policy recommendations that can and should clarify the situation. Meanwhile, I urge the passage of the bill before us.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON).

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of legislation to extend the golden eagle passport program, I speak for hundreds of constituents in the 23d Congressional District of California who have written expressing interest in the continuation of the program. These citizens, the youth and elderly, the laborer and bank president, will be pleased that we have provided the means for extending the program through the legislation before the House of Representatives today.

California, with its many miles of park lands, has a population which is particu-

larly geared to the enjoyment of the natural beauty of our State and other areas in the United States as well. The enthusiastic support of conservation groups in California has been manifest from the inception of the golden eagle program. Increasing numbers of senior citizens have been making use of the passports as they rediscover in their leisure years the grandeur of our national recreation areas. Families with growing children have indicated how helpful the passports are in family outdoor vacations. As more and more emphasis is placed upon preservation of the natural environment, increasing numbers of Americans are turning their attention to the simple pleasures arising from enjoyment of the scenic beauty of America.

It would appear, judging from my mail, that this is a program which might well be expanded, perhaps with restructuring as indicated by the committee hearings, but which under no circumstances should be permitted to expire.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. As one of the original cosponsors of the legislation, of course, I support the bill.

I express my appreciation to the chairman and ranking Republican member and all members of the committee for bringing this bill to us.

Mr. Chairman, as you probably know, I introduced legislation similar to S. 2315, which would reinstate the Golden Eagle passport, on May 15 last year. At that time, my legislation was cosponsored by 31 other Members of the California delegation.

Although my bill would have extended the passport indefinitely, I think that the Interior Committee's amendments to the Senate measure which we are considering today are more than reasonable, and I urge everyone here to vote in favor of this legislation.

As you will recall, the reason for the development of the Golden Eagle passport was to provide maximum use of those Federal recreation and conservation areas by the elderly and the average lower- and middle-income families. Also, as I am sure you are aware, the program, if extended, would help lift the financial burden from those most affected by inflation and those who are substantially dependent on fixed incomes, who, like everyone else, are entitled to a pleasurable vacation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and its chairman, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, for the concern shown in trying to provide American taxpayers with a means to inexpensively and frequently visit and explore those areas throughout the country which have been set aside because of their natural beauty and recreational value. Our parks and natural resources are their heritage and, as you realize, it is incumbent upon us in Congress to make it easier for the public to enjoy that heritage.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the House is finally prepared to take up S. 2315, some 2½ months after the program with which the bill deals had officially expired.

I am sure that many of my colleagues are familiar with the administrative chaos which the House delay on this measure has caused. Some Federal recreation areas are collecting no fees at all, others on only a sporadic basis. While everyone is agreed that some sort of fee collection is desirable, it seems to me that this agreement should have led to speedier action on the measure now before us.

The House committee version of S. 2315 strikes out all of the Senate text after the enacting clause. Most importantly, as far as the current situation is concerned, instead of the Senate's unlimited extension of the Golden Eagle program, it imposes a new time limit for the expiration of the program—leaving the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture open to the same sort of administrative uncertainty as now exists.

It is significant to note in the various agency responses to the committee inquiry, that these departments, which are most intimately concerned with the administration of recreational fee areas, favor the unlimited extension proposed by the Senate. I also favor this type of extension, since the bill as written removes one of the major handicaps to the program as it previously existed—the lack of coordinated advertising and sales effort relating to the passport program. There is every reason to believe that, were such a coordinated program implemented, the sales and revenues from this program would increase dramatically.

Let us also consider the wishes of the American people. I have had hundreds of letters urging the continuation of the program. Many of the individuals have written that they consider the program of such value that they would participate at a fee level of \$15 per year. Consider the situation of the millions of retired senior citizens, living on fixed incomes, who are allowed the pleasures of recreational travel at a minimal cost under the auspices of the Golden Eagle passport.

It is my hope, therefore, that in order to avoid further delay in the administration of this program, the House will pass S. 2315 today. It is my further hope that the conferees appointed will give favorable consideration to the Senate provision which repeals the time limitation on the golden eagle program, and not continue to subject this outstanding program to a further "Sword of Damocles" time limitation as continued in the House version.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in my judgment is one of the best led committees in the House. I have always had a tremendous admiration and respect for the very able chairman of the committee, and I have always had a very high regard for my shipmate of bygone years, the ranking minority member of the committee, and I will make it very clear in the remarks I make here today that they do not reflect any difference in our committee as to the importance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, or the very important mission which that bill has had in helping provide outdoor recreational opportunities for people, nor does it represent any very basic difference among the members of the committee with respect to the implementation of the so-called golden eagle program.

One of the things I have always admired about the chairman of our committee is his honesty and straightforwardness, and when we opened the hearings on this particular bill the chairman in an opening statement to the committee pointed out that the golden eagle program had three major objectives, and he put those three major objectives in the record, and then he went on and said that "anyone who is honest and candid must admit that the program as it has operated to date has failed on all three of these fronts."

The effort that our committee has made in the extension legislation that is before us has been to extend the golden eagle for a limited period of time and to require, under the amendment that was offered our committee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that a report be brought in speedily as to ways in which this program could be improved and made to work more effectively in the future.

I supported that amendment. I thought it was a very desirable addition to the bill.

The amendments which some of us in the committee offered and supported were further attempts to make the eagle fly right. That is my purpose today in bringing two amendments to the floor of the House that were considered in the committee. Neither one of them is new material so far as the committee is concerned.

One of them failed in the committee on a 9 to 9 vote, which gives the members some indication of the feeling in the committee about it and how well it was divided. The other failed on an 8 to 10 vote.

At the appropriate time I will offer those amendments.

The first of the amendments may provide Members with the only opportunity they will have in this Congress to cast a solid vote, with no mistake about it, against inflation. I do not know of any other opportunity we are going to get in this Congress to go solidly on record against price increases.

The bill passed in the other body and the bill before us right now is a bill that has a 42-percent increase in the price

of a Golden Eagle permit, from \$7 to \$10. If Members want to take a stand for preservation of the status quo while this program is being studied, and if they want to take a stand for holding the line on prices—the President has been calling everybody into the White House and saying, "Let us hold the line on prices"—then they will vote for that amendment and vote against the \$10 level which was passed in the other body and which is before us in the committee bill.

The first amendment that I will offer will be to strike out section 2 of the bill, which is the section that provides for the increase to \$10.

The second amendment is an amendment to put into law something that already, for all practical purposes, is being done by the agencies and by the administration; that is, to limit the fees that are charged to the people who are going into these outdoor recreation areas, to actual user fees assessed against the users of highly developed facilities. This is to make it clear that the American people have the right to enter their own property, whether we call it a national forest or whether we call it a Bureau of Reclamation reservoir recreational area, or whether we call it an Army Engineer reservoir recreational area. It is to say to the American people, "We recognize that this facility belongs to you and that you are entitled to come into it, to look at it, to sit on the grass, to walk across it, without paying any uniformed collector for the privilege of doing just that."

Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 provided that there would be no entrance fees at Army Engineer reservoirs. I have been very pleased to hear from both the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member their statements that they will fight to hold that provision in conference with the other body, because the other body elected to strike that provision which is in the law.

What the other amendment I will offer—that failed on a nine to nine vote in the committee—will do will be to say, in very simple words, that no entrance or admission fees shall be collected at any outdoor recreation facility or area other than the national parks where collection of such fees is found both practical and desirable.

I understand that the Park Service has already found at this time that there is only one area in the country at this time where entrance fees are being collected; that is the Jamestown historical area. At this time they are limiting their charges to user fees. The Park Service is doing the same thing in that regard that the Forest Service has been doing for quite a while.

I do not know of any Americans who object to a user fee for the use of a highly developed facility.

If they go into a highly developed park and use a campsite to stay overnight or for several days and plug in and use the juice and use the running water and other utilities, then I think the American

people expect to pay for that kind of service and that kind of a facility. But I think there is a tremendous body of opinion across this country, in which 32 of the States concur, that there should be no charge for simple entrance to a park. I hope when we wind up with this debate into their own outdoor recreation areas amendments and will have declared as a principle the right of the people to enter into their own outdoor recreation areas without charge, limiting that right for an entrance fee to specially designed and specially equipped parks such as the Jamestown area where there might be some justification for concluding that it was both desirable and practical to have an entrance fee.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct that the gentleman from Oklahoma introduced both of those amendments in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when this bill was being debated?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. And both of those amendments were considered and debated fully and both were voted down?

Mr. EDMONDSON. One was voted down 9 to 9 and the other was voted down 10 to 8. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. The important thing is that they were considered. I just want to make the record correct. These are not something new. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee listened to all of the arguments that you have given here. You failed in that committee, and now you are going to try again. Is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think I am going to have a little help on the floor today that I did not have in the committee on at least one of them, and I hope there will be a little help on the other.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would say to the gentleman that I do not see present here some of the people who voted for the amendment in the committee, so apparently the help that you had in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee you are not going to have on the floor today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If it will relieve the gentleman's mind about their not being here, the call to come over went out to them about 5 minutes ago. So if we can debate this thing for a few more minutes, I think we will see them all here.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. Could the gentleman enlighten me as to the philosophy of user fees? Is the fee you pay when you enter a national park a fee for the use of the facilities or is it a permit to enter which could be revoked if and when you were guilty of disorderly conduct like some of the groups entering our national parks are today? Is it a fee for use, or is it a permit to enter?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I think at the present time you have a mixed picture

on that subject, because in the national parks today there is no charge being made to enter, and there has not been for the past week, except at one facility. I think it would be debatable as to just what it entails. Certainly, the person who pays a fee to enter and engages in disorderly conduct would be subject to expulsion, it seems to me, whether he paid the fee or not.

Mr. GUBSER. I do not have a personal view on the subject, but we are having troubles at some of our national parks with hippies and the like making it almost unlivable for decent people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I asked for the additional minute merely to comment upon what the gentleman has said.

I do not think improper conduct by any group needs to be condoned and accepted by Federal officers whether they have paid the fee or not. I doubt very seriously, from what I have observed, if the presence of an entrance fee in any situation would operate to prevent unpleasant incidents on occasion.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I simply want to commend the gentleman for his comments and the statement he is making and associate myself with them.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just left the well was talking about the matter of inflation and the price for the golden eagle passport. As long as he has approached the subject from that direction, perhaps we ought to look at what kind of value some people have been getting for their \$7 passport.

Mr. Chairman, one of the difficulties we have had in making this program work is that once an individual has bought a golden eagle passport, he can take a carload of people into any and all such areas where the passport applies, for as many days a year as he wants to, with as many people as he wants to carry and, consequently, we have had a situation in which one person with a passport can use a parking place and have the use of the facility every day, all summer long, or all year long if he wants to which makes a pretty good bargain.

If we are talking about inflation, instead of talking about a 40-percent increase in the cost of the passport, we ought to be able to pay a little attention to just what kind of a bargain these people have been getting. It has permitted them to use very expensive facilities for a very few cents for each user. This is a difficult program to administer, and because of the fact that it has not worked

as it was originally contemplated that it would work, the committee has very wisely suggested a tentative program until we can come up with something better. It was originally the intent to let it lapse completely because it had not worked.

What we bring in today is not in any manner or means a permanent solution to the problem. The gentleman from California asked the question as to just what was the philosophy behind the collection of fees. Under the congressional formula the Federal Government is supposed to return to the Treasury as closely as possible the actual cost that it has in providing the service to the people.

Now, even if you are just going to enter a park area and look and visit, there is a cost to the Government. These are usually areas where it is expensive to build roads and if there are any public needs roads, those roads have to be maintained after construction. So, where it is possible to collect a fee without undue administrative burden or cost, the fee is collected. In the case of the land and water conservation fund, however, in this matter you have the philosophy involved in the cases where the money coming from those people who seek recreation on public lands and parks, and so on, that money goes back into a fund to provide more recreation for more people all over the country. In other words, the money from that fund is directed to purchasing in-holdings insofar as the Federal Government is concerned where the money is used by the Federal Government, but most of it is distributed to the States to provide on a 50-50 matching basis all kinds of recreation for more people where recreation areas do not exist. Of course, almost all of the national parks are located in our western areas. A lot of people cannot differentiate between a national park and a forest area insofar as the legal definition is concerned. They consider them as one thing. Since the tourists do go to those areas, it was considered as a new thought or philosophy to say if someone wants to use these facilities on public lands where we have few people but a lot of recreation areas we can generate a fund which will, in turn, provide for more recreation areas in Massachusetts, Burlington, Iowa, or anywhere else. I think it is a good philosophy because no particular department of Government gets the benefit of these fees which are collected because all of it goes into a fund to develop and acquire additional recreation facilities for people where they do not now have them. So, the philosophy is actually one of trying to expand recreation areas.

I say again I do not want anyone to have an idea that this is intended as a cure-all package of legislation or even a piece of legislation of great life because in and of itself it denies the existence after a certain date and, indeed, between the present and the time when this act expires we will have had an opportunity to talk to the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Defense, the

Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, the Interior, and all the rest, to see if we cannot work out a program which will work better, and do the job which has been ascribed, than the present program.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman to say that in effect an entrance fee is a variety of user fees to the extent that the person entering these recreational areas uses the roads and uses whatever other facilities are there?

Mr. KYL. There is no hard, firm policy which covers all cases, each case is considered on an individual basis.

Illustration: If the normal highway which you and I would use in going from one place to another goes through a park area or a national forest area, it is called a normal route of transportation, and, of course, no toll is ever charged for the use of that. If there is some unique value which attracts people, which is of benefit to the people who visit the area, and if it is easy to collect a fee without undue burden or administrative cost, without any other additional burden, then in some cases they have been charged, and they are a user fee only to the extent that it costs a lot of money to maintain these areas, let alone to acquire them in the beginning.

As a matter of fact, the amount we collect in user fees does not come close to paying the bill for annual administration of any of these areas.

And then in the third category that I would respond to, if the Government provides a facility which some people want to use and some do not, a place to park a trailer with electric outlets, perhaps sanitation facilities, and if there is a beach and pier to which they tie their boats then there is actually a user fee attached to any of those purposes, but each department has tried to make it reasonable in each instance.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma and urge your acceptance of the two amendments which he proposes to offer at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of this committee, if I may, to some rather glaring inequities that apply to the three Engineer-controlled lakes that are in the immediate area of my district, and in which the people of my district have a very deep interest.

These three lakes, in the first place, the people of the area feel that they have some equity as Federal taxpayers in the construction of the lakes, but that is not

the important factor. The big factor is that these are water supply lakes; they are lakes that the municipalities involved have already pledged and paid in something over 50 percent of the total cost of those lakes for the water storage which they have. They are paying the cost of that lake through the water charges which they are paying, and this up charge over the cost of distribution and purifying this water serves to liquidate the revenue bonds for their portion or contribution to the construction of these lakes. They therefore feel, and feel I think quite properly, that a mere admission tax or admission fee is the equivalent or tantamount to a third area of taxation against them for the maintenance and operation of those lakes.

Now, believe me, I have no quarrel whatsoever with a use tax that provides access to heavy investment and to heavy maintenance such as campsites, running water, showers, any launching ramps that are not maintained by concessionaires.

But I do feel that it is unfair and unjust. I am sure there are many other lakes in a comparable situation over the country where they have this equivalent of triple taxation.

I feel, to cite one particular instance at one of these lakes, which happens to be Grapevine Lake, there is a club, private property, paying a very heavy rental fee for boathouses in one particular cove. They built this road leading from their property to the cove wherein is located their boathouses. Then they have to pay a fee to travel on their own road to get access to their own boathouse.

I think the gentleman and ladies of this House will agree with me that that is an unfair type of taxation for a user fee that is not justified by the expense involved to the Government or to the engineers in providing them this access to these facilities to which they have already made a very major contribution toward the total cost.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this committee to vote for the amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the able chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I want to assure the Members of the House that thorough hearings were held on this matter. Not only did we hear proponents of both aspects of the bill presently before us, but we heard witnesses opposed to some features of the bill. We looked not only at the short-term objectives, but at the long-term interest of the outdoor recreation program.

The purpose of the legislation is not difficult to explain. Essentially, it does two things. The emphasis has been on one.

First, it temporarily extends the authority for Federal outdoor recreation agencies to sell the uniform annual en-

trance permits which are commonly called golden eagle passports.

Second, it extends the provisions of the 1968 amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act with respect to the advance contract authority.

Most of the public interest in this legislation is concentrated on the first element. Recreationists across the country are interested in the future of the Golden Eagle program because it involves them directly. As a result of this interest, probably every Member of Congress has received some correspondence on this subject. Some of these letters have been most helpful and constructive; others reflect misinformation about, or a misunderstanding of, the program.

The subcommittee and the full committee considered the arguments raised in the testimony taken at the hearings on this subject and it weighed the views contained in the correspondence which it received. But in formulating the legislation which is now before you, it went one step further. It considered our experience with the program in terms of its problems and its original objective. We recognized that the Golden Eagle passport would be a great bargain to many people even if they paid two or three or four times the existing price. At the same time, we realized that the number of sales of the passport never reached the levels estimated when the program was established.

Since the basic purpose of the program was—and is—to create revenues for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the subcommittee members did not feel that the unlimited extension of the existing passport program would serve any useful purpose. We generally favor the concept of the program, but we recognize that its success requires a substantive overhaul. Not only would it take time to formulate the terms of such legislation, but it was generally agreed that new hearings should be conducted prior to its consideration by the Congress.

On the basis of this conclusion, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recommended a temporary extension of the program essentially as it is. Nothing in the bill alters, in any way, the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1968—for all intents and purposes the existing situation at all Corps of Army Engineers and TVA recreation areas will remain the same. While there is nothing in this legislation directing a change in the administration of areas within the national park system or the national forest system, we expect these agencies to begin immediately to establish reasonable guidelines for distinguishing between admission fees and camping fees. We also expect to receive greater participation and cooperation in this program by the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the administration of recreation facilities under their jurisdiction.

The annual entrance permit, as everyone in this Chamber knows, terminated by operation of law on March 31, this year. If S. 2315, as recommended by the

committee, is enacted, the program will be reinstated and will be extended through December 31, 1971. This is stop-gap legislation. It will enable the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation to formulate a revised program, to conduct new hearings, and to submit new recommendations to the full committee and to the House.

Frankly, on the basis of the past performance of the program, we do not feel justified in recommending the unlimited extension of the Golden Eagle passport program, but we do feel that the concept behind it is essentially sound. For this reason we recommend its temporary extension so that we will have an opportunity to work out a more effective and equitable program. The Golden Eagle has failed as a source of revenue, producing only one-tenth of the amount estimated. Why? There has been a lack of uniform approach and application. Can this be corrected? Some people think that the collecting agencies should be given some of the financial benefits for operating costs. Would this improve collections? There should be separate admission and user fees as originally intended. The Golden Eagle is too big a bargain for some people. Should some of the funds be used for promotion of passport sales? Would this help sell the passports? These are some of the matters that we need to study.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other very important element in the measure before the House. It involves the advance contract authority granted by the Congress in its 1968 amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Unlike the other feature of S. 2315, this aspect of the legislation has not received a substantial amount of public attention. Notwithstanding this fact, it is an important feature of the bill, because it plays a significant role in the acquisition of needed outdoor recreation lands.

Initially, the advance contract authority was an experiment. At the time that the Congress authorized it:

It limited the annual contractual obligation permissible to \$30 million;

It limited its use to the acquisition of properties authorized to be acquired by the Congress;

It limited the duration of the authority to fiscal years 1969 and 1970; and

It required each proposed contract to be submitted through the budgetary process for review and approved by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No witness appeared to testify in opposition to the extension of this authority and the subcommittee is aware of no complaints about its use. We are advised that this is one of the most effective land acquisition tools available and we believe that it is in the best public interest to extend it. All witnesses were for this section of the bill. It will permit timely and economic acquisition of desirable properties. The time to purchase land is when it's offered for sale—when a bargain appears.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee realize that

there is a considerable amount of interest in the legislation before the House. We know that the enactment of temporary legislation is essential if the Golden Eagle program is to operate during the recreation season immediately ahead. While we recognize that there are some inequities and some problems with that program, we feel that affirmative action on a temporary extension will be in the best interests of the general public, the recreation users, and the administering agencies, as well as serving the interest of the overall outdoor recreation program.

In order to assure a reasonable period of time to review and revamp the program, the recommended bill calls upon the Secretary of the Interior to review the entire fee question and report his findings to the appropriate congressional committees no later than February 1, 1971. At that time, we fully expect to reconsider this entire question and we hope to develop a meaningful and equitable program.

That completes my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I urge all Members of the House to support the committee and enact S. 2315, as recommended.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as the author of one of the House of Representatives bill to extend the provisions of the Golden Eagle passport program, I rise in support of S. 2315, a bill to accomplish this purpose, which we have before us today.

The bill would provide an annual motor vehicle permit which would entitle the purchaser, and anyone accompanying him in his private car, to enter some 3,000 designated national parks, national forests, or national wildlife refuges which are administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. Should the Golden Eagle passport be allowed to die, it would impose a severe hardship on many people who now make regular visits to the fine parks and recreation areas which have been developed through the wisdom of the Congress of the United States by providing authorization and appropriations for these facilities. The only alternative is individual entrance fees which can add up to prohibitive amounts, especially when you consider the young father taking his family out for a day in the woods, or the retired couple seeking the peace of the outdoors.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the revenue from the Golden Eagle passport did not live up to its expectations. However, I do not believe that this fact alone should cause the death of the entire program. I believe that the record will show that in 1965, the first year of operation, some 90,000 Golden Eagle passports were issued. The following year, this increased by more than 400 percent. Then in 1967, the sales increased to 542,000 and in 1968 they increased another 150,000 to a total of 692,000 sales. A similar increase was reflected in the 1969 sales.

Mr. Chairman, as the representative of a congressional district which contains approximately 20 million acres of federally owned lands in great demand for recreational uses, including Death Valley, Mount Whitney, Yosemite, Lake Tahoe, Lassen Volcanic National Park, Lava Beds National Monument, the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, the Trinity Alps, the historic Mother Lode region, plus millions of acres of national forest lands, I can assure you that the greatest recreation pressure occurs where water resources have been developed. Such areas include Friant, Exchequer, Don Pedro, New Hogan, Oroville, Black Butte, Shasta, Whiskeytown, and Clare Engle Reservoirs.

Under the original Golden Eagle passport program, a problem developed relative to the fees charged for boat launching. There was no uniformity in the user fees charged by the various agencies at boat launching ramps. In some cases, I find that one agency will assess a daily boat launching fee of \$1 whereas another agency operating a similar facility nearby will make no charge. I have found that even at the same reservoir, charges are made at some boat launching ramps and not at others.

The daily fee imposed in many of the areas was excessive for people living in the immediate vicinity of these reservoirs. These people, as you can well imagine, use their reservoir facilities many times during the year.

If a pensioner were to go fishing with his rowboat or his small motorboat once or twice a week, as many used to do before launching fees were charged, you can well imagine what the cost in boat launching fees would amount to in just a year, even if the daily fee were only \$1 as many of them are. For many of these pensioners and other low-income families, a day of sunshine and fishing on the nearby lake is the most healthy and, up until fees were imposed, the least expensive family recreational opportunity available to them. Since the establishment of these daily boat launching fees, these people simply have been unable to do this because the limited family budget will not permit repeated payments of the launching fee.

Certainly I agree that if an individual launches his boat at an unmanned ramp, he should not be assessed a fee, and I am happy that the legislation as now constituted corrects this situation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, let us pluck the golden eagle from the edge of extinction.

I refer not to the bird of that name, but to the outdoor recreation fund passport for admission to federally administered outdoor recreation areas.

The passport has been tremendously popular with many of those who make use of our natural recreational facilities. This success unfortunately has been

clouded by overoptimistic predictions which were made at the time the passport was first authorized.

As a result of revenues from the sale of the golden eagle admission permits falling to meet inflated early goals, the Congress moved to terminate the program as of March 31, 1970. There were other reasons, of course, such as the controversy raised by the Corps of Engineers over charging for recreational use of water projects, and the high cost of administration for the program in some areas.

The Corps of Engineers has had its way so that there is no use of the golden Eagle passport at corps recreational areas.

Any program administered by the Federal Government on a nationwide basis is likely to have a few cases where operation of that program is not of the ultimate efficiency.

These are not, Mr. Chairman, reasons for us to discontinue an entire program, particularly when that program is well received and making progress toward the goal for which it was established. The golden eagle passport revenues were meant to go into a fund to purchase additional park lands at the Federal and at the State and local levels. The passport revenues are contributing to that fund. We should allow that contribution to be restored.

Admission fees from individual recreational areas will continue to flow into the fund, I realize. My thrust is to the point that the buyer should have available the opportunity to support that funding through the purchase of a single admission permit. This represents a considerable saving to the buyer not only in dollars and cents, but in time and convenience.

I support the increase in the authorized price of the passport from \$7 to \$10. I think that inflationary though such an increase may seem, it still represents a substantial bargain for the outdoor recreation public.

I do believe that we would be wise in extending the life of the permit for a period more in line with that recommended by the other body, or at least for a 5-year period rather than the year-and-a-half extension now before us for consideration.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to support the bill which I have introduced, S. 2315, to restore the Golden Eagle passport program.

We are fortunate that our National Government has looked ahead in planning for the recreation needs of future generations. Our Government has wisely recognized that it is important to conserve and preserve certain areas of our country endowed with particular beauty or historical significance. These lands have been set aside for public recreation use.

The bill that I rise in support of today deals with the public utilization of these national recreation areas. The bill is designed to extend and facilitate admis-

sion and use of our national parks and recreation areas.

Five years ago, Congress instituted the Golden Eagle passport program as a part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. Since then thousands of Americans have supported the program and enjoyed its benefits.

Yet in 1968, the Congress amended the act repealing authority for the Golden Eagle passport effective March 30, 1970. This action was taken in the face of two objections to the program which while important, seem to me to ignore the overall purpose and intent of the program.

First of all, however, permit me to explain the provisions of the bill which I support. The bill provides for the continuation of the Golden Eagle passport, reauthorizing the program through December 31, 1971. Second, it raises the maximum annual fee for the passport from not more than \$7 to not more than \$10.

The fees collected from the passport program go into the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 to repeal the Golden Eagle passport program for two reasons. Termination of the program stemmed from some complaints that not every national recreation area honored the Golden Eagle passport, and second, from the program's failure to live up to monetary expectations.

Some citizens complained that golden eagle passports were not honored at certain facilities under the administration and supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers. They protested that admission fees were established where none had been collected before.

If we are going to have a passport program to facilitate the use of our recreation facilities, it seems to me that it should be truly national and universal in coverage. This is an integral part of the whole concept of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a final word in support of the golden age passport proposal. I believe this measure merits our special consideration. All too often our senior citizens have been treated as if they are our real forgotten Americans. The inflation in our economy has hit these citizens the hardest of any group. Retirement for our older citizens is often difficult, both emotionally and financially. The golden age passport makes it easier for retired persons to enjoy their retirement years. It would make it possible for them to enjoy the American outdoors upon payment of a lifetime fee. The program takes account of the fixed incomes of many of our senior citizens, and it encourages them to take advantage of the recreation areas available.

Mr. Chairman, I urge careful consideration of the advantages and opportunities that would be afforded to our citizens by the extension and expansion of this passport program and support its passage.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in favor of S. 2315, legislation to restore the golden eagle passport which

was allowed to expire on March 31 of this year. Among the bills the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered on this matter is one which I introduced in the Congress, H.R. 12311, on June 23, 1969, to continue this fine program so that more citizens can use the recreational facilities of the public lands at a reasonable fee. The golden eagle passport, of which 692,300 were issued between 1965 and 1968 and over 400,000 in fiscal 1969, permits the bearer and everyone within a private vehicle and attached camper or trailer, to use one or all of the over 3,000 national parks, forests, and refuges, as well as other federally operated recreational areas, with the payment of a single \$7 fee.

I am convinced that the people in my district in Virginia, as well as the many hundreds of thousands of other Americans, who enjoy the wonders of our national parks, national forests, and other Federal recreation areas, the golden eagle passport is an unsurpassed bargain in outdoor recreation. I think there is no doubt as to the interest in preserving this simple method of collecting this fee, either for the Government or from its user citizens. This fee system is simple to administer and ought to be maintained as an example that all acts of this Government are not confusing and complicated. Not only does the golden eagle passport benefit the hundreds of thousands of our citizens who travel across the breadth of this land in campers and trailers, its users also put revenue into the land and water conservation fund. This revenue helps finance such projects as Federal acquisition of additional authorized areas, multipurpose metropolitan parks, snow-ski areas, campgrounds, swimming pools, and bicycling paths in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and our territories.

After a slow start in 1965, when only \$633,600 in fees were collected, ever-increasing acceptance and demand had increased receipts in fiscal 1969 to over \$5 million. The golden eagle passport has proved its value and popularity.

My prime interest in this legislation is to support the desires and wishes of my constituents who are vitally interested in seeing the golden eagle passport restored. The citizens of northern Virginia find the increase of the fee from \$7 annually to \$10 acceptable. They ask for but one consideration, that is, restore this fine program.

With the foregoing in mind, I urge the House to act favorably on S. 2315 to restore the golden eagle passport.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, today we will have under consideration a bill to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Act. I am very interested in seeing this program continued and believe it is one that is of much value to a large number of our citizens.

I have received much mail from my district asking that the golden eagle passport be retained and indicating that an increase in the fee would be acceptable, if necessary, in order to keep the program going. This, in my opinion, speaks well for the program.

I am particularly concerned that this

pass remain available to our young people, for our young families, so they can take advantage of the opportunity of traveling and yet be able to hold down some on expenses. Nothing is really inexpensive anymore. When there are three or four children admission fees can be a burden on the pocketbook when added to all the other expenses of family travel. These young folks need to be encouraged to visit our parks and to share the wonders and beauties of nature with their children. Family life in America is taking quite a beating these days and everything we can do to help them to grow and share together can only be in the best interest of the whole country. Many of our city-bound families need this outlet, and this great opportunity to help their children appreciate and enjoy the great outdoors.

In addition to the esthetic and educational value of our recreation areas, there is the practical aspect of the funds collected being used to help further develop parks and local community areas and other projects dealing with the outdoors.

I believe it is also worth mentioning that a great deal of the mail I have received is from our senior citizens explaining how very much they appreciate this program as they travel about the country. As we are aware, more and more retired people are taking advantage of the opportunity of seeing the country. Most of these folks are on fixed incomes and they are very grateful for the value they receive with the Golden Eagle passport.

I know there are many facts and figures to be considered on every program but I also know that we have to do all we can to encourage a wholesome life and an appreciation of the great outdoors by our old and young people particularly during these days when so many of our values are being downgraded and pushed aside and when some could not take vacations unless they could take advantage of a program such as that offered through this pass.

As you know, the program expired March 31, 1970, and a tentative program is presently in force. I strongly urge passage of this bill today.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support to that already expressed today for a temporary extension of the Golden Eagle passport, the annual permit to Federal recreation areas which was authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The funds anticipated from this and other sources designated under this act were to be used to help provide expanded local, State, and Federal outdoor recreational opportunities. Unfortunately, due to complaints from citizens regarding fees at Corps of Engineers reservoirs where fees were not previously collected, the fact that too few organizations actively promoted it, and the fact that the golden eagle passport did not receive the enthusiastic support of all Federal agencies involved, the program far from realized the monetary expectations of Congress which extended to \$180 million by the end of 1969.

In spite of this, campers and outdoor enthusiasts, like myself, have embraced the program and deplore its expiration.

I am very hopeful that Congress does realize the merit of the concept and by approving S. 2315 which will give the golden eagle a temporary extension while the congressional committees have an opportunity to redesign a program which will overcome the weaknesses of the golden eagle passport. By authorizing this temporary extension, the progress made heretofore will not be sacrificed while a worthwhile program equitable to recreationists and able to fulfill the needs of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 can be developed.

On behalf of the campers and outdoorsmen of the Nation, I urge the Members support for this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2315, a bill which would restore the golden eagle passport program operated by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. If we do not restore this highly productive program, thousands of American families will not have the benefit of it as the summer vacation season approaches.

I think that the program would offer an incentive to millions of families, who normally might not take a summer vacation, to visit our national parks, seashores, national forests, wildlife refuges, and other Federal areas.

The modest annual fees collected from each participating family is earmarked for deposit in the land and water conservation fund for use in acquiring and developing more Federal recreation lands and waters and for deposit in matching funds to assist States in expanding their recreation programs. I urge my colleagues to support this bill so that many more families in our Nation will be able to take advantage of the exhaustive recreational resources offered in our park and coastal areas.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the passage of S. 2315, to restore the golden eagle passport. Many constituents have told me that they use the passport and want it reinstated. Their statements demonstrate the value of the passport in providing economic admission to national parks and shrines. I should like to share some of their observations with my colleagues.

A member of the National Campers and Hikers Association wrote:

The passport has made it possible for many Americans to visit our national parks and shrines. Without it, we may not be able to do this, as it would cost too much.

Another constituent wrote:

I have purchased and used the pass since it was first issued. The pass permits me and my family to spend quiet weekends and vacations in natural surroundings.

A mother voiced her support:

Our family of nine has visited and camped in most of these recreations areas . . . we, and our fellow campers, want to enjoy the areas as they are.

Other constituents expressed their views on the use of the passport fee:

Since I am under the impression that the monies collected from the passports were used to purchase needed recreational lands and waters, I considered my money well spent. I am sure that many people purchase the Golden Eagle Passport not to save money

but to help provide funds to purchase lands for our future use. Please do all you can to reinstate the Golden Eagle Passport.

Another outdoorsman wrote:

We are campers and find the Golden Eagle important, and it helps support the National Parks.

Another advocate of the program wrote me:

I have purchased and used the pass since it was first issued. The pass permits me and my family to spend quiet week-ends and vacations in natural surroundings.

A supporter of the program, who has suggested to many friends that they purchase the passport, sums up the need for the program:

With little or no bother . . . my friends and I were able to see the great West . . . With the rising price of accommodations . . . and the need to breathe in fresh air and see the majestic sights, more and more people are taking to the road in campers. I am sure if enough of these people were aware of the Golden Eagle Passport more than enough of them would support it.

Federal recreation areas offer rest and relaxation to urban and suburban residents—many of whom cannot afford high admission fees. By reinstating the golden eagle passport program we shall give our citizens continued access to the federally administered outdoor recreation areas.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, as a co-author of legislation providing for an indefinite extension of the golden eagle passport program, I speak today in support of S. 2315, a bill to extend the program only until December 31, 1971. I do so reluctantly yet with all optimism that in this allotted time means will be discovered for providing the patrons of this program the indefinite extension many of us desire.

I have received, in recent months, many letters from constituents urging my support of this program. These letters speak with a certain eloquence and urgency that is difficult to ignore. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of one of these letters be printed in the RECORD:

We are writing in regards to the "Golden Eagle" Program.

We are a family of five and enjoy the program as it is now. We understand that in order to keep the "Golden Eagle" card in existence, the fee will be raised to \$10.00 a year. We support this issue and are willing to pay the increase of fee.

We urge you to also support this program, as this is one way to keep—"Young Americans" beautiful in mind and spirit.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES KEYS and family.
Anaheim, Calif.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2315, legislation to restore the golden eagle program.

I believe we should extend this program until such time as the Congress and the governmental agencies involved can agree on a permanent program to make low-cost access to our parks and recreational areas available to all our citizens. Any such program, in my view, should be at least as beneficial as the golden eagle program which has allowed citizens unlimited access to these facilities for a minimal charge of \$7 per year.

Under this legislation, Congress will have until December 31, 1971, to develop a sound, permanent program. In the meantime our citizens will continue to be able to purchase and utilize golden eagle passports to our parks and recreational areas.

If the program that is developed does not fully meet the needs of our people, then I for one will support further legislation to extend the golden eagle program as it is now. I believe it is vital that these national facilities acquired and maintained by our Government for the use of the people should be made available as widely and as cheaply as possible.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, has acted cautiously in approving only the temporary extension contained in S. 2315 as amended.

Certainly this is the most minimal step that must be taken. I urge my colleagues to support this compromise step which will allow your committee time to work on a more favorable permanent alternative.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to restore the golden eagle program to the operations of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The golden eagle passport, as it had been known, was an extremely popular feature of the Federal recreational program in recent years. By purchasing the passport, the holder and his family could enter any Federal recreation area at which an entrance fee was charged. The \$7 passport represented a considerable cost saving to a family traveling from one national park or national forest recreation area to another.

S. 2315, which we are considering today, would extend the authority for the golden eagle passport until December 31, 1971, a move which would offset a previous amendment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act terminating that authority in March of this year.

S. 2315, would also increase the authorized limitation on the fee for the passport from \$7 to \$10.

The golden eagle passport users are, to my mind, confirming two outstanding American character traits—the desire to pay one's own way, and the eye for a bargain.

Mr. Chairman, America possesses a rich heritage of natural wonders and scenic delights. There are additional lands which we would be wise to add to our existing treasures. The funds derived from the sale of these recreational passports will go to acquire these needed additions. Certainly we should do all within our power to enable the users of our recreational lands to assist in acquiring more. Our approval of S. 2315, restoring the Golden Eagle program is a meaningful contribution to that goal.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly support the golden eagle program. As you know, the program will provide an annual motor vehicle permit which would entitle its holder, and anyone accompanying him in his private car, to enter some 3,000 designated national parks, national forests, or national wildlife refuges. Public concern for our parks and forests and their future beauty and preservation is best generated by ex-

posure to these historical sites. The Golden Eagle passport, with its great convenience and minimal cost, is the best means for that exposure.

In these days of increased urbanization and polluted city air, the continuation of this inexpensive opportunity to be out of the city means a great deal. A visit to these largely unpolluted parks and recreation areas is a constant reminder of what a clean environment can be like.

By their very definition, national parks are meant for general public use and it is essential that we keep access to them within the reach of all Americans who desire it. Should the passport be allowed to die, it would impose a severe hardship on many people who now make regular visits to the fine parks. For many families in this country, termination of the Passport would mean the end of frequent camping trips. In addition, senior citizens are solid supporters of the program and because of the fixed income of many of these citizens, the golden eagle program permits them to have vacations and yet hold down the costs.

At the same time, this program brings in a needed revenue to keep the many parks and sites open, clean, and enjoyable. Thousands of Americans have already benefited from the golden eagle program and with increased publicity for the program, the great upswing in camping as a pleasant and economical means of traveling, and more and more people traveling to these sites due to our Nation's population growth, the program will undoubtedly be extremely successful. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of this legislation designed to restore the golden eagle passport.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the golden eagle passport program to encourage Americans to make use of national parks must be continued.

The key to the program, established in 1965, is the annual fee to allow use of national parks and forests without additional charge for each separate entry.

This program ended March 31 of this year and we are presently debating legislation to reinstate the golden eagle passport and its special conservation fund to expand State and Federal recreation lands.

Such a program is particularly important to those who have been able to take advantage of these recreational facilities at the reduced cost.

If we lose the fight to continue the golden eagle passport program, campers, families, young people, and the elderly will be deprived of the reduced rates and thus will not utilize these facilities. We would also eliminate the land and water conservation fund so vital to preserving and expanding our national parks and forest lands.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of the golden eagle passport program.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 1(d) of the Act of July 15, 1968 (Public Law 90-401, 82 Stat. 354), is amended by deleting "March 31, 1970." and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1971."

SEC. 2. Section 2(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897; 16 U.S.C. 4601-5(a)(1)) is amended by deleting "not more than \$7" and inserting in lieu thereof "not more than \$10".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDMONDSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: Page 3, lines 18 through 21, strike out section 2 of the proposed Committee amendment (raising the annual fee for the Golden Eagle from \$7 to \$10); and renumbering the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the two amendments I discussed during general debate. It strikes section 2 of the bill as reported by the committee and holds the line at a \$7 fee.

I mentioned in general debate the principal reason I had in mind for it. First was that it is, I think, counter-inflationary, in that it does follow the wishes of the President and, I think, of the people all over the country to try to hold the line on this general trend toward price increases. This is a 42-percent increase, from \$7 to \$10, which I think is against the public interest on the grounds of its inflationary character, if for no other.

Aside and apart from that, I think the point is valid that we may very well get more revenue out of a \$7 permit that is generally accepted than we will out of a \$10 permit. There will be many people who will buy a \$7 permit and hesitate to buy a \$10 permit.

I am aware there are some people who said they do not have any objection, but if one will walk out on the street and take any 20 people at random and ask them if they would like to pay \$7 or \$10 for this permit, I will bet my salary against a hat that they will prefer to stay with the lower figure.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be accepted, and accepted in the spirit of continuing this program as it presently is, while we study proposed changes in it.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I would like to make an additional legislative record. While the gentleman is "betting his salary against a hat" particularly, would the gentleman not say that if he limited his poll to those areas where there is a heavy retired population, those who live on fixed income, that they particularly would be done a disservice by the increase in the fee, and vote almost unanimously against it?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the RECORD, would the gentleman also recall that one of our very large labor organizations testified before the committee that it had no objection at all to increasing the price of the Golden Eagle, but they did want us to retain the Golden Eagle?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think we have had several witnesses along that line, and I am quite sure I have talked to some people who feel that way. I have talked to a great many more who would rather have it held at \$7.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Although the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) sounds like a modern-day amendment to cut back on prices and inflation, it really does not amount to that at all, because the reason this amendment was brought up in the form it has, was because most of the users from whom we heard suggested they would be very pleased to pay more—\$15 or \$20.

Not only that, this is not a set fee of \$10. It is entirely up to the President of the United States. If he sees fit to raise it to \$10, or to raise it to \$10 only under certain circumstances, he may do so. But it really is not inflationary at all. The thing we want to keep in mind is this, that the Golden Eagle pass as we have originally authorized it has been abused by many people, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) said when he questioned me during my presentation.

Also there is authority so that under the manner in which the act has been administered up to the present time, certain credits can be given, whether it be \$7 or \$10, and those credits can be shut off so far as users' fees are concerned.

Consequently this is what we want to take care of. I suggest to my colleagues when this legislation is passed, when they get their copies of the Public Land Law Review Commission's report, they will see what the Commission has to say about payment by all Americans for all uses of public lands.

That is really what is involved here. I would ask my colleagues to defeat the amendment and permit the increase if the President sees fit. He will have to make the determination as to whether or not it is necessary.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to commend the chairman of the full committee for his statement. It is not compulsory that this go to \$10; it is permissive. It is entirely up to the President and the Secretary of the Interior as to whether this fee shall be increased to \$10.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my friend, it is up to the President, who will be advised by the Secretary.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say further, as the gentleman explained in the well in his opening speech, since there will be no fee this year it is a question to be up for consideration next year.

I certainly urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The chairman is eminently correct in saying that authority is conferred to raise the fee, and it is not mandatory. I recall the same argument was made when we were setting a limit of \$7 on it in 1965. All the discussion had been about a \$5 fee. All the estimates had been about a \$5 fee. When the fee was imposed it was imposed at the ceiling of \$7.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman's memory is correct, of course, at least to the extent of the amount of the fee.

I would say this is perhaps one reason why we have not been able to get this program off the ground. I doubt if there will be any attempt to raise the fee, whether we have it here or not. It just does not seem to me we can use it as an inflationary argument.

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

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

Mr. RANDALL. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say it is his contemplation that none of this would apply to the Corps of Engineers, throughout the Nation?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct 100 percent.

Mr. RANDALL. Nothing in here would permit it to apply?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EDMONDSON) there were—ayes 13, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Sec. 3. Section 8 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-10a), is amended by deleting "of fiscal years 1969 and 1970" and inserting "fiscal year".

Sec. 4. On or before February 1, 1971, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a survey as to the policy to be implemented with regard to entrance and user fees and report his findings to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDMONDSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Edmondson; Page 4, After line 5, insert the following new section:

"No entrance or admission fee shall be collected at any Federal outdoor recreational facility or area other than at National Parks where collection of such fees is found both practical and desirable."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the second amendment referred to in general debate. It is an amendment which seeks to extend to the National Forest areas and to the Bureau of Reclamation recreation areas the same principle that is incorporated in section 210 of the Flood Control Act, which is that

there shall be no entrance or admission fees to these recreational areas. In short, it would confine the fees that would be charged to user fees, which the debate, it seems to me, has made very clear are the fees which are generally considered to be the fairest, the easiest collected, the best in their return to the Government on the basis of collection expense.

Now, if you want to continue to have somebody at the gate 24 hours a day during recreational periods to collect these entrance fees at some of these areas regardless of whether it is economical or considered to be feasible, why, you can go ahead and vote for entrance fees and admission fees if you like. But personally I believe it is the consensus of this committee that we should go to the user fee system. This amendment takes us to a user fee system every place except in the national parks and only in national parks where such collection is found to be desirable and feasible would the entrance fee be collected.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. It had nine votes in the committee, and I hope it gets at least that many on the floor of the House today.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment is premature. This is one of the matters that must be taken care of in the study with which the department will report back to us.

I am sure, of course, that the gentleman from Oklahoma, in the enthusiasm of his argument, did not intend to lead any of us to believe that there are any places that are being kept open 24 hours a day for the collection of fees, not even in the Park Service as far as that is concerned. In the old of the park areas, even under the old system, there was no charge made where charges were found to be infeasible and more costly than the revenues collected.

This argument sounds very good, but if you are thinking about recreation in the United States, I think you should keep in mind that there is some universality to this question of recreation, and to pick out the National Park Service at this time before the study is made, even with the argument that the gentleman from Oklahoma has made so forcefully, as far as the user fee is concerned, is just not, in my opinion, logical or rational.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I commend the chairman of the committee for his opposition to the amendment. The chairman and I have both assured the gentleman from Oklahoma that this legislation does not touch the Corps of Engineers projects. What he is trying to do here is to expand on that assurance and put in the Forest Service and recreation facilities of other departments.

Mr. ASPINALL. He wants to put in the Bureau of Land Management and also the wildlife refuges and anything else that might come up before the study was

made. The suggestion is just untimely and that is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2315) to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, pursuant to House Resolution 953, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 314, nays 1, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—314

Abbutt	Brown, Calif.	Corbett
Abernethy	Brown, Mich.	Corman
Adams	Brown, Ohio	Coughlin
Alexander	Broyhill, N.C.	Cowger
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, Va.	Cramer
Andrews, Ala.	Buchanan	Culver
Annunzio	Burke, Fla.	Cunningham
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Daniel, Va.
Ashbrook	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, Ga.
Ashley	Burton, Calif.	Davis, Wis.
Aspinall	Burton, Utah	Dellenback
Ayres	Bush	Denney
Baring	Button	Dennis
Beall, Md.	Byrne, Pa.	Derwinski
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Devine
Bell, Calif.	Cabell	Dickinson
Bennett	Caffery	Donohue
Berry	Camp	Dorn
Betts	Casey	Dowdy
Bevill	Cederberg	Duncan
Blaggi	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Biester	Chappell	Edmondson
Bingham	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Blackburn	Clausen.	Edwards, Calif.
Blanton	Don H.	Edwards, La.
Blatnik	Clawson, Del	Eilberg
Boggs	Clay	Esch
Boland	Cleveland	Eshleman
Brademas	Collier	Evans, Colo.
Bray	Collins	Evans, Tenn.
Brinkley	Colmer	Fallon
Broomfield	Conable	Fascell
Brotzman	Conte	Findley

Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallifanakis
Garmatz
Gettys
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hammer-
schmidt
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Hollfield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
King
Kluczynski
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen

Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
Macdonald,
Mass.
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mizell
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Quile
Randall
Rees
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle

Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebell
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stagers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—1

Thompson, Ga.

NOT VOTING—114

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson,
Tenn.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Barrett
Bolling
Bow
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Burluson, Tex.
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chisholm
Clancy
Cohelan
Conyers
Crane
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Dawson

de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Feighan
Fish
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gilbert
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard

Keith
Kirwan
Kleppe
Koch
Kuykendall
Landrum
Long, La.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClure
McEwen
McKneally
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Marsh
Meskill
Minshall
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Murphy, N.Y.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pirnie
Podell
Pollock

Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Pucinski
Quillen
Rallsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers
Robison
Rodino

Roe
Rooney, N.Y.
Roybal
St Germain
Scheuer
Schwengel
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Symington
Thompson, N.J.

Tiernan
Ullman
Vigorito
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whalley
Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Rooney of North Carolina with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Fish.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. McClure.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Whalley.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr.

Minshall.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Burluson of Texas with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Dent.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Koch.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Montgomery.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Marsh.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Howard.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Cohelan with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Tiernan.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend his remarks on the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JUNE 18, 1970.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this Committee. The work plans involved are (by watershed, State, and Executive Communication number):

Beaverdam-Warrior Creeks, South Carolina, 1741, 91st Congress.

Fish Bayou, Arkansas, 1741, 91st Congress.

Lost-Duck Creeks, Oklahoma, 1741, 91st Congress.

North Fork Obion River, Tennessee, 1741, 91st Congress.

Swan Creek, Alabama, 1741, 91st Congress.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, in the past year, we have been made increasingly aware of environmental deterioration in this country. While we struggle to know more about what our resources can support and tolerate, a rapidly increasing population continues to exact a terrible toll on our resources, and to place a heavier burden on our land, our waters, and even the air we breathe.

Our population is spread unevenly and uncomfortably. Nearly three-fourths of our population now live on only 2 percent of our land area. By the year 2000, we will have added another 100 million to our population and 35 to 40 million of them will be jammed into existing urban areas.

We will have no new supplies of air, water, soil, trees, or mineral resources, but somehow we will have to support more and more Americans.

Our conservation efforts of the past are not, by themselves, going to meet the challenge. Isolated parks and game reserves, scattered scenic rivers and roads, and individual conservation projects will not save, or more importantly, replenish and develop what has been destroyed.

But, as bad as it all seems today, there are good reasons to be encouraged for

tomorrow. The problems we now face are so great and so complex that they must be met with comprehensive and complete solutions.

The war on environmental decay is being waged in earnest by more Americans than ever before.

The farmers, who have long been our most active, working conservationists, are striving harder to restore their croplands and to awaken the potential of neglected acreage for usable recreational facilities.

During the past year, greater attention by the Federal Government and State governments has been given to enforcing existing laws for air and water quality standards.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 gives recognition to the collective impact of growing population and economic development. It sets forth an essential policy of cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments to meet necessary high standards for better environment.

The aspect of the problem which particularly attracts my attention is that of the plight of our rural areas. It is in our rural areas where I see prospects for early and fruitful rewards. It is puzzling to me that the countryside, where the American dream was planted, where our resources were used by farmers to grow food and fiber, where we found our timber, our minerals and our peace and quiet, would be ignored and cast aside as mechanization and urbanization changed the character of the nation.

The hard-working farmer has always been an American hero, but as he finds himself unable to stay alive economically on a small farm, we seem to ignore his agonies and turn our attention to the more obvious problems in our cities. The consequences of allowing rural America to disintegrate touch everyone in this country more than we realize.

Mr. Speaker, young people who are well-educated and vital, those with the potential to rebuild our rural areas are leaving at an alarming rate. They are abandoning the countryside where they see only their parents' past and no future for themselves. They are attracted, understandably, by news that there are job opportunities in the large metropolitan areas.

Often these young people find that things are no better in the city. They add to the crowding, the unemployment rolls and the crime rate.

Mr. Speaker, it is in our rural areas that we can still find generous resources of clean air, clean water and living space to absorb people who would leave their city life behind in a minute if they knew that jobs, good transportation, educational and health facilities were available. It is in the rural areas that we have our greatest recreational potential, scenic beauty and tranquility. It is in the outlying areas that we can most readily and economically develop facilities for industry. It is there that we can most easily develop and preserve our natural resources as our population expands.

People in rural areas want to improve their lot. Rural development is a dedication of the strengths of these individuals

through their own institutions—schools, churches, clubs, organizations, business and industry—to make more jobs, create more opportunities and to establish a better quality of life.

Legislation introduced in this Congress aimed at rural development could, in many instances, be very helpful. The bills designed to create tax-incentive programs for industry would help to create new job opportunities, would contribute to the needed job-training facilities and would provide not only incentives for rural people to stay where they are, but they would attract others to move out into the country.

The private industry of this Nation also must participate in the improvement of economic opportunity for rural America.

Existing laws and programs can be used most effectively. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has had for years a chain of organization and communication which ties together the effort of the Federal and State governments to aid the individual. The programs for soil and water conservation that exist and which have served us so well can be used more vitally in the future.

Since passage of the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, 261 small watershed projects have been completed; 651 projects are under construction or are in preconstruction phases; 581 projects are in the planning stages; and there is potential for nearly 7,000 more projects.

Small watershed projects and those for resource conservation and development, conservation technical assistance, soil surveys, and river basin surveys have created better living, working, and recreational facilities, have offered more employment to rural people, and have added to the enjoyment of rural living.

They must be used to their fullest in the future.

There are still nearly 30,000 rural communities with no adequate water systems and nearly 45,000 without sewer systems.

By developing a sound economic base in the country we will simultaneously improve living conditions in rural areas and relieve much of the pressure of urban centers. We will slow outmigration from the country and create a better distribution of people and economic growth.

By saving and restoring our rural resources we will insure a stronger resource base for the future. The total benefit of this program will be a higher standard of living and a higher quality environment for all Americans.

CONTRACTS AWARDED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, we have accustomed ourselves to the daily reading of news releases which tell of increased fighting in Indochina, a record unem-

ployment figure here at home and a proposal for increased taxation. It is seldom that a Member of Congress has the opportunity to read a news release that is humorous at best, while at the same time is the proverbial story of the American bureaucracy.

Many of my colleagues, I am sure, await with anticipation as I do for the daily arrival of the press notice announcing the grants and contracts awarded by the National Science Foundation.

The ingenuity the National Science Foundation displays in dreaming up outlandish ways to spend the taxpayer's money is truly a work of art. Last Friday they reached a new pinnacle of success in my estimation, as they announced a \$60,000 grant to South Dakota State University to conduct a 24-month study on "Physiological and Behavioral Effect of Insecticides on Cormorants."

Webster's dictionary describes the cormorant as a "greedy, web-footed sea bird related to the pelican, having a wedge-shaped tail, a hooked beak, and a bare, distensible patch of skin at the upper throat."

Despite the fact that I have lived in South Dakota all my life, I defy anyone to show me one cormorant in the State, let alone one whose physiological and behavioral habits may have been affected by insecticides. There is not a cormorant within a thousand miles of South Dakota, and while this \$60,000 grant is no doubt a boon to State University, it is a classic example of the Government's renowned ability to spend money foolishly.

Last month the House voted the National Science Foundation \$497 million for the coming fiscal year to carry on this folly of funding project equally as worth while as the one I have just mentioned.

Who will deny the pressing urgency for the need to spend \$28,000 in order to better understand the "Gene Expression in Sea Urchin Embryos?"

Show me a citizen in Slippery Rock, Pa., or Tulsa, Okla., who would say one discouraging word about the National Science Foundation shelling out \$229,700 for two grants enabling "Collaborative Research on Hawaii Terrestrial Biology subprograms."

Yes, my distinguished colleagues, when I leave this august body at the end of the current session, one of the things I shall miss most of all will be the daily news releases of the National Science Foundation, boasting, if you please, of their success in pouring taxpayer's money down a rathole.

BLUE RIBBON BOARD CONFIRMS C-5 CAPABLE OF DOING JOB

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a report from the blue ribbon scientific advisory board appointed by the Air Force to look

into contentions that the C-5A may not perform the mission for which it was designed.

It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, that this scientific advisory board was headed by Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, dean of engineering of MIT. The report confirms that the C-5 will meet all of its performance requirements.

Because the special scientific advisory board has now rendered its report on the C-5 saying, in substance, that the massive aircraft will perform its mission requirements, the shrill voices of the alarmist should be quieted.

Certain persons have been doing not only Lockheed a disservice but the entire public by raising their voices in criticism of the performance of the C-5 when in fact every report indicates the aircraft will clearly perform the mission for which it was designed.

Now that the blue-ribbon panel headed by Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, of MIT, has reported, possibly those who have sought to bring about a division in the American public with regard to the so-called military-industrial complex will silence their voices insofar as the C-5 program is concerned.

One of the oldest tactics used to destroy a program is to subject it to constant harassment and criticism, whether warranted or not. It is obvious that the actions of certain people lead many to the conclusion that they are simply trying to bring about the cancellation of the entire C-5 program which would mean the weakening of America's military might and possibly the destruction of a great national concern.

In order to accomplish this cancellation, a great volume of words and phrases have been forthcoming and in my personal opinion, particularly after the report of the Bisplinghoff panel, these voices should be stilled and Lockheed allowed to get about the business of producing the desired number of aircraft with adequate compensation paid by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the clearest reports of the findings of the commission is contained in the news release put out by Lockheed itself and I insert in the RECORD immediately following these remarks the text of this release:

BLUE RIBBON BOARD CONFIRMS C-5 CAPABLE OF DOING JOB, LOCKHEED NOTES

ATLANTA, Ga.—The blue ribbon report on the C-5 submitted to the U.S. Air Force by a Scientific Advisory Board supports Lockheed's contentions that the massive airlifter will perform its mission with the Military Airlift Command, Lockheed-Georgia Company Vice President, Engineering, Robert Ormsby said today. The report confirms that no new wing is necessary.

Ormsby stated that the thorough and comprehensive review given the C-5 program by the board, which was headed by Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, dean of engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, served to point out areas of concern that Lockheed engineers were aware of as a result of extensive development and flight testing of the world's largest aircraft.

Flight testing of the C-5 as well as continuing testing of non-flying static and fatigue specimens now have the highest priority at Lockheed-Georgia and some areas

of testing will be expedited to ensure that C-5s off the production line will perform as required and as indicated in the report, continued Ormsby.

Ormsby pointed out that the report identified no new problems with the C-5 and recommendations made were in line with action already being taken by company engineers.

"Specifically," Ormsby said, "we're now increasing our static test loadings beyond the 80 percent point and we're moving ahead with fatigue testing of the C-5. In any case, the difficulties we have encountered would ordinarily be considered normal in any aircraft development and testing program not subjected to the criticism given the C-5 program."

"Up to now," Ormsby indicated, "static tests on the C-5 wing have represented wing loadings 26 percent beyond those normally expected in flight operations. The C-5 wing in undergoing loading tests has had the wing bent upwards to where the wing tip was 16 feet above the level that is normal for a C-5 standing on a runway. Under the same loading conditions, the wing has been bent downwards to where the wing tip was 12 feet below the normal level. "Under our accelerated static test program," said Ormsby, "the wing will be subjected to increasingly severe loads that will bend the wing upwards and downwards over a range of 35 feet, representing a 50 percent load factor greater than the C-5 will ever experience in flight."

"Certain cost saving recommendations were made by the board, which suggested some changes in the over-all C-5 operational requirements," Ormsby said. These changes are primarily related to avionics or radar equipment developed especially for the C-5 and are now being proved. By using a less sophisticated radar system than was specified for the C-5 back in 1965, the Galaxy will still perform satisfactorily as the advisory board indicates.

"As for the recommended changes, it's solely a matter for the Air Force to decide after they weigh their operational requirements against system costs. In any event, Lockheed will cooperate fully with any decisions made by the Air Force in complying with recommendations of the advisory board."

"So far, the C-5s in flight test, those assigned to air crew training at Altus AFB, Okla., and the C-5 delivered for squadron operations at Charleston AFB, S.C., have been performing up to expectations and, in some cases, beyond," Ormsby said. The C-5 delivered to Charleston on June 6, for instance, has logged 71 hours of untroubled flight to date, including over water flights to Bermuda and Puerto Rico, Ormsby indicated. "This rate of usage only serves to indicate how anxious the Air Force is to have the C-5 in squadron strengths and how important it is to the Military Airlift Command," stated Ormsby.

The recommendations in the report are sound and in keeping with our own philosophy as to how to proceed with the program, said Ormsby, and we will certainly cooperate with the Air Force in implementing the positive recommendations of the report.

"Now that our own opinion of the C-5 has been confirmed by the Scientific Advisory Board," Ormsby continued, "we look forward to getting on with the job of delivering C-5s to the Military Airlift Command where we are confident it will have a successful career in the tradition of the C-130 and C-141 airlifters, but with the inherent improvements the C-5 offers MAC."

Commenting on the Scientific Advisory Board summary report on the independent study of the C-5 design and development, President Robert A. Fuhrman, of the Lockheed-Georgia Company, Wednesday, said:

"The previous speculation that the Scientific Advisory Board report would call for a new wing has been proved erroneous. The

summary of this report confirms our own prediction that, on the basis of test measurements received to date, the C-5A Galaxy flight performance will meet its contract guarantees. The important thing is that the basic design and structure of the C-5 are sound.

"The suggestions made by the independent SAB deserve, and will receive, careful further study and analysis. It is possible, as the committee summary notes, that some modification to the wing structure may be needed as tests progress. Such modifications are typical of those needed and experienced in a normal aircraft development program."

SECRETARY DAVIS OUSTED?

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the resignation "or firing" of Assistant Commerce Secretary Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., has been of great interest to those sponsoring the Mills textile-footwear import bill. It is passing strange that this event occurred at a crucial time in trade negotiations here in Washington with Japan and prior to an executive session of the Ways and Means Committee to consider this bill.

I have the very highest regard and respect for Secretary Maurice Stans. I trust and hope Secretary Stans and President Nixon will yet openly endorse the Mills bill as this bill will promote negotiations such as the high level conference now underway.

Recently the United States-Japan Trade Council here in Washington opposed in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee the Mills textile-footwear bill. Supposedly, the Council's chief interest was to promote trade between the United States and Japan. It came as a shock, that after the Council's testimony before the committee against the bill to learn that the United States-Japan Trade Council was financed largely by Japan.

I wish to commend our distinguished, able, beloved, and dedicated colleague, JOHNNY BYRNES, for exposing this fraud—this masquerade of the Council. Thus, Mr. BYRNES greatly contributed to an honest and fair evaluation of the merits of the Mills bill by exposing the under-the-table financing of the Council.

Mr. Speaker, these bizarre events and revelations point out the intrigue and procrastination of some who oppose fair, orderly trade legislation such as the one presently being considered by the Ways and Means Committee introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and 252 Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I might remind my colleagues that the high level Japanese mission in Washington today would not be here were it not for the strength manifested by the House in support of Mills textile-footwear bill. Yes, Mr. Speaker, 253 Members have joined in introducing the bill. Yes, Mr. Speaker, 14 members of the Ways and Means Committee have introduced the bill. This is a clear majority. Now is the time to proceed with passage of the bill. Again, Mr. Speaker, the bill itself provides for negotiations.

Passing this bill will encourage negotiations and meaningful voluntary agreements.

SENIORS MAKE EXCELLENT SPEECHES

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 31st I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Milton Hershey School graduation worship service at Hershey, Pa.

At this ceremony we heard addresses by three seniors and in all of my years in public service I have seldom heard remarks equaling the spiritual quality of these youths.

It is certainly comforting to know that in these very difficult and troubled times for today's young people that the Milton Hershey School is placing into the adult world young people with high spiritual values and constructive ideas. These young men, I am confident, will make a valid and outstanding contribution to the American way of life.

I, therefore, commend these three senior addresses to the attention of my colleagues:

SEEK AND YE SHALL FIND (By Curtis Lohler)

There is a label on a cage in a certain zoo that states simply, "This animal is new to science." A discovery of such magnitude sends thousands of scientists scurrying to their labs to try and trace the ancestry of this animal. Eventually, after much searching, man places this poor creature in its proper place in the animal world.

There is a label on a cage in the minds of men which reads, "The force contained in this cage is extremely dangerous, handle with care." Another label on the same cage reads, "The force contained herein is highly communicable. Those infected will find a peace unlike any they have ever known." The force thus imprisoned is God, waiting as it were, proper classification. We hurry about, reading books, performing experiments, disproving the words set down in ages long since past. During all of this drive for knowledge, a timeless Patriarch sits waiting patiently for us to return to the simple acceptance and faith of our ancestors.

When a scientist wants to answer a question, he goes about finding his facts in an orderly way. Each experimental result is used to support his preliminary hypothesis.

When a doctor performs exploratory surgery, he is using his professional experience to attempt to discover the causes for his patient's illness.

When you form an opinion, it is the conglomeration of the thoughts and opinions of your friends and acquaintances. This human chain is forged daily by millions of people helping one another through sharing their ideas and opinions.

What do you consider as God? Put all of the thoughts and ideas you have heard away and do some independent thinking on this question. Is he a being similar to us, whose power is unlimited? Is he a spirit unseen by man? Is he just a force whose unavoidable presence is constantly watching our actions?

In the Bible it is written, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." But how do you seek God? Can it be done with a telescope, or a microscope? Will experimental results verify His presence? The only advice that can be

given is that you search on your own. When you leave the cares and troubles of the world and close yourself into contact with your conscience, you will invariably reach a conclusion. Whatever you decide; whether to believe in a set doctrine or your "ownism," set your standards to this decision. Whether you feel the doctrine of God and Jesus Christ is your choice or whether or not you feel that there is an extraterrestrial force governing our actions is your own business, but once you do decide, stick to your decision, and respect those of others.

The majority of the convictions of men stem from the belief in a single, all-powerful diety. This power is constantly being defined and personified in written works; of which none are capable of being believed as fact, for each is only an extension of its own author's beliefs.

Each man must decide for himself how he will approach his God. Each must come on his own, in his own way; for no beaten path is accurate, no map is available.

I conclude my thoughts on choosing your path and your own spiritual guidance with these words written in 1693 and found in Old St. Paul's Church in Baltimore.

Go placidly amid the noise and haste and remember what peace there may be in silence! As far as possible, without surrender, be on good terms with all persons. If you compare yourself with others, you may become bitter or vain, for there will always be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with dark imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness.

Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here, and whether or not it is clear to you, no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

Therefore, be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be. And whatever your labors and aspirations, in the noisy confusion of life, keep peace in your soul. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world!

RELIGION, AN ESSENTIAL TO GOOD DECISIONS (By Kenneth Ornick)

Graduation means many things to many people, but for seniors it is a time when they must make some of the most important decisions in their lives. These decisions might be about attending college or entering one of the branches of our Armed Forces. But no matter who we are we must make choices.

When the time comes to make a decision how will we choose which way to go? What will we use as the basis for judgment?

Religion should play an essential role in our decision making, for it is in religion that our sense of right and wrong becomes clearly defined. Religion can give us a sense of direction.

What better way is there to make that all important decision, than to take a moment to think about it and quietly ask for divine help to answer it?

There are many stories that tell of how God has shown his way to those who have called upon him in earnest. There isn't time to go into all of them, but I would like to share with you one such story.

Two men stood atop a hill to make a decision. They had decided to split up and go their own ways. The one man asked the Lord for guidance and was told to let the other man have his way. The other man could choose his own way to go. If he chose the right the other would go left, and if he chose left the other would go right.

The two men made their decisions in different ways. One put greed and self-interest

above everything in making his decision, while the other chose to follow the Lord's advice.

The two men went their ways and eventually the man who let greed sway his thinking fell victim to his choice. He had chosen to go with the wickedness and sin of Sodom and was lost. The man who had asked for and followed the Lord's advice prospered. He had turned away from the wickedness of Sodom and had flourished.

These men were Abraham and Lot. God had shown the way.

We have a choice because it is by making decisions that we learn. Choice makes us strong. As George Eliot once stated, "The strongest principle of growth lies in human choice."

We must not think of religion as a cure-all for our problems and minor frustrations, for the final choice is left up to us. We are free to arrive at any conclusion or follow any course of action that we wish. We were given the freedom of choice and we are free to exercise that privilege. There is no predetermined plan for us to follow because of the element of choice. We can stray from any pathway, but when we stumble we must remember that it was our choice.

If we call upon the Lord he will show us the right way. We can ignore him if we wish or we can follow the road he indicates, but we must remember that he only indicates the right direction.

Which way will we turn?

WHAT DOES GOD MEAN TO US?

(By Arthur Orcutt)

When we refer to God we think of him as being the supreme being, who sent forth his son to redeem our sins. But who is God? What is he? Is he a spirit in nature? Or is he just a person that we invented? Is God with us at all times when we are in need? Do we use God when we get in trouble and say if you get me out of this, I'll be a good Christian? And then when it's all over do we return to our old habits?

Some people contend that there is no God but what reason could they offer for the world's existence? When you get right down to it, all these questions would be pretty difficult to answer. Even if one could answer them all would you want to find out there is no God? For if there were no God what could we believe in? God, Man, World—what are these in relation to each other? God is first. He is what we believe in and depend upon. Men, others and myself would be included in this, no man could exist without the other for each is dependent on the other. As John Donne once said, "No man is an island," no man can stand alone. World, why are we here? We are here for the betterment of mankind, to give to our fellow man a richer and more meaningful way of life.

The late W. Allen Hammond, in his book, *A Man and His Boys*, felt that a boy should have a guide to follow, and that is, a conviction of loyalty to the best that is in him, and a determination to win, what he wills. From the three words God, Man, and World, Mr. Hammond drew a triangle with God at the top and Man and World at the two bottom corners. And in the center is the individual "I, the flower of creation and the potential child of God, a position which marks the significance and dignity of human personality."

What is transmitted from the individual towards God? It is basically an attitude of child-like dependence on Deity, a desire to know his will and purpose to serve him. "Faith without works is dead."

What should one's attitude be toward his fellow man? I think the Bible answers this best: "Love thy neighbor as thyself, and do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

What is the relationship between the individual and the things of the world? One must

be in the world, but should not be of it. This is hard, for one tends to forget God, and his fellow man. When the going is tough prayers are frequent and when one starts to advance in economic and social life prayers are not said as often. The idea is to work hard, save what you can and to get ahead but let us not forget God.

God to me is someone I can go to in time of trouble and in time of need. God is someone that I can feel close to at all times whether good or bad. God to me is many things, he is trees and flowers, and animal life, for which without him none of this could exist.

I am glad God made me who I am and for this I am proud to serve him until and after I leave the earth.

A lot of people today are afraid to admit that they believe in God, for fear their friends and neighbors think of them as perhaps odd balls. But God is not one to be ashamed of knowing and with the help of God, one can move a mountain.

And when the day comes for God to call on me, I will remember Psalm 23 verse 4: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of Death, I will fear no evil: for Thou are with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me."

VETERANS FOR PEACE RETURN MEDALS TO GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, opposition to this country's continuing tragic adventurism in Southeast Asia comes from all quarters, but I do not think I have ever been so moved and impressed as when I participated in a San Francisco rally sponsored by Veterans for Peace in mid-April.

The men at that rally were not state-side and behind-the-lines soldiers; most of them had served in action in Vietnam. A number of them had earned the right to be called heroes.

Now they are bitterly opposed to American policy in Indochina. Their voices were hard, cynical.

These men felt as if they had been used, that they were pawns in a cruel, immoral, brutal game.

On April 15, they acted to cut off all their remaining links to the military system.

At the rally, over 50 of these veterans—some of them with service records stretching back through both Korea and World War II—renounced the medals and decorations they had received from the military.

Many of them also turned back their discharge papers and other official relics issued by the military.

For me, it was a tremendously emotional demonstration as the list of Purple Heart and Bronze and Silver Star winners grew.

Today, with peace no nearer than it was 3 to 4 years ago, I want very much to congratulate these Veterans for Peace on their courageous and patriotic efforts. Yet, as I do so, I must say again that the onus of responsibility for ending the needless slaughter in Southeast Asia lies directly upon this body, that there would be no need for Veterans for

Peace if the Congress utilized its given powers to halt the war.

For each hero turning in a Purple Heart, how many more have died in Indochina to preserve the fantasies of a small group of scare merchants?

Veterans for peace know that the terror, the agony, the horror they endured was meaningless, for nothing. We must listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Sacramento, Calif., Veterans for Peace plus a list of former and active servicemen turning in the medals they were awarded, an address by Kenneth E. Scott given at the April 15 rally, a series of letters and notes written by Veterans for Peace at that rally and given to me, and, finally, a list of the Veterans for Peace who turned in their medals at the rally.

The material referred to, follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
March 15, 1970.

President RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In turning in these military decorations to you, we, as veterans of the armed forces of the United States of America, wish to disassociate ourselves with an effort we are undertaking in Vietnam by using our military might to impose a form of government upon a repressed people. Most of us served in Vietnam, and a goodly number of us volunteered for this duty. Not a few of us spent more than one tour of duty there. Our observations have led us to believe that we are pursuing an unjust and evil war, and that those of us who participated in this war are guilty of lending aid and abetting this criminal venture.

While we can not cancel out the past, and those of us who served in Vietnam can not cancel the aid, can not bring to life those we killed or assisted to be killed, can not rebuild that which we caused to be destroyed, and can not dismiss our complicity, we can—and hereby do—reject symbolically our ties, participation and acts while members of the military. The medals we were taught to value so highly weigh heavily upon us; the medals we were taught to value highly are not worth so much anymore. It is incumbent upon us to rid ourselves of these symbols, for to keep them in the face of what we know would be the greatest hypocrisy.

We have decided to send these medals to you, Mr. Nixon, because you are the commander in chief of the military, because you, who once promised that if elected would move to end the killing, have reneged on your promises and have continued the war, have continued to insure the existence of a repressive military tyranny in the name of freedom. We do not believe the government you support in Vietnam is worthy to be associated with the word "freedom", and our actions in that country are not worthy of our Nation.

Once again we urge you to begin substantive negotiation with all factions in Vietnam; to end the killing now; to withdraw from Vietnam as rapidly as possible; to insure the freedom of political and other prisoners in Vietnam; to bring unity and peace to this Nation.

(Names of signatories adjoined:)

NAME AND BRANCH OF SERVICE
Michael Barnes, Army; Ronald J. Carpenter, Army; John Nastal, Air Force; Gerard T. Kane, Army; Joseph W. Kirchner, Air Force; Lester Rasmussen, Navy; Frank Arteaga, Air Force; David Cavert, Navy; Lewis A. Lopez, Army.

Robert Lucchesi, David C. Atkinson, Albert R. LeGault, Navy; F. H. Graham, Army; Tom Pavelchik, Army; Rees J. Williams, Navy; Roland Hoermann, Army; Susan Wilke, Army; Michael Oldham, Navy; Francis Teribile, Army; Michael McNeely, Navy.

Richard Paul, Army; James Silger, Army; Brandon Beedle, Army; Donna L. Pratt, Air Force; Dan Dinburg, Army; Ned Pierce, Navy; Martin McDonough, Army; James McKee, Marine Corps; Roger Thibault, Army; Wesley H. Osman.

General Rucker, Army; Frank Gibson, Marine Corps; Larry D. Licker, Army; Donna L. Barry, Air Force; Wayne B. Barry, Air Force; Paul L. Quandt, Air Force; William Sandness, Army; Craig J. Mathews, Army; Walter McClarin, Army.

Richard Stephens, Army; James Allen, Air Force; Steven Perkins, Army; Anonymous, U.S. Naval Reserve, active; Anonymous, U.S. Air Force, active; Michael Hayes, Army; Stephen C. Govedich, Air Force.

ADDRESS BY KENNETH E. SCOTT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 15, 1970

Military medals are supposed to be honors bestowed in recognition of personal acts of bravery and faithful service in defense of one's country. True bravery and valor are in themselves commendable. But what is the meaning of faithful service within a destructive institution perpetrating an unjust and immoral war? Faithful service is then direct support of unjust and immoral destruction. To accept and retain a medal honoring this destruction is to acquiesce in continued dishonor. No longer wishing to acquiesce in America's dishonorable intervention in Southeast Asia, the veterans gathered here today have requested the assistance of Congressman George Brown in returning their medals to the Commander-in-Chief, President Nixon. We cannot and would not attempt to escape our individual responsibility for the tragedy of America's intervention in Southeast Asia, but we wish to make it clear that we no longer tacitly accept either the unnecessary and immoral destruction of the Southeast Asian people, their land and their culture—or America's repressive military institution of destruction.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

I was awarded this Bronze Star medal and Purple Heart for my involuntary participation in the Viet Nam war, which I consider to be immoral, illegal, racist and senseless. I am therefore returning these medals because if I cannot look at them with pride, I would prefer not to have them at all. When I look at them I feel only shame, as someday this entire nation will surely feel about this war. I pray that the conscience of the American people will wake up before it is too late.

ALLISON BLAKELY.

I hereby relinquish my "achievement awards" from the Military-Industrial Complex since they represent to me the pain and suffering of millions of human beings in S.E. Asia. As an Annapolis graduate and Vietnam veteran, I take this opportunity to publicly display my moral repugnance for what I know to be our inhumane and grotesque military "adventure" in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. There are not sufficient words to express what anguish I feel for those unfortunate people who live under constant threat of extinction by the "mindless, obedient, war monster" and all its leaders hiding behind the color of their office or uniform who are responsible.

DAN LAVERY, Annapolis 1964, Lieutenant, U.S.N.R.

I am joining my fellow veterans in returning my military service ribbons as a protest against our Vietnam War policy. We have sacrificed over 40,000 American lives for the

lies about the Gulf of Tonkin, My Lai, the tyrannical and graft-ridden Saigon government, Pacification and Vietnamization. Daily we dishonor our American ideals by our continued presence in Vietnam. The time to end the War is now.

STANLEY MANDELES,
Ex-Lieutenant junior grade, D. USNR.

I, Roy Dugger, ex S/Sgt. US Army and Air Force, at the Anti-War Rally in San Francisco, April 15, 1970, do hereby return the following seven medals representing eight awards, to the US Government:

1. Air Force Commendation Medal
2. United Nations Defense Medal (Korea)
3. US Korean Service Medal
4. National Defense Service Medal
5. Army of Occupation Medal (Germany and Japan)
6. World War II Victory Medal
7. Good Conduct Medal

It is impossible to give all the reasons for this action in a brief statement—it would take books. However, I feel the senseless slaughter of innocent men, women and children in Viet-Nam and other parts of Asia is insane. No matter what the political situation was in Viet-Nam, I do not believe that it was truly a threat to our National Security. A threat, perhaps, to a few vested financial interests, but not a threat to America. A threat to a few American financial interests certainly does not justify the deaths of from forty to fifty-thousand, and the wounding and maiming of hundreds of thousands of our own American boys.

Further, I believe that this is a racist war. I do not believe that the people of the United States would permit this same inhuman type war if we were waging it against Poland, or perhaps Ireland. Think of it. We are now hated around the world as Nazi Germany was.

However, this undeclared war in Viet-Nam has surely become a threat to America now. As the fighting enlarges and gets closer and closer to China, we are threatening them. In street terms, short of atomic annihilation in Viet-Nam, we cannot win the "war" there, now we're messing around with Red China!

Aside from the humanistic aspect, there is the expense. This so-called war is costing us billions and billions of dollars yearly. All this, not to mention shots to the Moon, that costs billions, plus billions and billions more programmed for ABM systems that will not protect the people, all this while millions and millions of Americans live in dire poverty and want at home.

Just the other day the Government announced that there are a million more unemployed this year than last. As these figures soar, they do not include the nine to ten million on welfare. They do not include the many idle that are on neither welfare nor unemployment. They do not include the many in our jails and prisons, a great many of them incarcerated for the crime of being poor. They do not include the millions and millions who are employed but who still do not make a decent living wage. With automation, etc., these figures are all going to continue rising. Something must be done. Nixon's new proposed welfare program will never do it. *They do not have the jobs!* It seems his entire program is based on the idiotic idea that these millions and millions simply are too lazy to work.

Now, I was for World War II. You might wonder why I'm turning in that medal. On the reverse of it is printed, "Freedom From Fear and Want." People are not free from fear and want in this country and that medal was cast over twenty-five years ago. It is a hoax. All over this "Richest Country on Earth" we see mass mistreatment of millions of poor people daily.

Just the other day I saw a TV advertisement pleading for donations to help the poor and starving children of Seoul, Korea. Sup-

posedly, we fought over there to protect a Government so there could be freedom for her people. Freedom for who? Or should I ask, freedom for who to do what to who?

ROY DUGGER.

With this statement I renounce any right to wear any of the military decorations to which I am entitled. I would not serve in an Army which must fight an unjust and atrocious war such as that in Vietnam, nor do I want any of the honors which such an Army might grant.

JAMES W. MOORE.

DEAR MR. NIXON: Here are the medals that the army gave me for being in it and going to Viet Nam. They are common and ordinary, and the armed forces have given about one and a half million of them. To the government in Washington they will probably only represent a sub-micro percentage.

To me they represent my involvement in the stupidest war that ever was. I believe that sacrificing the lives and limbs of American Soldiers to maintain the Theiu-Ky regime is counter to America's best interests. Legal, moral governments derive their power from the consent of the people they represent. That government in Viet Nam is killing the People it represents and ruling by terror. Peace.

BERNARD R. GREENING.

I hereby renounce the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for Vietnam and the National Defense Services Medal awarded to me for service aboard the USS Richard S. Edwards from 1964 to 1966. In the four years since my discharge from active duty I have watched with horror as the war in southeast Asia intensified and expanded. I consider a major cause of this escalation and subsequent loss of life to be the illegal intervention of United States forces in that area, and I wish by this symbolic act to disavow that use of force and the policy that lies behind it. I do not believe that the foreign markets of U.S. business are worth the life of a single Cambodian, Vietnamese, or Laotian peasant.

G. R. HAMILTON.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Unfortunately, I do not have at hand my National Defense Service Medal; otherwise, I would turn it in to you along with the others that you are receiving from the Veterans for Peace. I hope that you will take this letter, instead, as symbolic of my opposition to maintaining or extending the war in Southeast Asia. Perhaps this will help to convince you that many patriotic and moderate citizens among the hitherto silent majority feel that you are not acting in the best interest of the country.

PAUL ROBERT WOLFSON.

I wish to renounce my medals because the concept of being awarded medals for involuntary servitude is repugnant to me. Many times during my two years in the Army I wondered what crime I had committed to occasion my being treated as a convicted felon. The United States policy of bombing and napalming Vietnamese peasants in the name of Democracy seems to me to be the arrogance of power carried to its logical absurdity. The fact that our "enemies" are Asians, and that American racial minorities and poor people are over-represented in U.S. Infantry divisions, makes it clear to me that my country is engaged in a racial war.

American foreign policy, even at this late date, supports corrupt dictatorships where it should, on both moral and pragmatic grounds, be supporting the legitimate efforts of peoples' revolutionary forces. After we have laid S.E. Asia to waste, will we bomb, scorch and maim South America and Africa? I call upon the Nixon administration to abandon what has now become

Nixon's War, to pull all U.S. Forces out of Vietnam immediately, to re-examine its support of repressive regimes wherever they may be, and to admit to the world that this country is guilty of an atrocity on the order of the Nazi war crimes of W. W. II. In view of the above, I cannot, in good conscience, retain my military medals.

WILLIAM R. SCHULTZ.

As a result of my government's actions, particularly its military involvement in Asia, I feel that I must take some action which shows my opposition.

At this time I would like to turn back into the government all the medals that I received as a result of my military service. These medals include the Good Conduct medal and the Air Force Longevity Service Award.

With shame in my government,
CONRAD T. DOBSON, JR.

VETERANS FOR PEACE TURNING BACK MEDALS
AT SAN FRANCISCO RALLY, APRIL 15, 1970

Name, service, and medals

Bruce Paul Phillips, Air Force, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Charles Walter Weiss, Navy, National Defense.

Kenneth Edwin Scott, Navy, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

George R. Hamilton, Navy, National Defense, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal.

Thomas Joseph Nunan, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Army Commendation, Bronze Star.

James W. Moore, Army, Good Conduct.

Bernard Robert Greening, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Sharpshooter.

Allison Blakely, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Purple Heart, Bronze Star.

Harold O. Kammen, Army, Army of Occupation, Victory.

Andrew Paul Fisher, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Army Commendation, Air Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge.

Robert Sylvester Hayes, Air Force, Good Conduct, Air Force Medal.

Roy Dugger, Army Air Force, Air Force Medal, United Nations Defense (Korea), Army of Occupation, Victory, Good Conduct.

Paul Robert Wolfson, Navy, National Defense.

William R. Schutze, Army, National Defense, Good Conduct.

Thomas J. Harriman, Jr., Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Richard D. Orlando, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Timothy Eugene Reese, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Combat Infantryman, Purple Heart.

Conrad T. Dodson, Jr., Air Force, Good Conduct, Air Force Longevity.

Steven Frederick Meadows, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Sherman Anthony Waring, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Stanley Mandeles, Navy, National Defense, Philippines Campaign, Victory.

Dan Lavery, Navy, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Paul H. Shelley, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Good Conduct, Presidential Unit Citation.

Charles Lutz, Navy, National Defense.

J. Morris Sigytas, Army, National Defense.

Greg M. Gotfried, Army, Vietnam Service, Purple Heart.

Robert W. Harman, Coast Guard, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Good Conduct, Navy Accommodation.

Loyd Parker, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

Lee Thorn, Navy, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Presidential Unit Citation, Naval Unit Citation.

Orville O. Fulkerson, Marine Corps, Navy Cross, Purple Heart.

Michael Goldstein, Navy, National Defense.

Joseph Avilla, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Purple Heart.

Douglas Paris, Air Force, Good Conduct, Unit Citations.

Steven Perrfmaan, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Bronze Star.

Nicholas Schooch, Army, Bronze Star (2), Silver star, Distinguished Service Cross.

John Trischetti, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Meritorious Unit Citation, Army Commendation.

Ace de Losada, Army, Victory, Bronze Star, Asiatic Campaign, Philippine Liberation.

George William Hooper, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Army Commendation, Purple Heart, Combat Infantryman.

George Williams, Air Force, National Defense.

Thomas Powers, Army, National Defense, Vietnam Service Vietnam Campaign.

Richard Pearce, Marine Corps, National Defense, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign.

William R. Whitmore, Navy, National Defense, Korean Campaign, Vietnam Service, Vietnam Campaign, Unit Citation.

Richard C. Webb, Navy, National Defense.

Kevin Smith, Army, Vietnam Campaign, Vietnam Service, Army Commendation, Bronze Star.

James Avillar, Army, Good Conduct.

John T. Reed, Air Force, Good Conduct.

William M. Lynch, Army.

Robert Meadows, Army, Good Conduct, National Defense.

Patrick R. Welch, Army, Meritorious Service, Bronze Star.

William M. Celestre, Marine Corps, National Defense.

Nels Estlund, Army, Purple Heart (3).

Robert M. Herhold, Army, Good Conduct, Victory.

James R. Connolly, Air Force, Air Force.

THE PENN CENTRAL CASE

(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, it is regrettable that today we are recording the Nation's largest commercial bankruptcy in history. It is tragic that the Penn Central Transportation Co. and its host of private lenders could not work out their mutual problems.

In recent days, much controversy has centered around a proposal to have the Federal Government—the taxpayers—step in and bail this corporation out of its financial difficulties. In other words, the Federal Government was expected to do what the private banks and other lenders would not do—place more capital in this massive corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned about the Penn Central case, and I have had it investigated from all angles. It is not a happy situation, but as a public official, I could not—on the evidence presented me—endorse the use of taxpayers' money to bail-out this \$7 billion corporation.

There are five basic reasons for my opposition to the Federal Government par-

ticipating in the bail-out as suggested by the administration:

First. The use of the Defense Production Act was improper; an unlawful use of an act designed to help small- and medium-sized defense contractors perform specific contracts to produce military hardware.

Second. The \$200 million guarantee was almost certain to result in a sizable loss to the Federal Government and the taxpayers. In addition, the railroad was seeking at least \$400 or \$500 million more under new legislation and it appeared very likely that the Government would be expected to put up endless sums to correct the management mistakes of the corporation.

Third. The basic question of whether the Federal Government can and should be in the business of bailing out private investors and private lenders who have taken their own risks in a free enterprise system.

Fourth. The question of priorities of the Federal Government. With all the needs in housing and other areas of the economy, is it proper for the Government to allocate \$200 million—and possibly \$500 million more—to a \$7 billion corporation?

Fifth. The problem of establishing a precedent for bail-outs of huge conglomerates and other big corporations who make management mistakes. If the Penn Central guarantee had been made in the manner suggested, we almost certainly would have seen a line-up of other corporations coming to the Federal Government for equal treatment and equal handouts. We might have committed billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money before the rush could have been stopped.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 48 hours, there has been much public discussion of meetings which I had Saturday afternoon with Penn Central officials. I have always kept my door open and I was happy to grant the officials' request and meet with them on their financial problems.

Since that meeting, some unnamed official of the railroad has issued some bitter and totally false comments. Some of the men who met with me have a large financial stake—a personal stake—in the railroad and I am sure that the difficulties of the past few days have been extremely hard on them. Under the circumstances, I am not surprised that some of these officials would make bitter comments—which at another time they would never utter.

The meeting in my office was an open, frank, and extremely courteous discussion of the issues involved. We listened to anything the railroad executives wanted to present; we did not limit their time or comments in any manner. We received much information from them, but they presented nothing which could justify the Federal Government's participation.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the information presented at the meeting reinforced my belief that the Federal Government had no business in the middle of the Penn Central operations.

Some of the revelations were startling—highly disturbing.

For some time, I questioned Mr. Paul Gorman, the chairman of the Penn Central board, about the chances that the Federal Government would ever recover the \$200 million.

Finally, Mr. Gorman admitted that the chances were very poor—almost nonexistent—unless the Congress also authorized legislation which would provide another \$750 million in credit for Penn Central and other railroads. In other words, I was being asked to endorse a \$200 million Government commitment contingent on something else possibly happening sometime and somewhere down the road. Otherwise, as Mr. Gorman readily admitted, the Government would undoubtedly be out the \$200 million.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a single Member of Congress who could go along with such a scheme—an outright gift of \$200 million—and probably \$500 million more—to a huge corporation. I know that I could not endorse such a plan. It was obvious that the Congress was supposed to endorse the original \$200 million guarantee and then become lobbyists for the additional \$750 million program in order to save the first \$200 million.

During the course of the meeting, we asked for copies of the loan papers which the Defense Department told me it was approving last Friday. These too contained some highly disturbing information.

Among other things, they revealed that the Federal Government would have been thrown in the pot with all the rest of the unsecured creditors. The Federal Government would have been at the bottom with the least likely chance of recovery of its commitment. As I stated previously, the Government should never make such a commitment unless it has the preeminent rights over any assets of the corporation. I am shocked that the Nixon administration participated in the drafting of a loan guarantee which placed the Federal Government—the taxpayer—at the bottom of the heap.

Overall, the Penn Central officials could give us no real assurance for the future. There was no indication of when the officials thought the company could start operating in the black. To me, it seemed that we were perhaps being asked to pour money down a bottomless pit.

Mr. Speaker, the commitment of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' money is something that cannot be taken lightly and this is a fact that apparently escaped the executives of this giant railroad. Several times during the discussion Saturday, the officials commented that "it seemed that the Congress was always appropriating a hundred million dollars for some project or other." Several times they indicated that the \$200 million was a small sum that they apparently felt the Federal Government would never miss.

One of them commented, "Why you couldn't build a highway for \$200 million."

These officials were trying to be frank with me and I do not want to be unkind about their comments, but, such an at-

titude about the taxpayers' money was not reassuring to me.

No one likes to see bankruptcies, but it is possible to successfully operate a railroad under reorganization and I hope maximum efforts are now turned to making this new structure workable in the public interest.

The filing under the Bankruptcy Act by Penn Central leaves many questions unanswered. It is obvious that all of the large banks in the Nation are deeply involved in the corporation. Many hold huge blocks of stock in their trust department, and many of these same banks also have heavy lines of credit out to the railroad. In addition, there have been and there remain massive interlocks between the commercial banks and the railroad.

It appears that there are a number of unsecured bank loans out to the corporation as well as massive sums of secured bank obligations. The banks are deeply involved in the bankruptcy of this corporation and it is essential that their role be investigated thoroughly. Such an investigation might well prevent another Penn Central somewhere else in the economy.

I hope that the bank supervisory agencies will also look closely at the banks' heavy involvement.

Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer, in its Sunday edition, carried a lengthy story which detailed some of the banks' involvement in Penn Central. I place a copy of this article in the RECORD:

BANKRUPTCY FEAR HOVERING AGAIN OVER PENN CENTRAL

(By Royal H. Plenty)

The specter of bankruptcy hovered again Saturday over the Penn Central after the scrapping of plans by the Nixon Administration to guarantee up to \$200 million of bank loans for the financially troubled railroad and real estate complex.

In Washington, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe warned that the Penn Central was vital to the nation's transportation system.

"If the Penn Central would go down, other railroads would suffer seriously, and we would possibly see a collapse of our railroad system," Volpe said.

Throughout the financial community, concern rose over the effects failure of the Penn Central would have upon the economy and the stock market.

The financial community has a big stake in the Penn Central.

The holders of Penn Central's 23.1 million outstanding shares of common stock have already seen more than \$1 billion of market value disappear in less than two years. There are more than 118,000 of these shareholders, including many of Penn Central's 94,000 employees.

Now the holders of more than \$2 billion of Penn Central bonds and longterm debt, the banks that have lent it \$500 million, and the institutions and other investors that have purchased more than \$150 million of its commercial paper: all have cause for concern.

RECORDS CHECKED

Who are the stockholders and creditors who will suffer if the Penn Central is allowed to go under?

The company has refused to open its books, but some indication of how widespread and serious the effects of a financial disaster for the huge railroad and real estate complex would be on the financial community can be

gleaned from an examination of public reports and other records.

The trust departments of banks, for example, have under their supervision or custody almost 10 million of the Penn Central's outstanding shares.

SINGLE HOLDER

Mutual funds and other investment companies hold more than 2 million of the line's shares.

A large proportion of its \$2 billion in bonds and other debt obligations are in the hands of insurance companies.

The nation's railroads are required to file each year with the Interstate Commerce Commission the holdings of their 30 biggest stockholders. Penn Central Transportation Co. filed such a list with the ICC for Dec. 31, 1968. In 1969, however, the Penn Central Co. was formed, and it took over all of the transportation company's stock, leaving it with but one holder to report.

The 1968 report listed 31 holders.

The biggest block of stock registered. Four of Morgan Guaranty's nominees showed up on the list: Carson & Co., with 424,830 shares of Penn Central; Reing & Co., with 182,600 shares; Kelly & Co., with 121,911 shares, and Genoy & Co., with 119,944 shares.

Close behind Morgan Guaranty was Chemical Bank, New York, with two nominees on the list: C. A. England & Co., with 448,743 shares; and J. C. Orr & Co., with 162,377.

OTHER BANKS

Other banks with nominees on the list and their holding were:

Bank:	Shares
Bank of New York.....	522,632
Bank of Delaware, Wilmington.....	500,000
Manufacturers Hanover, New York.....	469,439
Chase Manhattan Bank, New York.....	436,659
Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis.....	320,000
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust, Chicago.....	305,600
State Street Bank & Trust, Boston.....	225,350
First National Bank of Indianapolis.....	200,000
National Shawmont Bank, Boston.....	141,000
Irving Trust, New York.....	128,500
Boston Safe Deposit & Trust.....	128,500
Pittsburgh National Bank.....	127,953
First National City Bank, New York.....	125,802
U.S. Trust, New York.....	119,944

There were two banks on the list reported holdings in their own names—Credit Suisse, Zurich, Switzerland, with 184,176 shares, and Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., New York, with 109,508 shares.

Brown Brothers is also a broker and the shares it reported could represent holding of its customers "in street name."

BROKERS NOTED

Other brokers on the 1968 list were: Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, New York, with 498,401 shares; Butcher & Sherer, with 301,072 shares; Bache & Co., New York, with 259,750 shares; Cyrus J. Lawrence & Sons, New York, with 186,898 shares; Loeb, Rhodes & Co., New York, with 163,988 shares; and Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, New York, with 135,682 shares.

The remaining four holders on the list of 31 were: The Helene Fuld House Foundation of Trenton, with 282,300 shares; the Thrift Plan-Penn Central Co., with 211,172, and Allegheny Corp., New York, with 196,195.

Another source of stock holdings in the Penn Central is its proxy statements and the statements of changes in stock holdings of directors that it must file with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

DIRECTORS' SHARES

Fred M. Kirby tops the list of Penn Central directors in stockholdings. He is coguardian of assets that include 390,130 shares. In addition, he is chairman of Allegheny Corp. and

its holdings of 196,195 shares bring Kirby's interest to 586,325 shares.

John M. Seabrook, chairman and president of International Utilities, represents 505,850 shares, including 500,000 owned by International Utilities.

Walter H. Annenberg, who resigned as a Penn Central director early in 1969 to become ambassador to Great Britain, had approximately 189,000 shares at the time of his resignation. He has not been required to report his holdings since he left the board.

The only other director left on the Penn Central board with a sizable stock interest is R. Walter Graham Jr., a Baltimore physician, with 84,000 shares. Stuart T. Saunders, when he resigned June 8 as chairman, had 35,341 shares, and David C. Bevan, who also resigned, had 22,033 shares.

The holdings of the other directors range from 100 to 13,500 shares.

The reports of mutual funds on their stock holdings, which must be filed with the SEC, are another source of information on Penn Central stockholders.

These reports show holdings of more than 1 million shares in the hands of about 40 mutual funds.

The top 10 holdings at the end of the first quarter were:

Fund:	Shares
Investors Mutual.....	243,200
Fidelity Capital Fund.....	231,100
Fidelity Trend Fund.....	160,000
Commonwealth International.....	80,000
Chase Fund of Boston.....	60,000
Value Line.....	50,000
Corporate Leaders Trust.....	45,271
Axe-Houghton B.....	45,000
Hamilton Funds.....	36,000
deVegh Mutual Fund.....	30,000

The bond holders are a little more difficult to track down.

Insurance companies, however, must file reports on their investments with state commissions.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP: PART III—"ECONOMICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT"

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I called our colleagues' attention to a perceptive article by Edwin Dale dealing with the "economics of pollution." The purpose of that article was to set the scene for a series of my statements on the American business community's efforts to clean up the pollution caused by the production process.

Today I want to "set the scene" once again by bringing to your attention an interesting speech by the Honorable Murray L. Weidenbaum, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy. The subject of his talk before the McGraw-Hill Conference on Industry and the Environment in New York on June 16 was "Economics and the Environment."

The substance of Economist Weidenbaum's speech is similar to a position I have held for a number of years; namely, that the cost of pollution abatement and pollution clean up must become a "cost" of doing business. Mr. Weidenbaum is right in saying that business should find ways to produce without creating so much pollution but he faces the fact of life that what is needed now is a recognition that polluters should bear the cost of their pollution.

That is all well and good, and certainly we must strive in that direction, but let us not kid ourselves about the ultimate "cost" of the manufacturers' assumption of this responsibility. He will pass it on to the consumer.

I state for the record that this is not an entirely "bad" idea. Another way of saying this is that we are looking to transfer the cost of cleaning up America from the taxpayer to the consumer. What is the difference? There is no factual difference which I believe is worth mentioning. I can lead to this difference by use of a simplified look at the production-pollution-price circle.

If the costs of pollution abatement, control, and clean up were transferred to the manufacturing community, who in turn would transfer the cost to the consumer, there is no doubt in my mind that the cost of goods and services would be increased proportionally. By and large, such price increases would probably change the competitive position of manufacturer X. In order to improve or redress his competitive position, the manufacturer is going to be forced to put his "know how" to work on the problem of reducing the cost of doing business which was added with his assumption of the pollution abatement responsibility.

Right there is part of the goal we all seek—a way to make it economically feasible or (necessary!) for the manufacturer to control his pollution.

Realizing that the above account of the circle is stylized and oversimplified, it is nevertheless the path we should be following. The ultimate goal is to take care of and/or control pollution before it becomes an environmental, national, public problem. As it stands today we acknowledge the extent of the pollution and demand that Government—by use of the tax dollar—clean up the mess. One of these days, and I hope in the not too distant future, it will become apparent to all concerned that the time to lick the problem of pollution is before it occurs rather than after.

In my opinion, that is the direction we should be heading in the formulating of national policy regarding environmental pollution. I believe that is also the direction Murray Weidenbaum is very tentatively pointing and I recommend his speech to your careful attention with this in mind.

The speech follows:

ECONOMICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

In any consideration of the environment and how to improve it, there seems to be a division of labor. Ecologists and other scientists are supposed to dramatically and vividly get across the notion that we have a severe pollution problem. Engineers and other more practical types are subsequently charged with coming up with ways of cleaning up the pollution and thus improving the quality of our environment. However, then the economists are expected to fill their unique role. We are supposed to get up and say why we cannot afford to do any of these desirable things.

I am going to try to depart from tradition today and not play the proverbial role of the wet-blanket. Rather, my task is to attempt to show how we can—not necessarily that we will—but how, using sensible solutions, we can very much afford to clean up our environment.

First of all, some perspective is useful. The Federal Government currently is embarking upon a major increase in expenditures for reducing pollution and otherwise improving the quality of the American environment. From a level of \$644 million last year, we anticipate that such outlays are running at the rate of \$785 million this year and will reach \$1.1 billion in the fiscal year 1971. This more than 50 percent expansion during a two-year period is creating undoubtedly one of the major growth areas of the American economy. The 1971 figure represents a more than fivefold increase from a decade ago.

All indications point to a long-term continuation of the growth of government spending in the area of the environment. However, candor requires me to point out that very heavy pressures on the Federal budget are likely to dampen down the growth rate of any government spending program, no matter how worthy.

The Administration has announced revisions in the budget estimates for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 which show small deficits rather than the small surpluses indicated earlier. The budget situation is likely to remain relatively tight for some time. Nevertheless, environmental planning is basically a long-term affair. Hence, I believe that it would be useful to focus on the period beyond the immediate short-run.

As a starting point for any long-term economic and financial analysis, I find it useful to refer to the innovative 5-year projections that the Administration economists prepared and which were included in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1971. These projections show that, by the fiscal year 1975, Federal revenues from the existing tax system will increase by about \$64 billion from the current level. Of course, these and the other figures that I will present are based on a set of economic assumptions. Although I will not go into them, I think that you will find that they are quite reasonable.

On the other side of the ledger, when we cost out the future impact of the existing program structure of the Federal Government, we estimate that expenditures for all government programs in the fiscal year 1975 would be about \$28 billion above the current level. The revenue growth of \$64 billion, less the expenditure increase of \$28 billion, would seem to provide a comfortable cushion of \$36 billion for fiscal 1975.

I am afraid that, here, I am going to be, at least for awhile, the wet blanket. The Federal budget is not set in concrete; change will continue to be made in it. For example, the 1971 budget itself contains new initiatives—such as welfare reform and revenue sharing—which are estimated to cost \$16 billion in the fiscal year 1975. At this point, I, of course, do not know what new initiatives will be undertaken in the fiscal year 1972, or 1973, or 1974, or 1975. But there is something that I can say with considerable assurance, and that is that there will be new initiatives over these years.

Clearly, several more sets of \$16 billion a year in new initiatives would more than use up that \$38 billion margin in the fiscal year 1975.

Hence, even though there is some room for flexibility in the Federal budget, it is quite clear to me that the existing revenue structure—which is not a particularly low one—does not permit too great a variety of ambitious and costly new undertakings in the years ahead. One rather simple reaction to this type of analysis, of course, is to blithely come up with large new tax programs to cover new expenditure recommendations (which I take to be quite a different matter from raising revenues to meet expenditure commitments which already have been made). New taxes may seem to be an easy financing approach for the proponents of a

new spending program. However, I have failed in recent years to notice any ground swell of public opinion in favor of raising taxes substantially above their current levels. Indeed, while I have come across numbers of people who think that the other fellow may be undertaxed, I do not recall many complaining to the Treasury that their own tax bills were too low.

Hence, I think that we need to be thinking of some hard answers to the hard question of how are we going to finance the necessary improvements in the quality of our environment. Here I would think that an economist has something to say. It may not be pleasant, but I hope that it is useful.

As I survey the various estimates of the growing future costs of cleaning up the pollution which has not yet been created, but which is likely to occur on the basis of present practices, the economist in me is greatly stirred.

In a sense, I am offended by the prospect of our having to devote an even larger share of our national resources to cleaning up an even faster growing mountain of pollution. Rather, I am impressed by the desirability of all of us adopting methods of producing and consuming which are less polluting than our present practices.

The President was getting at this point in his environmental message of February 10, 1970. In discussing one particular aspect of the pollution problem, the disposal of solid waste, he said:

"One way to meet the problem of solid wastes is simply to surrender to it: to continue pouring more and more public money into collection and disposal of what happens to be privately produced and discarded."

However, President Nixon went on to state, "This is the old way; it amounts to a public subsidy of waste pollution." He pointed to a most constructive approach:

"If we are ever truly to gain control of the problem, our goal must be broader: to reduce the volume of wastes and the difficulty of their disposal, and to encourage their constructive re-use instead."

In that vein, as an economist, I find one general approach particularly appealing—to make the act of polluting more expensive to the polluter than not polluting, and sufficiently more expensive that he, she, or it will change their current ways of doing things.

Let us face it. Far too frequently, polluting is more profitable, or cheaper, or easier, than not polluting. The simple-minded solution that we hear far too often these days seems to be to tear down that capitalistic structure which is doing the polluting. To use the most scholarly and expressive language that I can marshal, that is pretty stupid. It is certainly hardly necessary for the purpose. For one thing, I am not aware of any highly advanced noncapitalistic society that has been able to avoid pollution on a large scale.

Here the economist, I think, does have a way out. The price system really does work to allocate resources efficiently, whether the society is capitalistic or socialistic. Hence, in order to make the price system work in the way that we want it—to discourage pollution—we need to attach some form of economic disincentive to the creation of pollution.

In a sense, the social cost of pollution now borne by society as a whole—whether in the form of smog or contaminated rivers—needs to be shifted back to the polluter himself. I do not mean this as a form of punishment but, rather, as a direct incentive to change to less polluting ways of doing things.

This is a critical point. If instead we are going the eleemosynary route and have society or the Treasury pick up the cost, we are not introducing any incentive to reduce pollution.

Again, I would like to quote a pertinent section from the President's landmark message on the environment:

"The fight against pollution . . . is not a search for villains. For the most part, the damage done to our environment has not been the work of evil men. . . . It results not so much from choices made, as from choices neglected; not from malign intention, but from failure to take into account the full consequences of our actions."

The next passage, again, is not taken from the works of an economist—although many of us might like to be able to claim the authorship—but from the President's message:

"Quite inadvertently, by ignoring environmental costs, we have given an economic advantage to the careless polluter over his more conscientious rival. While adopting laws prohibiting injury to persons or property, we have freely allowed injury to our shared surroundings."

The basic idea is that a product should be valued partly in terms of its burden on the environment. At present, much of the "cost" of pollution is borne by the public at large. To the extent that individuals, business firms, or other organizations whose actions contribute to pollution can be forced to absorb some of these hitherto "external costs," the market can be made to work against, rather than for, pollution. Thus, producers will have more incentive to "economize" on pollution, similar to their developing methods of reducing labor and material costs.

There are a number of alternative ways of promoting this general approach. For example, a tax could be levied upon the legal act of polluting. Alternatively, regulatory actions could be instituted either separately or perhaps in connection with a related tax payment. At the other end of the spectrum is legal action to make certain types of pollution unlawful. Enforcement could include perhaps levying fines, or taking more drastic action if the polluting continues to be performed.

I do not mean to beg the question as to what level of pollution control or reduction to aim for. I merely leave that most important determination to others. However, I sense that, of necessity, we will have to stop substantially short of any simple-minded notion of totally eliminating pollution. Let me cite a small, personal example. I find that my office generally is cleaned once a day. I am sure that it would be cleaner if that were done hourly; but the inconvenience that it would cause me, plus the added cost, would not be worth it. In a crude sense, I also find a parallel with the concern over obtaining the best possible education. There used to be a running debate between some professional educators, who favored "the best possible education," and those of us more mercenary types who advocate high quality education but would stop somewhat short of devoting 100 percent of the GNP to education. In the case of environmental pollution, as well as other potential objects of government spending, we are going to have to consider determining where the costs begin to exceed the benefits and even where the margin of benefits over costs is less than that for other claims on our resources.

Getting back to taxes as an instrument for reducing pollution, I find an array of alternatives available. The tax might well be high enough to cover the cost of cleaning up the pollution. This would bring the social and private costs closer together.

One possible application is to the junk automobile, which we are "producing" in ever growing numbers. The rate of abandonment is increasing rapidly. Here in New York City, 2,500 cars were towed away as abandoned on the streets a decade ago. In 1964, 25,000 were towed away as abandoned; in 1969 the figure was more than 50,000.

The way to provide the needed incentive is to apply to the automobile the principle that its price should include not only the cost of producing it, but also the cost of disposing of it. The Council on Environmental Quality is now studying methods such as the bounty payment (financed by a special tax on auto production) to promote the prompt scrapping of all junk autos.

In many other cases, however, the tax could be sufficiently high that it becomes a type of protective tariff. That is, it does not really bring in any substantial amount of revenue. But by encouraging less polluting methods, the tax reduces the need for government expenditures to clean up the pollution. This latter approach, of course, is reinforced by the budget outlook analysis that I presented here earlier. But even if that were not the case—even if the budget situation were a happier one—I still would see great charm to a "birth control" approach to pollution, to the extent possible.

Even though I find this approach instinctively attractive, I doubt whether it will suffice. It is more likely to work on prospective new production and consumption facilities—which have not yet been built and paid for. However, it may be inappropriate or highly inequitable in the case of facilities which are already in existence and which were constructed in good faith under a different set of ground rules.

Hence, the case for some direct government expenditures and/or substantial tax benefits, particularly during a long transition period, may be quite strong.

However, I doubt whether the tax and expenditure systems by themselves will suffice as devices for achieving the desired level of improvement in the quality of our physical environment. Despite our general distaste for governmental controls, pollution control appears to be one of the necessary exceptions.

In many areas, strict standards and strict enforcement will be necessary, not only to insure compliance but also in fairness to those who have voluntarily assumed the often costly burden while their competitors or neighbors have not. Without effective government standards, industrial firms that spend the necessary money for pollution control may find themselves at a serious economic disadvantage as against their less conscientious competitors.

Similarly, without effective Federal standards, states and communities that require such controls may find themselves at a disadvantage in attracting industry, as against more permissive rivals. Air pollution, particularly, is no respecter of political boundaries. A community that sets and enforces strict standards may still find its air polluted from sources in another community or state.

To sum up, I do not believe that we will have available resources to clean up all of the pollution that could possibly be generated in the United States in the coming decade, much less in the period beyond that. The approach that is feasible and more economically desirable is to encourage business, government, and consumers alike to so change their ways of producing and consuming as to reduce the amount of pollution that is created in the first place.

As President Nixon stated in transmitting his message presenting a comprehensive program to reduce pollution, ". . . We at last will succeed in restoring the kind of environment we deserve."

AN ANGRY MAN TALKS UP TO YOUTH

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of the now-famous letter which Dr. K. Ross Toole, professor of history at the University of Montana wrote and has been reprinted in various newspapers around the Nation. What he has said in this letter has long needed saying and I urge every responsible American to read it in its entirety. His letter follows:

HAMILTON, MONT.

I am forty-nine years old. It took me years of considerable anguish to get where I am, which isn't much of any place except exurbia. I was nurtured in the Depression: I lost four years to war; I have had one coronary; I am a "liberal," a square and a professor of history.

As such, I am supposed to have "liaison" with the young. But the fact is that I am fed up with hippies, Yuppies, militants and nonsense.

I am also the father of seven children, ranging in age from seven to twenty-three. And I am beginning to wonder what the hell I am incubating as a "permissive" parent. Maybe, indeed, I am the fellow who is producing the "campus rebel," whose bearded visage, dirty hair, body odor and "tactics" are childish but brutal, naive but dangerous, and the essence of arrogant tyranny—the tyranny of spoiled brats. Maybe all of this begins with me and my kind.

Wherever and however it begins, it is time to call a halt, time to live in an adult world where we belong and time to put these "children" in their places. We have come by what we have and become what we are through work, sweat, anguish and time. We owe the "younger generation" what all "older generations" have owed younger generations—love, protection to a point and respect when they deserve it. We do not owe them our souls, our privacy, our whole lives; and, above all, we do not owe them immunity from our mistakes or their own.

Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth; it has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation on earth in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man's history. It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself and committed itself and taxed itself and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

Its mistakes are fewer than my father's generation, or his father's, or his father's. Its greatest mistake is not Viet Nam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the minds, and the psyches, the *raison d'être* of the young.

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what right or what accomplishment should thousands of teenagers, wet behind the ears and utterly without the benefit of having lived long enough to have either judgment or wisdom, become the sages of our time?

Well, say the psychologists, the educators and preachers, the young are rebelling against our archaic mores and morals, our materialistic approach to life, our failures in diplomacy, our terrible ineptitude in racial matters, our narrowness as parents, our blindness to the root ills of society. Balderdash!

Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No eighteen-year-old is simply the product of his eighteen years; he is the product of three thousand years of the de-

velopment of mankind. And throughout those years, injustice has existed and has been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over the heads of men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress. But man has persevered. Society is obviously an imperfect production, but each generation changes its direction just a little, and most of the time it works.

As a professor and father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not. The trouble is that that minority genuinely threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over. I dislike that minority; I am aghast that the majority "takes" it and allows itself to be used; I am appalled that I have participated thus far in condoning it. I speak partly as a historian, partly as a father and partly as one fed up, middle-aged and angry member of the so-called "Establishment"—which, by the way, is nothing but a euphemism for "society."

Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society, it is the heart of the pie. Too many "youngsters" are egocentric boors. They will not listen, they will only shout down. They will not discuss but, like four-year-olds, they throw rocks and shout.

Wisdom is not precocity; it is an amalgam of experience, reading, thought and the slow development of perception. While age is no guarantor of wisdom, whatever else the young are, they are not wise, precisely because they are young. Too many of them mistake glibness for wisdom and emotion for thought.

Arrogance is obnoxious; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance when it is without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment. Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slob who occupy our homes, our administration buildings, our streets and parks, urinating on our beliefs and defiling our premises? It is not the police we need, it is an expression of our disgust and disdain. Yet we do more than permit it, we dignify it with introspective flagellation. Somehow it is *our* fault. Balderdash again!

Sensitivity is not the property of the young, nor was it invented in 1960. The young of any generation have felt the same impulse to grow, to reach out, to touch stars, to live freely and to let the mind loose along unexplored corridors. Young men and young women have always stood on the same hill and felt the same vague sense of restraint that separated them from the ultimate experience, the sudden and complete expansion of the mind and the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

Today's young people did not invent it; they do not own it. And what they seek to attain all mankind has sought to attain throughout the ages. Shall we, therefore, approve the presumed attainment of it through violence, heroin, speed, LSD and other drugs? And shall we, permissively, let them poison themselves simply because we brought them into this world? Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need; it is merely strength. The strength to explain, in our potty, middle-aged way, that what they seek, we sought; that it is somewhere but sure as hell not in drugs; that, in the meanwhile, they will ——— well cease and desist. And this we must explain early and hard—and then police it ourselves.

Society, "the Establishment," is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. The fact that we have been only minimally successful is the story of *all* generations, as it will be the story of the generation coming up. Yet we *have* worked a number of

wonders with it. We *have* changed it. We are deeply concerned about our failures. We have not solved the racial problem, but we have at least faced it; we are terribly worried about the degradation of our environment, about injustices, inequities, the military-industrial complex and bureaucracy. But we *have* attacked these things. All our lives we have taken arms against our sea of troubles—and fought effectively. But we also have fought with a *rational* knowledge of the strength of our adversary; and, above all, we have known that the war is one of attrition in which the "unconditional surrender" of the forces of evil is not about to occur tomorrow. We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully. That is the kind of war society has always fought because man and society are what they are.

Knowing this, why do we listen subserviently to the violent tacticians of the new generation? Either they have total victory by Wednesday next or burn down our carefully built barricades in adolescent pique; either they win now or flee off to a commune and quit; either they solve all problems this week or join a wrecking crew of paranoids.

Youth has always been characterized by impatient idealism. If it were not, there would be no change. But impatient idealism does not extend to guns, fire bombs, riots, vicious arrogance and instant gratification. That is not idealism; it is childish tyranny. And the worst of it is that we (professors and faculties in particular), go along in a paroxysm of self-abnegation and apology, abdicate, apologize as if we had personally created the ills of the world and thus lend ourselves to chaos. We are the led, not the leaders. And we are fools.

As a professor I meet the activists and revolutionaries of this new generation every day. They are not only boorish, they are inexcusably ignorant. If you want to make a revolution, do you not study the ways to do it? Of course not! Che Guevara becomes their hero. He failed; he died in the jungles of Bolivia with an army of six. His every move was a miscalculation and a mistake. Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh led revolutions based on a peasantry and an overwhelmingly ancient rural economy. They are the pattern-makers for the SDS and the student militants. I have yet to talk to an "activist" who had read Crane Brinton's classic, *The Anatomy of Revolution* or who is familiar with the works of Jefferson, Washington, Paine, Adams, or even Marx or Engels. And I have yet to talk to a student militant who has read about racism elsewhere and/or who understands, even primitively, the long and wondrous struggle of the NAACP and the genius of Martin Luther King, whose name they invariably take in vain.

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the U.S. in the 1930's recently remarked to me: "These 'radicals' couldn't organize well enough to produce a sensible platform let alone revolt their way out of a paper bag." But they can, because we let them, destroy our universities, make our parks untenable, make a shambles of our streets and insult our flag. I am not a conservative, I am a liberal. I am a concerned and fairly perceptive teacher and parent. I am neither blind to the ills of our society nor dedicated to the status quo.

I assert that we are in trouble with this younger generation not because we have failed our country, not because of affluence or stupidity, not because we are antediluvian, not because we are middle-class materialists, but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in its place and have failed to put them back there when they got out of it. We have the power, we do not have the will; we have the right, we have not exercised it.

To the extent that we now rely on the police, mace, the National Guard, tear gas, steel fences and a wringing of hands, we

will fail. What we need is a reappraisal of our own middle-class selves, our worth and our hard-won progress. We need to use disdain, not mace; we need to reassess a weapon we came by the hard way—firm authority as parents, teachers, businessmen, workers and politicians.

The vast majority of our children from one to twenty are fine kids. We need to back up this majority with authority and with the firm conviction that we owe it to them and to ourselves. Enough of apology, enough of analysis, enough of our abdication of our responsibility, enough of the denial of our own maturity and good sense.

The best place to start is at home. But the most practical and effective place, right now, is our campuses. This does not mean a flood of angry edicts, a sudden clampdown, a "new" policy. It simply means that faculties should stop playing chicken, that demonstrators should be met not with police but with expulsions. The power to expell (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

More importantly, it means that at freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not belligerently but forthrightly.

A university is the microcosm of society itself. It cannot function without rules for conduct. I cannot, as society cannot, legislate morals. It is dealing with young men and women of eighteen to twenty-two. But it can and *must* promulgate rules. It cannot function without order; therefore, those who disrupt order must leave. It cannot permit the students to determine when, what and where they shall be taught; it cannot permit the occupation of its premises, in violation both of the law and its regulations, by "militants."

There is room within the university complex for basic student participation, but there is no room for slob, disruption and violence. Therefore, the first obligation of the administration is to lay down the rules, early in the game, clearly and positively, and to attach to this statement the penalty for violation. It is profoundly simple, and the failure to state it in advance is the salient failure of university administrators in this age.

Expulsion is a dreaded verdict. The administration need not play Torquemada; it merely needs to make it clear, quite dispassionately, that expulsion is the inevitable consequence of the violation of the rules. And among the rules, even though it seems gratuitous, should be these:

1. Violence—armed or otherwise—the forceful occupation of buildings; the intimidation by covert or overt act of any student or faculty member or administrative personnel; the occupation of any university property, field, park, building, lot or other place, shall be cause for expulsion.

2. The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly by voice or presence; or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

These two simple and clear-cut rules, with penalty attached, should be promulgated to every freshman as part of his general orientation and should be circulated by the means every university has to all upper classmen.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. It is merely the reassertion of an old, accepted and necessary right of the administration of *any* such institution. And the faculty should be informed, firmly, of this reassertion *before* trouble starts. This does *not* constitute provocation. It is one of the oldest rights and necessities of the university community. The failure of university administrators to use it is one of the mysteries of our permissive age, and the blame must fall largely on faculties because they have consistently pressured administrators not to act.

And suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsions, suppose they march, riot, strike. The police? No. The matter, by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then

pass to the courts. If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students; it has the awful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order. Courts are not subject to pressures, not part of the action. And what militant will shout obscenities in court with contempt hanging over his head?

Too simple? Not at all. Merely an old process which we seem to have forgotten. It is too direct for those of us who seek to employ Freudian analysis, too positive for "academic senates" who long for philosophical debate and too prosaic for those who seek orgiastic self-condemnation.

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed up with nonsense. Those of us over thirty, tax-ridden, harried, confused, weary, need to reassert our hard-won prerogatives. It is our country too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it, and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

MORE REASONS WHY DR. LUCAS SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have already sent a strong letter to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee urging that the nomination of Dr. J. Richard Lucas not be confirmed. Additional evidence of a persuasive nature is contained in the following letter from the national chairman of Miners for Democracy, Mike Trbovich:

MINERS FOR DEMOCRACY,
Washington, June 10, 1970.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On June 3, I sent a telegram to you urging the rejection of J. Richard Lucas as the nominee to the directorship of the Bureau of Mines. Speaking for the 45,000 coal miners who are represented by Miners for Democracy, let me reiterate our objections to confirmation. To date, the Bureau of Mines has failed to enforce the Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, no doubt as a result of the lack of forceful and effective leadership which Mr. Jack O'Leary, the former director, has provided. We do not object to Mr. O'Leary's removal, but we are convinced that his successor must be a strong-willed individual dedicated to the full enforcement of the Mine Safety Act. We simply believe that Doctor Lucas is not the man for the job; nothing in his testimony or in his background suggests that he has either the administrative competence or the will to straighten out the chaotic situation now prevailing at the Bureau. At the very least, we implore the Committee to recall Doctor Lucas and to deny confirmation until he answers a number of important questions about the Act's enforcement and the Committee is satisfied that he is a man who will enforce it without fear or favor.

Let me review what has happened to the Mine Health and Safety Act since it was signed by the President. I am aware that this Committee has no jurisdiction over the Bureau's functions, but I am convinced that once the Committee becomes aware of the sad state of affairs that exists in the Bureau, it will agree that the new Director must have both the courage and the conviction to fully enforce the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

I. THE BUREAU'S FAILURE TO ENFORCE THE FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

When 78 coal miners were killed at Farmington, West Virginia in the Fall of 1968, a public outcry and a rank and file coal miners' revolt convinced Congress that tough coal mine health and safety standards were required. The 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act begins: "Congress declares that—the first priority and concern of all in the coal mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner." Seventy-six coal miners still lie entombed at Consol No. 9, while the Bureau has re-ordered the priorities and undermined the Act which their deaths inspired.

The Bureau's shabby enforcement of the Act is readily apparent in the number of work-related fatalities in coal mines since its effective date. According to the Bureau's own statistics, work-related fatalities in the coal mining industry have increased in the two months that the new Act has been in effect. Last year, work-related deaths in April and May numbered 14 and 15, respectively. This April there were 19 work-related deaths in the industry, and while the May figures are still incomplete, there have been 15 such deaths already confirmed. Given the Bureau's callous disregard for the lives and limbs of coal miners and the will of Congress, illustrated below, it is surprising that fatalities are not even higher.

A. Section 103(1) of the Act reads: "Whenever the Secretary finds that a mine liberates excessive quantities of methane gas or other explosive gases during its operations, or that a methane or other gas ignition or explosion has occurred in such mine which resulted in death or serious injury at any time during the previous five years, or that there exists in such mine other especially hazardous conditions, he shall provide a minimum of one spot inspection by his authorized representative of all or part of such mines during every five working days at irregular intervals."

There are some 225 coal mines which fall within this "especially hazardous" category. Consequently, the Bureau is compelled to conduct some 225 spot inspections per week. In fact, the Bureau admits that it is presently conducting only four spot inspections per week. The excuse offered by the Bureau for deliberately flouting the law is that there are not enough inspectors to conduct the weekly inspections, but the Bureau has done nothing to recruit and train new inspectors. Surely, Bureau officials knew or should have known more than a year ago that the new Act would require more inspectors. Though it has sufficient funds to train and pay many new inspectors, the Bureau has not conducted a single open door exam nor has it engaged in any sort of a public relations campaign to recruit inspectors. The new Director of the Bureau must meet this problem head-on and solve it.

We believe the safety of America's coal miners is endangered by the Bureau's failure to conduct all of the legally required spot inspections. We further believe that the Bureau's failure to comply with the law may make the United States liable for millions of dollars in damages under the Federal Tort Claims Act. What is Dr. Lucas' position on the mandatory spot inspections? Does he intend to change Bureau policy and meet the requirements to this section as to each of these mines? Will he shock the Bureau out of its apathy and force it to respond to the emergencies created by the new Act?

B. Our members from all over the country advise us that the Bureau's regular inspections are not nearly as thorough nor as frequent under the new Act as they were under the old one. Perhaps this is because of the Bureau's new "partial but representative" inspection system. This method allows the Bureau's inspectors to check for violations in portions of all underground mines

without taking the days or weeks normally required for a full mine inspection. While undoubtedly these once-overlightly inspections help to hide from public view the facts as to the Bureau's sorry inspection record, they do little to insure that miners can work in safety. Thus, on April 10 of this year one miner was killed and three injured in an explosion at the Helen Mining Co. in Homer City, Pennsylvania. Federal inspectors had completed a three-day "partial but representative" inspection there only two days earlier.

Furthermore, the Bureau has apparently abandoned its practice of making inspections of mines when there has been a fatality, near-fatality or gas ignition. In the past, the Federal and state inspectors usually came to the mine together after any of these incidents, but today, only the state inspectors view such mines. We are convinced that the Bureau has turned its back on us.

What is Dr. Lucas' position on these "partial but representative" inspections? Does he intend to return to the full-scale inspections which we believe are necessary? Has he any plans for improving the number and quality of the Bureau's inspectors?

C. The Bureau, in a series of incredible blunders, has failed to meet the administrative requirements necessary to the Act's enforcement. The Act established a number of mandatory safety standards for underground mines and authorized the Interior Department to establish, under very specific procedures, new and improved safety standards. Congress recognized that some established standards might need implementation, and, therefore, provided in Section 101(j) that regulations and other material carried over from the old act could, upon republication in the *Federal Register*, continue to exist until superseded, so long as such material was consistent with the new law.

Addressing himself to this question, the House manager stated (H. Conf. Rept. 91-761, p. 65) that the republication requirement is a "very minimal task for the Department to undertake and one that is quite important to both the operators and the miners, as they must know well in advance of the operative date of Titles II and III what interpretations, regulations and instructions will continue to apply" and therefore the carry-over regulations "should be published in the *Federal Register* as soon as possible after enactment." Ignoring this, the Department did not publish these regulations until one day after the effective date of Title III of the Act which relates to safety.

Implementing safety regulations for the new law were subject to the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act in order to give the operators, miners and the public a chance to comment on them. Despite this specific requirement in the Act, the Department said it was "impracticable" to have rulemaking and published the new regulations on March 28, 1970, 48 hours before the congressionally established mandatory safety standards became effective.

D. Finally, there is the Bureau's debacle in the Virginia litigation. On April 23rd, United States District Judge H. E. Widener, Jr., of the Western District of Virginia entered a temporary restraining order against the Bureau enjoining it from enforcing regulations adopted contrary to the Administrative Procedure Act. This order applied only to the 77 plaintiffs who brought the suit. Though the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that a hearing be held within 10 days before such injunctions can be extended, the Bureau's lawyers waived a hearing and willingly consented to a five-month continuation of the temporary restraining order. (See, *Congr. Rec.* pages 13479 and 17656.)

Willingly consenting to a serious curtailment of its powers was bad enough, but the Bureau was just beginning. First, it ordered all inspections to stop, but the next day it

ordered inspections to resume. Then the Bureau made the astounding decision to consider the Virginia injunction binding on it all over the country and stopped enforcing the questioned regulations everywhere. There was absolutely no legal authority or justification for this move. Yet the Bureau persists in a negative, defensive approach to the whole matter. It could have requested the district court to hold a hearing without waiting until September, but more significantly, it could have undertaken a proper promulgation of new regulations, thereby mooting the issue before the Court. It has done neither.

Administrative indecisiveness at higher levels has affected the men who make the mine inspections. With the injunction also running against the Bureau's arbitrarily adopted fine schedule, inspectors have been reluctant to cite companies for violations (the fine for which would be determined after a hearing). Instead, federal mine inspectors are merely issuing "warnings." This, of course, is catastrophic; operators are violating the law willfully since there is no punishment for so doing.

Today, I was advised that no mines have begun to provide sanitary toilet facilities to the men working underground. I believe that this is characteristic of this industry, which is bent on destroying the legislation it could not defeat in Congress. There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of all coal operators to test the Bureau's willingness to enforce the Act by jointly refusing to comply with the sanitary facilities provision.

In light of all this, it is readily apparent that an extraordinary person is required for the job of Director of the Bureau of Mines. The new Director must be someone who has a thorough knowledge of the new law, a special sensitivity to the health and safety needs of America's coal miners, a man who can buck the extraordinary pressures being brought to bear on the Department by coal operators who do not wish to see the law enforced, a man who can offer the Bureau real leadership through this morass of conflicting and inaccurate administrative interpretation of the new Act. Our lives depend on there being appointed such a man.

II. DOCTOR LUCAS IS NOT QUALIFIED TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF MINES

A. The Bureau has an annual budget of almost \$125,000,000 and an employee complement of nearly 5,000. Even under ordinary circumstances, the Director would have to be a skilled administrator, able to coordinate the different functions and responsibilities of the Bureau. Nothing in Doctor Lucas' background even remotely suggests that he possesses the administrative capability to guide and lead the Bureau even in normal times. But these are not normal times; the largest area of the Bureau's responsibility—oversight of coal production—has been dramatically enlarged. The new Act has created turmoil at the Bureau. Dozens of the Bureau's policy-makers occupy only temporary positions and none of the difficult administrative decisions which are essential to full enforcement of the Act are being made. As I noted above, the Bureau has adopted no emergency plan to recruit and train urgently needed federal inspectors. Indeed, there is not a single individual assigned to this project on a full-time basis. The situation calls for a skilled administrator of proven merit; it calls for a man of immense strength and determination to move the Bureau out of its inertia; it requires an individual of compassion and great personal dynamism who can bring to the Bureau a sense of unyielding dedication to mine safety. Doctor Lucas has not thus far demonstrated any of these essential traits.

B. The only thing cited in his favor by his proponents is his academic background.

But a close inspection reveals that Doctor Lucas' credentials are woefully inadequate. The Miners for Democracy staff in Washington has examined nearly all of Doctor Lucas' writings; the following is a summary of their analysis:

"We have read 22 of the 27 articles and other writings listed in Doctor Lucas' bibliography (pp. 16342-16343, May 20, 1970). Several of the articles are duplicated; *The Competitive Position of Coal and Fossil Hydrocarbon and Mineral Processing* are identical works, except that they have different titles, paragraph headnotes, and three paragraphs are rearranged.

"None of the writings suggest academic excellence. Those articles authored by Doctor Lucas are replete with superficial generalizations, more characteristic of a student, than a professor. Hardly a prolific author, considering that he has been a member of the academic world for almost two decades, the articles he has authored are unpersuasive proof of his academic ability."

C. Severe criticism of Doctor Lucas by former students and colleagues and the absence of enthusiasm or substantial support from the academic community for his appointment underscore our observations of his academic credentials. At the very least, the Committee should reopen the hearing to provide Doctor Lucas' critics with a forum to voice their concern with his ability to handle this most difficult position.

D. As working coal miners we are shocked at the possibility of a nominee with a substantial portfolio of mineral stocks being confirmed to run the government agency which has regulatory authority over the mining and mineral industry. Too many lesser officials in the Bureau are already casually aligned with the industry. To permit Doctor Lucas to become Director without divestment of his mineral holdings would be tantamount to putting the proverbial fox in the chicken house.

E. Doctor Lucas' ties to the coal industry and its largest operators also raise grave questions about his willingness to enforce health and safety laws that these men oppose. His resume states that he has been a mining consultant and engineer from 1956 to the present and that he has "served as a consultant to mining firms, industrial firms and government agencies." Two firms he has consulted for are named: Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., an affiliate to The National Coal Association, and Union Carbide, a company with a substantial number of coal mines. Other firms are not listed. We urge the Committee to inquire into this area more thoroughly, to obtain the names of these firms, the nature, duration, and purpose of the consulting work performed, and the fees paid.

F. Finally, and most importantly, we are dismayed at Doctor Lucas' lack of concern for our safety. Nowhere, during the course of his testimony does he allude to the crisis in the Bureau and in the coal fields wrought by the passage of the 1969 Act. Nowhere does he make a genuine commitment to enforce the Act. Last year, Congress said our health and safety was the Bureau's first priority, but Doctor Lucas has not echoed that concern. Surely, he is aware of the pressures exerted on it by the coal industry to nullify the will of Congress. But he makes no mention of what his approach will be. We implore the Committee to ascertain his position on these critical issues.

We worked long and hard for the passage of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. We feel we are entitled to have this Act enforced. Indeed, our very lives depend on its enforcement. We will not sit idly by and watch the Bureau ignore this Act and revert to its production-oriented policies. To this end we

urge this Committee to give careful consideration to this nomination. As we have stated, we do not think that Dr. Lucas is qualified for the job, and we think further hearings by this Committee are desirable to determine exactly what course the nominee intends to follow with respect to the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. Coal is, as everyone must admit, vitally important to our economy. But we will not continue to mine it at such a huge risk to our lives and health.

Very truly yours,

MIKE TRBOVICH,
National Chairman.

WEST VIRGINIA—THE CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT HER BEAUTY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, West Virginians are proud of the unspoiled beauty of the Mountain State, and our conservationists are in the forefront of the campaign to preserve that beauty in our forests, streams, mountains, and back country. There are always commercial exploiters eager to destroy nature for their profit.

I have introduced H.R. 17774 which will preserve and protect as wilderness three areas of the Monongahela National Forest. Among the leading proponents of the wilderness protection campaign is West Virginia's Secretary of State, the Honorable John D. "Jay" Rockefeller IV. Eloquent support for the protection and preservation of West Virginia's scenic beauty is voiced in the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post, printed this morning, June 22:

BAD NEWS ON OTTER CREEK

Last fall my wife, Sharon, and I hiked along Otter Creek in Randolph and Tucker counties, W. Va. We agreed that it was one of the most beautiful areas in the eastern United States—with its large, majestic trees; its lush undergrowth, and the crystal clear mountain stream rushing through sandstone boulders and over a series of waterfalls along the trail.

We recommend this hike to anyone who loves the mountains—and now with the rhododendron about to bloom is an ideal time. And we were proud that all of this was in West Virginia. We made a commitment then to work to preserve the Otter Creek we saw—largely untouched by the hand of man for nearly a century.

But there is already bad news. First, there was the talk of logging with the threat of clear-cutting. And now prospecting for coal—and the promise of ruin to the landscape that will mean.

The Forest Service has decided to permit logging in well over half of the Otter Creek area, over 10,000 acres in that part of the Monongahela National Forest. I think this was wrong. I applaud the efforts of the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy to spare from logging the entire 18,000 acres of the Otter Creek basin.

The federal government owns 808,000 acres of land in the Monongahela National Forest in eastern West Virginia. I believe that within this vast area we can afford to zone against logging and road building not only the 18,000 acres of the Otter Creek basin but also other areas such as Dolly Sods and the Cranberry back country. This can be done two ways. Congress can act, declaring national forests

as wilderness areas, or the U.S. Forest Service can protect them by administrative decision.

In all of the United States east of the Mississippi River, Congress has declared only three wilderness areas. They are in North Carolina, New Jersey and New Hampshire. Surely Congress should protect some wilderness areas in the mid-Atlantic region, and the Otter Creek basin in West Virginia is a most accessible and suitable candidate. At the very least the Forest Service should protect the area by administrative decision.

The other current threat to Otter Creek is the mining of coal. This requires different action. The underlying minerals are privately owned. These should be acquired by the government and as soon as possible. I would urge that congressional appropriation or other funds be made available.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV.
CHARLESTON, W. VA.

FOUNDATION FOR CONSERVATION- IST OPPOSITION TO DICKEY- LINCOLN

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly gratifying to note that the Appropriations Committee's report on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, H.R. 18127, clearly states:

The water resources programs administered by the agencies funded in this year's appropriation bill reflect a new and added emphasis to be more responsive to the objectives of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

It also states that "the committee has disallowed" all funds requested to resume planning of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project on the upper St. John River in northern Maine, House Report 1219, pages 3, 58.

Notwithstanding, a statement now is being circulated by one of the members urging the House to reject the committee's position on Dickey-Lincoln when H.R. 18127 comes up on the floor of the House. It states:

Conservationists have voiced objection to the project, but their objections are without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague who is making that statement must not have heard my remarks on this floor on Thursday, June 11. I pointed out at that time Dickey-Lincoln is opposed by numerous national and regional conservation organizations, including the Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Audubon Society, Maine Fish and Game Clubs, Massachusetts Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Council of Maine, New England Advisory Board on Fish and Game Problems, Sierra Club, State Biologists Associations of Maine, and Wilderness Society.

The objections of these serious conservation groups are not without foundation, however. The foundation of their opposition is the Federal-State Inter-Agency Committee report on New England water resources, Senate Document 14, 85th Congress. It establishes that Dickey-Lincoln would:

Destroy what that committee reported is the only remaining unspoiled wilderness area in northeastern United States;

Flood out the most vibrant two-thirds, or 70 miles, of the upper St. John River which has provided generations with a caliber of outdoor adventure not found elsewhere in the Eastern United States;

Inflict severe, large, and permanent damage to fish and wildlife; and

Excavate one of the area's most outstanding scenic and recreation attractions, the Deboulie Mountain region—for its granitic rock, concrete aggregate, and select armor stone needed for Dickey Dam, according to the Army Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statement of the interagency report, I also discussed on the floor on Tuesday, June 16, a recent book by naturalist George Laycock entitled "The Diligent Destroyers." That book also highlighted the irreparable damage the Dickey-Lincoln project would cause to the Maine landscape and the ecology of the upper St. John region. I sincerely urge each Member of this body to give serious consideration to whether you will give more credence to the position taken by professional conservationists as to the impact of the Dickey-Lincoln project or whether you will give more credence to one of our own members who has a personal ax to grind.

Mr. Speaker, I and other conservationists commend the committee for again rejecting all funds for Dickey-Lincoln. There are far less destructive ways of producing power. I earnestly urge the House to support the committee position opposing any appropriation for Dickey-Lincoln when H.R. 18127 comes before the House Wednesday afternoon, June 24.

THREE DIED IN MISSISSIPPI: CHANEY, GOODMAN, AND SCHWERNER

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a particularly poignant anniversary which was marked yesterday, and which I rise today to commemorate. Six years ago, on June 21, 1964, I rose in the well of the House to inform the Members that three young men were missing in the State of Mississippi, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Neshoba County.

The news of the days following June 21, revealed the atrocity which had taken place. James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner had been murdered—on American soil, by fellow Americans, in a struggle to secure basic rights for all American citizens.

In some ways, June 21, 1964 seems eons past. The convulsions of events have hurried us on to new crises. But, in the most tragic likenesses, June 21, 1964, is being replicated still. The deaths at Jackson State, the deaths in Augusta, the deaths at Kent State, all attest to the violence which is such ready response to individuals who espouse change, no matter how constructive that change may be.

Let me briefly recall 1964, and the three young men who lost their lives that year. Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner had gone to Mississippi to conduct voter registration drives and to open freedom schools under the auspices of the Council of Federal Organizations, an alliance of several civil rights groups—the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner went to Mississippi with no naive idealism that wishing would make things so. They went there ready and prepared to do the hard and grinding work of helping their black brothers and sisters to gain the rights supposedly guaranteed them by the 14th amendment to the Constitution, 100 years earlier. They were ready and prepared to help the blacks of Mississippi win the reality behind those very simple, but very profound words in the Declaration of Independence—"all men are created equal."

In Mississippi, they, together with James Chaney, a young black man, were murdered. In the most perverse of ironies, these three—two whites and one black—proved by their deaths the very truth their murders sought to deny: they may not have lived the same—and that is America's shame and her guilt—but they did die the same.

We are one.

Six years later, the same truth survives. The four dead at Kent State and the two dead at Jackson State show that we are one, no matter how much some Americans resist and dispute that oneness. This is no solace to those who mourn. Nor is it any satisfaction to those who note the irony. But at least it should be a lesson to those who deny the truth.

Six years later, also, we can look back upon some of the most significant legislation ever to be enacted into Federal law: The Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Civil Rights Act of 1968; even the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for that had not yet been passed by Congress when Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner were murdered.

This sixth anniversary of their deaths falls at a particularly significant time, for last week the House voted to accept the Senate version of the extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It was this act which the three murders helped to spur into creation. It was the three young men's mission of voter registration which this act helped in truly amazing degree to meet. Where Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner led the way into a hostile political environment, Federal registrars and election observers have followed, because of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The results of this legislation have been remarkable. In the seven Southern States which fell under the operative mechanism of the Voting Rights Act's language, 1,122,000 blacks were on the voting rolls in 1965. By the fall of 1969, the total of registered black voters in those States was 2,019,000—an increase

of 897,000 in 4 years. In Mississippi, the State in which Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner were murdered, only 8.3 percent of the eligible black voters were registered to vote in 1965. By the fall of 1969, the figure had risen to 66.5 percent.

Of course, there is much that remains to be done. Hundreds of thousands of blacks still are not registered. Few black officials have been elected. Effective political organization is still rare. But, I think no one can deny the vast importance of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And the tragic deaths of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner at least served to spur the Congress to action to pass this legislation.

Today, 6 years after their death, the extension of the Voting Rights Act awaits Presidential signature. Despite the efforts of the administration to gut this law, and to strip it of its effectiveness, we have been successful in retaining its strength so that the registration of blacks may continue, and so that registered blacks will not be disenfranchised by new and invidious local voting requirements.

And, to that bold civil rights measure, we have added a provision extending the vote to our disenfranchised youth, 18 and older. They have fought our wars; they have paid their taxes; they have abided by the laws of the land which deem them adults. Finally, they are to be accorded the right—a right very long overdue—to have a voice in the political process, so that they may help decide what wars, if any, shall be fought; what taxes shall be levied; and what laws shall rule this land.

In a sense, the actions of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner had a part in this new and historic legislation, as well as in the civil rights legislation which followed their deaths. For they demonstrated, as did thousands of their coworkers, the commitment and dedication to equality and freedom which are perhaps the finest attributes of our youth. They demonstrated what so many young people today are showing—that injustice and inequality and bigotry need not be tolerated. That they are not just the way things are. That change is America's prerogative and her glory.

So, this year, 6 years after June 21, 1964, the anniversary of those deaths in Mississippi is especially meaningful. We are fulfilling the duty three young men left us. Some oppose us. Some dispute us. We do not do enough, nor do we do many things well enough. But James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner goaded the slow to move more quickly, and movement, once begun, seldom stops. Let us press forward toward the fulfillment of the goals for which the three courageous civil rights workers gave their lives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MONTGOMERY (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. HAWKINS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through July 14, on account of official business (Southeast Asia Investigating Committee).

Mr. GAYDOS (at the request of Mr. MOORHEAD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. MCKNEALLY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 22 and June 23, on account of official business.

Mr. ROBISON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

Mr. CLANCY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 14, on account of official business (Select Committee on Southeast Asia).

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. McDONALD of Michigan) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 60 minutes, on June 23.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 15 minutes, on June 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to revise and extend his remarks on the bills called

up by the Committee on Ways and Means today.

Mr. MILLS, to revise and extend his remarks with respect to the bills passed today.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. HOGAN in three instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. DENNIS.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. COLLINS in three instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. AYRES.

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

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. CULVER in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in three instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. GAIAMO in 10 instances.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. FLOWERS in five instances.

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. 3691. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to lower the mandatory retirement age for Foreign Service officers who are career ministers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971, to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 16298. An act to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; and

H.R. 17241. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 23, 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:

2139. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on his disposition of the report of the Tariff Commission on its investigation No. TEA-I-16 under section 301(b)(1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, pursuant to the provisions of section 351(a)(2)(A) of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2140. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 39 of the District of Columbia Code to provide for the pay, allowances, and benefits of the District of Columbia National Guard performing militia duty in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2141. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the showing in the United States of documentary films depicting the careers of General of the Armies John J. Pershing, General of the Army N. H. Arnold, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army George C. Marshall, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., and Gen. Joseph Stillwell; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9311. A bill to declare that certain lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington (Rept. No. 91-1222). 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. ASHLEY (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 18150. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 18151. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18152. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act, to consumers through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in fraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 18153. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,400 beds in the county of the Bronx, New York State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 18154. A bill to provide that the Federal Office Building at 26 Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y., shall be named the "Robert Francis Kennedy Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General from 1961 to 1964 and a Member of the U.S. Senate from the State of New York from 1965 to 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 18155. A bill to amend section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970) to require that airline tickets, with respect to the transportation of persons by air which is subject to Federal tax, show the amount of such tax separately from the cost of the transportation involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 18156. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for persons who interfere with the conduct of judicial proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 18157. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 18158. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. TEAGUE of California):

H.R. 18159. A bill to terminate and to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy to take action with respect to certain leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in the Santa Barbara Channel, offshore of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 18160. A bill to promote the resolution of a labor conflict by regulating the distribution in interstate commerce of table grapes harvested and cultivated by nonunion workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18161. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 18162. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance to the States and localities for comprehensive health planning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18163. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18164. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18165. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18166. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to assist the States in developing a plan for the provision of comprehensive services to persons affected by mental retardation and other developmental disabilities originating in childhood, to assist the States in the provision of such services in accordance with such plan, to assist in the construction of facilities to provide the services needed to carry out such plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 18167. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income up to \$300 per month of scholarships and fellowship grants for which the performance of services is required; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 1268. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of May of each year as "National Foot Health Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1269. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 664. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H. Con. Res. 665. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Res. 1103. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Res. 1104. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H. Res. 1105. Resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the practice of Free Masonry by the city of Florida, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Res. 1106. 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. HANNA:

H. Res. 1107. Resolution extending deepest sympathy to the President and people of Peru in this dark hour of their suffering and distress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. POWELL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr.

REID of New York, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H. Res. 1108. Resolution to declare the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the Federal administration of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H. Res. 1109. Resolution to declare the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the Federal administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18168. A bill for the relief of Leonora Bascos Basconcello and her children, Abelardo Basconcello, Jr., and Maria Lourdes Basconcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18169. A bill for the relief of Giuliano Trettel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 18170. A bill for the relief of Lewis Vandiver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 18171. A bill for the relief of Ruben N. Vitullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

409. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Jedediah Smith, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

514. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chobyu Yara, Chief Executive, Government of the Ryukyu Islands, Naha, Okinawa, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

515. Also, petition of the Association of Chairmen of City, Town, and Village Assemblies in Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

516. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to stopping funds for the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Monday, June 22, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Reverend James E. Rogers, national chaplain, Disabled American Veterans, Columbia, S.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, before whose face the seasons find birth, we gather in this immense temple of freedom to acknowledge the touch of Thy eternal presence.

We speak of infinite time and space; we weigh the sun and saddle its heat, show us the way through the mystic chords of the better angels of our nature, how to drink deep from the living water, for therein is our salvation.

Be this day with those who search for the goblet of peace to lift to the parched lips of a crying humanity. Through Thy holy spirit distill into the cup a wisdom that shall overflow into the cisterns of the heart.

We pray Thee for our beloved country, our President, and our leaders. Share with them the sparkling waters of the good, the true, and the beautiful. And may their devotional love to Thee ever be a reflection of the soul of our country.

We pray through Him that commanded, "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink." For He prescribes it and presides in it, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 19, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit statements to 3 minutes in relation to the transaction of routine morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 10:09 a.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 10:17 a.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON).

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BRUTALITY BY NATIONAL GUARD AT KENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a terrible and absolutely unnecessary and uncalled-for tragedy occurred on the